



Department
for Education

Keeping children safe in education

Government response to consultation

July 2021

Contents

Contents	2
Introduction	3
Summary of responses received and the government's response to the consultation	4
Common Themes	4
Whole Document	4
Part one – Safeguarding information for all staff	5
Part two – The management of safeguarding	5
Part three – Safer recruitment	6
Part four – Allegations of abuse made against teachers and other staff	6
Part five – Child on child sexual violence and sexual harassment	7
Expanding our evidence base	8
Consultation Responses	8
Section 1 – Summary of the guidance	8
Section 2 – Part one: Safeguarding information for all staff	10
Section 3 – Part two: The management of safeguarding	12
Section 4 – Part three: Safer recruitment	25
Section 5 – Part four: Allegations of abuse made against teachers and other staff	28
Section 6 – Part five: Child on child sexual violence and sexual harassment	29
Section 7 – Expanding our evidence base	36
Low level concerns about staff	39
International students	43
Racist abuse	44
Recording safeguarding information	45
General	48
Conclusion	51
Annex A: Organisations which responded to the consultation	52

Introduction

On 10 December 2020, 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 to comment on proposed revisions to the Department’s stand-alone advice Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges. The consultation also sought to extend our evidence base by asking a number of questions (41 to 60) to help us gather a broad range of intelligence about how schools and colleges put KCSIE into practice. The consultation closed on 04 March 2021.

We delayed publishing this response to allow us to consider Ofsted’s report on its investigation into child sexual abuse in schools and colleges. Ofsted published this report on 10 June 2021 which is available on [GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk). The Ofsted report observes similar behaviours and issues as identified by respondents to the consultation. Especially regarding Part one and Part five of KCSIE and on the stand-alone advice. This has helped us to further strengthen key sections of the guidance to better support schools and colleges prevent abuse, identify abuse and respond appropriately where abuse is reported.

We have published, alongside this response, a draft of the revised KCSIE guidance ([KCSIE September 2021 - FOR INFORMATION](#)). This is **for information** so schools and colleges can plan for the commencement of the guidance on 1 September 2021.

Until the new revised guidance commences on 1 September 2021, the existing statutory guidance - [Keeping Children Safe in Education 2020](#) is still in force and is what schools and colleges must continue to have regard to.

We have also published alongside this response, a draft of the revised stand-alone advice 2021. **This is for information only. Until the new revised advice commences on 1 September 2021, the existing advice [Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges](#), is still in force and is what schools and colleges should continue to have regard to.**

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.

Due to rounding 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 644 organisations and individuals responded to the consultation; these include 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. The responses received also include those who responded to the first consultation in 2020 which was withdrawn due to COVID-19.

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 have referenced 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, added additional information.

We also note requests to include more information regarding child on child/peer on peer abuse that are already reflected elsewhere in KCSIE and are covered in the stand-alone advice. We have improved signposting and cross referencing but will continue to keep under review the best way to support schools and colleges with guidance on this matter.

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 child sexual exploitation and child criminal exploitation. To further increase awareness of peer on peer abuse and the importance of staff understanding what it is and responding to concerns about it, we have:

- made clear that staff should expect to see their school/college approach to peer on peer abuse in the child protection policy.
- made clear it is essential that when they make a report of abuse all victims are reassured that they are being taken seriously and that they will be supported and kept safe.
- reiterated the importance of raising “**any** concerns” about a child with the DSL or a deputy.
- explained in more detail the risks associated with peer on peer online abuse and what this can look like.
- made clear peer on peer abuse can happen outside the school or college. As with all forms of abuse schools and colleges should protect a child who has been harmed or is at risk of harm wherever the abuse may have taken place.
- highlighted that peer on peer abuse can sometime be hidden abuse and that just because there aren’t reports of it, does not mean it is not happening, it could be the case it is simply not being reported. We ask all staff to be vigilant and report any concerns.
- all safeguarding concerns regarding children should be appropriately recorded and we have provided more information for staff as to how the DSL and their deputies should be doing that.

Part two – The management of safeguarding

We have revised the mental health section and signposted to additional support and resources.

We have also now included information on Elective Home Education to ensure schools are aware of their responsibilities alongside best practice to inform the local authority when a parent decides to home educate their child.

To further strengthen what governing bodies and proprietors should be doing to protect children from peer on peer abuse and support victims we have:

- provided more information on reporting mechanisms and set out that: systems should be in place (and they should be well promoted, easily understood and easily accessible) for children to confidently report abuse, knowing their concerns will be treated seriously, express their views and give feedback.
- we have explicitly set out that the whole school and college approach to peer on peer abuse should be reflected in the child protection policy as should the approach to children reporting abuse.
- reiterated the importance of child protection files being maintained.
- emphasised the need to consider tailored approaches to teach children about staying safe especially with regard to victims of abuse, vulnerable children and SEND children.
- emphasised the importance of governing bodies understanding what online peer on peer abuse can look like and reflecting as appropriate in their child protection and mobile technology policies.
- highlighted the importance of governing bodies and proprietors recognising that peer on peer abuse can be hidden abuse and even if there are no reports of it, it may still be taking place, just not being reported.

Part three – Safer recruitment

We have provided details of how schools and colleges check the barred list status (in certain circumstances) of individuals engaging in regulated activity, via the Employer Access service administered by the Teaching Regulation Agency.

We have also provided clarification around Section 128 checks and overseas checks following removal of the EEA sanction list.

We have also reflected 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.

Part four – Allegations of abuse made against teachers and other staff

Following requests via the consultation for further information on low level concerns, we have separated Part four into two sections – Section one for allegations that may meet the threshold and Section Two for allegations/concerns that do not meet the threshold i.e. low level concerns.

As such we have included in Section two, information about concerns that do not meet the harm threshold. This includes what a low level concern is, making the link between low level concerns, staff code of conduct and safeguarding policies, and recording and sharing information with relevant parties including whether this information should be included in references.

Part five – Child on child sexual violence and sexual harassment

Overall, there was broad support for Part five, and it was generally seen as providing the right level of information. Although some respondents are worried that its already too long and more information risks blurring key messages.

There were a number of points made about the importance of a good safeguarding culture and this was highlighted as key. We have reflected this at various points in KCSIE.

A key factor is Part five is used alongside the more detailed stand-alone departmental advice - [Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

The biggest theme was a request to include more information in Part five that is already covered in the stand-alone advice (and in some cases elsewhere in KCSIE) - for example on indicators to look out for, on the challenges around identifying and dealing with harmful sexual behaviour and the disproportionate impact on young girls. To help with this we have set out some further context at the beginning of Part five and on what is included in the stand-alone advice, and we have, where possible, added additional information from other parts in Parts one and two of KCSIE. We have also:

- made clear that sexual violence and sexual harassment can happen outside of the school or college premises and online.
- made clear that there should be a zero tolerance approach to sexual violence and sexual harassment and that it is never acceptable and should not be tolerated.
- added a section on dealing with unsubstantiated, unfounded, false or malicious reports.
- included additional signposting to support schools and colleges in dealing with harmful sexual behaviour.

We will continue to consider how these two advice documents interact with each other.

It was encouraging to that see so much external specialist support is available and that schools rate it so highly. However, the length of time waiting to access some support is an issue as is local variation.

Expanding our evidence base

We were encouraged by the responses to the questions to further our evidence base. The detail provided will help us when considering further: whether safeguarding training for governors should be mandated; the best place for advice regarding racist abuse and safeguarding of international students; whether more prescription is needed about reporting requirements to help schools and colleges better record safeguarding information.

Consultation Responses

Section 1 – Summary of the guidance

Proposals and rationale

Proposal to introduce at Annex A of the guidance, a shortened version of Part one.

Q8 – Do you support this approach?

We received 635 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	530	83%
No	82	13%
No opinion	23	4%

Consultation Findings

83% of respondents welcomed the inclusion of a new shortened Part one, which is aimed at those staff who do not regularly work directly with children. The small percentage who did not welcome the addition of the shortened Part one said that safeguarding is the responsibility of all staff who work in the school or college regardless of whether they work directly with children, therefore they should read the full version of Part one.

Government Response

We welcome the support for Annex A and on this basis, we have included it in the revised guidance. We agree that safeguarding is everybody's responsibility and governing bodies and proprietors will be able to choose Part one or Annex A whichever they think will best suit the needs of those staff who do not work directly with children.

Q9 – Do you have any comments about the content of the new Annex A?

We received 637 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	179	28%
No	391	61%
No opinion	67	10%

Consultation findings

Most respondents (61%) did not have further comments. However, of the 28% that did comment, they agreed that the shortened version is more likely to be read and the information retained. Although some were concerned that having a shortened version might be interpreted as safeguarding not being as important for this cohort of staff.

Government Response

It should be noted that whilst this is a shortened version of Part one, it contains the main principles that staff need to be aware of and understand. We expect governing bodies and proprietors to emphasise the importance of safeguarding to these groups of staff so that they understand whilst they might not work directly with children, they do need to understand their responsibilities. The main message is the same: see something, say something.

