

# Online Child Sexual Victimisation Demonstration Project Report

September 2025

Dr Sarah Carlick (MeSafe) and Sam Clewarth (Violence Reduction Partnership)

*The support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is gratefully acknowledged. Grant reference number: ES/W002248/1.*

## Online Child Sexual Victimisation Demonstration Project

### Background:

Online child sexual victimisation (OCSV) presents a growing challenge for police, partner services, parents and children. Prevention efforts are trailing behind technology development and offender practices. Online prevention efforts have failed to stem the growth of child sexual abuse media (CSAM), and urgent action is needed to prevent CSAM from being created and harming children and young people at a local level. This requires focused multi-agency and community informed commitment.

The ESRC Vulnerability & Policing Futures Research Centre has co-produced a Quality Standards framework in Blackpool involving all relevant services and local community members, including workshops with children, with the aim of strengthening existing responses to OCSV ([May-Chahal, C et al., 2024](#)). These quality standards required testing to establish transferability and needs in other areas, which led to the Centre funding a 'demonstration project' to be undertaken in West Yorkshire to do this.

### What we did:

Our objective was to test the quality standards that were identified during the aforementioned project in West Yorkshire and understand how these standards could improve and support responses to OCSV. The intended outcomes and impacts from this piece of work have been formalised into a Theory of Change, which can be found in Appendix 1.

Dr Sarah Carlick, an independent subject expert, was commissioned to deliver the work, with the West Yorkshire Violence Reduction Partnership providing support in convening partners across the region to contribute to this project.

Once we had confidence that there was appetite for work to be done in the region, several workshop sessions were held with colleagues in West Yorkshire to test and shape how these standards could be taken forward in some capacity within a West Yorkshire context, culminating in a final project event held in Leeds in March 2025. The quality standards that were being tested are set out in what follows:

Quality Standard	Selected Statement
<b>Knowledge and Understanding (QS1)</b>	Children, young people, parents and services and businesses co-produce consistent messaging about online safety, sources of support and recording mechanisms across organisations and stakeholders
<b>Child-led (QS2)</b>	Children and young people's needs are listened to when responding to Online Child Sexual Victimization to inform support and agency response. Children and young people inform and co-produce online safety curriculum and may deliver parts of it.
<b>Public Awareness (QS3)</b>	A community wide co-produced public engagement strategy, which highlights the opportunities and dangers of the online world in relation to OCSV whilst taking children's viewpoints on board that there needs to be more openness and discuss about children's online world and behaviour in families.
<b>Multi-agency Response (QS4)</b>	Co-produced needs assessments and safeguarding procedures are aligned across services and organisations. All needs assessments reflect the importance of assessing children's and families' engagement with the online world. There are clear feedback loops between services about cases and trends that can inform responses to OCSV. Response to OCSV is recorded and can be shared with others so that patterns can be identified across services over time.
<b>Support Interventions (QS5)</b>	There is co-produced, long-term non-judgemental and trauma informed support for children who are experiencing OCSV and their families that reflects sensitivity to gender, sexuality, culture, race, ability and maturity.

During the approximate five-month duration of this project, over 50 representatives from local youth organisations, police, social care, children's safeguarding partnerships, health, local authority and education were engaged through a combination of in-person and virtual workshops and the final project event.

This report will collate the work that has been developed on each of these standards throughout the duration of this project.

## Findings:

### Quality Standard 1 - Knowledge and Understanding (QS1)

Prior to discussing the outputs that were developed in relation to this quality standard, we established baseline levels of confidence around knowledge and understanding of digital spaces, associated harms and OCSV. We asked colleagues to rate their confidence on a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the most confident, on the following three questions to baseline their confidence:

1. How confident are you of the workforce understanding the digital space and OCSV within West Yorkshire?
  - The average response (n=31) to this question was **4.7** out of 10, with the modal response being 5 (n=11), followed by 4 (n=6) and 6 (n=3), suggesting most people had a moderate level of confidence understanding of the digital space.
2. How confident are you in being able to respond to harms associated within the digital space or OCSV?
  - The average response (n=31) to this question was **5** out of 10.
  - These responses were far more varied, which suggests there may be some disparity in levels of confidence when needing to respond to harms.
3. How confident are you that you know how to access training on OCSV?
  - The average response (n=29) to this question was **4** out of 10. The modal response was 2 (n=7).
  - 35% of respondents (10) scored above a neutral or moderate level of confidence for knowing how to access training on OCSV, indicating that more awareness is needed on how to find training.

