

Handout 6 – Facilitator Implementation, Inclusion, Safeguarding and Review Guide

A. Before the activity

☐	I reviewed only group-level Sensor results and did not infer which students responded negatively.
☐	I checked bullying, discrimination, safeguarding, digital-safety and referral procedures.
☐	I selected non-sensitive prompts and tested challenges for time, clarity and accessibility.
☐	I planned groups without popularity-based selection and considered known safety issues.
☐	I prepared speech, writing, visual, movement and assistive participation options.
☐	I identified a quiet/low-stimulation option and a private route to request support.
☐	I know which adult will follow up concerns and how I will document them appropriately.
☐	I will record group-level conditions and environmental barriers—not friendship data or individual social scores.

B. Stop the group task and follow school procedures when

- a student reports fear, retaliation, coercion, stalking, threats, sexualised contact or pressure to communicate;
- interaction involves discriminatory harassment, targeted bullying, humiliation, intimate images, doxxing, impersonation or unsafe sharing of personal data;
- a student is repeatedly excluded, ridiculed, ignored or placed with a person involved in a known conflict or safeguarding concern;
- a student becomes significantly distressed or requests private help, or the group starts naming classmates, repeating rumours, exposing, diagnosing or ranking peers.

C. Facilitator language

Situation	Possible wording
Pressure to share	"You may pass or choose a different format. No explanation is required."

Situation	Possible wording
Dominating group member	"Pause. We need to use each person's information before finalising."
Ignored contribution	"I heard an idea that has not yet been considered. How does it change the shared result?"
High noise/overload	"Let us reduce volume and choose seated, written or smaller-group options."
Unwanted advice	"Ask first: would you like listening, a question, practical help or an idea?"
Popularity/friendship framing	"The task is about useful interaction, not who is close friends with whom."
Real harm disclosed	"Thank you for telling me. We will not explore this publicly. I will speak with you privately and follow the school's safety procedure."

D. Two-week group-level review

Review question	Evidence noticed	Action / responsible person / date
Can more students identify at least one personal benefit from interaction?		
Are different communication and participation modes being used?		
Are group roles and contributions more balanced?		
Do students set boundaries or request adjustments more safely?		
Are there students or groups still facing exclusion, ridicule or unsafe contact?		
What environmental barrier should the class or school remove?		

Review question	Evidence noticed	Action / responsible person / date
Which routine should be retained, adapted or stopped?		

Optional video/resource use

The British Red Cross “Web of Connections” video can help students consider reciprocal support. Preview it first. The original activity invites learners to map people they can turn to. For this method, the map must remain private; students must not be asked to show names, compare network size or explain an empty/small network. Offer a fictional network or categories of support as an alternative.

[British Red Cross – Web of Connections video transcript](#)

[British Red Cross – Connecting Well session plan](#)