Part one and Annex A are only part of the overall safeguarding picture. All staff should still receive safeguarding training at induction and that training should be regularly updated.

Q10 - Do you have any comments about any other content in the summary section to the draft guidance?

We received 502 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	62	12%
No	404	80%
No opinion	36	7%

Consultation findings

Only 12% of respondents commented on the content in the summary section. These comments included:

- training providers are not included in the guidance – those who provide work experience.
- the shortened version could be open to interpretation that safeguarding is not as important for staff who do not work directly with children.

Government Response

There was a misinterpretation by some respondents who thought the reference to the ‘summary’ section was referring to the new Annex A. The question was referring to the Summary section at the front of the guidance not the summary of Part one.

For clarity, in the section ‘Who is this guidance for?’ we have added senior leadership teams who have responsibility for safeguarding as they have an important role to play and should read the guidance.

Following the progress of the Government road map, we decided to remove the paragraph about COVID-19. We will of course keep this under review and as previously additional guidance will be published if necessary.

KCSIE has also been extended to all government funded post-16 providers of education and training following the enactment of The Education and Training (Welfare of Children) Act 2021.

Section 2 – Part one: Safeguarding information for all staff

Q11 - Are there any additional changes you believe should be made to help schools/colleges identify and support children at risk of criminal exploitation, sexual exploitation and serious violence?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	146	23%
No	391	61%
No opinion	96	15%
Not answered	3	1%

Consultation findings

61% of respondents felt the guidance was accurate and informative and that staff know their pupils and can recognise changes in behaviour. Comments from others included points about children not recognising that they are being exploited, requests to provide further information about county lines and criminal exploitation and clarification that

attendance plays a factor in these circumstances, particularly where a child is only in school or college for part of the day.

Government Response

We recognise the increased focus on child sexual exploitation, child criminal exploitation and county lines, on this basis we have revised the text in Part one and have moved some of the detail about the forms of Child Sexual Exploitation and Child Criminal Exploitation from Annex B to Part one to give it more prominence.

Q12 - Do you support the proposed changes to Part one set out at Annex G?

We received 637 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	557	87%
No	15	2%
No opinion	62	10%
Not answered	3	1%

Consultation Findings

87% of respondents welcomed in particular the inclusion of mandatory Relationships, Sex and Health Education (RSHE), Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHs) support; preventative measures for cyberbullying and online abuse in behaviour policies, serious violence, and improved clarity of CCE and mental health. The information in Part two regarding school and college powers to hold and use information as well as share it should be extended to training providers.

Government Response

We are pleased that the majority found the proposed changes helpful. We recognise the potential increase in pupils who may have developed mental health problems through the pandemic and have extended the mental health paragraphs and signposted to further materials and resources to help schools and colleges. In addition, as suggested, we have included a further paragraph to ensure staff are aware of the range of risk factors which increase the likelihood of involvement in serious violence.

As referred to in our response to question 10, the guidance now extends to post 16 training providers as set out in The Education and Training (Welfare of Children) Act 2021.

Q13 - Do you have any further comments about the content in Part one of the draft guidance?

We received 638 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	77	12%
No	556	87%
Not answered	5	1%

Consultation findings

A small number of respondents commented that training providers should be included in this section and also that information on dealing with racist behaviour should be included in the school or college's behaviour policy.

Government Response

We welcome these comments and have clarified that any prejudice based and discriminatory bullying, not just racism, should be included in the school or college's behaviour policy. We also note that one of the evidence questions asked whether further advice regarding racist abuse would be helpful. This is covered later in this document.

Section 3 – Part two: The management of safeguarding

Q14 - Do you support the proposed changes to how online safety is reflected?

We received 638 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	577	90%
No	18	3%
No opinion	39	6%
Not answered	4	1%

Consultation findings

90% of respondents supported the proposed changes on how online safety is reflected in KCSIE. A small number of respondents did not support the proposed changes and felt that more responsibility should be with parents/carers and that the changes would increase the burden on schools in particular the DSL.

Government Response

We are extremely pleased with the positive support for this change. We wanted to ensure that online safety information was given greater prominence.

Q15 - What additional roles does your DSL have (select more than one if appropriate)?

We received 630 responses to this question

Response:	Total
Headteacher	219
Deputy headteacher	234
Other senior leadership team (SLT) role	278
Teaching responsibilities (timetabled hours)	279
Other statutory role(s) e.g. SENCo, designated teacher etc.	240
Non-statutory role(s) (please state which ones)	127
Don't know	29

Consultation findings

The highest proportion of respondents (44%) identified other senior leadership roles and teaching responsibilities as additional to roles the DSL performs in their setting. A significant proportion of respondents also stated that the DSL was either the headteacher or deputy headteacher and/or held other statutory role(s).

Respondents' main concern was whether the DSL role should be a stand-alone role.

Government response

It is welcome that responses show that there is a high degree of overlap between the DSL and other senior roles, including headteacher and deputy headteacher. This is in line with the expectation that an appropriate senior member of staff is appointed as DSL and given the appropriate status and authority within schools and colleges.

We recognise the significant level of responsibility that the DSL role carries. However, it is for individual schools and colleges to determine the time and resources that the DSL requires, in line with the school or college's needs.

Q16 - Approximately how many hours does the DSL in your school or college spend fulfilling their DSL role and responsibilities in an average week?

We received 632 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
4 hours or less	75	12%
5 to 9 hours	134	21%
10 to 19 hours	171	27%
20 to 29 hours	68	11%
30 to 39 hours	32	5%
40 hours or more	33	5%
Don't know/Not applicable	108	17%

Consultation findings

Of the respondents to this question, 27% reported that the DSL spent 10 to 19 hours fulfilling their DSL role and responsibilities. A smaller number of respondents reported that the DSL spent 5 to 9 hours on their responsibilities (21%).

Government Response

We appreciate that many DSLs will perform multiple roles in their settings, and it can be difficult to estimate workload directly related to DSL responsibilities.

Whilst the findings are only indicative of the time commitment that DSLs spend fulfilling their duties, they show that the DSL role can vary between schools and colleges. Given existing variation in settings, including by size and type of setting, we would expect workload to differ depending on those factors. This is why we do not think it is appropriate to specify how much time or resource should be given to the role and that schools and colleges should be given autonomy over this.

However, last year we strengthened the guidance to clarify that the DSL should be given the time to provide advice and support to other staff on child welfare and child protection matters.

Q17- What is the role of the deputy DSL in your school(s) or college? Please include an outline of the number of deputy DSLs and their responsibilities.

We received 632 responses to this question.

Consultation findings

For respondents who answered about the number of deputy DSLs they had in their school or college, answers varied from 2 to 16. It was not clear whether all responses were on behalf of one school or larger entities such as multi academy trusts.

In almost all cases the deputy DSL is a member of the senior leadership team, most commonly the deputy head. Deputy DSL positions are also held by, in order of most cited, the SENCO (Special Educational Needs Coordinator), class teacher, administrative and pastoral support roles, phase leads and teaching assistants. Other roles, in order of most cited, such as family liaison/link/support workers, learning mentors, welfare officers and well-being leads are also deputy DSLs.

In terms of responsibilities, key themes from the responses were:

- acting as DSL in their absence;
- providing general support and additional capacity;
- attending meetings and liaising with stakeholders;
- administrative support.

Some of the responses also identified a division of discrete responsibilities across different deputies in their settings as well as the role of deputies in quality assuring the work of others and acting as a critical friend.

Government Response

We recognise the importance of DSLs working collaboratively and receiving support from other staff in their settings. This may often take the form of an extended team of deputies but it is for individual schools and colleges to decide whether they choose to have one or more deputy DSLs. The guidance is clear that any deputy should be trained to the same standard as the DSL.

Q18 - Are the responsibilities set out in the draft guidance at Annex C clear?

We received 634 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	534	84%
No	45	7%
Not sure	31	5%
Not applicable	19	3%
Not answered	5	1%

Consultation findings

The vast majority of respondents (84%) stated that Annex C clearly set out the responsibilities of the DSL.

The key concerns raised in responses and in consultation events were:

- the interpretation of the phrase ‘children who need or have needed a social worker’, including how long after a child stays in that category after social work involvement has ended;
- need for greater clarity on what the expectations are of DSLs for promoting educational outcomes and how to comply with the guidance;
- additional responsibilities for DSLs;
- greater clarity on resourcing the role (time and funding).

Government Response

In response to key concerns, we:

- have changed the phrase ‘children who need or have needed a social worker’ to ‘children who have or have had a social worker’;
- have changed the wording on page 35 (paras 145-148) to ensure consistency throughout the document.

The Children in Need Review showed that poor outcomes for children who have had a social worker persist even after social work involvement ends. Therefore, it is important for schools and colleges to promote the educational outcomes of both children who have and have had a social worker, recognising the lasting impact that experiences of adversity and trauma can have.