From the engagement on this quality standard, it was proposed that a 'Technology Alliance' should be set up that could encompass all quality standards. As visualised in the following table, terms of reference were collated which provides a suggested remit and activities that the Alliance could be responsible for. It also discusses suggested scheduling, ownership, resources and membership.

**Technology: Safety, Trust and Relationships Alliance**  
(based on the OCSV quality standards)

<b>Proposed Terms of Reference:</b>
-------------------------------------

- Ensure there is community engagement, and all partners provide consistent messaging on the subject.
- Compliment work that is already being carried out, avoiding any duplication.
- Leads consistent messaging of public awareness campaigns.
- Honours professional respect across all bodies, organisations and agencies.
- Recognises that technology is forever changing and evolving.
- Interchangeable between the off/online spaces (treat them with equal importance).
- Commitment to being child led.
- Offer organisations and practitioners self-evaluation tool(s).
- Supports Technology Champions.
- Supports the mapping of services and resources.
- Championing and up-skilling the workforce by offering good training and promoting training opportunities

<b>Proposed Chair:</b> Safeguarding Children Partnership Board's Business Managers (5x rotated)
---

**Schedule of meetings:** Online Quarterly

**Membership:** Technology Champions

**Resources:** Hosted on Safeguarding Children Partnership Board's Website

At the project event, we asked attendees to respond in one word “why do you think West Yorkshire would benefit from committing to a Technology Alliance?”. 36 attendees contributed, with the most common responses citing the benefits and importance of ‘collaboration’ and ‘consistency’. The benefits to safety, safeguarding, knowledge and improving protection were also covered, with all responses visualised in the following word-cloud.



We also asked, “What do you think the subject matters or topics are that the Technology Alliance should cover?”. Various topics were suggested, with a common focus on the importance of increasing understanding and awareness of these issues, as well as a focus on safeguarding.



## Technology Champions

In the workshops, a proposed ‘champions model’ was discussed as something that would be beneficial to embed within organisations. In principle, these would be similar to other ‘champion’ roles that organisations may have, such as wellbeing champions, mental health champions and inclusivity champions etc, acting as an advocate for positive change, education and action relating to technology-based harms and safety.

From the workshop sessions held throughout the project, a role description was developed for a ‘Technology Champion’ that details what the remit and responsibilities of a champion could entail.

## West Yorkshire Technology Champion

### Role Description:

- Signpost to resources and services at a local level across the five districts
- Share and signpost to any campaign resources
- Promote the use of the technology self-evaluation tool
- Keep trust, safety and relationships around technology on agendas and in conversations
- Provide information on the subject topic with their local Children's Partnership Boards
- Attend quarterly online Technology Alliance meetings
- Share knowledge and information from the West Yorkshire Technology Alliance in your teams and organisation
- Lead on sharing advice and guidance
- Be child first in trauma informed in your approach
- Act as an educator on the subject topic
- Respond to training needs and have knowledge of availability of training and support available

To build on this and to help define the remit of a technology champion, we asked colleagues to create a list of the topics and subject areas that a technology champion should know about. Responses were split between specific areas of need and the approaches which champions should take.

**Approaches:** Champions should be able to recognise, report and respond to harms. Responses highlighted the importance of showing professional curiosity, critical thinking, making use of what is already out there, and having consistency when it comes to language used. Listening to children and involving children's voices was also seen as important.

**Areas and Topics:** Suggested subjects included understanding vulnerabilities and safe experiences online, digital inclusion, and sharing of images. Colleagues also noted the importance of empowering both parents and communities, as well as highlighting a potential area of risk around those children who are not in education or are electively home educated.

