




A Complete Guide to Digital Monitoring for Multi-Academy Trusts

In this guide:

What is digital monitoring and how can it help your MAT to spot students at risk?



About this guide

This document has been produced to help Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs) understand their obligations around monitoring and how to approach an implementation programme across their schools.

Written by Smoothwall's Online Safety Experts, it answers the key questions organisations like yourselves are raising and shares real case scenarios of monitoring in action.

Essential reading for: Multi-Academy Trust Leaders and any other professionals responsible for ensuring safeguarding compliance within a school cluster.

If you have any questions about digital monitoring and its implementation, please do not hesitate to contact the team at Beeso IT.

They'll be happy to help.

Tel: +44 203 884 2222 (London office)

Email: hello@beesoit.com

You will also be able to find more resources on digital monitoring by visiting Smoothwall's website.

Web: smoothwall.com/education

smoothwall[®]
Part of **family zone**

BEESO IT
Managed Services | Consultancy

Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	3
2.0	Your Statutory Obligations Around Monitoring.....	5
3.0	The Digital Monitoring Challenges MATs Face.....	9
4.0	The Vital Role of Monitoring.....	13
5.0	Providing Evidence for Ofsted.....	20
6.0	How to Ensure Your Schools are Monitoring Appropriately.....	21
7.0	How to Integrate Digital Monitoring into a Busy Safeguarding Strategy.....	25
8.0	Frequently Asked Questions.....	27

Appendices

	Further Reading.....	29
	About Smoothwall.....	30
	Contact Us.....	31



1.0 Introduction

Children's safety online is a growing problem and is one of the reasons why the Department for Education has introduced, and continues to update, its requirements for online safeguarding within schools, including the role of safeguard monitoring.

Monitoring continues to be a key requirement in Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSIE) 2022. Schools are tasked with ensuring the governing bodies and proprietors have 'appropriate filters and monitoring systems in place and regularly review their effectiveness.'

As a Multi-Academy Trust it is your responsibility to ensure the children and young people in your schools are suitably safeguarded, and this includes appropriate monitoring.

Despite this many governing organisations are still unclear about what monitoring actually is, why it's needed and how to approach an implementation. This document addresses all three factors.

If you require further information or have any questions, please contact Beeso IT on **+44 203 884 2222** or email the team at **hello@beesoit.com**. They're happy to help.

You will also be able to find more resources on digital monitoring and digital safeguarding in general by visiting Smoothwall's website at **smoothwall.com/education**.



Child abuse is usually hidden from view. Adults in the child's life may not recognise the signs that they are being abused...the child may be too young, too scared or too ashamed to tell anyone.

NSPCC 2022



2.0 Your Statutory Obligations Around Monitoring

There are a number of legislative and statutory guidelines, including several recent and important changes, that necessitate some form of monitoring within your schools. Below is a summary.

KCSIE 2022

- Schools and colleges in England are obliged to “ensure they have appropriate filters and monitoring systems in place.”
- Monitoring systems are there to safeguard children and the responsibility should lie with the school leadership/ Governors and Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL).
- Schools and colleges should ensure that the leadership team and relevant staff have an awareness and understanding of filters and monitoring provisions in place.
- It is essential that children are safeguarded from potentially harmful and inappropriate online material. An effective whole school and college approach to online safety empowers a school or college to protect and educate pupils, students, and staff.
- There are four areas of risk that MATs, schools and colleges should be aware of which are highlighted as the ‘4Cs.’

Content: Being exposed to content that is illegal or harmful in nature.

Contact: Being subjected to harmful online interaction with other users; for example: peer to peer pressure.

Conduct: Online behaviour that increases the likelihood of, or causes, harm; for example, making, sending and receiving explicit images.

Commerce: Risks such as online gambling, inappropriate advertising, phishing and/or financial scams.

- Schools must have their own safeguarding policy based on their setting and needs. This means identifying the risks most specific to them and showing how they effectively intervene and help students when a problem arises. Even schools within a MAT are now expected to have their own individual policy.
- Schools and colleges should carefully consider how smart mobile technology is managed on their premises and reflect this in their mobile and smart technology policy and their child protection policy.
- Assessments of children should consider whether wider environmental factors are present in a child’s life that are a threat to their safety and/or welfare.

KCSIE 2022 (continued)

- All staff within schools and colleges should be aware of indicators of abuse and neglect, understanding that children can be at risk of harm inside and outside of the school/college and online.
- Schools and college staff should be aware that abuse neglect and safeguarding issues are rarely standalone events and cannot be covered by one definition or one label alone. In most cases multiple issues will overlap one another.
- Children with special educational needs or disabilities (SEND) or certain medical or physical health conditions can face additional safeguarding challenges both online and offline. Governing bodies should ensure their child protection policy reflects the fact that additional barriers can exist when recognising abuse and neglect in this group of children.
- DSLs should understand the risks associated with online safety and be confident they have the relevant knowledge and up to date capability to keep children safe whilst they are online at school.
- Data protection and GDPR should not interfere with the ability to share information relating to safeguarding.

