Origin: domestic

RPC reference number: RPC-3373(1)-DfE Date of implementation: late 2016 or early 2017



Keeping Children Safe in Education (Part 1 and 2) policy update

Department for Education

RPC rating: validated

Description of proposal

Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSIE) is the current statutory safeguarding guidance that must be followed by all schools in England.

The Department is proposing a number of minor updates to the KCSIE guidance. These updates seek to clarify the guidance in response to questions raised by the education sector, as well as responding to legislative changes in related policy areas such as preventing radicalisation and mandatory reporting on female genital mutilation.

The changes to the guidance include:

- adding a summary of the basic information all staff should know;
- changing a requirement from "considering" teaching children about safeguarding to "ensuring" children are taught; and
- adding information about online safety.

Impact of proposal

The proposal will affect all schools in England, however, only the impact on independent schools will be scored for the business impact target. The Department states that there are 2,357 independent schools in England, according to their latest data.

Costs

The Department states that in each school, the designated safeguarding lead and either the school proprietor or the school head teacher, and the school bursar, will each have to spend 30 minutes familiarising themselves with the proposal. To calculate the opportunity cost of this time the Department has used census data on average salaries from state funded schools as a proxy for average salaries in independent schools, due to the lack of available data on pay in independent schools. The Department estimates a one-off cost of approximately £64 per school, or £157,000 in total.

Date of issue: 25 May 2016 www.gov.uk/rpc

Origin: domestic

RPC reference number: RPC-3373(1)-DfE Date of implementation: late 2016 or early 2017



The Department estimates, based on its consultation with schools, that 90% of schools provide either full annual training or updates on safeguarding to staff. The number of independent schools where this is not the case is approximately 10%. The Department estimates that, as a result of the proposal, the 10% who do not currently provide annual full training will be required to provide at least updates on an annual basis. The Department estimates that this would require 15 minutes of each member of staff's time in such schools, costing £118,500 per year.

The Department states that independent schools that do not currently provide safeguarding training to pupils will incur the cost of providing this training. The Department has estimated that 48.5% of schools do not yet teach safeguarding to pupils. The cost of one hour for one teacher in each school to teach the material is calculated at around £125,000 per year.

Benefits

The Department expects that staff in independent schools will spend less time reading and understanding Part 1 of the KCSIE, when they re-familiarise themselves with it every two years, as this part of the guidance has been simplified to ease comprehension. The Department estimates that this will save independent schools £61,000 per year.

The Department expects the majority of the benefits of the proposal to result from greater awareness of child safeguarding policy, which may increase the number of safeguarding cases dealt with correctly. These benefits have not been quantified as it is difficult to apply monetary values to this impact.

The RPC verifies the estimated equivalent annual net cost to business (EANCB) of £0.2 million. This will be a qualifying regulatory provision that will score under the business impact target.

Quality of submission

The RPC considers that there are two issues with the calculated EANDCB, neither of which is likely to materially affect the EANDCB when rounded to the nearest £100,000. These issues are:

 It is unclear from the IA precisely which types of schools the Department includes in its EANDCB calculations. It states that it includes "independent schools" (page seven), which is correct, but the IA would be improved with clearer evidence demonstrating that the calculation also includes all schools in the private, voluntary and independent sector. The IA would also benefit

Date of issue: 25 May 2016 www.gov.uk/rpc

Origin: domestic

RPC reference number: RPC-3373(1)-DfE Date of implementation: late 2016 or early 2017



from clarification that the figures only refer to England and not the entire United Kingdom.

• The wage rates used in the IA are taken from the "School Teacher's Pay and Conditions Document" (page eight). It is unclear in which price year this data was collected. It is therefore unclear whether this is consistent with the Impact Assessment calculator submitted to the RPC alongside the IA, suggesting 2016 pricing was used. The IA would be improved by including this information and updating the calculations accordingly.

More generally the clarity of the IA could be improved by providing clearer descriptions of the different elements of the proposal, and from a clearer layout. This would improve the ease of comprehension of the IA for a reader who is not already extremely familiar with the KCSIE.

Departmental assessment

Classification	Qualifying regulatory provision (IN)
Equivalent annual net cost to business (EANDCB)	£0.19 million
Business net present value	-£1.47 million

RPC assessment

Classification	Qualifying regulatory provision (IN)
EANDCB – RPC validated ¹	£0.2 million
Business Impact Target (BIT) Score ¹	£1.0 million
Small and micro business assessment	Not required (fast track low-cost regulation)

Michael Gibbons CBE, Chairman

Date of issue: 25 May 2016 www.gov.uk/rpc

¹ For reporting purposes, the RPC validates EANDCB and BIT score figures to the nearest £100,000.

Origin: domestic

RPC reference number: RPC-3373(1)-DfE Date of implementation: late 2016 or early 2017



Alex Ehmann, Martin Traynor and Jeremy Mayhew did not participate in the scrutiny of this case to avoid a potential conflict of interest.