We also asked why (if at all) it would be beneficial to have a technology champion. These have been grouped under the following themes:

**Collaboration:** Many responses cited the benefits of working in collaboration, which would allow for the sharing of knowledge, best practice and intelligence across agencies. It was noted that it would also encourage a shared understanding and a common language, enabling consistency in approaches and responses. This collaboration could potentially reach parents and carers too, i.e. through development of a forum that allows parents to seek guidance and information.

**Accountability:** Some responses noted that having a champion would ensure accountability and responsibility regarding the topic and in turn raising the profile of the subject within the organisations.

**Knowledge and Improvements in Response:** Many noted how this role could support in developing confidence and understanding around the subject and in doing so strengthen



organisational responses relating to this subject. Some highlighted this could be achieved initially through training and development, mentioning key areas of knowledge such as laws and legislation and understanding differences between disinformation and misinformation. This learning should also be continuous, given the evolving nature of technology and associated harms. Linking back to collaboration, it was noted that the champion could then cascade this knowledge within their organisation to build staff confidence, skills and expertise, and improve responses such as reporting, not missing safeguarding opportunities and having the confidence to speak to someone about it.

**Process** – Responses noted the benefits of organisations having a single point of contact that staff members can refer to for support. Clarity in communicating ‘who’ their organisation’s technology champions would be key to this. It was noted in the follow-on discussion that some kind of framework would need to be developed too for champions.

### Quality Standard 2 – Child Led (QS2)

The second quality standard focused on the need for children and young people’s voices to be listened to when responding to OCSV and digital harm. This project sought to understand what was already happening in West Yorkshire and how we could most effectively engage with children on this topic. From the workshops, a range of work was identified as being done in West Yorkshire which captures the voice of children and young people in the region. Notably, Mayor of West Yorkshire Tracy Brabin made a ‘Child First’ approach one of her key manifesto pledges and a ‘[Child First Framework](#)’ has been developed that aims to place children at the heart of decision making on local services and issues, in addition to a ‘Child First Network’, guided by this framework, to share good practice and support colleagues to be able to amplify and involve the voices of children in their work.

<p><b>Child Led Co-Production Group(s)</b></p> <p><i>Should ensure there is representation from seldom-heard communities</i></p> <p><i>Flexible Model – Formal and informal approaches</i></p>
<p><b>Existing Practice and Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West Yorkshire Child First Framework</li> <li>• West Yorkshire Youth Commission ‘Big Conversation’ Report</li> <li>• My Schools Surveys</li> <li>• Youth Councils</li> <li>• Local Children’s Voice Group</li> <li>• Young People Action Group includes children in an age-appropriate way</li> <li>• Building Futures Groups – across children and young people services</li> <li>• Youth Clubs and Charity Groups</li> <li>• Police Connects Programme</li> <li>• Voice of the Child Influencer</li> <li>• Cyber Youth Survey in schools across West Yorkshire – survey consulted on with children and feeds into Southwest Grid for Learning</li> <li>• In education and youth work sectors, there is informal and non-informal work taking place that feeds into the Yorkshire SEND Alliance around digital issues and exploitation of young people with disabilities</li> <li>• Pol-ed content used in schools</li> </ul>



Discussions from the workshops also emphasised the importance of capturing a diverse range of voices through engagement, such as from seldom-heard communities, neurodivergent, LGBTQ+ and looked after children. The need to be flexible in engagement was also drawn out through conversations, with both formal and informal approaches potentially having value when employed in the appropriate context.

As such, an activity was completed at the event to understand how we should involve children and young people in decisions around technology in a formal and informal manner. Specifically, we asked how children could be involved in varying projects and forums that were linked to the quality standards being assessed:

**The technology alliance (QS1)** – colleagues recognised the importance of understanding from a child's perspective and suggested children should have involvement in early stages and have representation where appropriate. The development of voice of the child needs assessment was also suggested.

**Safety Curriculum (QS2)** – responses identified the need to co-produce this with children to allow them to create content that reflects the language they would use and allow them to inform us as to what makes them feel safe. Various methods were suggested to do this, including establishing 'digital leaders' in schools and using student councils to drive progress forward. Some suggested it could be done through informal arts-based approaches, including drama, music and rap, whereas others suggested the use of surveys and focus groups too. Other suggestions included were quizzes, informal debate clubs and audience interaction tools, such as Menti. A tier-based support structure was suggested, offering both a universal response and more targeted action and it was asked at what age education needs to be from in schools.