“The Data Protection Act and UK GDPR do not prevent the sharing of information for the purposes of keeping children safe and promoting their welfare. Fears about sharing information must not be allowed to stand in the way of the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children”.

Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018

Communication between institutions and multi-agency safeguarding partners is crucial.

- Clear evidence and a full picture will help the agencies put the right measures in place.
- Schools should provide support as soon as a problem emerges to avoid escalation.
- Local organisations and agencies should have in place effective ways to identify emerging problems as well as potential unmet needs of individual children and families.
- All practitioners should understand their role in identifying emerging problems and share information with other practitioners to support early identification and assessment.

OFSTED

MATs also need to be aware of the increasing importance digital monitoring plays within OFSTED inspections, with guidance specifically provided to support inspectors when visiting schools/colleges.

- Inspectors should consider the extent to which schools in the MAT understand the risks associated with using technology, including social media, bullying, grooming, exploiting, radicalising or abusing children or learners.
- There should be well-developed strategies in place to keep children and learners safe and to support them to develop their own understanding of these risks and in learning how to keep themselves and others safe.
- Inspectors should consider the extent to which, leaders oversee the safe use of technology when children and learners are in their care and take action immediately if they are concerned about bullying or children's well-being.
- Inspectors will look for evidence that leaders of early years settings implement the required policies on the safe use of mobile phones and cameras in settings.
- Inspectors should be able to see evidence of a whole-institution approach to safeguarding. This means ensuring that safeguarding and child protection are at the forefront of, and underpin all relevant aspects of, process and policy development. Ultimately, all systems, processes and policies should operate with the best interests of children and learners at their core.
- Inspectors should consider if there is a robust and proactive response from adults working with children and learners that reduces the risk of harm or actual harm to them. Adults working with them should know and understand the indicators that may suggest that a child, learner or vulnerable adult is suffering or is at risk of suffering abuse, neglect or harm.
- Inspectors should consider the extent to which leaders and managers have put in place effective child protection and staff behaviour policies that are well understood by everyone in the setting. For schools and further education and skills settings, there are also effective policies for tackling bullying, sexual harassment, online sexual abuse and sexual violence between children and learners.

The Prevent Duty 2015

Schools and educational entities should be aware of the increased risk of online radicalisation, as terrorist organisations such as ISIL seek to radicalise young people through the use of social media and the Internet. Schools and childcare providers should have “clear procedures in place for protecting children at risk of radicalisation”.

The Children’s Act 1989 and 2004

“Local authorities in England have overarching responsibility for safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in their area. As part of this, they have a number of statutory functions under the 1989 and 2004 Children Acts, including undertaking assessments of children who are in need or are suffering, or likely to suffer, significant harm in order to determine what services should be provided and what action should be taken.”

The Education Act 2002

Section 157 for academies and independent schools requires governing bodies of maintained schools and further education colleges to ensure they safeguard and promote the welfare of children for all pupils and students under the age of 18.

The UK Safer Internet Centre

This guidance highlights that schools should be led by their own risk assessments when deciding what level monitoring is right for them. Multi-Academy Trusts must help their schools monitor for and protect against:

- **Bullying:** Any behaviour that includes threats, coercion to abuse, intimidation or aggression towards other students.
- **Child sexual exploitation:** Manipulative or coercive behaviour towards a child that encourages them to engage in a sexual relationship, including encouraging to meet.
- **Discrimination:** Any prejudiced or unfair behaviour that defies the Equality Act 2010.
- **Drugs / substance abuse:** Any evidence of drug misuse or promotion of illegal drug use.
- **Extremism:** Content that encourages terrorist or terrorist ideologies, including intolerance or signs of violence.
- **Illegal:** Any content that is illegal. For example, extremist content or child abuse images.
- **Pornography:** Content that includes explicit imagery or sexual acts.
- **Self-harm:** Content that encourages or exhibits deliberate self-harm.
- **Suicide:** Anything that might suggest the user is considering suicide.
- **Violence:** Any threat or sign of physical force intended to hurt or kill.

3.0 The Digital Monitoring Challenges MATs Face

The guidelines focus not just on protecting children from seeing harmful content but on a school's ability to detect and identify risks before they escalate.

As a MAT leader, you want assurance that all students within your trust are free to explore their digital world without fear of abuse or exposure to inappropriate content. Here we explore four key challenges MATs face when it comes to monitoring;

- **Difficult detection**
- **Slow intervention**
- **Time to implement and scalability issues**
- **Meeting statutory obligations**

Difficult detection

Relying on teachers and staff to identify all risks in a classroom setting as well as focus on teaching and pupil attainment isn't feasible. Classes are often large and busy with conflicting demands on the teacher's time and attention. Without the aid of technology, this can make many risks undetectable. For example, a child might type a note to a friend to say he has a knife, and then quickly delete it. Or a registered sex offender studying in a college may search for inappropriate content online.