However, schools and colleges will need an individual-level understanding to determine the right support for a child. DSLs, working in partnership with the headteacher and other staff, should use their professional judgement to consider the child’s needs and whether

they require additional academic or pastoral support after social work involvement has ended.

The duties for promoting the educational outcomes of looked-after children remain distinct, with the Designated Teacher (DT) for looked-after and previously looked-after children and the Virtual School Head holding responsibility for this. Whilst recognising that in some settings those roles will be carried out by the same person, we would encourage the DT and DSL to work together and share expertise and resources, as appropriate, given the shared focus on supporting children who have experienced adversity and trauma.

We have addressed concerns about additional responsibilities and the support children who have a social worker need in our response to Questions 19 and 21 respectively.

Q19 - Are these responsibilities additional to what the DSL in your school or college currently does in their role?

We received 633 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	179	28%
No	295	47%
Not sure	86	13%
Not applicable	61	10%
Not answered	12	2%

Consultation findings

Approximately half of respondents (47%) said that responsibilities were not additional to what the DSL in their school or college currently do in the role, followed by those who said that those responsibilities were additional (28%) and those not sure (13%).

Most respondents who reported that the responsibilities were not additional to what the DSL in their school or college currently do, commented that these are areas they ‘would expect to cover’ and that ‘DSLs do all of this and more’. Some respondents who said that the responsibilities were additional to what the DSL in their school currently do, told us that responsibility for academic outcomes is an additional level of accountability. A common theme across open-text responses were concerns about the workload of DSLs. Some felt that this may distract from a safeguarding response and may place undue burden on DSLs. Some also raised concerns about DSLs who do not have an academic or teaching background and their ability to promote educational outcomes.

A concern raised by some respondents, particularly colleges, was the issue of DSLs not being in a teaching role and promoting these children's outcomes being the responsibility of curriculum colleagues.

Government Response

We know that many DSLs already see promoting the educational outcomes of children who have a social worker as part of their role. However, we recognise that some DSLs are concerned by these changes including the impact on their workload and existing safeguarding duties.

To support DSLs with these changes, we are committed to providing a toolkit of online resources – which is the type of support we know DSLs would particularly welcome. The toolkit will support DSLs with their role and include case studies, good practice resources and guidance on working with others, as well as information on what works in promoting the educational outcomes of children who have or have needed a social worker. The resources will be co-produced with DSLs in the Autumn term. It remains essential that DSLs are given the additional time, funding, training, resources and support they need to carry out the role effectively, in line with the expectations set out in KCSIE.

For all DSLs, including those with non-teaching backgrounds, promoting the educational outcomes of children who have or have had a social worker requires working in partnership with others and drawing on others' expertise. This is likely to include academic and pastoral teams, specialist staff e.g. SENCos, and other members of the senior leadership team. What we saw through the Children in Need Review is the benefits of DSLs understanding the experiences of these children and the impact that those experiences can have on their learning and ensuring that the right support – both academic and pastoral – is being provided for them to address their barriers to learning and help them reach their potential.

We recognise that some educational settings and in particular some larger schools and colleges may already have a strategic lead with responsibility for promoting the educational outcomes of children with a social worker. In those circumstances, we would expect the DSL to work alongside those leads to provide strategic oversight for the outcomes of these children and young people. We have updated wording in the guidance to reflect this.

Q20 - How does the DSL currently ensure that school and college staff understand the needs of children who need or have needed a social worker and the impact their circumstances can have on their education?

We received 634 responses to this question.

Consultation findings

Communication and training were the most cited ways that the DSL ensures that staff understand the needs of children who have or have had a social worker. Communication

was provided at the whole staff level or targeted for specific staff that work directly with relevant children. Communication was delivered via meetings and reviews and via emails and newsletters. Training was cited as a way that the DSL ensures that staff understood the needs of their vulnerable children. Training across the whole of staff was most common including training in attachment, Adverse Childhood Experiences, Social, Emotional and Mental Health needs.

Other ways that the DSL ensures that staff understand the needs of their children who have or have had a social worker include monitoring and record keeping. Staff are made aware of children with experience of a social worker, more commonly this is “on a need to know basis” although some respondents suggested that “all staff are made aware” of children with experience of a social worker.

Government Response

The DSL has a key role to play in raising awareness amongst staff about the needs of children who have or have had a social worker and the barriers that those children might experience in respect of their attendance, engagement and achievement at school or college. Effective communication, information sharing and training are important to this and it is welcome to see this highlighted in many responses.

Schools and colleges should know who their cohort of children who have or have had a social worker are. However, it is for the DSL, working with the headteacher and other staff, to judge the appropriate level of information to share with members of staff on individual children’s circumstances so that they can provide the right support to them and help them to succeed.

Q21 - How does the DSL currently ensure children who need or have needed a social worker are able to reach their potential in their education?

We received 633 responses to this question.

Consultation findings

From responses to this question, we identified the following main themes in how DSLs currently ensure that children who have a social worker are able to reach their potential:

- **Monitoring and assessment:** respondents mentioned a range of tools schools and colleges use to monitor progress and attainment of pupils as well as wider outcomes such as attendance, pastoral progress and wellbeing;
- **Providing intervention and support:** respondents mentioned additional pastoral support, including on mental health, extra tuition, 1:1 teaching, mentoring as well as after-school and extra-curricular opportunities;
- **Working with internal stakeholders and parents and social workers:** respondents provided valuable insights on working with internal stakeholders such as teachers, senior management, SENCo and pastoral staff, as well as

parents/carers and social workers. Respondents highlighted the importance of working with others to ensure the right support was in place for children.

Many respondents also reflected on the importance of listening to a child's voice and setting high expectations for these pupils.

Government Response

We welcome the range of support that DSLs already put in place to help children who have or have had a social worker reach their potential. We want DSLs, working with the headteacher and other staff, to continue to create a culture of high educational aspiration for these children including through additional support that recognises and responds to the impact of children's experiences.

Schools and colleges will be best placed to know what type of support is needed to help children reach their potential. However, we would encourage schools and colleges to consider the findings of the Children in Need Review, which explains barriers to education faced by children who have or have had a social worker and what is needed in practice to improve their educational outcomes. Additionally, schools and colleges may want to look at the projects identified by What Works for Children's Social Care, as appearing to have positive impacts for children with a social worker when determining additional interventions or support for these children.

We remain committed to building a strong evidence base of what works to support children who have a social worker to fulfil their potential. We are providing up to £12.6m of further funding to What Works for Children's Social Care. This funding will improve joint working between schools and local authorities and outcomes for children with a social worker through:

- continuing to embed social workers in schools to support teachers to spot the signs of abuse and neglect more quickly;
- testing the impact of supervision models for DSLs;
- scaling and evaluating projects to build the evidence base on what interventions are most effective to improve the educational outcomes of children with a social worker.

Q22 - How is the DSL supported by the school or college to undertake their role as a DSL?

We received 632 responses to this question.

Consultation findings

The following themes were mentioned by the majority of respondents as ways in which the DSL is supported to undertake their role:

- time e.g. through reduced teaching hours;

- training;
- team support e.g. safeguarding team, senior leadership team or governors;
- supervision.

Through the consultation events, we also heard about external support mechanisms for DSLs, such as those provided by their local authority or voluntary and community sector partners. Examples of this support provided by local authorities included: a helpline for school and college staff to safeguarding advice service, training for DSLs and other staff, local authority-based DSL forum, a supervision service, and templates of policies that could be reused and adapted by settings.

A number of responses also reflected the difficulty of the role, the challenge to find time to receive support or undertake training and the issue of not having sufficient protected time for DSL responsibilities.

Government Response

We welcome the range of support provided to DSLs by schools and colleges to support them undertake their important responsibilities to help safeguard children.

However, it is concerning that some DSLs do not have sufficient time to carry out their responsibilities or to access support and training. As set out in the guidance, we expect DSLs to be given the additional time, funding, training, resources and support they need to carry out their role effectively. Annex C of the guidance sets out in further detail the expectations around training for DSLs.

Q23 - Which of the following would be helpful in supporting the DSL to carry out the role and responsibilities as set out in the updated version of the guidance?

We received 631 responses to this question.

Response:	Total
Additional training	298
Online resources and guidance	380
Peer support	256
Support from leadership team	148
Supervision	307
Other	47

Consultation findings

Online resources/guidance is the type of support that most respondents identified as useful for supporting them with the changes to the DSL role – with 60% of respondents viewing this type of support as helpful. Just under half of respondents identified supervision (49%) and additional training (47%) as being helpful in supporting the changes.

A number of key themes emerged from the wider comments about helpful ways to support the DSL to carry out roles and responsibilities. These were:

- provision of time;
- funding for the role;
- provision and funding of supervision;
- training to support the role.

