# Keeping children safe in education

## Government response to consultation

**May 2022**

# Contents

# Introduction

On 11 January 2022, the Department for Education published a consultation on proposed changes to the statutory guidance for schools and colleges in England – Keeping children safe in education ("KCSIE"). The consultation provided respondents with an opportunity to comment on proposed revisions made across all parts of the guidance as well as the proposed incorporation of the Department's stand-alone *Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges* advice, which we proposed to withdraw. The consultation also sought to extend our evidence base by asking a number of questions (26 to 29) to help gather information about how schools and colleges respond to reports of sharing nudes and semi-nudes and about the filtering and monitoring systems they have in place. The consultation closed on 11 March 2022.

We have published, alongside this response, a draft of the revised KCSIE guidance (KCSIE September 2022 - FOR INFORMATION). This is **for information** so that schools and colleges can plan for the commencement of the guidance on 1 September 2022.

**Until the new revised guidance commences on 1 September 2022, the existing statutory guidance - Keeping children safe in education 2021 is still in force and is what schools and colleges must continue to have regard to.**

**Until the updated version of KCSIE commences on 1 September 2022, the existing advice Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges, is still in force.**

# Summary of responses received and the government's response to the consultation

This section sets out a summary of the responses that we received. It also sets out where we have decided to make additional changes as a result of consultation responses.

The responses have been important in shaping and strengthening KCSIE and we are grateful to respondents for sharing their views. We have reflected carefully on every response and in some cases made changes to the guidance as a result.

Not every respondent submitted an answer to every question. The number of responses analysed below therefore varies from question to question. Throughout the response document, percentages are expressed as a measure of those answering each question, not as a measure of the total responses and only reflects those that responded via the consultation portal.

Due to rounding and email submissions percentage figures may not always add up to 100%.

This analysis does not include issues raised, which were outside the scope of the consultation and/or the scope of the guidance.

We are pleased that 701 organisations and individuals responded to the consultation; these included responses from headteachers; school leaders; local authorities; teachers; designated safeguarding leads (DSLs); national representative organisations (including unions); school governors; parents and carers; and other organisations. We are grateful for the care and attention given to, and level of detail that people provided in, their responses.

A list of organisations that responded (who did not ask to remain anonymous) can be found at Annex A.

## Common Themes

### Whole Document

Throughout the guidance we reference government funded post-16 Education; 16-19 Academies, Special Post-16 institutions and Independent Training Providers, who are required to have regard to KCSIE following the enactment of The Education and Training (Welfare of Children) Act 2021.

We have identified a number of requests within the consultation responses for KCSIE to clarify terms which are already explained within the document. As a response to those

requests we have, where possible, provided clarification and added additional information.

## Part one – Safeguarding information for all staff

We have made general revisions to this part to improve its clarity. We have provided additional detail on what school and college staff need to know, to further increase awareness of the difficulties that children may have in telling somebody that they have been abused and the importance of staff understanding abuse and how to respond to concerns about it, we have:

- made clear the reasons why children may not feel ready or know how to tell someone that they are being abused

- made clear the importance of staff considering how to build trusted relationships with children and young people, which facilitate communication

- highlighted the need for professional curiosity and speaking to the DSL if staff have concerns about a child.

In addition, we have made the language regarding allegations and low-level concerns more consistent throughout the guidance.

## Part two – The management of safeguarding

We have added more detail about governor and trustee training, to clarify why it is important for governors and trustees to undertake training, highlighting that training should equip them with the knowledge to provide strategic challenge and assure themselves that the policies and procedures are effective, to support the delivery of a robust whole school approach.

We have provided clarification to the paragraphs on:
- The Human Rights Act
- The Equality Act
- The Public Sector Equality Duty
- Filtering and monitoring,
- Harmful challenges and online hoaxes, and
- Children who are lesbian, gay, bi or trans (LGBT).

We have also added new paragraphs on communication with parents about online safety and filter and monitoring systems, and the virtual school head.

## Part three – Safer recruitment

On the back of the tragic murder of Sarah Everard and the increasing prevalence of online issues in Teaching Regulation Agency prohibition cases we wanted to test whether, as part of their due diligence checks on shortlisted candidates, schools and colleges agreed that KCSIE should recommend they consider conducting online due diligence checks on publicly available information on those candidates shortlisted for a post.

We have removed the term 'social media' from the shortlisting section. Instead 'internet searches' should be carried out.

We have added:

- clarity on whether repeated concerns or allegations should be included in any references
- revised safer recruitment requirements for government funded post 16 Education; 16-19 Academies, Special Post-16 institutions and Independent Training Providers, who are required to have regard to KCSIE following the enactment of The Education and Training (Welfare of Children) Act 2021
- a footnote to explain that DBS checks on volunteers are free of charge, however there may be an administration fee set by the organisation that carries out the check.

## Part four – Safeguarding concerns and/or allegations of abuse made about staff, including supply teachers, volunteers and contractors

We have re-titled this section to make clear that it includes all safeguarding concerns and or allegations and we have provided further clarification on sharing low-level concerns.

We have also replaced the previous example of behaviour that might have led to a low-level concern, this was "using inappropriate sexualised, intimidating and offensive language".  On reflection this is not considered to be a low-level concern, so has been replaced with another example – humiliating pupils, which is more likely to be a low-level concern.

We have also strengthened this section to clarify the process of sharing low-level concerns.

## Part five – Child on child sexual violence and sexual harassment

The consultation has confirmed that now is the right time to withdraw the standalone Sexual violence and sexual harassment advice and absorb it fully within KCSIE.

In addition, we have:

- added a link to the London Grid for Learning 'Undressed' advice

- highlighted the importance of explaining to children and young people that the law is in place to protect them rather than criminalise them

- added a paragraph about schools and colleges working with safeguarding partners.

Other comments/requests raised in the consultation, require longer term thinking and further engagement as some of the issues are complex and cross cutting. We need time to explore these with trusted stakeholders, and other internal policy teams to help us better understand what information is already available for schools and colleges and to help us develop options on what more we can do.

# Expanding our evidence base

We were encouraged by the responses to the questions to further our evidence base about sharing nudes and semi nudes, awareness of UK Centre for Internet Safety (UKCIS) guidance and filtering and monitoring systems. We have made some small changes as a result of some of the comments and the detail provided will help us identify what further information we need to consider when considering further policy development.

# Consultation Responses

## Section 1 – Summary of the guidance

### Proposals and rationale

Following the amendment to the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009 by The Education and Training (Welfare of Children) Act 2021, KCSIE 2021 was revised to incorporate safeguarding requirements for 16-19 Academies, Special Post-16 institutions and Independent Training Providers.

**Question 7: Is the guidance clear on the safeguarding requirements placed on the above providers?**

**We received 680 responses to this question.**

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|-----------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 530 | 78% |
| No | 34 | 5% |
| No opinion | 83 | 12% |
| Don't know | 33 | 5% |

### Consultation Findings

78% of respondents agreed that the guidance set out clearly the safeguarding requirements placed on 16-19 Academies, Special Post-16 institutions and Independent Training Providers.