Both of these examples are true stories that digital monitoring detected within minutes, and so were dealt with appropriately. In the latter case, the individual was removed from the premises by Police within 45 minutes

of typing the content. In normal circumstances neither the DSL nor teacher could have seen these risks. In both cases digital monitoring identified both instances and prevented potentially dangerous situations arising.

Slow intervention

The speed at which risk alerts happen and quick intervention of these risks can be critical to ensure a student's safety. Busy DSLs within the Trust are often dealing with different priorities in addition to safeguarding which means that they are unable to intervene as quickly as they would like. Despite their best efforts to adopt a 'child/student first' approach, time constraints to deal with every safeguarding issue inevitably arise. DSLs also need to understand the context of the safeguarding concern, which may lead to mental depletion and alert fatigue.

Serious incidents can have devastating consequences if not spotted. Digital monitoring helps MATs to overcome this barrier. In 2021, Smoothwall Monitor identified a student at serious risk, every five minutes, which meant rapid intervention could take place. Students that could have otherwise gone unnoticed or noticed too late.

Time to implement and scalability issues

For MAT leaders, implementing a scalable monitoring solution across all schools can sometimes feel like another item on a very long to-do list. There are also often questions around the resources required and if it will create additional workload for staff who are already busy.

The most effective digital monitoring solution should break down this barrier, and provide MATs with a scalable solution that can be easily deployed and has no impact on your MATs computer network. It should also provide a 'Multi-Tenant' or 'MAT-wide' view of schools across the site, with appropriate user policies, to help streamline monitoring provision across the whole Trust.

Meeting statutory obligations

MATs are required to meet Statutory Obligations and provide evidence to Ofsted that effective policies are in place for tackling risks students face across the digital landscape. Bullying, sexual harassment, suicide, child-on-child abuse - sadly, the list goes on.

Without foolproof monitoring, it is difficult to demonstrate MATs are in complete control of early detection and intervention of all these risks. This is where the most effective digital monitoring can help. It gives MATs the ability to clearly show the extent to which; *'leaders oversee the safe use of technology when children and learners are in their care and take action immediately if they are concerned about bullying or children's well-being'* (Ofsted).

Serious Incidents

442 serious incidents reported to Ofsted in 2021-22

Source: Gov.uk

Social Media

4 out of 5 young people say social media platforms make their **feelings of anxiety worse**

Source: Royal Society for Public Health Report

Online Grooming

84% rise in online grooming crimes

Source: NSPCC 2022

Lack of Resource

52% of teachers say their **workload is unmanageable** all or most of the time

Source: NAHT 2022 Survey

Bullying

1 in 5 students experience at least one type of **online bullying behaviour**

Source: Online Bullying Survey 2020

Sexual Abuse

An estimated **1 in 20** children, aged 11-17 have been **sexually abused**

Source: NSPCC Statistics Briefing: Child Sexual Abuse 2021



In 2021, Smoothwall identified a child at serious risk, every five minutes - a 71% increase on the previous year.

Smoothwall Monitor Data Study



The challenges faced (continued)

Relying on the human eye to spot risk is no longer an appropriate means of safeguarding children. Schools are often in the dark as to what is happening with and to their pupils.

The fact is the universe has shifted for today's young people. They do not perceive any difference between their on and offline worlds. In the online world there is no undo button. Incidents outside of school may impact on the environment inside the school and vice versa. From hurtful messages to sharing images, schools can struggle to keep up and are commonly and understandably unaware of the risks in front of them.

Vulnerable, SEN and disabled students are at particular risk. KCSIE reminds schools to always have an *"it could happen here"* approach.

The move into secondary school has been identified as another risk. It's a time when students disregard their previous online safety advice and start to have the mentality 'it won't happen to me'.

With high risk comes the need to detect and react fast, and without a robust digital monitoring solution, MATs are unlikely to meet their legal obligations or duty of care.

The long-term impact if risks are not identified

A report published in April 2022 by the UK Mental Health Policy Commission shows evidence that adverse childhood experiences can lead to mental health issues. Around 50% of mental health conditions are established by the time a child reaches the age of 14, and 75% by age 24. Early intervention through digital monitoring can reduce this significantly.



4.0 The Vital Role of Monitoring

As online dangers continue to increase so does the technology capable of addressing them.

What is digital monitoring?

Digital monitoring is a technology system in which digital devices within schools are constantly monitored to check for signs of risk in children.

Early detection and intervention

Digital monitoring helps to identify students at risk quickly. Serious risks such as a suicide, grooming or a gang meeting can all be picked up in real-time if a child has used their keyboard to view content, message someone, look for information, type out their feelings – even if they delete it immediately or never press 'send' or 'enter'.

It can help you detect problems and respond to issues you were previously unaware of and help individuals who haven't previously been shown to be at risk. For students already at risk you can check for escalation and feedback the evidence to relevant bodies.