Government Response:

We recognise that schools and colleges are facing pressures and that the right help needs to be provided to support DSLs. That is why we are committed to providing a toolkit of online resources to support DSLs with their role including these changes - which is the type of support we know DSLs would particularly welcome. The toolkit will include information on what works in promoting the educational outcomes of children who have a social worker, good practice resources and guidance on working with others. The resources will be co-produced with DSLs in the Autumn Term. If DSLs are interested in being involved in developing and testing these resources, we would invite them to get in touch via DSL.CONULTATION@education.gov.uk.

From September, we will also be extending the role of the Virtual School Head to all children with a social worker. The Virtual School Head will act as a local champion in each local area to help build and support partnerships between schools, local authorities and other support services and provide the strategic leadership, expertise on what works and advocacy for children with a social worker. The Virtual School Head will be able to provide expert advice and support to DSLs on promoting the educational outcomes of children with a social worker.

The consultation responses and events also highlighted the importance of supervision to DSLs and the benefits that supervision can have. However, we also recognise the need for supervision to be both high-quality and effective. That is why we are providing the What Works Centre for Children's Social Care (WWCSC) with further funding to test group and direct supervision approaches, at both primary and secondary phase, across up to 40 local areas. This investment will help us better understand the impact of different types of supervision on DSLs and inform what support is needed for DSLs going forward.

We recognise that some schools and local authorities are already providing practice supervision to DSLs, and DSLs told us about successful supervision programmes that have been rolled out in their settings. We would encourage schools and local authorities to consider the benefits that supervision can have for the work they do with children who have a social worker.

Q24 - Have you experienced any barriers to sharing information for the purposes of safeguarding and improving educational outcomes for children who need or have needed a social worker?

We received 632 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	235	37%
No	277	44%
Not sure	43	7%
Not applicable	62	10%

Consultation findings

A slightly larger number of respondents had not experienced any barriers to sharing information (44%), however a significant number of respondents (37%) had experienced barriers to sharing information.

The most common themes here related to information flows in and out of children’s social care and social workers along with wider agencies and professionals. UK GDPR issues were cited as were problems associated with parental consent. Information sharing at key transition points was a recurrent theme and IT systems was also raised as an issue.

A notable number of respondents told us that they are not told when a child has a social worker. Where they do know that a child has a social worker, some said that information is not shared in a timely way or when the child’s circumstances change. This was particularly the case for children that transfer schools or at transition points between settings.

Government Response

Schools and colleges need an individual-level understanding of the circumstances facing pupils with a social worker in order to determine the right response and support for them. Effective information sharing across agencies is central to this.

As emphasised in the conclusion of the Children in Need Review, and existing guidance, local authorities are expected to share the fact of a child currently having a social worker, and schools should hold and use this information so that they can take the right decisions that are in the best interests of children’s safety, welfare and educational outcomes. There are clear powers to do so, under existing duties on both agencies to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. The Government’s expectation is that this should continue to be considered as a matter of routine.

The Data Protection Act 2018 and UK General Data Protection Regulations do not prevent the sharing of information for the purposes of keeping children safe and promoting their welfare, including their educational outcomes. Working Together to Safeguard Children provides further guidance on this. It also includes a ‘myth-busting guide to information sharing’ which addresses common myths that may hinder effective information sharing including around data protection legislation and consent.

Q25 - Do you have any further comments about the content of Part two of the draft guidance?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes:	120	19%
No:	516	81%

Consultation findings

Key concerns raised in the responses and raised in the consultation events were:

- providing additional funding and time for the DSL role;
- whether DBS checks should be the responsibility of HR teams;
- whether the governors’ responsibilities in relation to safeguarding should be clearer and bespoke safeguarding training provided for them;
- issue of thresholds and whether children’s social care practice and processes should be standardised across different local authorities;
- whether schools and colleges should be required to have a whistleblowing policy and for this to be reflected in paragraph 76 of the guidance.

Government Response

As set out in KCSIE, governing bodies and proprietors should ensure that the person appointed to the DSL role has the time, funding training and resources they need to carry out the role effectively. Schools and colleges should have their own arrangements in

place to carry out DBS checks, this is not something DfE can or would want to prescribe. In terms of governor responsibilities in relation to training, in section 7 of the consultation we asked a number of questions about safeguarding training, a summary of the responses can be found at questions 41 – 45.

In terms of whistleblowing, KCSIE is clear that appropriate whistleblowing procedures should be put in place for such concerns to be raised with the school’s or college’s senior leadership team.

KCSIE is also clear that all staff and volunteers should feel able to raise concerns about poor or unsafe practice and potential failures in the school’s or college’s safeguarding regime, and know that such concerns will be taken seriously by the senior leadership team.

Section 4 – Part three: Safer recruitment

Q26 - Is the revised new format of Part three helpful?

We received 637 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes:	558	88%
No:	5	1%
No opinion	74	12%

Consultation findings

We were very pleased to see that the vast majority (88%) of respondents supported and welcomed the new format of Part three and only 1% did not find the new format helpful. Those who found it helpful consider it to be easier to follow and that it provides clarity of responsibilities regarding safeguarding checks.

Government Response

We have clarified some additional areas which are explained more fully in the following questions.

Q27 - Do the proposed changes to Part three provide clarity about the principles of safer recruitment and not just being reliant on a DBS check?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	564	89%
No	11	2%
No opinion	57	9%
Not answered	4	1%

Consultation findings

89% of respondents supported the restructure to make Part three more aligned with the safer recruitment process. The way it is now structured will help schools and colleges know which section to check when conducting safer recruitment checks. The 2% who answered no, wanted to see more information on interview techniques; they expressed concern about not being able to obtain meaningful references, and others said a checklist would be helpful.

Government Response

We are pleased that the changes to Part three have been welcomed. We have made some minor changes to provide clarity. However, we think schools and colleges should make their own decisions about interview techniques and do not think DfE should be prescriptive by providing checklists.

Q28 - Do you have any suggestions about how the safer recruitment process might be improved beyond the changes we are proposing to Part three?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	113	18%
No	523	82%

Consultation findings

A small number of respondents were concerned that references were difficult to obtain and were often not provided in a timely manner, which held up proceedings. There were also some concerns about how to check the identity of individuals appropriately, especially where they have possibly changed their name.

Respondents also suggested that we provide a template for the single central record (SCR), further information on visitors and whether DBS checks are required, and clarity about overseas checks.

Government Response

The guidance sets out clearly what information needs to be recorded on the SCR, we consider it best to give schools and colleges the autonomy to set out this information in a way that suits their organisation.

We have made a number of small changes in order to strengthen the guidance. These include clarification that:

- the self-declaration under the shortlisting heading is subject to Ministry of Justice guidance on the disclosure of criminal records.
- it is not appropriate to ask an individual about their criminal history at the application stage of the process. Therefore, we have moved the bullet point which refers to self-declaration about any criminal offences committed in any country from the application stage to shortlisting.
- it is important to provide references in a timely manner.
- it is important to be sure that the person is who they claim to be, this includes being aware of the potential for individuals changing their name, best practice is checking the name on their birth certificate, where this is available.

In addition, we have reflected the changes to the stand-alone barred list service. Schools and colleges can use the Teaching Regulation Agency service to check the barred list status of individuals they directly employ (in specified circumstances). We have also added further details about overseas checks and how to confirm an individual does not have any sanctions or restrictions whilst living or working overseas.

Q29 - Do you have any further comments about the content of Part three of the draft guidance?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	68	11%
No	568	89%

Consultation findings

The restructure was welcomed and the focus on the application process was considered to be at the right level, complementing safer recruitment training. It was also considered

very helpful to reinforce the importance of safe culture within schools and colleges and that pre-employment checks are only one component of safe recruitment.

Government Response

We are pleased that the content is considered to be at the right level and will help schools and colleges follow the correct procedures to ensure the individuals they employ are suitable to work with children.

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

Q30 - Is the proposed new format of Part four of the draft guidance helpful?

We received 637 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	529	83%
No	9	1%
No opinion	99	15%

Consultation findings

83% of respondents found the new format and additional information very helpful, providing clarity with respect to matters that do not meet the LADO threshold, i.e. low level concerns. It was found to be clear and easy to follow, the information flows more logically, particularly the information about supply teachers. However, there was some concern that the term 'low level' might be interpreted as concerns that are not serious or significant.

Government Response

We are pleased that the overall response to Part four was positive. However, we have made some minor additions to provide clarification. These are set out in the next question.

Q31: Do you have any other comments about the content of Part four of the draft guidance?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	69	11%
No	567	89%

Consultation findings

Out of the 11% that provided comments, these were mainly requesting:

- clarification about whether unsubstantiated allegations should be included in references,
- that we extend the supply teachers section to include contracted staff; and,
- clarify that supply agencies and contractors should have their own policies for managing allegations and referring to the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Government response

We have added contracted staff to the heading of supply teachers, because where a school or college engages individuals who are not directly employed by them whether from a supply agency or a contractor, the principles for dealing with concerns and allegations are the same.