The small number who said they didn't agree suggested specific reference to post-16 providers to be included in the 'who is this guidance for' section. They wanted more information about how they can apply KCSIE in a post-16 environment and a reiteration of the importance of transferring child protection files from schools to colleges, which includes post-16 education providers.

## Government Response

We are very pleased that the majority of respondents felt the guidance is clear. Whilst KCSIE explains which settings come under the heading 'college', we have now added reference to these providers in the 'who is this guidance for' section.

In the longer term we will carry out further stakeholder engagement with post-16 providers to ensure we keep the guidance relevant to them.

# Section 2 – Part one: Safeguarding information for all staff

## Proposals and rationale

We think it is important that all staff should be aware that children may not feel ready or know how to tell someone that they are being abused, exploited, or neglected – or they may not recognise their experiences as harmful. As such we have added this into the section on what school and college staff need to know.

**Question 8: Is the additional information helpful for school and college staff?**

**We received 675 responses to this question.**

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|-----------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 624 | 92% |
| No | 14 | 2% |
| No opinion | 27 | 4% |
| Don't know | 10 | 1% |

## Consultation findings

The majority of respondents (92%) felt the additional information was clear and concise, emphasising the responsibility of staff to take action. However, it was suggested that the guidance should be clearer on the reasons why a pupil may not feel ready to share that they have been harmed or abused.

Comments from others suggested the inclusion of:

- pictures, diagrams and flowcharts

- specific examples in the document of where staff have successfully navigated the circumstances where a child is not ready or know how to tell someone that they are being abused

- scenarios published on the DfE website that DSLs could use in their training, which they could then use to remind staff what they need to do.

## Government Response

We are pleased that the majority found the additional information helpful. We recognise that there are many reasons why a pupil may not feel ready to share that have been harmed or abused. On this basis we have added further information about the importance of staff having a professional curiosity, and if they have a concern about a child, it should be discussed with the DSL.

To provide further support for and in conjunction with DSLs, DfE is developing an online support hub which will provide good practice and case studies to help them when handling with a wide range of abuse indicators.

# Section 3 – Part two: The management of safeguarding

## Proposal and rationale

Schools and colleges have legal duties with regard to the Human Rights Act 1998, the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty (those schools and colleges that are publicly funded). Whilst these are not new requirements, we have added information (originally in the standalone sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges advice) to remind schools and colleges of these legal duties and the links to their safeguarding duties and sources of additional information.

**Question 9**: **Is this additional information helpful?**

### We received 675 responses to this question.

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|-----------|------:|--------:|
| Yes | 607 | 90% |
| No | 20 | 3% |
| No opinion | 38 | 6% |
| Don't know | 10 | 1% |

## Consultation findings

90% of respondents agreed that the additional information is helpful and believed that having the information integrated within KCSIE provides a good reminder for all staff of their obligations in this area.

Of the 3% that disagreed, we found that some comments were not relevant to the question. Others thought there was:

- too much emphasis on duties or responsibilities and not enough on support on how these might be achieved

- too much information making it confusing.

## Government Response

We are pleased with the positive support for this change. We have made some small changes to provide clarity, such as including a duty to make reasonable adjustments for disabled children and young people, including those with long term conditions. Many children with long-term conditions would be considered disabled under the Equality Act. We have also highlighted that the Public Sector Equality duty applies to all protected characteristics and means that whenever significant decisions are being made or policies developed, specific consideration must be given to the equality implications of these such as. For example, the need to eliminate unlawful behaviours that relate to them, such as sexual violence and sexual harassment, misogyny/misandry and racism.

# Governor and trustee training

## Proposal and rationale

Training is essential to ensure new governors/trustees understand their roles and responsibilities, in particular enabling them to take a strategic oversight rather than have only operational approach to their work. Other departmental guidance already sets out the importance of appropriate governor training (the Governance Handbook and the Academy Trust Handbook). Whilst evidence suggests that the majority of governors and trustees already undertake some form of safeguarding training, we are proposing to strengthen KCSIE and explicitly set out that all governors and trustees should receive safeguarding and child protection training (including online safety) at induction. We will also say the training should be regularly updated.

**Question 10: Do you agree that KCSIE should set out that all governors and trustees receive safeguarding and child protection training as part of their induction?**

## We received 674 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---:|---:|
| Yes | 650 | 96% |
| No | 12 | 2% |
| No opinion | 11 | 2% |
| Don't know | 1 | 0.5% |

### Consultation findings

Almost all respondents agreed that governors and trustees should receive safeguarding and child protection training as part of their induction and that the training should be regularly updated. Comments from respondents agreed that top-down training to support the culture of safeguarding is vital. And that all parties should have a full understanding of the safeguarding in their settings to be able to support the staff.

A small number who disagreed felt that the word 'training' was not explicit enough, rather than disagreeing with the proposal itself. They asked if it was enough to take an online course or should it be explicit that training is 'certified'? They also questioned whether all governors needed to know the detail of safeguarding or a general overview?

### Government response

We are pleased to see such an overwhelmingly positive response. Whilst it is everyone's responsibility to play a part in safeguarding children, governors and trustees need to have a strategic oversight, to be aware of what is involved in supporting a safeguarding culture and how they can contribute. Having training and knowledge will help them to hold schools and colleges to account. We appreciate that schools and colleges have different training needs and should be afforded the autonomy to be able to decide on the most appropriate training.

## Whole school and college approach to safeguarding

### Proposal and rationale

We made changes to Part two and Part five of the guidance in 2021 to support schools and colleges take a whole school and college approach to safeguarding and especially child-on-child abuse. This included clearer guidance on the systems that should be in place to support the reporting of abuse, the importance of recognising that just because abuse isn't being reported it does not necessarily mean it is not happening and provided links to the various policies such as behaviour, exclusion and RSHE, all that will play an important parts in the whole school/college approach.

**Question 11:** Does KCSIE, but especially Part two and Part five, support schools and colleges take a whole school approach to safeguarding?

### We received 671 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|-----------|------:|--------:|
| Yes | 587 | 87% |
| No | 28 | 4% |
| No opinion | 34 | 5% |

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Don't know | 22 | 3% |

## Consultation findings

The highest proportion (87%) of respondents thought that the guidance does encourage a whole school approach. They believed that the clear definitions and information will help staff in achieving this.

Respondents' main concerns were that the guidance explains what to do but offers no actual support, and the whole school approach is too demanding. This includes implementing a zero-tolerance approach to issues such as child-on-child abuse or sexual violence and sexual harassment.

## Government response

We are pleased that KCSIE supports schools and colleges to take a whole school approach to safeguarding but acknowledge that there were some respondents who were concerned that the guidance isn't prescriptive enough. Whilst the guidance provides the basis of a framework to support settings to implement a whole school approach, we appreciate that guidance alone cannot support schools and colleges to embed this. It is the responsibility of the governing body and proprietors to ensure that safeguarding and child protection are at the forefront.