Digital monitoring creates a safety-net for teachers who, in a busy classroom, may be unable to see what is happening online.

How it works

There are generally two types of digital monitoring solution available:



Non third-party moderated



Third-party human moderated

Non-third party moderated

When a student or staff member types or views something alarming into a digital device, a screen capture is made by the digital monitoring system. This capture could be of a browser, an email, a Microsoft document, a social media platform or a chatroom. Digital monitoring is not like CCTV that films everything. It only captures the moments where a person has shown risk.

The system will create a risk-grade based on the capture. Schools can see risk alerts easily enabling them to act on severe alerts immediately.

Alerts are logged into a console, in real-time, enabling you to see the details as soon as you log in and decide which alerts need immediate attention and which can be dealt with later.

Lower level alerts are not discarded. In a robust solution, they will be analysed to uncover any concerning patterns and trends.

For example; a child searching online for 'cotton wool' and then later chatting on Facebook Messenger about 'diets' could indicate an eating disorder which, without the system's trend analysis, may go undetected.

Third-party moderated

The other type of digital monitoring is one that is human moderated. In this more advanced solution a capture is made in the same way as before. Artificial Intelligence (AI) then analyses the capture and creates a profile of the alert context. It also removes false positives at this point.

The capture is then sent to a human moderator for analysis. The analyst grades the capture and decides on the severity of the alert. They will also remove any further false positives.

Severe alerts are immediately communicated via phone call, and lesser alerts may be sent in conveniently timed reports. Most providers have a safeguarding portal for you to log in and see the full context of the alert and gather any extra evidence you may require.



Digital monitoring helps to identify students at risk of suicide, grooming, cyberbullying or gang meetings in real-time.



Key differences

Non third-party moderated

- More affordable
- Allows the Multi-Academy Trust to create their own individual setting
- Uses risk grading
- Works offline
- Has a console that makes it easy for safeguarding staff to access and analyse information

Ideal for: The Multi-Academy Trust who wants to run safeguarding as a service for schools.

Third-party human moderated

- AI profiling creates a clear picture of the context of an alert, removing many false positives therefore reducing DSL workload
- A human moderator - a team of experts - will check all of your schools' captures and analyse their priority grade whilst removing any false positives that may have slipped through
- Works offline
- A more time efficient monitoring solution as most false positives will be removed

Ideal for: The Multi-Academy Trust that wishes to ensure their schools have effective safeguarding with human moderation already included, avoiding the need for alert management themselves.

Do you have a question?

Get in touch with Beeso IT. They will be happy to help.

Tel: +44 203 884 2222 (London office)

Email: hello@beesoit.com

You will also be able to find more resources on digital monitoring by visiting Smoothwall's website.

Web: smoothwall.com/education

Illustrative case scenarios

The following cases show how monitoring can help you identify risks. Some of these scenarios are real and where that's the case, the names and details have been changed to protect confidentiality.

Monitoring type: **None in place**

Bobby year 9

Risk type:
Violence to others

1. Bobby brought a knife into school.
2. He messaged one of his peers that he was going 'to get' another pupil.
3. Later that afternoon, Bobby stabbed another pupil.
4. The log was found the next day by the school technician, after painstaking forensic analysis of the computer Bobby was using.

5. If digital monitoring had been used, this risk would have been spotted and the stabbing avoided.

Freddie year 9

Risk type:
Drugs

1. Freddie was working on a shared document with a friend.
2. Freddie quickly typed in "fancy a spliff at break?". The friend agreed and then deleted the words.
3. At break-time, Freddie and his friend met up and smoked cannabis.
4. The use of drugs was discovered several weeks later by a member of the break-time staff.

5. If digital monitoring had been used, this incident would have been spotted and the drug-use avoided.

Jessica year 11

Risk type:
Mental health

1. Jessica was working on a computer in the school library.
2. She typed "how to cope with depression and anxiety" into Google.
3. As her depression worsened she read a forum online about depression and began to cut herself.
4. She covered her arms and legs for weeks to hide her self-harm. It wasn't until her PE class started gymnastics that her teacher noticed the scars.

5. If digital monitoring had been used, this risk could have been spotted and she could have received treatment.



Monitoring type: Non third-party moderated

Emma year 6

Risk type:

Child exploitation - vulnerable student

1. Emma was sat at a school computer during her lunch break.
2. She was sent a threatening email saying that if she didn't meet someone called Richard after school, he would post the photos she sent to him so that everyone could see what she had done (using serious sexual language). She was told "not to tell anyone" about the meeting.
3. The serious sexual language triggered a severe alert.
4. The school DSL picked up the alert. She was able to intervene by asking Emma to come and talk to her.
5. The DSL invited Emma's foster parents into the school and used the support of her social worker and outside agencies to help Emma. Richard was reported to the police and the school were able to give clear evidence of the incident. The monitoring system de-escalated the problem and ensured Emma received the help she needed.