We have also clarified that unsubstantiated along with false, malicious and unfounded allegations should not be included in a reference.

Whilst the feedback on the paragraph on low-level concerns was positive, some respondents said they would find it helpful if we expanded the information, so we have added a new section on low-level concerns and signposted to further resources. We have also been clear that “low level” does not mean that the concern is insignificant. We will keep this section under review.

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

Q32- Do you have any comments on these changes?

We received 634 responses on to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	132	21%
No	444	70%
No opinion	58	9%

Consultation findings

70% of respondents had no comments to make on the changes we proposed to make and indeed welcomed the changes made. Of the 21% who did make comments, a common theme was for additional information already covered in the stand-alone advice

[Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk) to be included.

Government response

We are pleased that the changes made have been found to be helpful and clear. To address some of the calls for additional information, we have added further information to highlight that Part five should be read in conjunction with the stand-alone advice [Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk) and set out some further context on what is included in the stand-alone advice and we have, where possible, added additional information from other parts in Parts one and two.

Q33 - Do you think that Part five of the draft guidance provides schools and colleges with the right level of information to support them to manage reports of child-on-child sexual violence and sexual harassment effectively?

We received 634 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Too much	19	3%
About right	569	90%
Not enough	46	7%

Consultation findings

There was an overwhelming view that Part five contained the right level of information. Although some respondents are worried that it is already too long and by adding more information, it risks blurring key messages. Only 7% of respondents thought that there was not enough information in Part five on managing reports of child-on-child sexual violence and sexual harassment.

Government response

We are very encouraged that 90% of respondents think the level of information provided is about right.

For those requesting more information, a very common theme was for additional information which is already included in the stand-alone advice - [Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk).

We will continue to think carefully about the relationship between Part five and the stand-alone advice and consider if there is a better way of reflecting both parts of the advice.

Q34 - Part five provides advice and guidance on how to access support for victims and perpetrators of child-on-child sexual violence and sexual harassment. Locally, do you know how to access such support?

We received 345 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	230	67%
No	115	33%

Consultation findings

Around two thirds of respondents know how to access support for victims and perpetrators. Of those that did not, some stated it was because it wasn't needed in their role. Concerns were also raised that access to support was not always readily available, and that some services are overwhelmed therefore accessing support is not quick or easy.

Government Response

Whilst we are encouraged that a good majority of people know how to access support we are concerned that 33% don't know.

This in part reinforces how critical it is for those in the DSL role to be aware of support and know how access it (as set out in Part two and Annex C), in advance of incidents occurring, so they can act immediately when required. We have given greater prominence to this important part of the DSL role in the DSL job description at Annex C.

Q35 - What would you change about Part five to make it more effective?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Consultation findings

There were calls for additional information to be added on areas that are already covered elsewhere in KCISE or the stand-alone advice, for example on indicators to look out for, on the challenges around identifying and dealing with harmful sexual behaviour and the disproportionate impact on young girls.

It was felt that a section on dealing with malicious or unfounded reports would be helpful, similar to what is in Part four on malicious or unfounded allegations.

There was also a suggestion that by adding specific information to address workforce abuse (i.e. where staff experience abuse from children), this could help improve the safeguarding culture across the whole school and college.

Government Response

Given 90% of respondents are happy with the level of information provided in Part five we have thought very carefully about making further changes.

However, the responses to the consultation were extremely thoughtful and very helpful. As such we have:

1. made clearer that sexual violence and sexual harassment can happen in both primary and secondary schools, both online and offline and that it can happen outside of educational premises.
2. reinforced messages that all victims must be taken seriously and that they should never be made to feel like they are creating a problem or that they should be ashamed by making a report.
3. cross referenced to other parts of the guidance where additional guidance is available.
4. given more prominence to online abuse and handling incidents of sharing nudes and semi nudes.
5. signposting to useful sources of support, particularly on addressing harmful sexual behaviour.

We acknowledge comments about the disproportionate impact on young girls – whilst we must remember boys are victims too. This is already explicit in Part one of the guidance and the stand-alone advice. But it is a key point to understand so we have also reflected in Part five.

We have decided against reflecting abuse of staff as we feel we must keep the focus of this guidance on its core purpose and that is safeguarding of children.

Q36 - Do you have any further comments about the content of Part five of the draft guidance?

We received 635 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	19	3%
No	616	97%

Consultation findings

97% of respondents did not have any further comments to make. Of those that did, there were calls for additional information on handling incidents that happened outside of school and college premises and on the importance of getting the response to low level concerns right.

Government Response

We of course recognise the importance of responding appropriately to low level concerns and have added further information on the importance of addressing inappropriate behaviour, which **can** be an important intervention that helps prevent problematic, abusive and/or violent behaviour in the future. As well we see it significant to remind schools and colleges about the importance of regularly reviewing decisions and actions and that relevant policies are updated to reflect lessons learnt. To support schools and colleges, we have provided further resources on addressing harmful sexual behaviour.

We have also made it clearer that the same principles apply where an incident takes place outside of school and college premises.

Q37 - Are you aware of the DfE's advice on Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	571	90%
No	65	10%

Consultation findings

We received a total of 636 responses to this question and an overwhelming number of respondents said they were aware of the stand-alone advice on Sexual violence and sexual harassment between children in schools and colleges.

Government Response

We are very pleased such a high proportion of respondents are aware of the advice.

We do continue to think about how we can promote the advice and ensure as many people, especially DSLs and senior leadership teams see it, read it and act on it.

Q38 - Do you think the advice provides adequate information to support schools and colleges to prevent and as required respond to reports of child-on-child sexual violence and/or sexual harassment?

We received 345 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Too much	8	2%
About right	309	90%
Not enough	28	8%

Consultation findings

The responses to this question were very positive and most felt that the advice provided adequate information, and that it was right to keep it separate from Part five in KCSIE. But there were a small number of respondents who felt that additional information was needed, particularly on prevention.

Government Response

We are very pleased that 90% of respondents think the advice provides adequate information to support schools and colleges.

Given 90% of respondents are happy with the level of information provided in stand-alone advice we have thought very carefully about making further changes.

To help schools and colleges, we have updated the evidence section, the RSHE curriculum section and included better signposting to useful resources and we have, where possible, added additional information from other parts in KCSIE.

Q39 - Do you have any comments on the proposed changes to the DfE stand-alone advice?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	30	5%
No	519	82%
No opinion	87	14%

Consultation findings

Although the majority of correspondents are content with the proposed changes, there continues to be a mixed response on whether it be included in the statutory guidance to give it more additional weight and importance and to avoid continued confusion on statutory obligations.

Government Response

Given the continued mixed responses, we will need to continue to think carefully about the relationship between Part five and the stand-alone advice and consider if there is a better way of reflecting both parts of the advice.

Q40 - What would you change about the advice to make it more effective?

We received 636 responses to this question.

Consultation findings

The common themes identified from the responses include:

- requests for tailored support according to the needs and vulnerability of victims and perpetrators.
- requests for more support and guidance on Harmful Sexual Behaviour.
- the importance of a good safeguarding culture, zero tolerance of sexual harassment and sexual violence and eradication of victim blaming.
- suggestions to updates the RSHE and Evidence sections.

Government response

We recognise the challenges that schools and colleges face in identifying and dealing with Harmful Sexual Behaviour, so we have included better signposting to additional sources of support.

We have made clearer in the advice that it is essential that **all** staff know that all victims must be taken seriously and that they should never be made to feel like they are creating a problem or that they should be ashamed by making a report.

We have also provided further information on the important role education plays, including in relation to how the RSHE curriculum supports this.

We have updated the evidence section to help schools and colleges understand the challenges.

Section 7 – Expanding our evidence base

Q41- Does your school or college have a safeguarding governor or equivalent?

We received 633 Responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	534	84%
No	13	2%
Not sure	17	3%
Not applicable	19	11%

Consultation findings

The majority of respondents confirmed they had a safeguarding governor or equivalent.

Government response

We are pleased to see such a high figure for schools and colleges which have a safeguarding governor or equivalent. It suggests further changes to KCSIE are not required but we will keep this matter under review.

Q42 - If yes, have they had safeguarding training?

We received 631 Responses to this question.

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	513	81%
No	9	1%
Not sure	29	5%
Not applicable	17	3%
Not answered	63	10%

Consultation findings

81% of respondents confirmed they have had safeguarding training.

Government response

These responses will help us determine whether further work is necessary on whether safeguarding training should be mandated.

Q43 - If yes, what format did the training take?

We received 631 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Face to face	306	48%
Online	142	22%
Blended	92	14%
Not answered	91	14%

Consultation findings

Respondents that have had training have used different formats depending on their specific needs.

Government response

This information has helped us understand that different formats of training are helpful. We appreciate that schools and colleges have different training needs and should be allowed to receive the training in the most appropriate way for them. This shows that 48% have received face to face training, however, during COVID-19 we suspect the online figure will have risen.