There appears to be some confusion over the implementation of a zero-tolerance approach to safeguarding. To clarify, we mean that this behaviour is never acceptable and will not be tolerated i.e. having a zero-tolerance approach. Responding assertively to sexually inappropriate behaviour is an important intervention that helps prevent challenging, abusive and/or violent behaviour in the future. **All** incidents of child-on-child abuse or sexual violence and sexual harassment must be responded to. However, a zero-tolerance approach does not mean the automatic exclusion of pupil/student, each incident should be considered on a case-by-case basis and the response appropriate and proportionate to what has occurred.

**Question 12: Is there anything else that would support schools and colleges take a whole school and college approach to safeguarding?**

## Consultation findings

Most respondents did not have further comments. However, the small number who did respond suggested the following:

- Change 'governing bodies and proprietors '**should'** ensure they facilitate a whole school approach to safeguarding to '**must'**

- Better sharing of information about safeguarding concerns between schools and colleges.

### Government response

The 'About this guidance' section of KCSIE (page 3) sets out the use of the terms 'should' and 'must'. We can only use 'must' when there is a legal requirement to do something. However, where we say 'should' we strongly recommend that a school or college follow the advice unless there is a good reason not to do so. We take the view that it would be difficult for a school or college to justify why they do not have a whole school/college approach to safeguarding.

There is a myth that GDPR prevents the sharing of safeguarding information, and some schools and colleges fail to share such information to receiving schools or colleges. This means the receiving school or college does not have the full picture of a child's needs to be able to put appropriate support mechanisms in place. Whilst Parts one and two already include extensive advice about information sharing and attempt to dispel this myth, we have moved the text from Annex C into Part two of the guidance to make it clear that the child protection file should be transferred to the new school or college as soon as possible, and within 5 days for an in-year transfer or within the first 5 days of the start of a new term.

## Online safety

### Proposal and rationale

We made relatively significant changes to the online safety section in 2021. We want to test if those changes have helped schools and colleges and what more we might do via KCSIE.

**Question 13:** Do you think the changes made on online safety in KCSIE 2021 have helped to embed online safety into your whole school/college approach to safeguarding?

### We received 673 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|-----------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 421 | 63% |
| No | 77 | 11% |
| No opinion | 114 | 17% |
| Don't know | 61 | 9% |

### Consultation findings

63% of respondents agreed that the changes made in 2021 have helped embed online safety and only 11% disagreed.

Respondents' main concerns were around the remit of schools and parental engagement in dealing with matters that happen outside of the classroom. This was followed by requests for more specific guidance and regular updates on emerging threats. Respondents felt online safety is a difficult topic and what happens outside of school is the biggest concern. They added that there is still a lot of work to be done in engaging and educating parents to understand the risks that their children face online.

## Government response

We are pleased to see that online safety has on the whole been further embedded into the whole school approach. We acknowledge that this is a societal issue. However, we want to do more. The engagement of parents and carers continues to be a priority for the department and we will continue to work closely with the Children Commissioner and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport on this matter.

We appreciate that there are new online hoaxes and online challenges emerging all the time but the same principles for dealing with any harmful online challenge or online hoax should be followed regardless of the source and type of the harm.

The Department in collaboration with partners in the UKCIS Education subgroup and the Samaritans, has developed advice for schools and colleges to support their approach to harmful online challenges and online hoaxes Harmful online challenges and online hoaxes - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). To give this guidance more prominence we have added a link in part two.

**Question 14: Are there any additional changes you believe should be made in Part two of KCSIE to help schools/colleges better understand how to keep children safe online:**

- In the classroom and on school or college premises
- During remote learning

## We received 644 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 176 | 27% |
| No | 289 | 45% |
| No opinion | 106 | 17% |
| Don't know | 73 | 11% |

## Consultation findings

45% of respondents felt that there were no additional changes to be made to KCSIE to help schools and colleges better understand how to keep children safe online.

Of those respondents that did feel additional changes should be made (27%), the main ask was to provide more advice about remote education and how better to protect children when they are using technology whilst not on school premises. In particular, during periods of prolonged absence, including the use of personal devices (i.e. those outside of the schools filtering and monitoring systems). Many of the respondents also reiterated the same points as in question 13 addressed above, such as parental engagement. Respondents also cited harmful behaviours, including viewing pornography, that happens away from schools as one of their biggest challenges.

A number of respondents also suggested that the curriculum be updated to cover online safety in more detail in Relationships, Sex and Health Education (RSHE) lessons to give the children the most relevant teaching possible.

### Government response

It is pleasing to see that nearly half of respondents felt no additional changes were needed. However, the consultation responses show that this is an area where schools and colleges would welcome more specific support and guidance.

Through the statutory RSHE curriculum pupils are already taught about online relationships, the implications of sharing private or personal data (including images) online, harmful content and contact, cyberbullying, an over-reliance on social media, and knowing where and how to report concerns and get support with issues online.

To support teachers to deliver the content effectively we have developed teacher training modules which are free to download from: Teaching about relationships, sex and health - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). These modules will be updated periodically to reflect relevant new legislation.

KCSIE already includes numerous links to additional information and resources (see annex B) to support schools and colleges to keep children safe online, much of which will also be helpful for children and their parents. However, we have added further information in relation to remote education in order to remind schools and colleges that communications with parents and carers should be used to reinforce the importance of children being safe online, regardless of whether in school or out of school.

## Designated safeguarding lead

### Proposal and rationale

We want to ensure, as already set out in KCSIE, that the designated safeguarding lead (DSL) has the appropriate status and authority to carry out the duties of the post. It is especially important that governing bodies and proprietors recognise the key role the DSL plays in the day-to-day leadership of safeguarding and provide those in DSL roles with the necessary authority, status, resources, and training. As such we have made this clear in Part two of KCSIE.

To encourage governors and proprietors to read the full DSL job description, and fully understand the importance and breadth of the role, we have moved the majority of the DSL content in Part two, into the full DSL job role as set out in Annex C.

**Question 15: Do Part two and Annex C adequately reflect the importance of the status and authority of the DSL role?**

## We received 668 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 579 | 87% |
| No | 41 | 6% |
| No opinion | 31 | 5% |
| Don't know | 17 | 3% |

## Consultation findings

87% of respondents agreed that Part two and Annex C adequately reflect the importance of the status and authority of the DSL role. They believe it to be clear on the importance of providing adequate support, resources and training. Whist the guidance provides a clear and concise description of the role, some were not sure there is sufficient recognition of the importance of the responsibilities that are attached to the role.

Respondents' main concerns were about identifying suitable training, a lack of recognition of the importance of the DSL role and time constraints, i.e. they do not have sufficient time to undertake the role, when they are also the head teacher or deputy head. It should be mandatory for supervision to be provided to DSLs.

## Government response

It is welcome that responses show that the guidance is clear. We are carrying out further work with DSLs and are developing an online resource hub to help disseminate good practice on dealing with forms of abuse and will continue to work with DSLs to identify what further support is needed.