Matthew year 7

Risk type:

Violence

1. Matthew was in a maths lesson where the teacher had set a 20-minute maths consolidation exercise on the computer.
2. While his teacher helped another student on the other side of the classroom, Matthew wrote a note on screen, "I think James brought in a knife".
3. An alert was triggered at this point and sent to the school's DSL. Matthew nudged his best friend to take a look. His best friend saw it but then Matthew's maths teacher called the class to attention. Matthew quickly deleted the note on screen.
4. The school DSL on duty had seen the alert and its severity. Having a full safeguarding picture of the school the DSL knew which James the note was referencing. They de-escalated the situation by implementing the school safeguarding strategy to remove weapons from a student.

Sara year 9

Risk type:

Child-on-child bullying

1. A relationship rift had caused a group of girls to set-up a "we hate Sara Potts" website.
2. The girls posted malicious messages anonymously on the website with cruel comments.
3. Sara told a teacher but didn't know who was doing it.
4. The school added customisation around Sara Potts' name on the website. The DSL received alerts of 5 girls adding to the website within 24 hours and could follow up on the situation.

Monitoring type: **Third-party moderated**

Sabena year 10

Risk type:
Discrimination

1. Sabena had created a video of her classmate Sophie and had placed Sophie's head on a dog's body. Sophie had Marcus Gunn Syndrome.
2. Sabena set-up a website called "*Sophie, the dog*".
3. Sabena's friend Thea accessed the website from her Chromebook and wrote "*yeah Sophie looks good as a bitch*".
4. An alert was triggered and sent to the human moderator.
5. The human moderator assessed the situation and notified the school.
6. The DSL logged into the monitoring console to see the full context.
7. **The DSL was able to immediately implement the school safeguarding policy for this context.**

Mohammed year 11

Risk type:
Suicidal

1. Mohammed typed into Google "*the most pain free way to kill yourself*".
2. Although never pressing Enter, his keystrokes were recorded and an alert was sent to the human moderator.
3. The human moderator could see how Mohammed had previously looked up paracetamol and codeine. They contacted the school's DSL immediately.
4. **The Safeguarding Lead logged into the console, located Mohammed's whereabouts and put together a swift plan to implement the school's safeguarding policy for a child at risk and intervene before it was too late.**

Harry year 5

Risk type:
Self-harm

1. Harry typed into Google "*can i cut my hair myself*".
 2. An alert was raised for self harm because of the word 'cut'.
 3. **AI and human moderation removed this as a false positive.**
- Digital monitoring with a human moderator allows you to act on alerts fast, as well as save time by removing false positives like the one above. A good proactive provider will build individual profiles and learn from past experiences to have a clear understanding of your cohort.**





Identifying students at risk is now the task at hand for schools across the UK. And the good news is that technological advances in safeguarding and digital monitoring make this easier than ever before.



5.0 Providing Evidence for Ofsted

Ofsted will ask your schools or institutions to provide evidence of appropriate monitoring.

A technology based digital monitoring solution will help you and your schools evidence appropriate monitoring in a number of key ways:

- Identify individuals at risk (both obvious and not so obvious), allowing you to intervene early and provide support as required.
- Highlight risks and concerns in real-time giving a comprehensive picture of the risk landscape affecting your schools.
- Demonstrate far reaching effective arrangements to identify children at risk.
- Provide a full evidence-based picture of the safeguarding provision and communicate effectively to outside agencies to ensure those at risk are identified and receive support at the right time.

A high-quality monitoring solution will expand your school's safeguarding provision whilst reducing the number of false positives, supporting and facilitating, not adding to, existing resource requirement. (A human moderated monitoring solution removes false positives almost entirely.)

The reality is you and your schools will not meet your obligations if you remain unaware of troubled students or students at an early stage of risk.

Identifying at risk students is now the task at hand for schools across the UK. And the good news is that technological advances in safeguarding and active monitoring make this easier than ever before.



6.0 How to Ensure Your Schools are Monitoring Appropriately

There are three steps every Multi-Academy Trust can take to ensure their schools are monitoring appropriately.

1. Ask your schools to review their current monitoring practices using the handy matrix below.
2. Assess areas of non or weak compliance to determine the level of monitoring support needed.
3. Define an approach to implementation.

1. Ask your schools to review their current monitoring practices

You should encourage your schools to review whether they are using the most effective solutions to identify students in need.

The matrix below shows government recommended guidelines together with a traffic light system to highlight where, if any, you and your schools' monitoring gaps may be.

	Green	Amber	Red
Policy/set-up			
Monitoring policy	We use an acceptable use policy which is embedded into the culture of our school. We also use it for the purpose of teaching online safety.	We use one acceptable use policy with all students.	We tell students what they should and shouldn't do when accessing the Internet.
Devices	Our system monitors all school devices.	Our system works on all managed devices in schools.	Our system only works on desktop computers / we only use physical monitoring.
Multi-Academy Settings	Our system is fully customisable with a granular configuration that gives access to a full overview of all schools and a singular view for individual schools. And / or we use a human moderator with a singular portal for individual schools to access.	We monitor an overview system but it is not possible for individual schools to see a portal of monitored activity relevant to their individual school.	A granular view is not possible. We need a separate system for each individual school.