---

*“Get children/young people to educate us/families”*

---

**Campaigns (QS3)** – responses noted meaningful involvement being essential and suggested engagement could be done in schools and clubs, which could include focus groups with young people. It was suggested that collaborating with colleges and media schools would be effective, such as Leeds Trinity University which has students in media and digital marketing. Regarding the content, the use of true stories and cautionary tales were put forward as ideas.

**Self-Evaluation Tools (QS4)** – The need to adapt approaches was highlighted depending on the different needs of children and young people. Conversations with children should be done where they feel comfortable and having a relationship with them may help to get more information. In addition, the language of these tools could be adapted to be more child friendly. As means of engagement, child focus groups and online platforms were suggested as ways of gathering information.

**Knowing what support is available – developing a directory (QS5)** – the response to this noted that having a wide ranging, diverse, inclusive and representative group of children and young people was essential. There would also be a need for age related peer support, so that content is relatable and is in the correct format for the intended audience. A directory of information for children should be co-produced with children.

### Quality Standard 3 – Public Awareness – Campaigns (QS3)

This standard focussed on how to develop a community wide co-produced public engagement strategy, which highlights the opportunities and dangers of the online world in relation to OCSV, whilst taking children's viewpoints on board that there needs to be more openness and discussion about children's online experience and behaviour in families.

Throughout engagement, two campaign focuses were determined; one targeted towards children and young people and the other aimed at parents, carers and adults.

**Children and Young People:** The focus of this campaign should be to encourage children to tell someone if they are being blackmailed, with clear advice on how to tell a trusted adult if you've sent an image, understanding what is stopping them and reinforcing the message that you will 'not be in trouble'.

**Parents, carers and adults:** The focus of this campaign should be on understanding and educating on the methods used by perpetrators. It should encourage an 'ongoing' conversation with your children or the children you work with, not a one off, and empower children and young people to speak to us on the topic, absent of any shame or blame. It was also suggested that any campaign should seek to provide education on social media security on devices.

Varied methods of promoting a campaign were suggested that could be tailored to the intended audience. Promoting on social media platforms such as TikTok, Instagram, Snapchat and Facebook were all seen as effective ways to reach children and adults when considering the varying audiences of each platform. Using an influencer in these campaigns was also seen as a viable way to boost engagement, particularly for children and young people. Again, with a focus on children and young people, workshop attendees felt that there was value in ensuring a campaign is promoted where children and young people visit. As such, suggestions involved featuring posters in bus/train stations, inside toilet doors at school and in shop changing rooms. Using billboards and digital advertising boards were also put forward as ideas. Potential engagement opportunities included youth clubs, community groups, business, comms experts and detached youth work.

Other key themes covered in the workshop are referenced in the table below. To note a few, the importance of not reinventing the wheel and saving costs were mentioned, either through understanding and using existing campaign material or by joining up and collaborating on developing one. It's crucial to understand what organisations have already tried and tested to better understand what works, as well as mapping an understanding of what other work or campaigns may be on the horizon.