We have been testing DSL Supervision since Sep 2020 to develop the evidence of its impact and we expect the evaluation to be published in early 2023

The evaluation report for the DSL Supervision trials will include both qualitative and quantitative evidence of impact, based on analysis of data and participant surveys and interviews. The report will also include updated descriptions of the interventions based on findings of good practice. Along with exploring safeguarding practices in schools and DSLs' experiences, we will encourage wide dissemination to local authorities and schools through various networks including virtual school heads.

**Question 16: What would you suggest DfE can do to emphasise the authority and status that should be attached to the DSL role?**

## Consultation findings

A small number of respondents commented that the guidance should be strengthened by:

- Changing where it says 'should' do so, to 'must' do so

- Provide a separate guide on the DSL role as well as it being incorporated into other guidance

- Be more explicit on DSLs being given quality time and resources.

## Government response

KCSIE is clear that DSLs should be given quality time and resources. We are not prescriptive on how much time and resource because this will depend on the needs of the school or college, and as explained in response to question 12 we cannot use the term 'must' when something is not required by legislation.

Annex C provides a job description that sets out the role of the DSL. Schools and colleges can use this framework to develop their own bespoke guidance that reflects the needs of their settings, if they wish.

# Children at greater risk of harm

## Proposal and rationale

Whilst **all** children should be protected, it is important that governing bodies and proprietors recognise (and reflect in their policies and procedures) that some groups of children are potentially at greater risk of harm. We already provide guidance on categories of children that governing bodies and proprietors should be aware of, and reflect as appropriate, in their own process, policies, and procedures. The standalone sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and college advice sets out that children who are lesbian, gay, bi or trans (LGBT) may, in some cases, be at increased risk of harm. As we incorporate the standalone advice into KCSIE we are including this in the 'children at greater risk of harm' section, along with signposting schools and college to sources of support.

**Question 17**: Is the additional information helpful for schools and colleges?

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 580 | 87% |
| No | 34 | 5% |
| No opinion | 37 | 6% |
| Don't know | 19 | 3% |

### Consultation findings

87% of respondents found the additional information helpful, commenting that it provides clarity, covers all necessary information and doesn't assume a certain level of knowledge. It emphasises the risk present to these children and makes the school more mindful of this when delivering training and instruction to staff.

The 5% who answered 'no', wanted further information on DfE's expectations on training for all staff and felt that it should be clearly stated that students being gay, or trans is not a safeguarding concern.

### Government response

We are pleased that the majority of respondents welcomed the incorporation of the Sexual violence and sexual harassment standalone advice. The guidance is not explicit on training, as we believe schools and colleges are best placed to decide on appropriate training, taking into account the needs of their pupils and staff. The opening sentence in the 'children who are lesbian, gay, bi or trans' section now reflects the fact that because a child or a young person may be LGBT it is not in itself an inherent risk factor for harm.

## Section 4 – Part three: Safer recruitment

## Restructure

In 2021 we substantively revamped Part three of KCSIE to better reflect the recruitment process that schools and colleges follow. We want to test if the new Part three is an improvement.

**Question 18:** Is the restructured Part three (designed to follow the recruitment journey) an improvement compared to the old layout?

**We received 673 responses to this question**

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 521 | 77% |

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| No | 4 | <1% |
| No opinion | 97 | 14% |
| Don't know | 51 | 8% |

## Consultation findings

The majority of respondents (77%) found the guidance to be clearer and more logical to follow which has had a positive impact on safer recruitment training.

The four respondents (<1%) who said no, wanted the guidance to go further and stipulate a course that providers should undertake.

## Government response

It is welcome that responses show that there has been such positive feedback. We have already set out in our responses to other questions in this document, that it is for schools and colleges to decide which training products they wish to use, and this should be based on the needs of their staff.

**Question 19: Are there any additional changes you would suggest we make to Part three to better support school and college safer recruitment?**

## We received 650 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 128 | 20% |
| No | 350 | 54% |
| No opinion | 114 | 18% |
| Don't know | 58 | 9% |

## Consultation findings

The majority did not have any further comments or opinions. However, of those who did have suggestions, they wanted the information to be in a 'checklist', table or flowchart format to show:

- what checks are required by what type of provider

- checklist of recruitment process, from start to finish

- minimum frequency with which new DBS checks should be obtained

- clarity on how often to refresh safer recruitment training.

## Government response

The comments made are welcome. We have considered the requests for KCSIE to include a table or flowchart, however, we do not think it is appropriate to provide a table or flowchart on the recruitment process. This is because we agree with the responses to the previous question, in that the guidance is set out logically and the requirements clear.

We continue to believe that it is right that schools and colleges should be given the autonomy to decide how often schools and colleges need to obtain a new DBS check or how often safer recruitment training needs to be refreshed on a case-by-case basis. This is because every school or college will be familiar with the circumstances if any recruitment or appointment and the role of the individual in the school and will therefore be best placed to make such decisions. prescriptive on.

We have also added a footnote to explain that the Disclosure and Barring Service do not charge for DBS checks on volunteers, however if schools and colleges use an independent organisation to carry out the check, there is likely to be an administration charge.

## Shortlisting

### Proposal and rationale

As part of the shortlisting process, we have added a new paragraph suggesting schools and colleges, as part of their due diligence checks, **should consider** carrying out an online search (including social media) on shortlisted candidates. This would identify anything publicly available online which may be worth testing at interview.

**Question 20:** Is it helpful to suggest schools and colleges **should consider** online searches?

### We received 671 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---:|---:|
| Yes | 471 | 70% |
| No | 103 | 15% |
| No opinion | 36 | 5% |
| Don't know | 61 | 9% |

## Consultation findings

70% found the suggestion for schools and colleges to consider online searches as part of shortlisting helpful. Many respondents said their schools and colleges already do online searches of social media sites. They agree it gives them a better understanding of the applicant and social media identifies things which might not be found on a reference. Online presence is now an important factor in professional roles.

Respondents' main concern was that the scope of online searches is too vast, and some information on social media can be unreliable, open to misinterpretation or even fake. Further detail should be provided on which sites to search, how far back in time to go and how to deal with information that is found. A small number of respondents also felt that such searches are time consuming.

## Government response

The responses showed that there are a lot of schools and colleges who already choose to carry out online searches as part of their safer recruitment processes and have done so for some time. However, there are some schools and colleges who felt that this was an invasion of privacy and felt uncomfortable with doing searches of social media. However, this practice is about checking for information that could build a picture which along with other information will help schools and colleges make a judgement on an individual's suitability. Whilst we have removed the reference to 'social media', we do want recruiters to use their professional curiosity and use a search engine as another tool which provides more information about the suitability of an individual to work with children. Schools and colleges should use their professional judgement in considering any information that comes to light.