Green

Amber

Red

Processes

Prioritisation alert management

Alerts work in real-time and let the DSL react to concerns when needed immediately. They are activated by various sources online and offline.

Alerts are risk-graded but do not show in real-time. Alerts may not occur out of browser. The system may be limited in the way it makes captures.

The DSL must look through a logbook for any issues. There is limited or no prioritisation. We have limited categorisation. A teacher makes a note if they see an incident.

Flexibility

We use intelligent analysis and profiling to gain a full picture of a student's activity. We used added human moderation to ensure only the right risks get through and with the right severity level.

Schools can customise their risk-grading and words to fit the cohort. They can customise by class groups to avoid curriculum captures.

Customisation is not possible and no profiling or AI exists. We only use physical monitoring.

Procedures

Reporting and evidence

We can view a full contextual background in a report. We can analyse peer trends and pupil profiles.

Context is given with screenshots as evidence.

Logbooks take much time in making sure nothing is missed. Limited evidence is given. We have no context. The tutor reports incidents to DSL to note down.

Data storage

We hold data in a guarded off-site setting with robust levels of online protection.

We hold data in a secure setting with good online protection.

We hold data physically on site and have no extra security.

Impact

What is the outcome and impact of your monitoring strategy?

Our alerts are risk assessed in real-time through AI and human moderation. False positives are removed and DSLs only have to react to real alerts.

Our alerts are listed in risk order. This relies on the DSL checking through alerts. Gives text evidence.

We don't act on alerts quickly enough. Evidence is very limited. Teachers may not see misuse or risks as children are good at concealing screens.

Suitable for

Size of institution / staff / student ratio

Our monitoring provision is suitable for clusters of schools looking to have effective granular controls over their monitoring arrangements.

Our monitoring provision is suitable for settings in which schools do not require their own access to evidence trends and are happy with reports created.

Our provision is not suitable for Multi-Academy Trusts.

Restrictions

Any limitations

Not controlled completely within individual schools.

Will take more time in removing false positives and may not give enough evidence for disciplinarys.

We have hundreds of students. We manually check log files or watch over the shoulder of students. We don't always understand the logs.



A good monitoring solution will not invade privacy. It will pick up risk concerns that should be identified, as outlined by KCSIE guidelines.



2. Assess areas of non or weak compliance to determine level of monitoring support needed

The result of the review will determine your next step. If your schools' predominantly report greens then your need for further action will be low.

If your assessment reveals varying levels of provision you may consider recommending a technology-based monitoring solution to individual schools who need it most.

If your assessment reports predominantly ambers or reds, you may wish to implement school-wide monitoring as a means of raising standards to a more appropriate level and quickly.

3. Define approach to implementation

Smoothwall's monitoring solution can be deployed within a single school or set up to monitor multiple groups of schools from a central point, sometimes referred to as a 'Multi-Tenant View.' MATs can access alerts to specific groups, individual sites, or top level information about all sites depending upon the requirement.

Digital monitoring

Digital monitoring systems rely on a dedicated DSL within the school or governing body to monitor alerts raised by the system. If your preference is to monitor multiple schools then settings can be customised to give individual schools access to the customer portal to see their own captures, while an overall monitor within your governing body keeps an eye on all schools.

Human-moderated digital monitoring

If within your schools or governing organisation you have none or limited staff to monitor alerts, you may wish to consider a human moderated option. In this option a third-party team monitors all of your schools and alerts their DSL of risk or incidents. This set-up would help with workload efficiency as it reduces the number of false positives.



7.0 How to Integrate Digital Monitoring into a Busy Safeguarding Strategy

Whether you are looking to procure a digital monitoring solution to centrally manage all of your schools or looking to assist each school individually, the following checks will help you find the right one and ensure a smooth implementation.

Integrating with your safeguarding processes

- Will the monitoring solution fit into your schools' processes for identifying students at risk?
- Will it be easily accessible to the DSL, so that they can determine levels of risk quickly and efficiently without missing major concerns?
- Check the solution's features will effectively risk grade and categorise the type of risk your processes have flagged.
- Does the solution allow your schools to react quickly to concerns? Ask how long it takes for an alert to take place and whether it functions in real-time.
- Does the solution have the right set-up for supporting multiple schools at once?
- Does it include online and offline captures for browsers, email, Microsoft documents and chatrooms? Alerts are just as likely to come in a Word document as they are

from the more obvious chat room or email. Not having this level of reach will impact on your schools' ability to spot risks.

- Ensure your system monitors multiple languages if needed.