## Awareness Campaigns

Children and Young People	Parents / Adults / Carers
<b>Campaign focus:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tell someone if you are being blackmailed.</li> <li>- How do you tell a trusted adult if you have already sent the image? What is stopping you?</li> <li>- Reinforce children and young people are 'not in trouble'.</li> </ul>	<b>Campaign focus:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Understanding the methods used by perpetrators.</li> <li>- It is an ongoing conversation, not a one-off.</li> <li>- Empower children &amp; young people to speak to us, with no shame or blame.</li> <li>- Educate on social media security on devices.</li> <li>- Direct and strong messaging.</li> </ul>
<b>Methods/Mediums:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social Media – TikTok, Instagram, Snapchat, Facebook                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Be child led and co-produced</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Buses / Bus Stations / Train Stations</li> <li>- Billboards – Digital Advertising Boards</li> <li>- Inside toilet doors (schools)</li> <li>- Shop changing rooms</li> <li>- Use of an influencer</li> </ul> <p><i>Resources hosted at a central point</i></p>	<b>Engagement opportunities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Youth clubs, scouts, brownies, guides, dance groups</li> <li>- British Transport Police</li> <li>- Grassroots community groups</li> <li>- Community Safety Partnership</li> <li>- Leeds BACIL, businesses in the city centre – shops, fast-food, supermarkets etc.</li> <li>- Detached youth service</li> <li>- Engage with the West Yorkshire Communication Groups</li> </ul>
<b>Other considerations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Simple Message i.e. like Ask for Angela, Report Remove it campaign</li> <li>- Don't reinvent the wheel</li> <li>- Universal, targeted &amp; specific</li> <li>- Link in with PSHE curriculum lessons</li> <li>- Work with organisations that have already tried and tested campaigns or can advise on what work has been done or is about to be done re campaigns</li> <li>- Messaging could be forceful and relentless</li> <li>- Address why children do not report when it comes to intimate images</li> <li>- It should change people's understanding of what the issue is</li> <li>- Acknowledge the generational ages and gaps between children and parents / carers</li> <li>- Can we join up a campaign/use what exists? Would be more cost-effective</li> </ul>	

## Quality Standard 4 – Multi-agency response: Online Self-Evaluation Tool (QS4)

The vision of this standard is for co-produced needs assessments and safeguarding procedures to be aligned across services and organisations, with these needs assessments reflecting the importance of assessing children's and families' engagement with the online world. There should be clear feedback loops between services about cases and trends that can inform responses to OCSV and any response to OCSV should be recorded and shared with others so that patterns can be identified across services over time.

To achieve this, our project looked at the potential of developing an Online Self-Evaluation tool. One model was suggested across West Yorkshire, where the analysis and learning coming out of these tools being shared on a bi-annual basis back to the proposed Technology Alliance to inform improvements in processes and practice. The proposed evaluation tool would need to be designed in a way that has use at both a practitioner and an organisational level. As discussed in the following table, any tool should avoid creating and duplicating work unnecessarily and should be combined with other tools, reviews or audits. If creating a new tool, consideration would need to be given as to how these align or could be embedded with other local or national reviews. Existing tools, such as the Section 11 Audit, could also provide a template for how a 'technology' audit could be set up.

<b>Online Self-Evaluation Tool</b> <i>(Biannually across five districts led by the SCPBs)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Goes back to the Alliance Board for analysis / trends</li> <li>- Good for those with little training or no formal qualification</li> <li>- One model across West Yorkshire</li> </ul>	
<b>Practitioner Level</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessments could be built into single agency safeguarding procedures.</li> <li>- Offers questions, education, capture and respond effectively.</li> <li>- Guidance documents on what <b>good</b> looks like with examples provided.</li> <li>- To include an outline for practice regarding professional respect across professionals – i.e. within youth work there can be barriers to information sharing and gathering intelligence, as it was reported that some people think one professional knows more about the child. Youth workers work with non-attendance out of office hours and have an availability to have different conversations with young people.</li> </ul>	<b>Organisational Level (policy)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Needs to contain OCSV and guidance documents on what good looks like, with examples provided.</li> <li>- Must compliment and not duplicate work. Could be combined with other tools, reviews or audits.</li> <li>- What would these evaluation tools be covering and how do they align or embed within other local or national reviews (i.e. National Child Abuse Review Assurances).</li> <li>- A 'technology audit' could be accessed and set up in the same way as the Section 11 Audit.</li> </ul>

The project event was used as a forum to dive deeper into what a technology self-evaluation tool would look like for practitioners and organisations, and how this could be embedded into existing practice. Feedback from the groups also suggested alternative language for the tool, suggesting that **reflection** would be more appropriate of a term than **evaluation** in this case.

## **What would you include in a technology self-evaluation tool for practitioners?**

A form of skills audit, structured assessment and knowledge check would be valuable to be embedded in such a tool. As an example, knowledge of the types of online platform being used by children could be tested, which would support in being more agile to new, regular developments in the digital landscape. Where there may be knowledge gaps, responses recognised the value of having sight of good and bad practice for their reflection and learning, as well as signposting to other CPD opportunities.