# Section 5 – Part four: Allegations of abuse made against teachers and other staff

## Managing allegations of abuse

### Proposals and rationale

KCSIE has always reflected the fact that schools and colleges should have processes in place to respond to any allegations or concerns about staff, volunteers, and contractors. However, whilst there has always been detailed guidance in Part four of KCSIE on managing allegations and concerns that meet the harms threshold, we have not in the past provided guidance on allegations or concerns that fall short of that threshold. In response to feedback from our last KCSIE consultation we added a new section about 'low-level' concerns**.**

**Question 21:** Has this new section about 'low-level' concerns helped to clarify the importance of addressing 'low-level' concerns?

**We received 670 responses to this question**

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 553 | 83% |
| No | 55 | 8% |
| No opinion | 36 | 5% |
| Don't know | 26 | 4% |

## Consultation findings

The majority of respondents agreed that the new section on low-level concerns helped clarify the importance of addressing low-level concerns. This is vital information and staff are much more aware of the need to look out for and report low-level concerns. It reinforces the need for an open and transparent culture of sharing information within the school or college.

Respondents' main concerns were that the guidance needs more clarity. That the low-level concerns policy should be statutory. Using inappropriate sexualised, intimidating or offensive language as an example is not a low-level concern.

## Government response

It is welcome that 83% of responses show that this new section on low-level concerns is helpful. We were pleased to see that some schools and colleges already have policies in place. Revisions have been made to provide clarity and more detailed guidance and further clarity. Paragraph 444 in KCSIE and the Farrer and Co website already provide case studies as well as additional information that has been requested.

**Question 22: Does this section provide the right level of information on 'low level' concerns?**

**We received 658 responses to this question**

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 449 | 68% |
| No | 116 | 18% |
| No opinion | 52 | 8% |
| Don't know | 41 | 6% |

## Consultation findings

The highest proportion of respondents felt this section sets out the importance of having a culture where low-level concerns are reported and documented and a whole school approach to develop an open and transparent school culture.

Respondents who disagreed that we had the right level of information on low-level concerns suggested that we provide an example policy. They were concerned that some local authority designated officers (LADO) wanted to be told about low-level concerns, but some didn't. They also said we should give more examples of what might be considered a low-level concern.

## Government response

Responses show that there are a range of low-level concerns which might be interpreted differently by schools and colleges. Alongside these responses we also acknowledge that the process for handling low-level concerns varies across local authorities. Schools and colleges should liaise with their local authority designated officer (LADO) to ensure they understand what information the LADO wants and take this into account when developing their low-level concerns policy. As per question 21 above the Farrer and Co guidance contains most, if not all, of the additional information requested.

# References

## Proposals and rationale

KCSIE is clear that only substantiated allegations that meet the harms threshold set out in Part four should be included in employment references. Now that we have added a section on 'low level' concerns, we want to find out more information about sharing these concerns when they are substantiated.

**Question 23:** Would you include substantiated 'low level' concerns in an employment reference?

### We received 661 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 332 | 50% |
| No | 93 | 14% |
| No opinion | 23 | 3% |
| Don't know | 111 | 17% |
| It's not my responsibility | 102 | 15% |

### Consultation findings

50% would include substantiated low-level concerns on an employment reference citing that if the low-level concern led to a formal disciplinary warning, then it would be included on a reference. This needs to be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on what the concern was and whether it was repeated behaviour. Information provided in a reference should provide context and include any actions taken.

Respondents' main concern was that there is insufficient information about what a substantiated low-level concern is. There was a view that the individual should be given the opportunity to learn and undertake additional training to help them understand what the concern is, as part of their professional development. Some respondents said they have encountered problems in the past where information provided on a reference related to low level concerns, but the respondents didn't provide specific detail of what these problems were.

### Government response

This information is welcome. It provides further detail on specific issues, in particular regarding information being included in references and what a substantiated low-level concern is. We will engage with stakeholders to determine how the department might help further.

## Section 6 – Part five: Child on child sexual violence and sexual harassment

## Effectiveness of Part five

### Proposals and rationale

We have withdrawn the *Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in school and colleges* standalone advice and removed all references to it. This guidance has now been incorporated throughout KCSIE, and especially in Part two and Part five, in order to give the issue the prominence it deserves in statutory guidance. It will also remove duplication as much of the content in the standalone advice was already in Part five of KCSIE.

Incorporating the standalone advice ensures schools and colleges only need to go to one document rather than two when considering child-on-child sexual violence and sexual harassment. We have also taken the opportunity to move from the standalone advice the definition of 'victim' and 'perpetrator' – into the summary section of KCSIE – and information that links school and college legal duties under the Human Rights Act 1998

(HRA) [1], the Equality Act 2010[2], the Public Sector Equality Duty[3],  and their safeguarding responsibilities is moved into Part two.

**Question 24: Please provide any comments on how we have incorporated the standalone sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges advice into KCSIE?**

**We received 295 responses to this question**

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|-----------|-------|---------|
| Positive | 228 | 77% |
| Negative | 41 | 14% |
| Neutral | 26 | 9% |

## Consultation findings

The highest proportion of respondents believe it is the right move to have the information in once place.

A small number of respondents referenced their concerns that there is a lack of training and support on these complex issues. They also commented on the language used i.e. victim and perpetrator and that they would find flowcharts on the processes helpful.

Some respondents thought it was easier to have information about sexual violence and sexual harassment in two documents rather than having to trawl through the whole of KCSIE.

## Government response

It is welcome that the majority of the responses are positive about the incorporation of the standalone advice.

We have received some helpful detailed comments in relation to these important matters, which require longer term thinking and further engagement as some of the issues are complex and cross cutting. We need time to explore these with trusted stakeholders, and other internal policy teams to help us better understand what information is already available for schools and colleges and to help us develop options on what more we can do.

---

[1] Human Rights Act 1998 (legislation.gov.uk)

[2] Equality Act 2021 Advice for schools-for-schools

[3] The Public Sector Equality Duty is a legal requirement for schools and colleges that are public bodies.  Public Sector Equality Duty (advice for schools)

**Child-on-child sexual violence and sexual harassment**

The department continues to recognise the complexities for schools and colleges of managing reports of child-on-child sexual violence and sexual harassment. We think incorporating the standalone advice in KCSIE will help give the issue the prominence it deserves and remove duplication between the two documents for schools and colleges. Part five of KCSIE remains the primary resources for schools and colleges on this matter and has been strengthened by incorporating additional guidance and support from the standalone advice.

**Question 25**: Does the revised Part five of KCSIE provide the right level of information to support schools and colleges manage reports of child-on-child sexual violence and sexual harassment

## We received 662 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---:|---:|
| Yes | 509 | 77% |
| No | 47 | 7% |
| No opinion | 72 | 11% |
| Don't know | 34 | 5% |

## Consultation findings

77% of respondents thought we had the right balance to help schools and colleges apply the guidance to their own school or college at a local level. It is clear and easy to follow and gives schools and colleges enough detail to formulate their own policies and procedures.

Those who said more information was needed, wanted indications of age-inappropriate behaviours; more information on the role of the school as part of any criminal proceedings; felt that too much responsibility is placed on schools and colleges; and that there was no guidance on what safeguarding partners will do to support. Respondents also felt there was too much room for interpretation, and wanted the guidance strengthened to cover what to do when police take no further action on a case and the implications that follow.