Integrating with your safeguarding policies

- Will the monitoring solution help pick up signs of issues from various contexts whether it be a third-party contacting by email or webchat, or peer to peer digital communication?
- Will it give you a better understanding of risks that may not involve time in school or at home?
- A good monitoring solution will not invade privacy. It will pick up risk concerns that should be identified, as outlined by KCSIE guidelines.
- If you are looking to manage centrally can it provide easy customisation so that your schools can manage risks local to their needs?

- Check that you are aware of how long data will be stored and whether it is kept in a secure setting.
- Ask where support and development for the solution will take place. Check it is within a country deemed to have adequate data protection.
- Check that you are aware of how long your data will be stored and whether it is kept in a secure setting.

Integrating with your safeguarding procedures

Once a pupil at risk has been identified check that your monitoring solution supports the procedures that follow.

- Does it provide evidence and detail to share with parents or outside safeguarding bodies?
- Does it give context around a capture to enable understanding of the full picture?
- Is it age appropriate? Check that it allows for different levels and content settings dependent on your year groups and curriculum sets. This will help in prioritising your alerts and avoiding false captures.

Integrating with existing safeguarding policies

- Will the monitoring solution help pick up signs of issues from various contexts whether it be a third-party contacting by email or webchat, or peer to peer digital communication?
- Will it give you a better understanding of risks that may not involve time in school or at home?
- A good monitoring solution will not invade privacy. It will pick up risk concerns that should be identified, as outlined by KCSIE guidelines.
- If you are looking to manage centrally can it provide easy customisation so that your schools can manage risks local to their needs?
- Check that you are aware of how long data will be stored and whether it is kept in a secure setting.



8.0 Frequently Asked Questions

How much should we expect to pay for monitoring?

Digital monitoring solutions range in price depending on the number of schools, the quality and range of monitoring, whether it is real-time risk grading, moderated by humans or AI, and other factors.

How are other Multi-Academy Trusts budgeting for this?

Sources of budget can vary by institution. Multi-Academy Trusts might want to use school budgets from their safeguarding, general, or computer software funds.

Smoothwall have written a document to help prepare a case for funding. You can download it at

<https://smoothwall.com/how-to-create-a-case-for-funding>

How can we use digital monitoring within the Data Protection Act 2018 and GDPR?

Monitoring is not affected by Data Protection Act and GDPR. KCSIE 2022 states:

“The Data Protection Act 2018 and GDPR do not prevent, or limit, the sharing of information for the purposes of keeping children safe. Fears about sharing information must not be allowed to stand in the way of the need to promote the welfare and protect the safety of children.”

How do we know that a monitoring system will store our MAT data securely?

You will need to ensure the safety of your sensitive data. Vendors should be able to show evidence of where your data is stored. At Smoothwall, data privacy is a top priority and data is stored in a secure Microsoft Azure data centre. Smoothwall employees are all DBS checked, even those who don't visit schools.

How can we check the impact a monitoring solution might have on our schools' IT systems?

You should check with your vendor that their software is discreet and that you have the necessary capacity required to run it on your schools' networks. Smoothwall's monitoring solution has no discernible impact on performance and work silently in the background. A user will not be aware that monitoring is taking place or that a capture has been taken.

What's involved in implementing a monitoring solution?

Installation can be different depending on the vendor. Ask if there is a requirement for staff to have specific technical knowledge and if the system is cloud based. At Smoothwall, installation is simple and straight forward with no technical knowledge required. Smoothwall support can guide Multi-Academy Trusts on the best way to set up a centralised place for their monitoring or create a different approach by signing schools up for human moderated monitoring.

Our schools already have web filtering, why do they need monitoring as well?

Filtering blocks content to prevent it being seen and accessed by students. It is essential. But it cannot monitor what a child types into their device. Most filtering systems do not send alerts in real-time enabling you to act upon them quickly. Monitoring and filtering work hand in hand to provide you with a robust digital safeguarding capability that helps you keep children safe and meet Ofsted's requirements.

Our schools are overstretched as it is. Won't monitoring add more safety concerns to address?

All schools must keep their pupils safe online and should actively look for risks. You will find a choice of solutions that vary in need for resources from your individual schools. If you are managing the service for them, or if you suggest a human-moderated version, you will significantly reduce the need for staff time spent on it in individual schools.

Will monitoring make unnecessary captures by topics used in the curriculum?

In some solutions, customisation is available to manage your risk settings so that you can remove key topics for specific classes. However, in doing this you should be careful not to remove content that might need to be there. Every school has different needs which is why a good monitoring system will vary and have flexible settings tailored to the needs of each of your schools.

Is monitoring scalable for larger institutions?

Early solutions were beset by scalability issues, putting many people off digital monitoring, however Smoothwall are one of a few exceptions. Smoothwall Monitor can monitor multiple schools simultaneously. It's easily scalable due to its minimum impact on networks, cloud-based portal, its easy installation and automatic updates.

Do you have a question?

Get in touch with Beeso IT. They'll be happy to help.