Q44 - To what extent has the training assisted them to fulfil their role and helped them hold others to account?

We received 631 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Fully assisted	366	58%
Not assisted	8	1%
Not sure	176	28%
Not answered	81	13%

Consultation findings

Just over half of respondents said that training assisted them to fulfil their role and helped them hold others to account. 28% said they were not sure, some of the reasons why they answered not sure were that there is a lack of transference between training and following matters up in reality.

Others said that the training assisted them with a knowledge base which helped them ask the right questions.

A proportion of those that said the training fully assisted them had roles in their employment that helped, such as social worker, CEO or ex teachers.

Government response

This information has given a good basis for future policy development.

Q45 - What safeguarding training, if any, have other members of the board had?

We received 632 responses to this question

Consultation findings

There was a mixture of safeguarding training which included:

- Local authority training
- Same training as headteacher
- Online training
- Trust delivered training
- DSL training for governors
- In house training run by DSL

- External training provider

Government response

This information has given a good basis for future policy development. We will consider further taking into account evidence produced through the Ofsted review into child sexual abuse on whether safeguarding training is an issue.

Low level concerns about staff

Q46 - Do you agree with the definition of “low level concerns” described above?

We received 637 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	526	82%
No	59	9%
No opinion	52	8%

Consultation findings

82% agreed with the definition of ‘low level concerns’. Comments from respondents agreed that schools and colleges should have appropriate policies/procedures in place. They suggested we link to the code of conduct requirements and that training would be useful on this subject.

A small number who disagreed with the definition said the term ‘low level’ minimises the risk, a concern is a concern. The definition does not provide clarity, which leaves it open to interpretation.

Government response

We are grateful for the comments and suggestions about ‘low level’ concerns and on this basis, we have added a new section to Part four of KCSIE, which also signposts to more detailed guidance.

Q47 - Do you agree that it is an important component of school and college safeguarding procedures for low level concerns about staff to be recorded?

We received 637 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	593	93%
No	10	2%
No opinion	34	5%

Consultation findings

Nearly all respondents welcomed the addition of information about 'low level' concerns. More than one respondent referred to research and learning from serious case reviews noting that it is often the case that individuals who abuse start with 'low level' abuse and the fact that a concern is recorded could stop an individual repeating such behaviour. Keeping a record of concerns can help identify patterns of behaviour and also help staff understand why their actions/behaviour are of concern. Clarity was requested on where to record such information and how long records should be kept.

Government response

We were pleased that this information was welcomed, but appreciate that there were some areas in relation to which respondents requested clarification. We want schools and colleges to create an environment where staff feel comfortable reporting such concerns because although in many cases it might be a misinterpretation of a colleague's behaviour, this can't be confirmed until it is investigated. On this basis we have added a new section on 'low level' concerns. We are not being prescriptive on how and where to record the information, schools can decide based on their own procedures. We have however, signposted to [Farrer and Co](#), who have developed more detailed guidance and a toolkit which will help those schools and colleges who choose to use it.

Question 48: Does your school or college have arrangements in place for staff to report and record low level concerns about the actions and behaviours of staff?

We received 634 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	457	72%
No	39	6%
Not sure	73	12%
Not applicable	65	10%

Consultation findings

A high percentage of respondents said they already have arrangements in place for staff to report low level concerns about the actions and behaviours of staff.

Government response

This gives a very strong indication that schools and colleges are doing what they need to do, which is very encouraging, on that basis we have added a short section to Part four but also signposted to more detailed guidance, should schools and colleges need it.

Q49 - Would it be helpful for DfE to provide advice about low level concerns in KCSIE?

We received 636 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	552	87%
No	37	6%
No opinion	47	7%

Consultation findings

Whilst respondents have arrangements in place 87% said they would like advice in KCSIE.

Government response

This is linked to the questions above. Schools and colleges already have arrangements in place, as such DfE has provided high level principles to support schools and colleges. We will keep under review.

Q50 - Do you have any specific comments about what these arrangements should look like?

We received 636 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	173	27%
No	463	73%

Consultation findings

The majority of respondents did not have specific comments about what the arrangements for reporting low level concerns should look like. Of those that did comment, the issues were in relation to:

- including arrangements in a school or college's safeguarding/child protection policy;
- linking to staff behaviour policies so staff can understand what is acceptable;
- giving examples of low level concerns;
- how to share concerns with the individual.

Government response

We have tried to address the majority of the issues made by respondents, but have not been prescriptive in some areas, because we feel schools and colleges are best placed to make their own decisions with regard to detailed implementation of any 'low level' concern policies.

Q51 - What would be the workload implications for schools and colleges of implementing a system to record low level concerns as described above?

We received 633 responses to this question

Consultation findings

Workload implications do not compare to the fallout for child safeguarding concerns. As many schools and colleges already have arrangements in place, there isn't an impact on workload, it is part of the current arrangements. For those schools and colleges who do not already have arrangements in place, respondents envisaged time would be needed to initially develop the arrangements but once in place, recording concerns should be part of day to day processes.

Government response

It is encouraging that the majority of respondents considered there would be no additional workload and those that don't have arrangements in place accepted that there will be an impact on time whilst setting up the arrangements but then this would decrease because it should become part of the overall safeguarding ethos in the organisation.

International students

Q52 - Given the potential extra vulnerabilities set out above do you think it would be helpful for KCSIE to include guidance to support schools and colleges to help them keep international students safe?

We received 635 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	402	63%
No	30	5%
No opinion	154	24%
Not sure	49	8%

Consultation findings

Over half of respondents think it would be helpful to have additional information about safeguarding international students in KCSIE.

Government response

This question was posed very much with longer-term policy thinking in mind and we are particularly grateful to all those who responded.

Racist abuse

Q53 - Would schools and colleges find it helpful if advice regarding racist abuse was included in KCSIE?

We received 348 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	272	78%
No	30	9%
No opinion	43	12%
Not answered	3	1%

Consultation findings

A high percentage (78%) would find it helpful to have advice regarding racist abuse included in KCSIE.

Government response

This question was posed very much with longer-term policy thinking in mind and we are particularly grateful to all those who responded. This is an area of work that we intend to give further consideration.

Q54 - If yes, what do you think is the best way to do this?

We received 348 responses to this question

Consultation findings

The following bullet points reflect the different ways respondents considered the best way to include this information in KCSIE.

- describe as prejudice based or discriminatory as part of behaviour policy;
- provide an explanation of racist abuse and example policies on what schools should have to deal with any form of discrimination;
- include it in other forms of peer on peer abuse;
- include in Part two – management of safeguarding;
- have an appendix;
- produce stand-alone guidance;

Also teaching children about other cultures can help them understand the differences.

Government response

We are grateful for the insight respondents provided on what they think will work for their schools and colleges. In the first instance we have added prejudice based or discriminatory as part of the behaviour policy in Part two. This is an area of work that we intend to give further consideration.

Recording safeguarding information

Question 55: Are you confident that the school's recording systems that are in place are appropriate and used effectively?

We received 344 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	284	82%
No	6	2%
Not sure	14	4%
Don't know	24	7%
Not answered	16	5%

Consultation findings

82% are confident that the school's recording systems that are in place are appropriate and used effectively.

A number of respondents said that using electronic systems helps, where staff have different levels of access to ensure confidentiality. CPOMS and Myconcern were two of the electronic systems that were highlighted by respondents.

A lot of schools have governance processes in place and conduct routine auditing and monitoring of records.

Due to the different systems, transferring records between establishments can be difficult.

Government response

The fact that a high percentage said their school had appropriate recording systems in place and they were used effectively is very encouraging.

This information will help with future policy development.

Q56 - Do these systems help ensure information and data can be extrapolated at an appropriate level so that governing bodies can ensure that safeguarding, child protection and welfare policies and procedures that are in place are working?

We received 344 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	263	76%
No	12	3%
Not sure	22	6%
Don't know	29	8%
Not answered	18	5%

Consultation findings

The feedback was positive, the majority of respondents were happy that the systems they have in place allow for information and data to be extrapolated at appropriate level, so that governing bodies can ensure that safeguarding, child protection and welfare policies and procedures that are in the place are working. Looking at safeguarding data is an agenda item for a lot of governing bodies.

Government response

It is imperative that governing bodies ensure the policies and processes they have in place are effective and being implemented appropriately. The information gathered appears to be very positive. The use of random audits provides reassurance that governing bodies have the oversight we expect them to have, so that they can act quickly on any gaps in policies or any misunderstanding by staff of the procedures they are responsible for.

Question 57: Would a certain level of prescription in KCSIE about reporting requirements help schools and colleges better record safeguarding information?

We received 346 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	166	48%
No	54	16%
Not sure	104	30%
Don't know	12	3%
Not answered	10	3%

Consultation findings

Respondents considered it would be good to have a prescribed level of detail in accordance with known best practice, so that a standard approach could be applied.