## Government response

It is welcome that responses show that we got the right balance. Information on safeguarding partners is covered in statutory guidance Working Together to Safeguard Children. Safeguarding partners are required to have their own policies in place to help work effectively with schools. It is expected that, locally, the safeguarding partners will name schools and colleges as relevant agencies. Safeguarding partners will set out in their published arrangements which organisations and agencies they will be working with,

and the expectations placed on any agencies and organisations by the arrangements. Once named as a relevant agency, schools, and colleges, in the same way as other relevant agencies, are under a statutory duty to co-operate with the published arrangements. As with our response to question 24, we will engage with stakeholder to determine how the dept might help further.

## Section 7 – Expanding our evidence base

## Sharing Nudes and Semi Nudes

### Proposal and rationale

We know that this is a societal issue but also one that manifests in schools and colleges. KCSIE signposts schools and colleges, and especially DSLs, to – Guidance overview: Sharing nudes and semi-nudes: advice for education settings working with children and young people - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk).

**Question 26: Do you feel confident in handling reports of sharing nudes and semi nudes?**

### We received 669 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 438 | 65% |
| No | 49 | 7% |
| No opinion | 38 | 6% |
| Don't know | 44 | 7% |
| It's not my responsibility | 100 | 15% |

### Consultation findings

The highest proportion of respondents feel confident in handling reports of sharing nudes and semi nudes. When they had to do it, they felt confident when dealing with parents and carers, students and police. The supporting advice for teachers and DSLs is clear.

Respondents' main concern was that some schools are not confident and call the police when in doubt. There were mixed messages about effective support from the police and parents and carers often look to schools and colleges to sort these issues out.

### Government response

It is welcome that responses show that 65% feel confident in handling reports of sharing nudes and semi nudes.

KCSIE already signposts to 'when to call the police' guidance and if in doubt the school or college should contact the police. Annex B of KCSIE also provides links to parental support that schools and colleges can signpost parents to. Schools and colleges should also check with their safeguarding partners on what support they can offer.

We welcome the responses which will help with future policy development.

**Question 27: Are you aware of the UKCIS advice on sharing nudes and semi nudes?**

### We received 652 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|-----------|-------|---------|
| Yes | 480 | 74% |
| No | 172 | 26% |

### Consultation findings

The majority are aware of the UKCIS advice.

### Government response

We are pleased that the majority of respondents are aware of the UKCIS advice. However, out of those that said they weren't aware, a high number were DSLs and head teachers/principles. We would expect individuals in these roles to be aware of any such guidance that may be relevant to their school or college. We will consider what further steps we might need to take to promote this advice.

**Question for Designated Safeguarding Leads (DSLs) and their deputies**

**Question 28**: What further information would you find helpful in your DSL role to help you understand better how to manage reports of sharing nudes and semi nudes?

### Consultation findings

Many thought the current guidance was clear and do not need any additional information. However, some respondents want:

- specialist advice for each type of school

- specific training

- clear flowcharts, templates with questions to ask and things to consider

- better support from safeguarding partners

- clear guidance on checking phones and assurance that staff will not be investigated for viewing images on a child's device as part of the investigation, and bespoke training

- information for parents and carers.

## Government response

The majority of respondents would like further guidance on checking phones and viewing images, in addition to bespoke training and flowcharts or templates with questions to ask and things to consider. These requests are outside the scope of the guidance, which is why we have Annex B of KCSIE that signposts to further information and guidance for parents, schools and colleges. The links in Annex B can be used by schools and colleges in their communications with parents. In particular, the UKCIS advice provides flowcharts to help schools make referrals to the police and provides a wealth of practical information about online safety, including not viewing images and questions to consider. We do not think bespoke training is the answer, we believe that schools and colleges are best placed to decide on appropriate training, taking into account the needs of their pupils and staff. We would like to thank the respondents who provided other comments. We will consider these comments further when looking at future versions of KCSIE.

## Filtering and monitoring systems

### Proposal and rationale

Filtering and monitoring systems are an important part of a school or college's toolkit to keep their children safe online. KCSIE sets out that appropriate filtering and monitoring systems should be in place and signposts to advice from the UK Safer Internet Centre – Appropriate Filtering and Monitoring.

**Question 29:** Do you feel able to make informed decisions on which filtering and monitoring systems your school or college should use?

### We received 662 responses to this question

| Response: | Total | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 312 | 47% |
| No | 76 | 11% |
| No opinion | 49 | 7% |
| Don't know | 24 | 4% |
| It's not my responsibility | 201 | 30% |

### Consultation findings

The highest proportion of respondents (47%) felt that they are able to make informed decisions. A worrying 30% of respondents answered that it was not their responsibility to make informed decisions on which filtering and monitoring systems their school or college should use. However, following a more in-depth review of the responses received

this appears to be due in part to another party having the responsibility, for example either within the academy trust or through a technical supplier.

Of the 11% who said 'no', there were a number of thematic answers as to why they answered no:

- they do not feel they have the expertise to fully understand the technical requirements needed for deploying filtering and monitoring. Also, a number of head teachers and DSLs would appreciate more training on the requirements of filtering and monitoring.

- budgetary constraints mean that there are concerns around being able to buy the "right" software.

- respondents wanted more specific guidance on what should be filtered and what are considered 'safe sites'. They also wanted more support from the department in keeping up with the current and emerging risks.

- a common concern was the remit of the school and where it ends. Parental responsibility and engagement featured in a number of replies.

## Government response

We are pleased to hear that there are a lot of respondents who are confident in making informed decisions on which filtering and monitoring systems to use.

We have made small changes to reflect the fact that governing bodies and proprietors should ensure their school or college has appropriate filtering and monitoring systems in place and regularly review their effectiveness. They should ensure that the leadership team and relevant staff have an awareness and understanding of the provisions in place and manage them effectively and know how to escalate concerns when identified.

We received some helpful comments in relation to this matter, which require further thinking and engagement with subject experts to help us develop options on what more we can do to better support schools and colleges.

# Conclusion

The number of responses to the 2022 consultation was higher than we have previously received, and we are very grateful to all those who took the time to respond to the consultation and share their helpful views. We believe that the changes and refinements we have made to the guidance in response to the consultation, will provide further clarity for schools and colleges, and ultimately provide children with the high-quality safeguarding they deserve.

Given the detailed nature of some of those responses, there are areas which warrant further consideration and engagement with interested parties and respondees. We propose to use some of this year's findings to inform the future development of the guidance.