Tel: +44 203 884 2222 (London office)

Email: hello@beesoit.com

You will also be able to find more resources on digital monitoring by visiting Smoothwall's website.

Web: smoothwall.com/education



Appendices

Further reading

You can also go to Smoothwall.com to download:



Safeguard Monitoring: How to Prepare Your Case for Funding

A step by step guide for DSLs, Head Teachers, Principals and anyone responsible for ensuring a compliant digital monitoring provision within their School.


Available at: <https://smoothwall.com/how-to-create-a-case-for-funding>



How to Scale Filtering and Monitoring for MATs

A practical guide around how to scale safeguard technologies and how to do it cost-effectively within Multi-Academy Trusts.

Available at: <https://www.smoothwall.com/education/tech-resource-hub/articles/how-to-scale-digital-safeguarding-technology-across-your-mat/>



Smoothwall Monitor Q&A

Produced by Smoothwall's Online Safeguarding Experts to help DSLs to better understand digital monitoring and decide whether it should be a part of their school safeguarding provision.

Available at: <https://resources.smoothwall.com/hubfs/Digital-Monitoring-Q&A-for-DSLs.pdf>

About Smoothwall

Smoothwall is the leading digital safeguarding solutions provider in UK Education. 12,000 schools, colleges and academies depend on our filtering and monitoring technologies to keep their students safe and their education organisations compliant.

From our humble beginnings in 2000 we have been dedicated to empowering educational organisations to digitally safeguard the young people in their care. Our solutions are innovative and pioneering and developed from the ground up to meet and exceed the legislative requirements set out by the Department for Education, as outlined in the Prevent duty and Keeping Children Safe in Education.

Digital safeguarding solutions were historically seen as security products to be selected, deployed and managed by a school/college's ICT department. And while the ownership remains generally true, the meteoric rise in the use of the internet as a vital tool for learning has firmly placed digital safeguarding on the agenda of most educational stakeholders.

Web filters today are not tools for blocking content. They are a means of improving learning outcomes by enabling students to freely access rich internet content, protected by granular filtering, controls and alerts to ensure any risks and safeguarding issues are quickly and accurately identified. Schools/colleges favour Smoothwall because of our understanding of this core concept and our pioneering solutions that support it.

Where Smoothwall Filter dynamically analyses content and intelligently blocks harmful content, Smoothwall Monitor is installed onto the school/college's computers where it analyses on-screen content and any keystrokes made.

Words or phrases indicating the user may be at risk of harming or being harmed are captured in a screen shot and sent to the DSL for analysis (or the Smoothwall team if it's a managed service). Behavioural profiling by monitoring words over time provides an added level of vigilance to enable an early stage help intervention.

As digital learning becomes more commonplace in the classroom, so does safeguarding issues such as mental health, cyberbullying, radicalisation, child sexual exploitation and others. The demands placed on the physical eyes and ears of teachers far exceed their ability to identify all but the most obvious risks, and puts the organisation at odds with both student needs and statutory guidelines.

Smoothwall's robust filtering and monitoring provision work in tandem to keep your young people safe and your organisation compliant with the legislation, guidelines and recommendations placed upon it.

Our partners

Smoothwall are members of the Internet Watch Foundation (IWF) and implement the Child Abuse Image Content list of domains and URLs. Smoothwall also implements the police assessed list of unlawful terrorist content, produced on behalf of the Home Office.

Smoothwall exclusively partners with National Online Safety to offer customers their award-winning e-safety training for the whole school community. We also partner with EduGeek and regularly consult Headteachers, Teachers, DSLs, IT leaders and a range of supporting bodies across UK Education.



Contact us

Ask yourself

Are you confident that all of your schools are monitoring effectively, keeping their children safe in real-time, and fulfilling the requirements set out in KCSIE and Ofsted's inspection guidance?

If you don't know, it's time to check. If you're unsure or have a question, contact our Online Safety Experts who will be happy to help.

Arrange a free demonstration


To see a free, no-obligation demonstration of Smoothwall Monitor or to ask any questions please contact **Beeso IT**.

Tel: +44 203 884 2222

Email: hello@beesoit.com

beesoit.com | smoothwall.com





Smoothwall

Second Floor
2 Whitehall Quay
Leeds
LS1 4HR

Tel: 44 (0) 800 047 8191

Email: enquiries@smoothwall.com

smoothwall.com

 [Smoothwall](#)

 [Smoothwall](#)

 [Smoothwall-ltd](#)

 [SmoothwallTV](#)

Beeso IT

52 Tabernacle Street
London
EC2A 6NJ

Tel: +44 203 884 2222

Email: hello@beesoit.com

beesoit.com

 [BeesoIT](#)

 [Beeso IT Limited](#)

© Smoothwall Ltd. This document is the copyright work of Smoothwall Ltd and may not be reproduced (in whole or in part, in any form or by any means whatever) without its prior written permission. The copyright notices and trademarks on this document may not be removed or amended without the prior written consent of Smoothwall Ltd.