Mapping Responsible Use - Synthesis
Introduction

• to collate the experiences and resources of existing key players in this area

• main respondents: presenters during the Experts’ Meeting + various international organizations

• 13 valid entries (i.e. other entries are not ICT-related)

• does not include desk research done by UNESCO team
## Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Programs</th>
<th>International Organization/Multi-O rganizations</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>PPP</th>
<th>Local NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target audience:</strong></td>
<td>The target audience is equally divided among <strong>all age ranges of students</strong> and <strong>teachers</strong>. National Programs are more likely to target the <strong>general public</strong></td>
<td>The target audience is likely to be <strong>teachers and policy makers</strong></td>
<td>The main target audience is <strong>secondary and tertiary students, and teachers</strong>.</td>
<td>The target audience is <strong>likely to be Primary and Secondary</strong>.</td>
<td>The target audience is <strong>everything before the university level</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus (topic covered):</strong></td>
<td>National programs focused on a <strong>broad spectrum of topics.</strong> Security and ethics were the most popular.</td>
<td><strong>All topics (except e-waste and health) were covered roughly equally.</strong></td>
<td>The main topics were <strong>ethics and security</strong>.</td>
<td>PPP tackled <strong>the most topics (4 on average) across the spectrum. They did not focus on the other category.</strong></td>
<td>Local NGOs covered the <strong>whole range of topics (except e-waste)</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality (action area):</strong></td>
<td>Advocacy was the most common. Though, every topic was covered.</td>
<td>Research, policy, and <strong>advocacy were covered.</strong></td>
<td>Learning content was the <strong>sole action area.</strong></td>
<td>Advocacy, capability building, and learning content.</td>
<td>Advocacy, capability building, and learning content were the most common.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes – Target Audience

- Secondary students were the most likely to be targeted (10/13), followed by primary students and teachers (8/13).
- Tertiary students and general public both got 6/13.
- Only national programs and local NGOS focused on Pre-Primary (4/13).
- Only national programs and international organizations-multi-organizations targeted policy makers (3/13).
- A number of programmes targeted parents/caregivers (4/13); 1/13 targeted the ICT-related industry.
Notes – Topic covered

• Ethics and security were the most common. (11/13)
  – Etiquette (7/13), health & wellness (8/13)
• No group covered e-waste.
• International and local NGOs were the most likely to focus on “others”:
  – Access to information and digital technologies
  – Digital skills
  – Rights to participate/ empowerment
  – Child protection & social justice
  – Online communities to share good practices
Samples of specific topics

- Rights of information, self-expression, education
- Netiquette
- Safeguarding digital reputation
- Digital citizenship (positive, constructive behaviour)
- Cyber-bullying
- Online safety / protection
- Frauds, tricks, and scams
- Cyber threats
- Digital abuse (esp. bullying and sexual content, addiction, stalking/harrassment)
- Discrimination
Notes – Modality (Action Areas)

- Advocacy was the most common (9/13).
- Research and policy were the least common (4/13).
- Capability building and provision of learning content both got 7/13 – usually go hand-in-hand.
- Others: online counselling; reflection-based, peer-led education; mentorship & role models
Implementation strategies

• multi-stakeholder approach (ministries, country offices, international org, private sector, experts, teachers, students, associations, etc.) for various roles and wider reach
• Localized / customized implementation
• Online availability of free resources (portal), sometimes in different languages; with regular updates
• F2F outreach, helplines, clubs, engaging activities
• Providing scenarios; roadshows; competitions; sharing of stories, findings and outputs; training camps; etc.
Some creative samples

• Insafe: “eSafety label” (self-assessment for schools on status and needs to guide them in developing their action plans)
• MTV: evocative news specials, “Draw Your Line” (crowdsourced online visualization tool that celebrates ways young people are taking action)
• Cybersmart: “Chatterbox” (online forum for parents)
Success Factors

• Wide audience reach
• Placing in the Government agenda
• Multi-stakeholder engagement/ linkages (including community)
• Establishing research agenda to have evidence-based policy and interventions
  – Ensure “real life” – what target audience are actually doing and issues that they are facing
  – Bottom-up strategy, consulting the target end beneficiaries (for intended solution to be responsive to local needs and are “sticky”)
• Exchange of knowledge and good practices for possible scaling up
• Appropriate project design with sound M&E plan to measure progress and impact, including gathering feedback and validation of actions and resources
• Committed staff
Challenges

• Easy accessibility to online devices/internet for children; fast pace of technology advances vis-à-vis digital divide in other areas
• Difficulty among students/children to share the issues they are facing
• Low awareness and skills levels among parents/teachers
• Overly strict government restrictions
• Media’s focus on dangers and risks (rather than opportunities) that cause misguided panic/fear (“Celebrate and normalize positive behavior so it doesn’t seem like digital abuse is the norm.” – MTV)
• Varying quality of research
  – few comparisons across countries and regions
  – lack of longitudinal research (note: “only after 2 decades of anti-bullying campaigns are we finally learning that they can actually promote bullying” - Insafe)
  – few evaluations on digital skills and programmes
  – consideration of vulnerabilities
• Identification of local experts on emotional intelligence
• Regular review_updates of resources; lack of non-English resources
• Programme sustainability, esp. in line with funding and staffing
END