# Annex A: Organisations which responded to the consultation[4]

**Academies** Enterprise Trust
ACE Tiverton
Active Learning Group
Ad Astra Academy Trust
AJCEducation
Akaal Primary School
All Saints CEP
Ann Cam Church of England Primary School
Anzuk Education
Arthur Terry Learning Partnership
Ashbourne College
Askham Bryan College
Aspirations Academies Trust

Association of Colleges
Association of Educational Psychologists
Astor Secondary School
Avon valley school
Barking & Dagenham College
Barking and Dagenham College
Barnardo's
Barnsley & Kirklees Special Provision Partnership
Bath College
BCP Council  (Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council)
Beckfoot Oakbank School
Bedales School
Bedford Road Primary
Bellerive FCJ Catholic College
Belmont Primary School
Birmingham City Council
Bishop Challoner Catholic College
Bishop Fox's School
Bishop grosseteste university
Bishop John Robinson CofE Primary School
Blackthorn primary school
Blundeston CEVC Primary School

Milton Road Primary School
MISCD
Moorland Federation
Moorland Private School Limited
Morden Primary
More House School
Morecambe Bay Community Primary School
Morris&Associates Ltd
Mulberry Primary School
Nacro
NAHT
NASUWT - The Teachers' Union
National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT)
National Association of Independent Schools and Non-Maintained Special Schools (NASS)
National Children's Bureau
National Governance Association (NGA)
National LADO Network
Natspec
NCC
NCDAT / Consett Academy / North Durham Academy
Nene Education Trust
Netherwood Academy

New Bridge MAT
new city college Epping Forest
New Horizons Learning Centre
Newcastle City Council
Newcastle College
Newcastle High School for Girls
Newdigate Pre-School
Nisai Virtual Academy
NJ Vass Ltd
Noel-Baker Academy
Norfolk County Council
North Star Community Trust
North Wingfield Primary and Nursery Academy

---

[4] We had further responses from organisations but if the respondent had not indicated that he/she was responding on behalf of the organisation or included the name/address of the organisation, we have excluded them from this list.  Likewise, we have not listed the names of private individuals who replied or of those who requested their responses were kept confidential.  However, these views were included in the analysis. We also had some respondents who did not answer the specific questions in the consultation or responded after the consultation closed.  Although these responses were not included in the formal consultation analysis, they were read and the views there in taken into account when shaping the revised guidance.

Boarding Schools' Associaiton
Bohunt Horsham
Bottle Green Training Limited
Bradstow School
Bridgeway Consulting
Brooke Weston Trust
Brookfields SEN school
Buckland Primary School
Bullers Wood school
Busy Bees
Busy Bees Education and Training
Caldicott Trust Ltd
Cambridge Regional College
CAPE
Capel St Mary CEVC Primary School
Capital City College Group
Carisbrooke College
Carmel College
Carshalton High School For Girls
Caterham School
Catholic Education Service
Centre of Expertise on Child Sexual Abuse
Cheshire East
Chetham's School of Music
Chichester College Group
Chiltern Way Academy
Churston Ferrers Grammar School
CIFE compliance committee
City College, Plymouth
Claxton Trust Primary Schools
Cleaswell Hill School
Clifton College
Cobham Free School
Cognus
Collab Group
Colnbrook C. of E. Primary School
Community Academies Trust
Compton Dundon Independent Special School
Concord College
Confederation of School Trusts
Constituent of Nick Gibb MP
Coombe Girls' school
Coop Academies Trust
Coop Southfield
Coppice Valley Primary School
Corbets Tey School
Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School
Cotmanhay Junior School
Cranleigh C of E Primary School
Cressing Primary School
Cromwell Consulting Ltd

Northlands Schools
Northlands Wood Primary Academy
Norton Canes High School
Norwood Primary School
nottingham local authority
Nottinghamshire County Council
NSPCC
Nursteed Community Primary School
Oak Green School
Oasis Community Learning
OBJECT
Ofsted
One Edui
Opsequela
Orchard School Bristol
Orley Farm School
Ormiston Chadwick Academy
Other
Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary School
Our Lady of Pity RC Primary Sch
Outcomes First Group
Outwood Academy Newbold
Oxfordshire County Council
Oxfordshire Hospital School
Oxted School
Paediatric Continence Forum
Palmers Green High School
Parentkind
Pearl Safeguarding Consultancy
Pembridge Hall School
Pendle Community High School and College
Phoenix Aspirational Learning Support Ltd.
Pioneer Educational Trust
Pipers Corner
Pipworth CP School
Place2Be
Platt Bridge Community School
Polygon School
Portsmouth Virtual School and College
Potteries Educational Trust
Poverest Primary School
Premier early Years training
Prospect Training Services
Purley Oaks Primary School
Queen Alexandra College
Queen Anne's School
Queen Ethelburga's Collegiate
Queen Marys College
Rainham Mark Grammar School
Ratton School
Ravenscote Junior School

Cygnets Preschool
Cyril Jackson Primary School
Dame Allan's Schools
Dartford Science and Technology College
Defend Digital
Delegated services
Denefield School
Derby and Derbyshire Safeguarding Children Partnership (DDSCP)
Derby College Group
Dickens Heath Community Primary School
Diocese of Bath and Wells
Disclosure and Barring Service
Diseworth CofE Primary
Dixons Academies Trust
Domestic Abuse Commissioner
Dorney School
Dorton College of Further Education
Downe House School
Duke of Kent School
Dunmore Primary School
Durham High School
Durham University
E Safety Training Limited
Earith Primary School
East Coast College

East Point Academy
East Riding Council
East Surrey College
East Sussex county Council - SLES Safeguarding
Eastern Colleges Group - West Suffolk College, One and Abbeygate
Eastlea Community School
Ecclesfield School
EDLounge Limited
Education Development Trust
Education Training Collective
EKC Group
Emanuel School
Endeavour Partnership Trust
Englefield C of E Primary School
English Martyrs RC Primary School
EPM LTD
Equals Trust
Essa Primary
Essex County Council
Exceptional Ideas Ltd
Exeter Diocese
Eyre Safeguarding Services Ltd

Reach Academy
Reach South Academy Trust
REAch2 Academy Trust
Red oaks primary school
Reed Specialist Recruitment
Richard Huish College
Rickmansworth School

Ridgeway Secondary School
Ripley St Thomas Church of England Academy
Riverbank Academy
Romero Catholic Academy
Rushden Academy
Ruskin Mill Trust
Rydes Hill Preparatory School and Nursery
Safe Schools Alliance
SAFEcic
Safeguarding and Child Protection Association
Safeguarding Associates for Excellence
Safeguarding Network Ltd.
Saint Augustine's school
Salutem Healthcare
SAND Multi Academy Trust
Sandroyd School
SayersSocialCareConsultancy
Schools Choice
Schools' Safeguarding Team, Virtual School, Northumberland County Council
Schoolsworks Academy Trust
SCL Education Group
Scott-Broadwood CofE Infant School

SEA Inclusion and Safeguarding
SECAT
Sedgefield Community College
self employed
SENAD
Senad group
Services For Education
Shaw Primary Academy
Sheffield Park Academy
Showcase Training Ltd
SJSafeguarding
Smith's Wood Primary Academy
South Gloucestershire & Stroud College
Southampton City Council
Southampton Engineering Training Association
Spaghetti Bridge Ltd
Sparkenhoe Community Primary school
Springhill Residnetial school