The following questions were created by colleagues during the event that could be considered when developing a tool:

- Asking a practitioner's experience of responding to OCSV/A. Have they dealt with it before? How common/uncommon?
- Have you had any training on the topics of OCSV/A?
- Is OSCV/A being reported? How would you report it in your organisation?
- Are you able to look after yourself, your wellbeing in this area? Do you have internal support?
- What are your training needs?
- How do you/do you record safeguarding incidents around OSCV/A? Do you capture any data?

Lastly, it was discussed that any tool will need to be simple and relatively quick, especially when considering existing competing demands and workloads and consideration needs.

## **What would you include in a technology self-evaluation tool for organisations?**

Training needs were mentioned consistently as something that would be invaluable to capture for organisations, as well as continued personal development and self-reflection while giving thought to how that will influence the wider organisation. The tool should support organisation wide evaluation to encourage improvement, including benchmarks and potential action plans for future prevention, as well as providing evidence-led feedback to any gaps in understanding. What works well should be captured and measured, to encourage the continuation of this practice within organisations, however guidance could still be provided to improve even further. A tool could also encompass the review of existing organisational policies and procedures to aid them in being fit for purpose. In principle, the tool should also improve offline responses to these online harms and be agile and adaptive to new and emerging trends. Lastly, it needs to be something that adds value and cannot be a needless tick box exercise.

## **How would you embed technology self-evaluation tools into what currently exists in terms of audits and reviews?**

Some attendees noted that as a self-evaluation tool doesn't exist or due to the number of forms and tools required, that embedding would be difficult. It is really important to understand the goal of audits and reviews, so it is worth first considering is the current question set fit for purpose and these self-evaluation tools should be tailored as required. It was mentioned that

curriculum audits could be undertaken and where necessary scaffolded learning could be embedded.

Safeguarding logs could also be assessed for behavioural trends. A specific example noted that a lot of child safeguarding practice reviews happen, and it would be good to capture what works and does not work on online specific reviews. Another promising suggestion was adapting and embedding a focus on technology into the existing Section 11 Audit and Organisational Safeguarding Assessment (OSA). The questions have been set for 2025, however there is potential to include some technology/online focused questions into this existing audit.

### Quality Standard 5 - Support Interventions (QS5)

Finally, this fifth standard picks up on the necessity for there to be co-produced, long-term non-judgemental and trauma-informed support for children who are experiencing OCSV and their families that reflects sensitivity to gender, sexuality, culture, race, ability and maturity.

It was acknowledged within the workshops that a lot of support will exist and there is a need for this to be mapped and collated through a directory or central source that can be made easily accessible for children, parents and professionals.

At the project event, we gave attendees an opportunity to share any best practice to initiate some of this mapping of what is already available, however minimal information was fed back, which could imply there is a lack of awareness of best practice in relation to digital safety. It could also raise considerations around potential challenges and limitations of undertaking a mapping exercise. The responses provided noted the need to be more proactive instead of reactive when focusing on digital safety, as well as focusing education for parents at a much earlier stage, such as at ante-natal or early years.

We also asked where colleagues were not aware of best practice, what they felt was needed and missing. Responses highlighted that across organisations there was little to no practice. Colleagues felt that online safety needs to consider the voice of children, safeguarding and all external factors and that education needs to be done across children, parents and professionals to maximise the impact and numbers informed.

### Conclusion

This project has reaffirmed that there is still plenty of room for work to improve the prevention and response to digital harms and OSCV, with the level of confidence of professionals we engaged with being extremely varied. As technology continues to progress at pace, it's important that there's a greater understanding of this rapidly changing landscape to ensure that we can keep children and young people safe. This project brings forward suggestions on different ways in which this could be taken forward. To summarise, this is through:

- The development and a Technology Alliance in West Yorkshire
- The creation of tech champion roles
- Co-producing public awareness campaigns

- How to involve children in this co-production
- Developing and embedding an Online Self-Evaluation Tool
- Mapping available support

This project provides guidance on how these can be achieved, however further steps beyond this work need to be taken to drive this work forward. These recommendations are outlined below.

