



Department
for Education

Our ref: 2016-0004809

Date: 15 March 2016

Dear Jenna Corderoy

Thank you for your request for information, which was received on 19 January 2016. Your request said:

Dear Sir or Madam,

This is a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act. My request relates to the newly launched website, 'educate against hate': <http://www.educateagainsthate.com/> Please note there are several parts to this request.

First part:

I would like to know the organizations and companies that were consulted by the Department for Education during the development of the 'educate against hate' website.

Second part:

I would like to know the total amount spent on the 'educate against hate' website. Please include a breakdown of costs.

Third part:

I would also like to request all internal reports held by the Department for Education that were generated before, during and after the development and launch of the 'educate against hate' website.

Conclusion:

I would like to receive the information electronically. If you feel that a substantive response to this request is not possible within a reasonable time frame, or the request is too broad or too vague, I would be grateful if you could contact me by email or by phone and provide assistance as to how I could refine the request as soon as possible.

Many thanks,

Jenna Corderoy

[REDACTED]

You also sent further clarification, which said:

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank-you very much for your email.

I understand that the following needs to be clarified:

"I would also like to request all internal reports held by the Department for Education that were generated before, during and after the development and launch of the 'educate against hate' website."

I am specifically requesting for reports held by the DfE about the website itself, the 'educate against hate' website. For example, reports on the website's traffic, and reports of positive and negative feedback about the website.

I understand this also needs clarifying:

"I would like to know the organizations and companies that were consulted by the DfE during the development of the 'educate against hate' website."

I'm asking for the organizations and companies that were consulted about the content of the website itself, such as the advice and the resources that should appear on the website. (So not anything to do with the more technical aspects like programmers.)

For example, I'm assuming that the Westminster Prevent team might have been consulted during the development of the website, as they are referred to on the website in the resources section. Apologies, I should have made that clearer.

If you need further clarification, you're more than welcome to call me

[REDACTED]

Thanks,

Jenna

Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding. The Department takes very seriously its obligations under the Act, including the requirement to respond within the statutory deadline of 20 working days. I am afraid that we have not been able to maintain this standard in this instance and I am very sorry for any

inconvenience the delay may have caused you.

I have dealt with your request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. My response to each of your questions is below:

1. The Department for Education consulted with the following organisations about the content of the website:
Home Office, Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, Department for Communities and Local Government, Ministry of Justice, Ofsted, Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS), Association of Governing Bodies of Independent Schools (AGBIS), Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL), Catholic Education Service (CES), Church of England (CofE), Freedom and Autonomy for Schools (FASNA), Information for School and College Governors (ISCG), Local Government Association (LGA), National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT), National Co-ordinators of Governor Services (NCOGS), National Governors Association (NGA), Governors for Schools (SGOSS), Schools, Students and Teachers Network (SSAT), National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL), NSPCC, Internet Matters, Childnet, Parentzone, Safer Internet Centre, New Schools Network, Miriam's Vision, Since 9/11, Maimonides Interfaith Foundation, Citizenship Foundation.

In addition to the above organisations, we also consulted the Prevent Coordinators network, the Department's Counter Extremism Reference Group (which provides advice, expertise and intelligence on the effectiveness of our policies and communications) and focus groups of parents and teachers.

2. Currently the Educate Against Hate website has a total budget of £102,000 for any costs incurred up until January 2017. Of this total budget, we have spent £16,200 on development and £41,643.04 on promotion, to ensure that our target audiences of school leaders, governors, teachers and parents are aware of the site. £44,336.96 remains to cover ongoing development and promotions costs.
3. A copy of a survey on the name of the website is enclosed in the format you requested. The Department holds the remainder of the information you requested, but it is being withheld because the following exemption(s) apply to this information:
A) Section 35(1)(a) covers any information relating to the formulation and development of government policy. It is a qualified exemption and is subject to the public interest test. The following factors have been taken into account when balancing the public interest:

There is a general public interest in disclosure. Knowledge of the way government works increases if the information on which decisions

have been made is available. This can lead to public contribution to the policy making process becoming more effective. There is a general public interest in being able to see if ministers are being briefed effectively on the key areas of policy the department is taking forward and how policies are developed.

Conversely, it is in the public interest that the formulation of government policy and government decision making can proceed in the self-contained space needed to ensure that it is done well. Good government depends on good decision making and this needs to be based on the best advice available and a full consideration of the options. Without protecting the thinking space and the ability for Ministers and senior officials to receive free and frank advice, there is likely to be a corrosive effect on the conduct of good government, with a risk that decision making will become poorer and will be recorded inadequately.

In this case, the public interest test determines that the information is exempt from release for two main reasons. Firstly, some documents contain the summaries and transcripts of the views those we have consulted. In this case, we consider that they would have had a reasonable expectation that their views were being shared privately and would not later be made public. Disclosing this information would therefore damage our ability to consult with these groups privately in the future and impede our ability to maintain a safe space for policymaking. Secondly, the information contains analysis and advice which informs live policy decisions. Release of these documents would damage the safe space we need to develop ideas, debate live issues and reach decisions away from external interference and distraction.

The Department has concluded that, in this instance that public interest consideration was greater than the general public interest considerations for disclosure described above.

B) Section 40 (2) allows 3rd party personal data to be withheld where disclosure of this information would contravene the data protection principles in the Data Protection Act 1998, and would be regarded as 'unfair'. By 'unfair', I mean that the data subject would have had a reasonable expectation that his or her information would not be disclosed to others. Section 40(2) is an absolute exemption and is not subject to the public interest test.

The information supplied to you continues to be protected by copyright. You are free to use it for your own purposes, including for private study and non-commercial research, and for any other purpose authorised by an exception in current copyright law. Documents (except photographs) can be also used in the UK without requiring permission for the purposes of news reporting. Any other re-

use, for example commercial publication, would require the permission of the copyright holder.

Most documents produced by a government department or agency - Department for Education - will be protected by Crown Copyright. Most Crown copyright information can be re-used under the Open Government Licence (<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/>). For information about the OGL and about re-using Crown Copyright information please see The National Archives website - <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/uk-gov-licensing-framework.htm>

Copyright in other documents may rest with a third party. For information about obtaining permission from a third party see the Intellectual Property Office's website at www.ipo.gov.uk.

If you have any queries about this letter, please contact me. Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are unhappy with the way your request has been handled, you should make a complaint to the Department by writing to me within two calendar months of the date of this letter. Your complaint will be considered by an independent review panel, who were not involved in the original consideration of your request.

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint to the Department, you may then contact the Information Commissioner's Office.