Family Education Trust
Fareham College
Federation of Leaders in Special Education
Fielding Primary School
Finborough School
Finchley Catholic High School
Finton House School
First Class Supply
Fishergate Primary School
Francis Holland Sloane Square
Frensham Heights School
Frizinghall Primary School
Fulham Cross Academy Trust
Furness College (Barrow Sixth Form)
Fylde Coast Academies Trust
Geddington CofE School
Georgian Gardens
Giggleswick School
Glenmead School
Gloucestershire Engineering Training
Gloucestershire Safeguarding Children Partnership
Godolphin and Latymer School
Godolphin School
Good Shepherd
Governing Board, Shaftesbury Park Primary School
Grange Park Primary School
Great Bradfords Infant & Nursery School
Greenways Primary School
Gresham's School
Gretton School
Grove Academy
Hackbridge Primary
Haileybury Astana
Hamilton Academy
Hannah Ball School
Harris federation
Haselworth Primary School
Havering School Improvement Service
Hawes Side Academy
Hayling Community Preschool
Hazelmere Junior School
Health Conditions in Schools Alliance
Heathcote Primary School and Stratford upon Avon
Primary School
Helen's Childminding Service
Henlow C of E Academy
Hertford Regional College
Highworth Grammar School
Hill House
Hollinwood Academy

Spurcroft Nursery and Primary School Thatcham
Berkshire
SSE Governance
St Alban's CVA, Derby
St Anne's Catholic School
St Bees School
St Bernadettes Primary School
St Bonaventure's School
St Catherine's School
St Christopher
St Christopher School
St George's RC Primary School
St George's School
St Gregorys Catholic Primary school
St Gregory's Primary School
St John and St Nicolas Schools Federation
st john's ce mosley common primary school
St John's College School
ST JOHNS PRIMARY ACADEMY
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School
St Joseph's Primary
St Mary's
St Mary's Magdalene's
St Mary's School Ascot
St Matthew's Little Lever
St Michael with St Thomas ce primary school
St Michael's C of E Primary School
St Nicholas' CE Foundation Stage and Infant school
St Nicholas CE Primary Academy
St Ralph Sherwin Catholic Multi-Academy Trust
St Stephen's CE Primary School
St. Augustine's CE High School
St. John the Evangelist
St. John's School & College
St.John and St. Nicolas Schools
Staffordshire County Council
Step 2 Young People's Health
Stephenson Memorial Primary School
Stoke Damerel Primary Academy
Stonewall
Suffolk County Council
Suffolk County Council Virtual School
Surbiton childrens centre nursery school

Sussex Learning Trust
Sutton Road Primary School
Sutton Valence School
Swale Academies Trust
Sydenham High School
Tanfield School
Tarnerland Nursery School

Holy Rood Primary
Holy Trinity CEP Dartford
Honeywell Junior School
HORIZONS SPECIALIST ACADEMY TRUST
HSDC
Hyline Security (UK) Limited
IgniteEducationUK
Ilkley Grammar School
Immanuel College
Ince CE Primary School
Independent School's Commissioner
Independent Schools' Bursars Association (ISBA)
Independent Schools Inspectorate
Inspiration Trust - Great Yarmouth Primary Academy
Inspire: Culture Learning Libraries
Ivel Valley School
James Allen's Girls' School
James Montgomery Academy Trust
John Bramston Primary School
John Guest Safeguarding Ltd
Jonathan Miller Education Consultant
JTL
Just for Kids Law
K Mellors Chaucer Staff
Kaplan Financial
Keir Hardie Primary School
Kelmscott School
Kent College Junior School
Kernow Learning
King Edward VII Academy
King's High School
Kingston & Richmond Safeguarding Children Partnership
Kingston Grammar
Kirklees Council
Knowepark ELC
Lady Barn House School
Lady Eleanor Holles
Lady Zia Wernher School
Lakes College
lakes primary
Landau Forte College
Langold Dyscarr Community School
Larkfields Junior School
Latymer Upper School
LB Redbridge
Leading Learning Trust
Leconfield Primary School
Leigh & Bransford Primary School
LGfL
LHPA
Lickey Hills Primary School

Tarporley CE Primary
Terrington Hall school
Tetherdown Primary school
Thameside Primary School
The Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS)
The Association of School and College Leaders
The Baird Primary Academy
The Beacon
The Bethlem and Maudsley Hospital School
The Bournemouth and Poole College
The Brookfield School
The Castle School
The Castle School Education Trust (CSET)
The Challenging Behaviour Foundation
The Children's Society
The Children's Trust
The Chiltern School
The Difference
The Diocese of Hereford MAT
The Education People
The Focus Training Group
The Gateway Academy
The Harefield Academy
The Independent Schools Association
The King Fahad Academy
The Leys School
The Milestone School
The Perse School
The Pointer School
The Primary First Trust
The Sheffield UTC Academy Trust
The Walnuts School
Thomas's Academy
Three Towers
Titchfield Primary School
TKAT
Tollgate
Tollgate Primary School
Tor Bridge High
Transform Trust
Treloar's
Trent College
Trinitas Academy Trust
Trinity CE Primary School
TSSC
UK Feminista
Ullswater Community College
UNISON
Unity Schools Partnership
University College School
Valley Invicta Academies Trust (VIAT)

Life Multi Academy Trust
Linwood School
Lionwood Junior School
Little Sutton primary school
Loders CE Primary Academy
London Academy of Excellence
London Borough of Hounslow
London Design and Engineering UTC
London South East Colleges
Long Furlong Primary School
Long Road Sixth Form College
Long Sutton County Primary School
Longhill School
Longridge Towers School
Lostock Hall Academy
Loxford School Multi Academy Trust
Lucy Ellis consultancy
Lucy Faithfull Foundation
Madeley school
Maiden Erlegh Trust
Malvern St James School
Manor Hall Trust Academy
Manor Junior School
Manor Primary School Reading
Marches Academy Trust
Marie Weller Primary School
Marish Academy Trust
Matching Green C of E Primary School
Mayfield School
Medway Primary School
Mersey Drive Community Primary School
Middlewich Primary School
Midlands Association for Safeguarding in Education
(MASIE)
MILLFIELD PREP
Milton Keynes Council

Victoria Junior School
Virtual School, Essex County Council
Voice Community Union
VWV LLP
Waberthwaite C of E School
Wargrave House School
Warminster School
Warwickshire College
Warwickshire Virtual School
Waverley Training Services
Welbourne Primary School Tottenham
Wellington College
Wellspring Academy Trust
West Acton Primary School
West Berkshire District Council
West Lancashire Community High School
West Nottinghamshire College
West Thames College
Westfield Primary Community School
Westgate Primary School
Westminster Kingsway College
Weydon School
Whitley Park Primary School
Wilbarston CE Primary
William Brookes School
William Cobbett Primary School
Wiltshire Council
Wirksworth Junior School
Woodlands Primary School
Wymondham College
Wyre Forest School
Xavier Catholic Education Trust

Yavneh College
Youth Justice Board