## Recommendations

1. Refine the proposal for a technology alliance (consider in further detail membership and more focused remit) and implement when possible and appropriate.
2. Refine the remit of the technology champion role, along as providing clear guidance and support for these champions.
3. Draw together and centralise a repository of resources, guidance and support relating to digital harms and online child sexual exploitation and abuse.
4. Consider and utilise the findings of the Public Awareness Campaign scoping when developing any future campaigns around this topic area.
5. Consider utilising the findings of this research to explore the development of an online self-reflection tool for practitioners and organisations.
6. Consider embedding a focus on technology into the existing Section 11 Audit and Organisational Safeguarding Assessment (OSA) for 2026.



## Appendix 1 – Theory of Change

	Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes (immediate from project)	Impacts (long term)
<p><b>Rationale:</b> Online child sexual exploitation and abuse (OCSEA) presents a growing challenge for police, partner services, parents and children. Prevention efforts are trailing behind technology development and offender practices. Online prevention efforts have failed to stem the growth of child sexual abuse media (CSAM), and urgent action is needed to prevent CSAM from being created and harming children and young people at a local level.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are broader harms that children face due to technology which professionals across the region need to be better equipped to respond to.</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <p>There is interest and appetite for work to be done on this in West Yorkshire.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <p>Lack of interest and appetite for this work to be done in West Yorkshire.</p> <p>Limited time to deliver project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding from ESRC Vulnerability &amp; Policing Futures Research Centre</li> <li>Staffing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1x Project Lead</li> <li>1x Violence Reduction Partnership Staff</li> </ul> </li> <li>Previous research undertaken by the Vulnerability &amp; Policing Futures Research Centre in Blackpool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Virtual and in-person multi-agency workshop sessions</li> <li>Feedback session</li> <li>Final Project Event</li> <li>Resource development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of workshop sessions held</li> <li>Number of partners engaged with across districts and agencies</li> <li>Production of documents and diagrams that can be used in West Yorkshire and scaled nationally. Including guidance on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setting up a West Yorkshire Technology Safety Trust and Relationships Alliance</li> <li>Role descriptions and guidance for Tech champions</li> <li>Child-led info and mapping</li> <li>Developing a public awareness campaign</li> <li>A multi-agency self-evaluation tool for organisations and practitioners</li> <li>Mapping of support interventions</li> </ul> </li> <li>Number of 'pledges' from organisations declaring an interest to be a technology champion</li> <li>Creation of the Technology: Safety, Trust, Relationships Alliance</li> <li>Resources for West Yorkshire are all held centrally and easily accessible</li> <li>Final project event</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professionals have an increased understanding of dangers children and young people face through technology</li> <li>Resources provided are used within West Yorkshire to support improved response to OCSEA and technology-based harms</li> <li>Professionals feel more equipped to respond to dangers children and young people face through technology</li> <li>Professionals are more confident around what support is available to respond to technology-based harms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A West Yorkshire Technology: Safety, Trust and Relationships Alliance</li> <li>Technology Champions Model</li> <li>A public awareness campaign</li> <li>A multi-agency self-evaluation tool for organisations and practitioners</li> <li>Mapping of support interventions</li> </ul> </li> <li>Improved understanding of how to incorporate children's voice into responses to technology-based harms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in repeat child safeguarding referrals</li> <li>Potential increase in child safeguarding referrals involving technology, due to increased understanding across the system</li> <li>Children and young people have increased awareness of threats associated with technology</li> <li>Responses to OCSEA in West Yorkshire are strengthened through evaluation</li> <li>Improved partnership working across West Yorkshire in response to OCSEA</li> <li>Those working with children feel confident in identifying and knowing how to respond to instances of OCSEA (reporting figures from children and parents)</li> <li>Fewer instances of OCSEA in West Yorkshire</li> <li>Culture of sharing learning and responses to OCSEA is shared across the region, understanding what does and does not work.</li> <li>Consistent messaging and understanding across West Yorkshire around public awareness campaigns</li> <li>Develops a culture of professional respect across all bodies, organisations and agencies</li> <li>All work and resources in this area co-produced with children</li> <li>New datasets are made available from self-evaluation tools</li> <li>Services are easier to find or signpost to due to mapping and directory work</li> <li>Technology or OCSEA embedded within policy, audits and review as standard operating practises (tbc dependent on remit)</li> </ul>