Others said it would depend on what DfE was proposing, good practice principles for record keeping could be helpful, but a prescriptive criteria for reporting would not be helpful.

Schools do not need a level of prescription about reporting requirements, they need good training for staff on recording information.

Government response

Whilst nearly half of the respondents answered yes it would be helpful to have more prescribed detail to allow a more consistent approach across schools. There were other issues for DfE to consider, such as the level of training staff need to ensure they can record information effectively and what level of prescription would be required. This is an area we will be considering more fully in the future.

General

Q58 - Thinking about Keeping children safe in education (putting aside this years proposed changes) do you think it provides effective advice and support to schools and colleges?

We received 636 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	550	86%
No	38	6%
No opinion	46	7%
Not answered	2	1%

Consultation findings

Only 6% said that they did not think the guidance provides effective advice and support to schools and colleges. The reasons given were:

- Post 16 providers would benefit from more information on managing and sharing their data;
- Make it relevant to a wider audience not just schools, e.g. social workers and local safeguarding partnerships;
- KCSIE tells schools and colleges what to do but not how to do it.

Government response

We are extremely pleased that 86% of respondents consider that KCSIE provides effective advice and support to schools and colleges. However, we are grateful for the responses from the 6% who did not agree for the reasons given above.

As covered in previous questions, we have now included post 16 providers in KCSIE. As the Act only came into force at the end of June, we will be working with this cohort to find out more information on how KCSIE applies to them.

KCSIE is statutory guidance which means it is underpinned by legislation that covers schools and colleges, this legislation does not include social care or local safeguarding partnerships. However, there is a strong link between schools and colleges, children's social care and the local safeguarding partners, which are covered in detail in Working Together, and there are separate projects in train for both social care and local safeguarding partners. When the outcomes of these projects are known, we will reflect any relevant changes in KCSIE.

Thinking about the format of the guidance. Currently the guidance contains 5 parts plus several Annexes and is published as one document.

Q59 - Is the current format (i.e. one document) the most appropriate format?

We received 347 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	276	79%
No	24	7%
No opinion	41	12%
Not answered	6	2%

Consultation findings

79% of respondents consider KCSIE to be in the right format. Only one person who said they did not think the format was not right gave a reason, which was that they would find it useful to have translations of Part one and Annex A more easily available to support the engagement of staff whose first language is not English.

Government response

We are pleased that the majority of respondents are happy with the current format, however this is something we will keep under review.

In response to the comment about translating Part 1 and Annex A, schools and colleges should be aware that public sector workers are expected to be fluent in English as per the [Code of Practice on the English language requirements for public sector workers](#).

Q60 - If no, is there another format that would make it easier to read and/or be more accessible?

We received 342 responses to this question

Response:	Total	Percent
Yes	39	11%
No	65	19%
No opinion	82	24%
Not answered	156	46%

Consultation findings

Suggestions on how to make it easier to read KCSIE included:

- split the different areas into separate documents so staff are more inclined to read the area relevant to their role;
- provide an index for quick reference;
- use more signposting within different sections rather than having them in the annex.

Government response

We would like to thank the respondents who provided information on how to improve the format of KCSIE. We will consider these comments further when looking at future versions of KCSIE.

Conclusion

We are grateful to all those who took the time to respond to the consultation and share their 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 in schools and colleges they deserve. The intelligence around usual practice gathered during this exercise will be used to help inform any future development of departmental guidance.

Annex A: Organisations which responded to the consultation¹

Abbeys Primary School
Abbeywood Community School
Abingdon and Witney College
Academic Appointments
Academy Transformation Trust
Ad Astra Academy Trust
Ada. National College for Digital Skills
Aldenham School
Alderley Edge School for Girls
Alderman Knight School
All Saints' CEVCP School
Alpha Plus Group
Anglesey Primary Academy
Anglesey Primary Academy
Arreton St George's Primary School
Ascent Trust
Ashbridge Independent School and Nursery
Association of Colleges
Association of Education Welfare Management - AEWM
Astrea Academy Sheffield
Atlantic Academy
ATLP
Aylesbury High School
Aylesbury High School
Babcock International
Babcock LDP
BAND Ltd
Barnardo's
Barnby Road Academy
Baysgarth School
BCP Council (Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council)
Beaconsfield High School
Beaufort Primary School
Beaufort Primary School
Bellevue Education
Belper School and Sixth Form Centre
Berkhamsted School
Beverley St Nicholas Community Primary School
Birmingham Metropolitan College
Bishop Fox's School
Bishop Fox's School
Blackburn College
Blackpool & The Fylde College
Blackpool Council
Blackwell Primary (partners in learning academy)
Bolsover Secondary School
Boundary Oak School
BPIF Training
Branston Community Academy
Brinsworth Academy
Bristol City Council
Brockwood Primary School
Brook Learning Trust
Broughton Hall High School
Bubwith Community Primary School
Bures CEVC Primary
Bury Children's Services Quality Assurance Unit
Bushy Hill Junior School
Cadland Primary School
Cambian – Hill House
Cambian Group – Oakwood School
Cambian Hereford School
Cambian SEMH Schools
Cambridge County Council. Education Directorate.
Cambridge Regional College
CAPE (Child Protection in Education)
Capel St Mary CEVC Primary School

¹ 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.

Carmel College
Castle Hill High School
Catch 22
Catholic Education Service
Cayley Primary School
Cedars Academy
Chaucer School
Chepping View Primary Academy
Cheshire East
Chetham’s School of Music
Christian Concern
Christopher Whitehead Language
College
City of London Academy - Highgate
Hill
City of London Freeman’s School
City of London Freeman's School
City of Wolverhampton Council –
School Improvement Team
City of Wolverhampton Council (School
Improvement Team)
Claines CE Primary, Worcester
Clifton College
Clifton Community School
Cognus
Commonswood Primary & Nursery
School
CONLE/CCCG
Coop Academies Trust
Copley Academy
Cophall School
Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School
Cosain Consulting Ltd
Crawley Ridge Junior School
Crosslee Community Primary School
Cumbria Children's Services
Safeguarding Hub
CUMBRIA EDUCATION TRUST
Darlington College
Dartford Science and Technology
College
de Ferrers Trust
Deanesfield Primary School
Deer Park School
Derby and Derbyshire Safeguarding
Children Partnership (DDSCP)
Devon County Council
Dixons Academies Trust
Dorothy Goodman School
Dorset council children services
Dover’s Green Infant School
Dovers Green School
Dovers Green School ` `
Downs View
East Coast College
East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Eastchurch Church of England
PrimarySchool
Edge Grove
EKC Group
Ellistown Community Primary School
Embley
EMW Law LLP
End Violence Against Women Coalition
EPM
EPNE
Equality and Human Rights
Commission
Esher Sixth Form College
Fairfield Endowed Junior School
Falconhurst School
FBA
Felsted School
Felsted School
Fishergate Primary School
Fishergate Primary School
Fitzmaurice Primary School
Five Rivers Child Care
Fleetville Infant and Nursery School
Forest Hall School
Forest School
Fulneck School
Furness College
Garden city Academy
Gayhurst School
Geoffrey Field Infant School
Gidea Park College
Glascote Academy
Glebe House Friends Therapeutic
Trust
Gloucester House the Tavistock
Children’s Day Unit
Governor Newchurch CP / Warrington
Safeguarding Partnership
Green Lane School
Greenacre School

Greenleas School
 Greenmeadow Primary
 Greenside
 Greys Education
 Grundisburgh Primary School
 GSEP
 Hadley Learning Community
 (Secondary Phase)
 Hailey Hall School
 Haileybury Turnford
 Halcyon London International School
 Halesowen College
 Hamilton Academy
 Hanbury Primary School
 Hants Childrens Services Department
 Hardy Mill Primary
 Harrison Clark Rickerbys
 Harrytown High School Stockport
 Hartlebury CofE VC Primary School
 Hartley Primary School
 Hatfield Academy
 Havering Education Services, London
 Borough of Havering
 Hawes Side Academy
 Hawkedale Primary School
 Hawthorns Primary school
 Heath Farm School
 Heather Ridge Infant School
 Hedingham School
 Hereford, Ludlow and North Shropshire
 College
 Herefordshire Council
 Herne Bay Junior School
 Herschel Grammar
 Highfield and Brookham Schools
 Highgate Primary School
 Hills Road Sixth Form College
 Holy Trinity Primary
 Honley High School
 HOPE VIEW SCHOOL
 Hope View School
 Hopwood Hall College
 HSDC Group
 Huish Episcopi Primary School
 Hull Collaborative Academy Trust
 Hungerhill School
 Hurst Green Infant School and Nursery
 Hurst Primary School
 Independent Schools Council
 Independent Schools Inspectorate
 Intake Primary Academy
 Internet Matters
 Invicta Grammar School
 Ivel Valley School
 Ivel Valley School - an area special
 school
 James Allen's Girls' School
 James Montgomery Academy Trust
 JFS
 John Hampden and Tetsworth Schools
 Federation
 John Taylor High School
 JTL
 Juniper Education - working with Essex
 County Council
 Kennet School
 Kensington Prep School GDST
 Kensington Primary School
 Kilburn Grange School
 Kimbolton school
 King Edward VI College
 Kings Brighton
 Kings Education
 Kings Langley School
 Kingston College
 Kingston Maurward College
 Kirkby Avenue Primary School
 Kirklees College
 Kirklees Council
 Lancashire County Council
 Lancaster and Morecambe College
 Lancaster Steiner School
 Landmarks Specialist College
 Langley Hall Primary Academy
 LB Lewisham
 LEAD Academy Trust
 Learning and Skills Service
 Northumberland County Council
 Leigh & Bransford Primary School
 Leigh Day
 lincoln castle academy
 Lionheart Academies Trust
 Lionheart Academies Trust Primaries
 Litcham School
 Littlebourne Church of England
 Primary School

London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
London Borough of Enfield
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
London Borough of Southwark
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Design and Engineering UTC
Longfield Academy
Longfleet CE Primary School
Longsands Academy
Lound Academy Trust
Lovewise
Loxford School Trust
LSCP
Malvern St James Girls' School
Manor Green School
Manorfield Primary School
Marish Academy Trust
Marshlands Primary School
Martin High School
Marymount International School
Mayfield Special School
Meadow Primary School
Meath Green Infants School
Merryfields School
Metropolitan Borough of Solihull Council
MHCHS
Micklem Primary School
Miles Coverdale Primary School
Millway Primary School
Minds Ahead
Moor Hall Primary
More House School
Moulton College
NAHT
NASS (National Association of Independent Schools and Non-Maintained Special Schools)
NASUWT
National Commission on Forced Marriage (UK)
National Education Union
National Governance Association (NGA)
National LADO Network
NCG

New Era Education
New Horizons Learning Centre
Nicholas Postgate Catholic Academy Trust
Norfolk County Council
North Wingfield Primary and Nursery Academy
Northampton School for Girls
Northumberland College
Northumberland County Council
Notre Dame High School
Notre Dame High School
Notre Dame High School Sheffield
Nottinghamshire County Council
Nower Hill High School
NSPCC
Nutfield Church Primary
Oakbank School
Oakfield CE Primary
Oakway Academy – School
Oasis Community Learning
Ocean Lodge Independent School
Ofsted
Olympus Academy Trust
On Track Education
Ontrack Education Services
Orchard Academy
Ormiston Victory Academy
Ossett Academy and Sixth Form College
Otter Valley Federation
Our Lady and St Rose of Lima Catholic Primary School
Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary School
Outcomes First Group
Outcomes First Group
Oxford Spires Academy
Oxford Spires Academy
Oxfordshire Teacher Training (SCITT)
Paddock JIN School
Paddocks Primary School
Park View School
Park View School
Parkstone Grammar School
Peartree Primary School
Perryfields High School
Peterborough City Council

Petts Hill Primary School
Phoenix School
Phoenix School, Tower Hamlets
Pipers Corner
Pipers Corner School
Plymouth College
Plympton Academy
Poppleton Ousebank Primary School
Portesbery School
Practice Managers Association
Primary school Beatrix Potter
Priory Learning Trust
Prospect House School
Pudsey Bolton Royd Primary School
QEGUK
Queen Ethelburga's Collegiate
Queen Mary's College
Raedwald Trust
Rape and Sexual Abuse Centre
REAch2 Academy Trust
REAch2 Academy Trust
Reaseheath College
Redland Green School
Revoe Learning Academy
Rivermead Inclusive Trust
Riverside Area Special School
Riverside College
Riverview C of E Primary and Nursery School
Roecroft Lower School
Royal Wootton Bassett Academy
RTY
Rush Common School
Safe Schools Alliance U.K.
Safeguarding Governor, Melland High School. Bright Futures Educational Trust
Safeguarding in Education Team
Safeguarding Network
Safer Recruitment Consortium
Sandal Castle VA Community Primary School
Sarah Turner Consulting
Schools Choice
Schools ICT (East Sussex County Council)

Schools' Safeguarding Team,
Children's Services, Northumberland County Council
SEA Inclusion and Safeguarding
Sedbergh School
Selly Park Girl's School
Sense College
Services for Education
Sevenoaks Preparatory School
SGSC1
Shawley Community Primary School
Sherburn High School
Shoeburyness High School
Showcase Training Ltd
Showcase Training Ltd
Shrewsbury Colleges Group
Shropshire Council (Education HR Team)
Sitwell Infant School
South West Grid for Learning
Southampton City Council School Improvement Team
Southglade primary school
Sprowston Infant School
St Agatha's Catholic Primary School
St Albans School
St Andrew's Catholic Secondary School Leatherhead Surrey
St Anne's School and Sixth Form College
St Annes Catholic School
St Augustine's Catholic Primary School
St Bernadette's Catholic nursery & primary school
St Brendans Sixth Form College
St Catherine's School, Bramley
St Edward's School, Oxford
St Francis Catholic Primary School
ST James Infant school daventry
St John's C of E Primary School
St Joseph's and St Gregory's Catholic Primary School
St Mary of Charity Primary School
St Mary's Catholic Primary School
St Mary's C of E Primary School
St Nicolas and St Mary CE Primary School
St Nicolas' C of E Combined, Taplow

St Paul's School
 St Paul's Catholic Primary School
 St Paul's CE Primary School
 St Peter & St Paul Carbrooke Primary
 Academy & Nursery
 St Peter's Primary School, Bratton,
 Telford
 St Peter's C of E Primary, Farnham
 and St Mary's C of E Infant School,
 Shackelford. Surrey
 St Peter's School
 St Saviour's
 St Sebastians CofE Primary Great
 Gonerby
 St Thomas More
 St. Catherine's, Twickenham
 St. James CEC Primary School
 ST. JOHNS C OF E PRIMARY
 SCHOOL
 St. Matthew's Primary School
 Stamford Junior School
 Stanwick Primary School
 Stoke Heath Primary School
 Stoke Hill Junior School
 Stoke Prior First School
 Stony Dean School
 Stonyhurst College
 Stormont School
 Stowupland High School
 Stradbroke High School
 Stradbroke High School
 Stroud School
 Suffolk County Council
 Suffolk one
 Summerlea CP School
 Support Services for Education -
 Governance
 Swinemoor Primary School
 Tameside College
 Tandragee Junior High School
 TCHC Group
 Teaseldown School Exceptional Ideas
 Ltd
 Teddington School
 Tenterfield Nursery School
 Terrington Hall School
 thames primary academy
 Thameside Primary School
 Thameside Primary School, Reading
 The Aspire Hub Burnley
 The Association of Directors of
 Childrens Services (ADCS)
 The Association of School and College
 Leaders (ASCL)
 The Castle School
 The Castle School
 The Challenging Behaviour Foundation
 The Children's Trust School
 The Children's Society
 The De Montfort School
 The Federation of Manor Mead and
 Walton Leigh Schools
 The Grove Infant and Nursery School
 The HEART Education Trust
 The Heath Family (NW) Trust
 The Henry Cort Community College
 The Holy Spirit Catholic Primary
 School
 The Hub School
 The Levett School
 The Littlehampton Academy
 The Lloyd Williamson School
 The London College of Beauty
 Therapy
 The London Oratory School
 The Meadows Montessori School
 The Mendip School
 The Oaks Primary School
 The Phoenix School
 The Pointer School
 The Priors School
 The Shaw Education Trust
 The Sheffield College
 The Westbrook Trust
 The Westwood Academy
 The Woodlands
 Therfield School
 Thomas Aveling
 Thomas Lord Audley School
 Thornhill Community Academy
 Train2Train
 Transform Trust
 TRB Training & Consultancy
 Treloar School and College
 Treloar's
 Trinity School and College

Truro High School
TSP Learn
TVS Education Limited
Tylers Green Middle School
UK Safer Internet Centre / SWGfL
Various governing bodies of
maintained and academy school in
England
Virtual School Sensory Support
Waltham Forest Child Safeguarding
Board- London Borough of Waltham
Forest
Wapping High School
Warlingham School
WCG (formerly Warwickshire College)
Welbourne Primary School
Welford & Stockcross CE Primary
Schools
Wellspring Academy Trust
Wemms Education Centre

West Norfolk Academies Trust
West Nottinghamshire College
West Thames College
Westholme School
Westminster Academy
Westminster School Teacher / St.
Matthew's Primary School Governor
Weydon School
William Law CE primary
Winnersh Primary School
Woodfield Nursery School
Woodlands Park Primary School
Woodlands Primary School
Woolmer Hill School
Worcester Sixth Form College
Writtle Infant School
Wycombe Abbey School
Wyndham Park Infants' School
Wyvern Academy
Youth Justice Board



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2021

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to: Information Policy Team. The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/publications



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk