



Department
for Education

Keeping children safe in education 2026

Government consultation response

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	7
Summary of responses received and the government's response to the consultation	8
Changes made following consultation feedback Whole document	9
Part one – safeguarding information for all staff	9
Part two – the management of safeguarding	9
Part three – safer recruitment	9
Part four - safeguarding concerns or allegations made about staff, including supply teachers, volunteers and contractors	10
Part five – child-on-child sexual harassment and sexual violence	10
Annexes	11
Expanding our evidence base	12
Consultation responses	13
Section 1 – Summary of the guidance	13
Question 11	13
Question 12	13
Question 13	14
Question 14	15
Question 15	15
EYFS framework	16
Question 16	16
Consensual and non-consensual sharing of nude and semi-nude images and/or videos (also known as sexting or youth produced sexual imagery)	17
Question 17	17
Question 18	18
Misogyny	19
Question 19	19
Section 2 – Part one: Safeguarding information for all staff	20
Question 20	20
What school and college staff need to know	21
Question 21	21
Early help	22

Question 22	22
Child Sexual Exploitation	22
Question 23	23
Question 24	23
Serious violence	24
Question 25	24
Question 26	25
Question 27	25
Question 28	26
Question 29	26
What school and college staff should do if they have a safeguarding concern or an allegation about another member of staff	27
Question 30	27
Section 3 – Part two: The management of safeguarding	29
Mental Health	29
Question 31	29
Question 32	29
Guidance relating to children who are questioning their gender	30
Question 33	30
Question 34	31
Question 35	32
Opportunities to teach safeguarding	32
Question 36	33
Question 37	33
Artificial intelligence (AI)	34
Question 38	34
Government response	34
Question 39	34
Filtering and monitoring	35
Question 40	36
Information security and access management	36
Question 41	36

Alternative provision (AP)	37
Question 42	37
Question 43	38
Medical conditions	38
Question 44	38
Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)	39
Question 45	39
Information Sharing	40
Question 46	40
Question 47	41
Section 4 – Part three: Safer recruitment	42
Adults who supervise children on work experience	42
Question 48	42
Single Central Record	42
Question 49	42
Section 5 – Part four: Safeguarding concerns or allegations made about staff, including supply teachers, volunteers and contractors	44
Changes to Part four	44
Question 50	44
Question 51	44
Question 52	45
Question 53	45
Section 6 - Part five: Child-on-child sexual harassment and sexual violence	46
Question 54	46
Question 55	47
Section 7 – Annex B (to become Annex A): Further information	48
Question 56	48
Section 8 - Annex C (to become Annex B): The role of the designated safeguarding lead	49
Question 57	49
Question 58	50
Section 9 - Expanding our evidence base	51
General feedback on KCSIE	51

Question 59	51
Question 60	52
Question 61	52
Affluent neglect	53
Question 62	53
Question 63	54
Question 64	55
British Sign Language (BSL)	55
Question 65	56
Domestic abuse	56
Question 66	56
Grooming Gangs	58
Question 67	58
Gaming platforms	58
Question 68	59
Harmful sexual behaviour (HSB)	60
Question 69	60
Self-Referral – harm towards a child	61
Question 70	61
Teenage relationship abuse	62
Question 71	62
Verbal abuse	63
Question 72	63
Question 73	63
Designated safeguarding lead (DSL)	64
Question 74	64
Question 75	65
Question 76	65
Question 77	65
Question 78	65
Question 79	66
Conclusion	68

Introduction

On 12 February 2026, the Department for Education (DfE) launched a public consultation on proposed revisions to the statutory safeguarding guidance for schools and colleges in England, Keeping children safe in education (“KCSIE”). The consultation closed on 22 April 2026, and sought views from education professionals, safeguarding practitioners, and wider stakeholders.

The consultation provided respondents with an opportunity to comment on proposed revisions throughout the guidance.

Based on consultation responses, we have further updated the guidance in a few areas which can be found in the summary of changes section at pages 11-13. Of note, we have provided further clarification in relation to information sharing and in particular the transfer of the child protection file, the terminology around sharing nudes and semi-nudes, preventing serious violence, revised the definition of rape, clarified the important role of parents when children are distressed, revised the mobile phone section to reflect that the guidance is now statutory, and made clear that the one-page summary is not intended to replace Part one of KCSIE.

In addition to updating existing content, the consultation sought to strengthen the evidence base underpinning future policy development. Stakeholders were invited to provide insight and experience in relation to a number of emerging or complex safeguarding issues, including affluent neglect, the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in safeguarding, grooming gangs, and domestic abuse.

Alongside the consultation response, we have published a draft version of the revised guidance ([KCSIE September 2026 – for information](#)). This draft is **for information** and intended to support schools and colleges in preparing for the implementation of the updated statutory guidance, which is scheduled to come into force on 1 September 2026.

Until that date, the current statutory guidance, Keeping children safe in education 2025, remains in force. Schools and colleges must continue to have regard to this version in meeting their safeguarding responsibilities.

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

This section summarises the responses received through the consultation and outlines the government's response, including changes made to the guidance as a result of feedback.

We received 2,048 consultation responses via the online portal and an additional 74 via email or post from a wide range of stakeholders. The respondents included headteachers, school leaders, local authorities, teachers, designated safeguarding leads (DSLs), national representative organisations (including unions), school governors, parents and carers, and other organisations.

The consultation feedback has been instrumental in shaping and strengthening KCSIE. We are grateful to all respondents for taking the time to share their views. Every response has been carefully considered, and, in a number of cases, further amendments have been made to the guidance to reflect this feedback.

Not all respondents answered every question. As a result, the number of responses analysed varies across questions.

In addition, a number of responses which appear to reflect coordinated engagement activity are incomplete or contain limited responses to questions which may affect the overall distribution of responses for some questions. This is also the case for some responses received from parents, carer and other members of the public. This has been taken into account in the analysis. We have observed that a number of these submissions are incomplete or contain limited responses to specific questions, which may affect the overall distribution of responses for some questions; this has been taken into account in the analysis. It has also highlighted areas where parents and carers would welcome greater access to resources and guidance to help them support their children outside of the school setting.

This analysis focuses on issues within the scope of the consultation and the guidance. We note that some of the consultation responses raise points around the lack of references to racism, antisemitism, and anti-Muslim sentiments within KCSIE. We have strengthened references to education around hate, extremism and harmful ideologies, alongside clearer signposting to external resources such as Educate Against Hate. This will support schools in addressing discriminatory or prejudicial behaviour consistently. We will consider further changes following Sir David Bell's review into antisemitism.

A list of organisations that responded (and did not request anonymity) is provided at Annex A.

Changes made following consultation feedback

Whole document

Across the guidance, we have made a number of changes to improve clarity and consistency. This includes providing further clarification on information sharing, with particular emphasis on the transfer of the child protection file to support continuity of safeguarding practice between settings. We have also made clear that the one-page summary is not intended to replace Part one of KCSIE, which all staff must continue to read and understand. Terminology relating to the sharing of “nudes and semi-nudes” has been updated following consultation feedback and is supported by the inclusion of a definition section in ‘About this guidance’. We have also updated wording on sexual assault throughout to more accurately reflect the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Part one – safeguarding information for all staff

In Part one we have strengthened content relating to mental health, serious violence, and also in relation to the role of parents. We have made clearer the importance of engaging parents appropriately where children are distressed, whilst at the same time ensuring this engagement helps support staff identify and respond to safeguarding concerns at the earliest opportunity but is also balanced with safeguarding considerations.

Part two – the management of safeguarding

In Part two, we have made a number of updates to strengthen safeguarding practice within schools and colleges. This includes clear guidance on gender-questioning children, updating the status of the mobile phone guidance to statutory guidance, and strengthening content on filtering and monitoring, information security, and access management. We have also expanded content to include references to misandry and mental health.

In addition, as in Part one, we have strengthened the guidance on the role of parents, making clearer the importance of engaging them appropriately where children are distressed, while ensuring this is also balanced with safeguarding considerations.

Part three – safer recruitment

In Part three, we have made a number of updates including changes to regulated activity, revisions to the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) flowchart, and clarified expectations in relation to work experience.

We have taken the decision to remove the Single Central Record (SCR) template in response to consultation feedback. Respondents noted that its inclusion risked creating confusion about required content across the sector, particularly where schools and

colleges already have well-established SCRs integrated into their data management systems. We have therefore reverted to setting out only the mandatory and non-statutory requirements, while considering how best to reflect this feedback in future iterations of the guidance.

In addition to the changes proposed through this consultation, we have made technical amendments to reflect provisions within the Crime and Policing Act. The legislation removes the “supervision exemption” from the definition of Regulated Activity. As a result, individuals volunteering with children in roles that were previously exempt where supervision was in place will now be engaging in regulated activity. Schools and colleges must therefore ensure that volunteers are not barred from working with children by applying for an enhanced DBS check with children’s barred list information. These provisions, which implement a recommendation of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse, are intended to come into force from 1 September 2026. As these changes arise directly from primary legislation, they were not included as part of the policy consultation questions.

Part four - safeguarding concerns or allegations made about staff, including supply teachers, volunteers and contractors

In Part four, we have made some minor amendments to the section on supply teachers, trainee teachers and contractors. This includes clarifying that safeguarding responsibilities are shared between schools and colleges and the employment agency or business. In addition, we have made it clearer that schools and colleges remain responsible for gathering the facts and the safeguarding process, while the employment agency or business leads on any disciplinary action.

Part five – child-on-child sexual harassment and sexual violence

We have restructured Part five to improve clarity and better support professionals in identifying and responding to safeguarding concerns. This new structure better aligns with other established, evidence-based frameworks such as the Hackett Continuum, and reflects current research and good practice in the identification and management of HSB.

We have also added in content relating to “consensual and non-consensual” behaviour and included links to additional resources regarding HSB to help support schools in identifying age-appropriate versus problematic or harmful sexual behaviours, especially in primary-aged children.

Annexes

We have made a number of updates to the annexes. This includes reflecting legislative changes that come into force in September 2026 through the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Act which places a new duty on local housing authorities when a child is placed in temporary accommodation. It is important that schools and colleges are aware of this duty, but it does not replace existing duties and expectations that are already in place to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

We have also made a number of technical updates, including adding a bullet point to the Operation Encompass section, making minor amendments to the serious violence section, and including a new link to an [online safety website for parents](#). Annex B has been updated to strengthen guidance on the role of the DSL, including responsibilities relating to information sharing. Annex C has been removed completely given the changes to the definition of regulated activity.

Expanding our evidence base

We were encouraged by the responses received to the consultation questions, which have provided valuable insights and highlighted areas which are worthy of further consideration, and which strengthens our evidence base. As a result, we have made a number of minor changes in response to specific themes or comments.

The strengthened stakeholder informed evidence base will inform the identification of priorities for future policy development.

We welcome the helpful and insightful feedback received on the structure, formatting and navigation of KCSIE, which will be considered alongside other potential improvements to for KCSIE 2027.

Consultation responses

Section 1 – Summary of the guidance

Proposal and rationale

Feedback from schools, colleges and safeguarding professionals continues to be very mixed in relation to the length of the current KCSIE document. We are keen to explore this further to see how we can best meet the needs of the sector.

Please note that Questions 1 – 10 were providing personal information to contextualise responses and results will not be published.

Question 11

How do you typically access and refer to the KCSIE guidance?

Government response

50% of the respondents, who answered this question, confirmed that they read and refer to KCSIE in electronic format. A further 23% had a preference for using a combination of both electronic and printed versions.

The use of printed copies is particularly common among those who refer to the guidance regularly, such as DSLs, as they value the ability to annotate and highlight key sections of the guidance for ease of reference and training purposes. Respondents noted that an electronic version allows for quicker searching and navigation, whilst printed copies provide a useful contingency in the event of limited or disrupted internet access.

We welcome the fact that most respondents are comfortable accessing KCSIE electronically and recognise that the length of the document may make printing impractical for some users. It is nevertheless encouraging that those who prefer or require a printed copy are generally able to. Given the detailed nature of some of those responses, there are areas which warrant further consideration and engagement with interested parties and responders. We will consider these findings to inform the future development of the guidance.

Question 12

Do you think the current length of KCSIE is appropriate for its purpose?

Government response

Of the respondents who expressed an opinion, 34% considered the current length to be about right in contrast to 29% who considered it too long.

While some respondents noted that the length of the document can act as a deterrent to thorough reading, we welcome feedback describing the guidance as clearly structured, well-presented and appropriately reflecting the seriousness and importance of safeguarding. Respondents also commented positively on the value of having comprehensive and accessible safeguarding guidance in a single statutory document.

Respondents who expressed concerns about length suggested that further improvements could be made through streamlining the structure, reducing duplication and, where appropriate, signposting to linked guidance rather than repeating contextual information. We recognise the merit of these suggestions and will consider how clarity and usability can be further enhanced in the longer term.

Notwithstanding these views, it is encouraging that respondents broadly understand why KCSIE is necessarily detailed and comment that any significant reduction in length could risk the omission of critical safeguarding information.

Question 13

Would you prefer:

- **A shorter, more concise version (with links to detailed guidance)**
- **The current more comprehensive format**
- **A modular approach (core guidance plus optional annexes)**
- **Another format/something else**

Government response

Views are mixed with some respondents, given the option, preferring a shorter, more concise version with links to detailed guidance, as it is perceived that this may encourage easier reading. This view is, however, somewhat balanced with around a third of respondents being content with the current format with concerns expressed that reliance to links could make the guidance less useable. Those who opted for a modular approach suggested that this could improve clarity by clearly setting out responsibilities for different roles in school and college settings.

We recognise the benefits of exploring ways to enhance navigation and accessibility in the longer term whilst acknowledging the strength of feeling that the current comprehensive format provides reassurance, clarity, and a single comprehensive statutory document.

Question 14

What benefits or challenges do you foresee in moving from a PDF to HTML format?

Government response

Only 43% of respondents chose to answer this question, indicating limited engagement with the issue. Among those who did respond, views were mixed. Some respondents identified the benefits of moving KCSIE to an HTML format for a more modern approach and presentation which could improve navigation. However, a significant proportion expressed resistance to change. Concerns were raised regarding the potential risks associated with an editable HTML format, as well as possible accessibility issues arising from unreliable internet connections. Respondents also frequently cited the importance of being able to print the guidance, with a perception that an HTML format would limit this functionality. Less frequently raised concerns related to the removal of fixed page and paragraph numbering.

Overall, responses indicate a clear preference for retaining the current PDF format. Where respondents acknowledged the potential introduction of an HTML version, many emphasised that a PDF version should continue to be made available alongside it. We note the strength of feeling expressed by respondents in favour of retaining the PDF format. We also recognise that, should a HTML version be introduced in future, there is a strong preference that the guidance would continue to be published in PDF form in parallel. We propose to use these findings to help inform the future format of the guidance.

Question 15

We have produced a one-page summary of Part one of KCSIE. Would schools and colleges find this helpful?

Government response

We welcome the positive feedback on the proposed one-page summary of Part one of KCSIE. A majority of respondents (61%) agreed that it would be a helpful tool for communicating key safeguarding messages, supporting a strong safeguarding culture, and keeping safeguarding at the forefront for those working in, or visiting schools and colleges. Respondents particularly highlighted its usefulness for non-teaching staff, volunteers, and visitors.

We recognise, however, that some respondents felt the summary was too brief. They suggested enhancements, such as the inclusion of core safeguarding principles, clearer references to updates in the guidance, and links to further information. Concerns were also raised that a one-page summary could be relied upon in place of reading Part one of the full statutory guidance.

The one-page summary is intended to complement, not replace, any part of KCSIE. Its purpose is deliberately limited to one-page to provide a concise prompt that reinforces key safeguarding messages and helps keep safeguarding visible across settings. It does not replace the statutory requirement for relevant staff to read and understand Part one of the guidance. We have, however, acted on feedback and have accordingly amended the one-page document to make its purpose clearer.

EYFS framework

Proposal and rationale

Stakeholder feedback has suggested that schools are sometimes unaware of the additional safeguarding requirements set out in the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) framework, particularly for children in reception year. To address this, we have clarified that this statutory guidance applies to school-based nurseries and reception classes for children aged 0–5, by explicitly referencing the EYFS.

Question 16

Were you aware that the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) framework sets out additional safeguarding requirements for children in school-based nurseries and reception classes?

Government response

Responses to Question 16 were analysed to assess awareness of the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) safeguarding requirements among those respondents whose role and work setting mean they should reasonably be expected to know about them.

To ensure the analysis was meaningful, responses were filtered to exclude respondents for whom the question was not applicable, including parents or carers, those representing secondary-only provision, further or higher education settings, and other respondents without direct EYFS involvement. The analysis focused on respondents working in EYFS-relevant settings, such as primary schools, nurseries, and multi-academy trusts, and in professional roles with safeguarding or educational responsibilities.

Using this approach, 462 respondents were identified as falling within the “should-know” cohort. Of these, 441 respondents (approximately 96%) reported that they were aware that

the EYFS framework sets out additional safeguarding requirements for children in school-based nurseries and reception classes. Only 21 respondents within this group reported that they were not aware.

This indicates that awareness of EYFS safeguarding requirements is very high among practitioners and organisations with direct responsibility for early years provision. Apparent uncertainty in the unfiltered responses largely reflects participation by respondents outside EYFS-relevant settings, rather than a lack of awareness among those working with young children.

Consensual and non-consensual sharing of nude and semi-nude images and/or videos (also known as sexting or youth produced sexual imagery)

Proposal and rationale

KCSIE currently uses the terminology “consensual and non-consensual sharing of nude and semi-nude images and/or videos (also known as sexting or youth produced sexual imagery).” Following stakeholder feedback, we propose to change this language to “consensual and non-consensual self-generated intimate images and/or videos including those generated using AI e.g. deepfakes.”

Question 17

Do you agree with this change?

Government response

71% of respondents agreed with the change, 11% disagreed, and 18% indicated that it was not applicable or that they had no opinion. Focusing specifically on respondents who expressed a clear view (i.e. those who answered either “yes” or “no”), approximately 86% of respondents who expressed a definitive opinion were in favour of the proposed changes, while 14% opposed them.

In particular, there was strong, positive feedback on clearly recognising AI-generated images, including deepfakes, which respondents considered an important and necessary update to the guidance.

However, some respondents expressed concerns about the inclusion of the term “self-generated”. They felt that this wording could limit the scope of the guidance, and risk excluding situations where images or videos are created or altered without a child’s knowledge or consent. Several also noted that the term could reduce clarity in cases involving coercion, exploitation, or third-party generation of content.

After carefully reviewing the feedback, we agree that the term “self-generated” could unintentionally narrow the scope of the guidance. We have therefore decided not to include the terminology.

Instead, we have added a short explanation in the ‘About this guidance’ section of KCSIE to clarify how the term “nude or semi-nude images” will be used. We have kept the distinction between “consensual” and “non-consensual” to help staff consider the context and respond appropriately. We have included the term “making” to cover different situations, such as images taken by others, images created by a child, and AI-generated content.

This approach ensures the guidance covers the full range of safeguarding concerns, including cases where images are created or altered by others, and avoids placing undue emphasis on a child’s role in the creation of content. Overall, these changes improve clarity, align with safeguarding language used across the sector, and better reflect the seriousness of harm that can arise from both consensual and non-consensual situations.

Question 18

What other terms or language do you currently use (or hear used) to describe situations involving the creation and/or sharing of self-generated intimate images?

Government response

Respondents highlighted a wide range of terminology used to describe situations involving the creation and/or sharing of self-generated intimate images. Commonly cited terms included “pics”, “nudes”, and “sexting”, alongside more specific or explicit phrases such as “dick pics”. Other terms reflected evolving digital contexts and harms, including “deepfakes” and more formal language such as “inappropriate intimate images” and “youth produced sexual imagery”.

Overall, it was evident that “nudes” is one of the most widely recognised and commonly used terms, which supports the decision to retain this terminology in KCSIE.

Misogyny

Proposal and rationale

The current KCSIE guidance already includes references to misogyny, however we propose to include further references throughout the guidance to explicitly address where misogyny intersects with harmful sexual behaviour (HSB).

Extreme misogyny is increasingly prevalent online and is often linked to harmful sexual behaviour amongst young people. Misogynistic ideologies can contribute to:

- The normalisation of sexual harassment and sexual violence
- Child-on-child exploitation and coercion
- The spread of harmful narratives

Question 19

Do you agree with the proposal to include further references to misogyny throughout KCSIE, specifically to highlight its intersection with harmful sexual behaviour (HSB)?

Government response

Respondents expressed a range of views on the proposal to include further references to misogyny within KCSIE, particularly to highlight its intersection with HSB. Many agreed that clearer references would support earlier identification and better understanding of behaviours that can contribute to safeguarding and behavioural issues, including links to exposure to pornography and wider patterns of HSB. Respondents emphasised the importance of ensuring that guidance supports proportionate responses, clear routes to support, and alignment with existing safeguarding frameworks.

Some respondents suggested that references to misogyny should be expanded or more clearly structured within the guidance, including calls for a dedicated section. Others noted that misogyny is already referenced multiple times and highlighted the importance of clarity and concision to avoid repetition.

We also recognise feedback highlighting the need to acknowledge that harmful attitudes can affect all children and young people. KCSIE will continue to stress the importance of identifying and responding to all forms of harmful or prejudicial behaviour, including where different forms may overlap, and ensuring that appropriate support is available. Alongside updates to the guidance, we will be providing teaching materials, including lesson and assembly plans, to help schools address misogyny, HSB and related issues in an age-appropriate way, supporting education that promotes respect, safety, and respectful relationships.

Section 2 – Part one: Safeguarding information for all staff

Proposal and rationale

Annex A was introduced into KCSIE in the September 2021 update. It was created as a condensed summary to Part one specifically for staff who do not work directly with children. Currently, schools and colleges can decide, based on their own assessment, whether such staff should read Part one or Annex A. We are proposing to remove Annex A as evidence suggests that Part one is more commonly used, and we take the view that all staff need a broader safeguarding awareness which Part one provides.

Question 20

If Annex A were removed from KCSIE, how would this affect your ability to engage with safeguarding guidance?

Government response

We have carefully considered the views expressed in response to this question, recognising that responses were largely qualitative and reflected how the proposed removal of Annex A might affect engagement with safeguarding guidance in different settings and roles.

Overall, many respondents reported that removing Annex A would have little or no impact on their engagement with safeguarding guidance, noting that they already require all staff to read Part one of KCSIE regardless of role. A further significant theme was that removal of Annex A would improve consistency and clarity, reinforcing a shared understanding of safeguarding across staff groups and supporting the principle that safeguarding is everyone's responsibility.

Fewer than one in five responses raised concerns that could be interpreted as opposing the removal of Annex A outright, with most concerns focused on implementation and accessibility rather than principle.

Alongside this, some respondents highlighted that Annex A is currently used as an accessible entry point for specific staff groups, such as non-teaching or non-child-facing staff, and raised concerns about accessibility where staff may face barriers related to literacy, language, or confidence in engaging with longer documents. A smaller number of respondents also raised concerns about length, workload, and complexity, including reliance on Annex A in certain contexts such as further education.

On balance, we consider it proportionate to remove Annex A in order to provide a single,

consistent set of safeguarding expectations for all staff. We remain of the view that Part one provides the broader safeguarding awareness all staff need, regardless of their role or level of direct contact with children.

In recognition of the accessibility issues raised, and to support effective engagement in practice, we have produced a short, practical one-page summary to assist settings in supporting staff understanding of Part one. This is intended to complement local induction, training, and support arrangements, and does not replace the requirement for staff to read and understand Part one of the guidance.

What school and college staff need to know

Proposal and rationale

To align with [Working Together to Safeguard Children](#) (WT), we have made changes to paragraphs 13-14 and paragraph 65 of KCSIE. Aligning both pieces of statutory guidance promotes consistency across the safeguarding system and clarifies schools' roles within multi-agency arrangements.

Question 21

Do you agree with the proposed changes to paragraphs 13–14 and paragraph 65 of KCSIE to align with Working Together to Safeguard Children (WT), promoting consistency across the safeguarding system and clarifying the role of schools and colleges within multi-agency arrangements?

Government response

Responses to this question were broadly supportive of the proposed changes. Among those who expressed a clear view, there was strong agreement that aligning KCSIE with *Working Together to Safeguard Children* improves consistency across the safeguarding system and helps clarify the role of schools and colleges within multi-agency arrangements.

Many respondents highlighted the benefits of consistent terminology and expectations across statutory guidance, noting that this supports clearer communication, reduces confusion between agencies, and strengthens joint working. The changes were also seen as reinforcing the role of schools and colleges as key partners in safeguarding and supporting more effective information sharing and decision-making.

A number of respondents raised questions about how the guidance operates in practice. These included the distinction between what all staff need to know as compared with the more detailed responsibilities of DSLs, the importance of maintaining clarity and usability within Part one, and the need to ensure expectations remain proportionate. Some

respondents also noted that variations in local authority practice can affect the extent to which alignment between national guidance is reflected in practice.

Overall, responses support the intention to improve consistency and clarity across the safeguarding system, while highlighting the importance of ensuring that expectations are clearly articulated, proportionate, and workable in practice, and that schools and colleges are supported to fulfil their role within multi-agency arrangements.

Early help

Proposal and rationale

Following stakeholder feedback, we have suggested amendments to paragraph 17 of KCSIE to include “...has been repeatedly removed from the classroom...” to reflect the [Behaviour in Schools](#) guidance around causes and responses to misbehaviour. And also “...is on a part-time timetable...,” which can be a contributing factor towards child criminal exploitation.

Question 22

Do you agree with the proposed amendments to paragraph 17 of KCSIE, including the references to pupils who have been “repeatedly removed from the classroom” and those “on a part-time timetable”, to better reflect the guidance and highlight potential safeguarding risks such as child criminal exploitation?

Government response

Respondents were overwhelmingly supportive, while a significant number had no opinion or felt the amendments weren't applicable to them. Many of the supportive respondents who left a comment indicated that it was important to make the connection between part-time timetables or exclusions and Child Criminal Exploitation and felt that doing so would allow more children to be effectively supported via early help and Family Help.

We are pleased to see that there is overall support for this change and that respondents felt it to be helpful.

Child Sexual Exploitation

Proposal and rationale

The current wording of paragraphs 26 and 39 of KCSIE risks creating confusion about the legal definition of rape. Under UK law, rape occurs when a person uses their penis without consent to penetrate the vagina, anus, or mouth of another person. Phrases such as “rape or oral sex” may imply that non-consensual oral penetration by a penis is not rape, which

is incorrect. To improve clarity, we propose removing this phrasing and adding an example of penetration with an object, which is legally recognised as a distinct form of sexual assault.

Question 23

Do you agree that the proposed changes to paragraphs 26 and 39 improve clarity around the legal definition of rape and sexual assault?

Government response

The majority of respondents agreed that the wording should be changed to improve clarity, as the present example “rape or oral sex” may imply that non-consensual oral penetration by a penis is not rape, which is incorrect.

A minority of respondents raised concerns about possible confusion between common usage of the word rape and its legal definition, expressing that rape is commonly understood to be vaginal penetration by a penis and that the suggested wording may appear to exclude forced oral or anal penetration by a penis. A small number of respondents also raised concerns that the new wording may appear to minimise sexual assault where there is no penetration by a penis. Additionally, a minority of respondents raised concerns relating to clarity about the sex of perpetrators of rape, either stating that rape could only be committed by men, or that women could also commit rape. Others suggested it be made clearer that sexual abuse can be perpetrated by any gender. A small number of respondents suggested more emphasis be put on the issue of consent and others suggested it be made clear that the perpetrators of child sexual abuse are more often known to the child than not.

We are pleased to see that there is support for changing the wording in this paragraph to improve clarity. We recognise the concerns raised that the legal definition of rape is not always understood and have changed the wording in these paragraphs to more accurately reflect the Sexual Offences Act 2003, making a distinction between rape and assault by penetration. We have also made it clearer in the guidance that sexual abuse is usually carried out by someone known to the child, as this can support practitioners to notice and respond to abuse.

Question 24

Do you agree that the revised wording in paragraph 41 helps education professionals better understand the risk of victims of child sexual exploitation being criminalised for actions taken under coercion?

Government response

We welcome the strong support for the changes proposed in this question. We agree that practitioners should consider all indicators that a child may be experiencing harm, including where that child themselves may be involved in offending. We have also considered feedback on how to support practitioners to take action. We have amended the wording to address these points.

Serious violence

Proposal and rationale

We have clarified that violence between children may, in some instances, constitute a safeguarding issue, particularly where there is a risk of harm, exploitation, or vulnerability. The guidance now includes:

- explicit references to physical assault and threats with weapons
- recognition that children who display violent behaviour may themselves be at risk or in need of support
- a strengthened message that safeguarding responses should consider both the child who has been harmed and the child who has caused harm.

This change reflects stakeholder feedback and aligns with a more trauma-informed approach to safeguarding.

Question 25

To what extent do you agree with the following statement:

“The revised guidance makes it clear that serious violence, including when children are perpetrators, is a safeguarding issue.”

Government response

We welcome the strong support in recognising that serious violence, including where children are perpetrators, is a safeguarding issue. We agree that safeguarding responses should attend to children who are victims, as well as children who may be at risk of, or are involved in committing violence (who may also be victims themselves).

In response to concerns about the expectations placed on schools and DSLs, we have amended the wording in Part one to remove reference to “any action needed” when it comes to de-escalating peer conflict. This change is intended to better reflect the role of

schools within a wider safeguarding system and to recognise the importance of partnership working with other agencies where risks extend beyond the school setting.

We have also strengthened the language to emphasise safeguarding responses alongside de-escalation and contextual understanding of peer conflict.

Question 26

How confident are you that you understand your setting’s responsibilities in identifying and responding to serious violence as a safeguarding issue?

Government response

Respondents generally reported confidence in understanding their responsibilities to identify and respond to serious violence, though this varied across roles and settings. Some also highlighted uncertainty around thresholds for action and engagement with external agencies, indicating a need for clearer signposting and support. We recognise the importance of ensuring that schools and colleges clearly understand their role in identifying and responding to serious violence, as part of their wider safeguarding responsibilities.

In response to feedback, we have clarified and slightly expanded the content on DSLs assessing risk to add that appropriate action includes Safety and Support planning, and we have clarified where DSLs can find further guidance on referrals and when to contact the police, including correcting references to the relevant annex and sub-sections.

We have also expanded content in Annex A to provide additional indicators of risk, supporting staff to identify concerns earlier and respond proportionately.

Question 27

To what extent do you agree with the following statement:

“The guidance supports early identification of risk and outlines appropriate early help or preventative responses.”

Government response

Respondents generally agreed that the guidance supports early identification and prevention, although some considered it too high-level and called for clearer terminology and more practical, evidence-based examples. We agree that early identification and prevention are critical to reducing risks associated with serious violence, and that the updated guidance is intended to support this more effectively.

In response to consultation feedback, we have revised the language in Part one to move away from the term “teachable moments”, which some respondents felt was ambiguous or risked minimising the seriousness of violent incidents. This has been replaced with clearer wording focused on early, evidence-based support at critical points when concerns emerge.

We have also strengthened links to practical, evidence-informed resources produced by the Youth Endowment Fund (YEF), including guidance and tools that support schools to implement proven preventative approaches.

Question 28

To what extent do you agree that the revised Part one better equips schools and colleges to identify and prevent abuse and violence between children?

Government response

We welcome the overall positive response to the revised Part one, with respondents broadly considering it to be an improvement in equipping schools and colleges to identify and prevent abuse and violence between children, particularly through its strengthened focus on peer-on-peer violence. However, some highlighted the need for clearer indicators and more practical support for applying the guidance in context.

Reflecting consultation feedback, we have expanded and provided clarification in Annex A to include additional indicators and risk factors associated with serious violence. We have also strengthened content on times and locations of heightened risk around the school day, supporting schools to take a contextual safeguarding approach.

Further additions highlight partnership working, including engagement with local safeguarding partners to support schools in preventing and addressing violence between children.

Question 29

If KCSIE were to include more guidance on recognising and preventing child-on-child violence, what would be most helpful?

Government response

We acknowledge the strong call for more practical and accessible support to help schools recognise and prevent child-on-child violence.

While it is important that KCSIE remains statutory guidance rather than a practice manual,

we have responded by including links to high-quality external resources, particularly evidence-based tools and guidance produced by the Youth Endowment Fund, specifically designed for education settings. We have also improved the clarity of definitions and updated risk indicators within Annex A.

What school and college staff should do if they have a safeguarding concern or an allegation about another member of staff

Proposal and rationale

Following stakeholder feedback, we have added wording to highlight earlier in the guidance that the headteacher or principal will consider whether a Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) referral is appropriate. This should help staff to understand that this is an expectation.

Question 30

Do you agree with the proposed addition to paragraph 75 of KCSIE, which highlights earlier in the guidance that a headteacher or principal should consider whether a referral to the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) is appropriate? This aims to clarify expectations for staff.

Government response

Responses to this question were broadly supportive of the proposed addition. Among those who expressed a clear view, there was strong agreement (over 90%) that highlighting earlier in the guidance that the headteacher or principal should consider whether a referral to the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) is appropriate and improves clarity for staff.

Many respondents noted that this change reinforces existing safeguarding expectations and supports more timely and consistent decision-making where concerns or allegations about staff arise. It was also seen as helpful in strengthening staff confidence, by making clear that consideration of a LADO referral is a standard part of the safeguarding process rather than an exceptional step.

A small number of respondents raised points about how the guidance operates in practice. These included the role of DSLs in supporting or informing decisions, the importance of clear escalation routes where concerns involve senior leaders, and the need to ensure that thresholds for referral are well understood.

Overall, responses support the proposed clarification as a proportionate change that improves visibility of expectations and helps promote a consistent safeguarding culture, while maintaining appropriate flexibility for local safeguarding arrangements.

Section 3 – Part two: The management of safeguarding

Mental Health

Proposal and rationale

The section on mental health has been redrafted to better show how mental health issues can become safeguarding concerns. It highlights serious risks, clarifies staff responsibilities, promotes whole-school approaches, and encourages appropriate referrals, aiming to help schools respond more confidently and compassionately.

Question 31

To what extent do you agree with the following statement:

“The revised section on ‘children requiring mental health support’ clearly explains the role of schools and colleges in identifying and responding to mental health needs.”?

Government response

Many respondents felt that the added references to self-harm, suicidality and eating disorders added greater clarity regarding the expectations of school staff and the role they can play in mental health-related safeguarding concerns.

Some responses highlighted concerns that the updated sections placed increasing expectations on schools and colleges to manage mental health-related safeguarding concerns in the absence of access to appropriate pathways for specialist support, e.g. CAMHS.

Some respondents felt that the role of parents and carers could be made clearer, which we have considered, and in response have made clearer the importance of engaging parents appropriately where children are distressed.

Others felt that we could clarify more clearly the role of staff with regards to mental health problem diagnosis. We have updated the wording to align make clear that ‘only appropriately trained professionals should attempt to make a diagnosis of a mental health problem’.

Question 32

To what extent do you agree with the following statement:

“The revised section on ‘children requiring mental health support’ provides a clear and useful high-level summary and appropriately signposts to more detailed guidance.”?

Government response

Many respondents felt that this section clearly sets out what resources are available for schools and colleges, and that the signposted guidance is helpful.

Some respondents again raised the issue of broader support access constraints, whilst others suggested the section could signpost education staff more widely to local support offers, which we have sought to reflect.

Guidance relating to children who are questioning their gender

Proposal and rationale

We have updated the section which focuses on issues that might arise in relation to children who are questioning their gender. We have also proposed separate new sections on single-sex spaces and single-sex sports. These sections are also informed by the public consultation on the draft non-statutory Gender Questioning Children: Guidance for Schools and Colleges. We will not be publishing standalone guidance for schools and colleges on gender questioning children but propose instead to include this content in KCSIE so that children’s wellbeing and safeguarding are considered in the round, and so that schools and colleges can easily access this information in one place.

Question 33

Does the updated section of the guidance on children who are questioning their gender provide clarity about the considerations schools and colleges will need to take into account?

Government response

Educational institutions or LAs were the most likely group to agree that the revised guidance provided clarity.

Some respondents expressed concern about the policy on parental engagement, with some concerned that the policy risks dangerously “outing” children against their will, and others arguing that we have failed to protect the role of parents as the primary decision-makers for their children. This government takes seriously the role of parents, and we trust schools and colleges to make careful decisions about safeguarding risks. We have strengthened the language around parental involvement to be clear that parents’ views should carry great weight, and that schools and colleges should have safeguarding in

mind whenever a child discloses information that might raise significant concerns about that child's welfare. The guidance is also clear that where a child confides in a member of staff but does not ask the school or college to make changes to how they are treated, there is no reason to break any confidence unless there is a related safeguarding risk.

Some respondents expressed concern that we have not gone far enough in protecting all children – and particularly those in primary - from taking steps which they may later regret or which may push them towards a medical pathway which may have serious implications for their adult lives. Other respondents felt we have not adequately taken into account the reality of young people's experiences or their agency, particularly in the case of older children. Our guidance is clear that the welfare of children and young people should be at the forefront of decisions in this area, and that while this is not an area where there can be a one-size-fits-all approach, particular caution should be taken in relation to requests by primary-age children.

We heard from many respondents who felt that the guidance lacks clarity around definitions and terminology or fails to give schools the guidance they need.

There is a wider debate about appropriate language, and about the meaning of the phrase "social transition." We have offered some clarification in the guidance about what counts as a request for support for social transition. The language used in the guidance is intended to be inclusive and to recognise the breadth and individuality of children's experience and circumstances.

Question 34

Do paragraphs 104-115 provide clarity for schools and colleges about their legal obligations relating to toilets, changing rooms, and boarding and residential accommodation?

Government response

Educational institutions or LAs were the most likely group to agree that the revised guidance provided clarity.

Some respondents welcomed the clarity in the guidance in relation to single-sex facilities, with some welcoming clarity about safeguarding children, especially girls. Among those who felt the guidance did not provide clarity, responses were mixed between those who felt that the guidance fails to strongly-enough protect single-sex facilities and those who felt that the guidance harms GQ children or misrepresents the law by denying them access to single-sex facilities. We also heard from respondents who expressed concerns about the welfare implications for children questioning their gender, including children who might have been previously offered access to facilities for the opposite biological sex.

We recognise that clarity in this area is essential for schools and colleges. In line with the safeguarding duties of schools and colleges and the premises regulations for schools, we are committed to protecting single-sex toilets, changing rooms and boarding and residential accommodation. We also recognise the importance of protecting the dignity and privacy of all children and understand the scope for serious distress where children are questioning their gender, which is why we have said that schools and colleges should find alternative arrangements where possible.

Question 35

Do paragraphs 94-97 provide clarity for schools and colleges about the circumstances in which the school is justified in having a policy of single-sex sports?

Government response

Educational institutions or LAs were the most likely group to agree that the revised guidance provided clarity.

Some respondents welcomed the clear position on single-sex sports where there are safety reasons for separating children by biological sex. Some respondents were concerned about the lack of equivalent clarity in relation to fairness and competitive sports. We also heard from respondents who noted the importance of participation in sport for all children, and some of these respondents expressed concern about limiting participation for children who are questioning their gender.

We are determined to ensure the safe and fair participation of all children in school and college sports, which is why we have made clear that schools and colleges should not allow pupils to participate in sport designated for the opposite biological sex where there are safety reasons for this. We are clear that fairness is an important factor affecting participation, and that schools and colleges will need to weigh fairness issues carefully in taking decisions.

Opportunities to teach safeguarding

Proposal and rationale

Paragraph 153 in KCSIE describes the importance of preventative education and zero tolerance for sexism and other forms of prejudice or harmful behaviour. Including references to “racism” and “derogatory behaviour” in this paragraph aligns the guidance with existing expectations set out in Ofsted’s school inspection framework and the DfE guidance on promoting fundamental British values. This addition reinforces the importance of addressing discriminatory behaviour as part of a whole-school safeguarding approach and supports schools in creating inclusive, respectful environments.

Following stakeholder feedback, we have also updated the wording in paragraph 155 to include new links to RSHE resources: [Free, time-saving teacher resources | Oak National Academy](#)

Question 36

Do you agree that including references to “racism” and “derogatory behaviour” in paragraph 153 of the KCSIE guidance is helpful?

Government response

The majority of respondents (65%) agreed that including references to racism and derogatory behaviour is helpful. A smaller proportion (7%) disagreed, while 28% selected not applicable or expressed no opinion.

This was a closed question that did not provide an opportunity for comments. The aim of this question was to confirm that the inclusion of explicit reference to racism and derogatory behaviour makes it clearer to identify of safeguarding concerns is helpful, which responses indicate it is. As addressed in the introduction, we will consider whether any further changes are required following Sir David Bell’s review into antisemitism.

We are grateful for the views and feedback provided in response to this question. References to racism and derogatory behaviour are included in the guidance, reflecting the views of the majority of respondents.

Question 37

Are the new links to RSHE resources helpful for schools and colleges?

Government response

A significant proportion of respondents (45%) said that the new links to RSHE resources are helpful. An equal proportion (45%) selected not applicable or expressed no opinion, while a smaller proportion (10%) indicated that the links were not helpful. However, if you discount those who responded that did not have a view, the breakdown of respondents who are supportive of this addition becomes 81% vs 19% who disagree.

Many respondents did not provide further comment. Where views were expressed, respondents raised questions about the appropriateness of including links to RSHE resources within a safeguarding-focused document, with some suggesting that it is simply the full RSHE statutory guidance that should take precedence. Other respondents welcomed the inclusion of RSHE resources and highlighted the importance of RSHE as part of a whole-school approach to safeguarding.

The guidance continues to include links to RSHE resources, reflecting consultation responses and the role of RSHE in supporting safeguarding in schools.

Artificial intelligence (AI)

Proposal and rationale

We are proposing the addition of two new paragraphs after paragraph 159 of KCSIE focusing on AI. The department updated its [policy](#) on the use of generative artificial intelligence in education. The Policy outlines key safety considerations and legal responsibilities for schools and colleges when using generative AI in both teacher-facing and pupil-facing contexts.

To support implementation, the department, working in partnership with the Chiltern Learning Trust and the Chartered College of Teaching, has published online resources for all school and college staff. These resources emphasise safe and effective use of AI, with a strong focus on safeguarding.

Question 38

Do you support the inclusion of references to the DfE’s generative artificial intelligence policy and resources within KCSIE, to help schools and colleges understand their safeguarding responsibilities when using AI tools?

Government response

We were pleased to see that a clear majority of respondents (64%) supported the inclusion of references to the Department’s generative AI policy and resources in KCSIE. Many respondents recognising that AI is already embedded across education and welcoming clear signposting to official guidance to help schools and colleges understand safeguarding responsibilities. Around a third (31%) selected not applicable or expressed no opinion, while a small minority (5%) did not support the inclusion.

Question 39

In your view, does this addition provide sufficient clarity and support for managing risks related to ethics, data protection, and safeguarding in AI use?

Government response

For the follow-up question on whether this addition provides sufficient clarity and support for managing risks related to ethics, data protection and safeguarding, responses were mixed. Just over a third of respondents (35%) considered that it did provide sufficient clarity, while nearly a quarter (23%) disagreed and a substantial proportion (42%) selected

not applicable or expressed no opinion.

For questions 38 and 39, many respondents did not provide additional comments. Where views were expressed, some welcomed the inclusion of AI within KCSIE and the signposting to Departmental guidance, particularly to support busy safeguarding leads and leaders. Others felt the wording was too high-level and overly reliant on external links and called for clearer safeguarding expectations within KCSIE itself. Respondents also highlighted the rapidly evolving nature of AI, with many questioning whether annual guidance would remain current and calling for more regular updates, clearer accountability, and additional training for staff.

Respondents raised concerns about risks associated with generative AI, including inaccurate outputs, data protection and privacy breaches, bias and ethical harms, over-reliance by pupils, and potential impacts on learning. Many emphasised safeguarding risks such as AI-generated sexual images and deepfakes, grooming or harmful chatbot interactions, misuse of pupil or staff data, and the inappropriate use of AI as a substitute for pastoral support. Views ranged from calls to strongly discourage AI use in education to requests for clearer governance, minimum standards, and practical examples to support safe and ethical use.

We remain committed to supporting the safe and effective use of AI in schools and colleges. References to the generative AI policy paper and supporting resources will continue to be reflected in KCSIE helping settings understand their safeguarding responsibilities, alongside the Generative AI Product Safety Standards launched in January 2026, which set child-centred expectations on data protection, ethics, and safeguarding by design. These measures reflect consultation feedback and the need to balance innovation with clear protections for children and young people, while recognising the importance of keeping guidance under review as technology and associated risks continue to evolve.

Filtering and monitoring

Proposal and rationale

KCSIE currently states that “...*governing bodies and proprietors should ensure their school or college has appropriate filtering and monitoring systems in place and regularly review their effectiveness.*” paragraph 166.

Following recent ministerial commitments and cross government work to strengthen school and college online safety, we propose adding that governing bodies and proprietors should ‘*carry out a review of their effectiveness at least once every academic year*’, and that ‘*Reviews should include checks that filtering is working appropriately on all internet-connected devices in all relevant locations, and a record should be kept of these checks.*’

This wording is already used in the filtering and monitoring standards and reflects expectations that schools and colleges proactively assure the effectiveness of their systems.

Annual, documented reviews are essential to demonstrate that schools and colleges are taking timely and effective action to keep children safe online, particularly given the increasing risks from harmful digital content, AI generated material, and rapid changes in online behaviour.

Question 40

Do you agree with this change?

Government response

A majority of respondents (58%) agreed, while a smaller proportion (6%) disagreed. A further 36% selected not applicable or expressed no opinion.

Respondents raised concerns about the potential burden on schools and about clarity around roles and responsibilities for filtering and monitoring, including the role of safeguarding leads, senior leadership, and governors. The guidance now clarifies that while those responsible for governance should ensure that appropriate checks and reviews are carried out, they are not expected to undertake these checks personally. We have also made clear who within a school or college is expected to carry out reviews in practice, and signposts to existing guidance and support. These changes do not introduce new requirements but provide greater clarity on expectations already set out in the filtering and monitoring standards.

Information security and access management

Proposal and rationale

We propose to change the wording in paragraph 170 and also add an additional paragraph on cyber security.

Cyber security is now recognised as a safeguarding concern, not just an IT concern. Schools and colleges hold sensitive personal data about children, including safeguarding records and health information. If this data is compromised through a cyber-attack, this can pose immediate risks to a child's safety and wellbeing.

Question 41

Does the revised wording in paragraph 170 and additional paragraph effectively communicate that cyber security is an integral part of safeguarding practice?

Government response

A majority of respondents (57%) agreed, while a smaller proportion (6%) disagreed. A further 36% selected not applicable or expressed no opinion.

Respondents raised concerns regarding technical expertise and where responsibility for cyber governance should sit within schools. There were also calls for clearer and more explicit references to safeguarding in the guidance. In response, the guidance has been updated to make clear that cyber security is part of schools' safeguarding responsibilities and should be approached as a whole school issue, rather than resting solely with individual roles or external providers. Support is already available to schools through existing advice and guidance on cyber security, including the cyber standards, the Plan technology for your school service, and the newly launched Cyber Sector Hub.

Alternative provision (AP)

Proposal and rationale

We propose adding a paragraph between paragraphs 203 and 205 in KCSIE, which sets out the department's voluntary national standards for non-school alternative provision, along with guidance to support schools and local authorities in quality assuring providers.

Including reference to the voluntary national standards for non-school alternative provision in KCSIE helps strengthen safeguarding oversight for children educated outside traditional school settings. These standards provide a clear framework for quality assurance, supporting schools and local authorities in selecting safe and appropriate providers.

Question 42

Do you agree that referencing the voluntary national standards for non-school alternative provision in KCSIE helps reinforce the responsibility of schools to carry out safeguarding checks and ensure the suitability of commissioned provision?

Government response

There was broad support for referencing the published voluntary national standards for non-school alternative provision in KCSIE. Of the answers provided, 49% indicated that they agreed that referencing the voluntary national standards was helpful. However, as 44% of respondents indicated that they did not have a view, when you discount these, the percentage of respondents who were supportive becomes 88% vs 12% who disagreed.

Schools should read the voluntary national standards alongside the accompanying guidance, which many respondents welcomed. The guidance supports schools and local

authority commissioners to quality assure providers and promotes a more consistent approach to commissioning and oversight.

Respondents also made repeated calls for the standards to become statutory over time and expressed strong support for local authorities leading quality assurance of non-school alternative provision settings, reflecting their greater capacity and system oversight. We intend to take forward this approach, when parliamentary time allows, as part of the Department's wider SEND and alternative provision reforms.

Until these measures become law, schools must continue to carry out appropriate safeguarding checks and due diligence, in line with KCSIE guidance, so to assure themselves that commissioned provision is safe, suitable and meets each child's individual needs. We are pleased that respondents felt the standards and accompanying guidance would support schools in fulfilling these responsibilities more effectively and consistently.

Question 43

Does this inclusion support schools and local authorities in maintaining high standards of care for children educated outside mainstream settings?

Government response

There was broad support for including the voluntary national standards for non-school alternative provision as a way of supporting high standards of care for children educated outside mainstream settings.

Respondents welcomed the use of a nationally consistent framework to support schools and local authorities in commissioning and monitoring non-school alternative provision, particularly for children who may be more vulnerable or less visible when educated off site. Many felt this would help reduce variation in practice and strengthen safeguarding oversight.

Medical conditions

Proposal and rationale

We have added a new paragraph (paragraph 243) which sets out guidance on 'safeguarding children with medical conditions.'

Question 44

Do you agree with the addition of guidance on safeguarding children with medical conditions, and does it help clarify when a medical condition may become a safeguarding issue?

Government response

The proposed addition to the guidance on the interaction between medical conditions and safeguarding was strongly supported, with only 6% of respondents disagreeing. A majority (42%) supported it.

While some respondents felt that the addition was helpful in clarifying the threshold for a safeguarding intervention, many felt that further information was required. A number of respondents suggested that specific medical conditions should be referenced.

Since consulting on revisions to KCSIE, we have also published a further consultation on new statutory guidance on supporting children and young people with medical conditions and allergy. This also makes reference to safeguarding.

We are aware that some respondents have highlighted the slight differences in wording used in the two documents. In considering our response to both consultations, we will ensure there is clear and consistent information on how safeguarding cases should be considered where children and young people have medical conditions. It may be most appropriate for greater detail to be provided in the dedicated guidance on medical conditions and allergy.

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

Proposal and rationale

We have listened to previous stakeholder engagement which indicated that more was needed on additional barriers.

Question 45

Do you think the expansion of the list of additional barriers children with SEND can face is helpful?

Government response

The majority of respondents supported the expansion of the list of additional barriers faced by children with SEND. This change was generally welcomed as an important step in improving awareness of the heightened safeguarding risks these children face, including communication difficulties, increased vulnerability to abuse and exploitation, and the risk of behaviours being misunderstood or misattributed. Many highlighted that a more explicit and comprehensive list can support greater professional curiosity, earlier identification of concerns, and more consistent safeguarding practice, particularly among staff in mainstream settings who may be less familiar with SEND.

Alongside this support, there was recognition that improving outcomes for children with SEND requires not only clear guidance, but also ongoing work to strengthen system capacity, workforce confidence, and joined-up support across education, health, and care. We will review again following the wider consultation on *SEND reform: putting children and young people first*, which is gathering feedback on proposals to reform the special educational needs and disabilities system.

Information Sharing

Proposal and rationale

We have strengthened guidance on the transfer of child protection files when a pupil moves to a new school or college. The update clarifies that the DSL or a deputy should share any information indicating that a pupil may pose a risk to themselves or others, such as concerns about serious violence or harmful behaviours, with the receiving setting. In addition, we recommend that DSLs or a deputy from both settings have a direct conversation where there are significant issues or concerns, as good practice, to ensure continuity of safeguarding support.

Question 46

Do you support the proposed clarification that, when a pupil transfers to a new school or college, the DSL or a deputy should share any information indicating potential risk to self or others (e.g. serious violence or harmful behaviours)?

Government response

As expected, responses indicate strong support for effective information sharing as a fundamental component of safeguarding practice, particularly at key transition points such as when children move between schools or services. Respondents clearly understand and value the critical importance of timely access to relevant safeguarding information in identifying and responding to risk. This reflects the importance of effective information sharing as repeatedly highlighted in published learning from Serious Case Reviews and Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews on GOV.UK, as well as in the context of recent high-profile cases.

However, there is consistent emphasis, particularly from practitioners, that more is needed, not only in relation to what information is shared, but also how it is shared and understood in practice, including the need for consistency, clarity, and professional judgement in its application.

Respondents stated that there is very limited support for the routine transfer of full safeguarding files, whilst also noting that large or unstructured records may obscure key risks rather than support effective decision-making.

In response, further changes have been made to KCSIE to reflect this feedback. The department also recognises that guidance alone is not sufficient and will continue to consider what more can be done, working with the sector and safeguarding partners, to support consistent and effective practice in information sharing.

Question 47

Do you support the addition that it is considered good practice for DSLs at both settings to have a direct discussion where concerns exist?

Government response

Responses to this question reinforced the view that effective safeguarding relies not only on the information that is recorded and transferred, but on how it is communicated and understood between professionals. Respondents emphasised that written records alone are often insufficient, and that timely and direct communication between safeguarding leads plays a critical role in ensuring that key risks are properly understood and acted upon.

There was broad agreement that clear, concise and relevant information is essential, but that this should be supported by discussion where needed, particularly in more complex cases. Respondents highlighted that over-reliance on documentation, without supporting professional dialogue, can lead to important context being missed or misunderstood. Some responses also suggested that variability in practice may reflect differences in confidence or clarity about what should be shared, reinforcing the need for consistent expectations and support for practitioners.

In line with this, the department's approach is to strengthen expectations within existing guidance, including KCSIE, to emphasise both the quality of information shared and the importance of effective professional communication between settings. The department will continue to work with the sector and safeguarding partners to support consistent practice, recognising that effective safeguarding depends on both strong record-keeping and active information sharing between professionals.

Section 4 – Part three: Safer recruitment

Adults who supervise children on work experience

Proposal and rationale

We have suggested amendments to the current work experience section, in response to feedback from the sector that schools are requesting Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks from employers where they are deemed unnecessary, i.e. where the workplace experience does not meet the definition of regulated activity.

Question 48

Are there any aspects of the work experience section in KCSIE that are unclear and deter, schools, colleges, or employers from enabling young people to undertake work experience?

Government response

We welcome the breadth of feedback on the guidance for adults who supervise young people on work experience. Responses indicated the need for greater clarity around expectations for employers. We have subsequently referenced guidance set out by the Health and Safety Executive for employers who host young people on work experience. We have also included a link to a gov.uk tool to enable schools and colleges to check what DBS checks might be necessary. In addition, guidance on DBS checks has been updated to reflect changes to the definition of regulated activity, announced as part of the Crime and Policing Bill.

Changes have also been made to update language to align with new the new definition of work experience outlined in careers statutory guidance for schools and colleges.

Single Central Record

Proposal and rationale

In response to feedback from key stakeholders, we included an example Single Central Record (SCR) template that meets the statutory requirements of KCSIE.

Question 49

Do you think this is helpful?

Government response

The SCR continues to play a critical role in safeguarding children by ensuring schools and colleges can demonstrate that required pre-appointment checks have been carried out for their staff.

Whilst just over half (51%) of respondents welcomed the inclusion of a single central record (SCR) template, many also raised substantial concerns about its format. They noted that its inclusion risked creating confusion about required content across the sector, particularly where schools and colleges already have well-established SCRs integrated into their data management systems. Some respondents thought it was too basic and preferred the current list of mandatory and non-statutory requirements. This figure also included responses from parents and carers, as well as other members of the public, some of whom misunderstood the purpose of the question.

We have therefore decided to remove the SCR template in its entirety and revert to including only the list of mandatory and non-statutory information in the guidance. We will consider the feedback received from this consultation when reviewing future iterations of the guidance.

Section 5 – Part four: Safeguarding concerns or allegations made about staff, including supply teachers, volunteers and contractors

Changes to Part four

Proposal and rationale

We have suggested amendments to Part four to clarify that when an allegation is made against a trainee teacher schools and colleges should follow the same procedures as set out for supply teachers and contracted staff.

Question 50

How confident are you in responding to allegations about trainee teachers and understanding their respective roles?

Government response

Consultation responses showed confidence in how Part four applies to trainee teachers and welcomed the inclusion of “trainee teachers” in the wording to provide further clarity. Therefore, the final guidance includes explicit reference to trainee teachers to clarify that whilst trainees are on placement to develop their practice, schools and colleges should manage any concerns about a trainee as they would for any other person working with children, whilst also ensuring that teacher training providers are fully involved in the process.

Question 51

To what extent do you agree with the following statements about a school’s safeguarding responsibilities for individuals who are not directly employed by the school (e.g., volunteers, contractors, trainee teachers, or staff from third-party organisations)? *Note: This relates to safeguarding responsibilities, not safer recruitment.*

“Schools have full safeguarding responsibility for all individuals working on their site or with their pupils, regardless of employment status.”

Government response

This is addressed at Q53 below.

Question 52

To what extent do you agree with the following statements about a school's safeguarding responsibilities for individuals who are not directly employed by the school (e.g., volunteers, contractors, trainee teachers, or staff from third-party organisations)? *Note: This relates to safeguarding responsibilities, not safer recruitment.*

“Schools share safeguarding responsibility with third parties but must ensure appropriate checks, supervision, and policies are in place.”

Government response

This is addressed at Q53 below.

Question 53

To what extent do you agree with the following statements about a school's safeguarding responsibilities for individuals who are not directly employed by the school (e.g., volunteers, contractors, trainee teachers, or staff from third-party organisations)? *Note: This relates to safeguarding responsibilities, not safer recruitment.*

“Schools can delegate safeguarding responsibility to external providers but must retain oversight and assurance that appropriate standards are met.”

Government response

Responses to Questions 51–53 show a range of perspectives on how schools understand and describe their safeguarding responsibilities in relation to individuals who are not directly employed by the school, such as volunteers, contractors, trainee teachers, and staff from third-party organisations.

The questions were designed to encourage careful consideration of how responsibility is understood and articulated in situations involving third party employers, including the distinction between a school's overarching responsibility for safeguarding children and the employment responsibilities held by external employers or organisations.

We have amended Part four of KCSIE to clarify and reinforce how these shared responsibilities are described, including the assurance process, and the principle that safeguarding responsibility cannot be transferred, even where individuals are employed by a third party.

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

Proposal and rationale

We have restructured Part five of KCSIE to present a clearer and more progressive continuum of sexual behaviours. The revised structure begins with early indicators of harmful sexual behaviour (HSB), progressing through to sexual harassment and culminating in sexual violence. This sequential approach enhances clarity, improves the logical flow, and supports ease of reference for professionals addressing safeguarding concerns. This approach also aligns with evidence-based frameworks such as the Hackett Continuum.

Question 54

Do you agree that the revised structure of Part five of KCSIE, presenting a clearer continuum of sexual behaviours from early indicators of harmful sexual behaviour through to sexual harassment and sexual violence, improves clarity and supports professionals in identifying and responding to safeguarding concerns?

Government response

We welcome the range of views received in response to this question and note that the majority of respondents (57%) agreed that the revised structure of Part five of KCSIE improves clarity and supports professionals in identifying and responding to safeguarding concerns. A smaller proportion (6%) disagreed, while 37% indicated no opinion or that the question was not applicable to them.

When considering only those respondents who expressed a definitive view (i.e. those who answered either “yes” or “no”), approximately 91% agreed and 9% disagreed, indicating strong overall support among those with a clear position.

Having carefully considered the feedback, we intend to proceed with the proposed restructuring of Part five. We recognise that presenting behaviours along a continuum provides a more logical and structured framework for understanding how concerns may develop and escalate over time. This approach is intended to support professionals in identifying issues at an earlier stage and take appropriate, proportionate action to safeguard children and young people.

The revised structure also aligns with established, evidence-based frameworks such as the Hackett Continuum. We consider this alignment to be an important strength, as it reflects current research and good practice in the identification and management of harmful sexual behaviours. We note, however, that some respondents are requesting more prominent and explicit signposting to the Hackett Continuum within the guidance. In

response to this, we have included further references to the framework to ensure that it is easily accessible.

In addition, respondents highlighted a desire for further resources and guidance on identifying age-appropriate versus problematic or harmful sexual behaviours, especially in primary-aged children. We recognise the importance of supporting the sector in making these distinctions and have included further links to resources on HSB to help support this.

Overall, we consider that the revised structure strengthens Part five by improving the clarity, coherence, and accessibility of the guidance. It is intended that these changes will better equip professionals to recognise, respond to, and prevent harmful sexual behaviours, thereby contributing to improved safeguarding outcomes for children and young people.

Question 55

Does this approach, aligned with evidence-based frameworks such as the Hackett Continuum, help schools and colleges better distinguish between developmentally inappropriate, problematic, and abusive behaviours?

Government response

We welcome the range of views received in response to this question and note that the majority of respondents (49%) agreed that the revised structure of Part five of KCSIE helps schools and colleges better distinguish between developmentally inappropriate, problematic, or abusive behaviours. A smaller proportion (6%) disagreed, while 45% indicated no opinion or that the question was not applicable to them.

When considering only those respondents who expressed a definitive view, approximately 90% agreed and 10% disagreed, indicating strong overall support among those with a clear position. Responses to Question 55 were considered alongside Question 54, particularly in relation to clarity around frameworks, and supporting guidance. Our response to this question is therefore reflected in the answer to Question 54.

Section 7 – Annex B (to become Annex A): Further information

Proposal and rationale

We have added in links to [Understanding and responding to AI-generated child sexual abuse material](#) guidance from the National Crime Agency's CEOP Education programme in collaboration with the Internet Watch Foundation, and [Financially motivated sexual extortion \(FMSE\) guidance](#) for education settings on FMSE from the National Crime Agency's CEOP Education programme.

Question 56

Are these new links helpful for schools and colleges?

Government response

While overall responses appear mixed, a large proportion selected “not applicable / no opinion” (29%) or did not answer (28%), indicating that many respondents did not express a view. Among those who did provide a clear opinion, support was very strong: around 96% considered the links helpful, compared to around 4% who did not. This indicates clear support among respondents who felt able to comment.

Free text responses broadly reflected this, with many welcoming links to authoritative, specialist guidance on emerging risks such as AI-generated abuse and financially motivated sexual extortion. This supports the approach of maintaining KCSIE as a high-level framework, with signposting to more detailed external resources where relevant.

Some respondents raised usability concerns, including navigating and locating links, alongside wider workload pressures. Views also differed on the balance between high-level guidance and more detailed content, with a small number suggesting links alone may not always provide sufficient clarity in practice.

Overall, responses support the continued use of external links to specialist resources as a proportionate way of addressing emerging safeguarding issues, whilst continuing to maintain and refine a clear and usable core document.

Section 8 - Annex C (to become Annex B): The role of the designated safeguarding lead

Proposal and rationale

We have added further detail regarding the importance of schools having robust cover arrangements. We recognise there may be times when the DSL may not be available, for example because of an illness. We aim to ensure that any safeguarding concerns are acted upon without delay. We have added “*skills and experience*” to paragraph 125, this aims to reinforce the expectation that DSLs should not only hold appropriate status and authority but also possess the practical capability to carry out their responsibilities effectively. This has also been reflected in Part two.

Question 57

Do you support the inclusion of a requirement for schools to implement robust cover arrangements to ensure safeguarding concerns are addressed promptly when the DSL is unavailable?

Government response

Some respondents, particularly those from smaller settings, raised concerns about the challenges of providing adequate cover where staffing and resources may be more limited. However, the majority were in support of the inclusion to further clarify the expectations around safeguarding cover arrangements when the DSL is unavailable. Many felt they already had effective cover in place in the absence of the DSL and described robust practice with supportive teams and clear arrangements.

There was a call from some for further clarity on the term ‘robust cover arrangements,’ and whether this expectation extended beyond normal school and college hours. Robust cover means that, whenever the DSL is unavailable, there is a clear, reliable, and known arrangement in place so that concerns can be raised, managed, and escalated without delay. Schools and colleges have the flexibility and discretion in how these arrangements operate, provided safeguarding responsibilities remain appropriately covered, we have reflected this in our guidance.

While the consultation question did not explicitly reference colleges, we are grateful for the feedback received and confirm that the expectation regarding DSL cover applies equally to college settings.

Question 58

Do you agree with the proposed addition of “skills and experience”, to reinforce the expectation that DSLs should have the practical capability, background, and expertise to carry out their responsibilities effectively?

Government response

The proposed addition of “*skills and experience*” to the expectations of the DSL role were strongly supported, with only 3% of respondents disagreeing. Many respondents welcomed the inclusion, noting that it better reflects the importance and complexity of the role.

Some respondents felt the wording would benefit from further clarity, particularly around what constitutes appropriate “*skills and experience.*” A number also used this question to highlight the increasing expectations and pressures placed on DSLs, suggesting potential measures to support consistency and development, such as national standards, enhanced training, or a formal qualification similar to that of the SENCO.

Concerns were raised from smaller settings, where opportunities to gain relevant skills and experience may be more limited. However, respondents also acknowledged that skills and experience can be developed over time and emphasised the importance of appointing the right individuals to the role of DSL.

Overall, we are pleased to see that most respondents agreed that the inclusion of ‘skills and experience’ strengthens the expectations of the DSL role and supports effective safeguarding practice.

Section 9 - Expanding our evidence base

Background

We asked a number of questions to help build our evidence base. In the main, the findings gathered through this section of the consultation will be used to inform future iterations of KCSIE, unless we have indicated that changes have already been made. As this section is intended to strengthen our evidence base in areas where current knowledge may be limited, responses will support longer-term understanding of emerging issues and practice challenges. This will enable more robust, evidence-based decision-making when considering updates to KCSIE, rather than leading to immediate changes in the current version.

General feedback on KCSIE

Question 59

What aspects of KCSIE do you find most helpful in supporting safeguarding practice?

Government response

Respondents consistently identified KCSIE as a valuable and authoritative framework for safeguarding. Key aspects highlighted included:

- the clarity it provides on safeguarding roles and responsibilities, particularly for staff and DSLs,
- the role of Part one as a clear, accessible summary of key safeguarding expectations for all staff,
- its status as a single, nationally recognised reference point for safeguarding expectations,
- the consistency it supports across education settings, and
- the breadth of safeguarding issues covered, enabling a common understanding of risk.

Overall, responses indicate that KCSIE is widely valued as a core statutory framework that underpins safeguarding practice across the sector.

Question 60

What aspects of KCSIE do you find least helpful or most challenging?

Government response

Respondents identified a number of challenges relating primarily to usability and accessibility of the guidance, including:

- the overall length and volume of content, particularly for non-specialist staff,
- difficulty navigating the document and quickly locating key information,
- perceived duplication or repetition in parts of the guidance, and
- challenges translating high-level expectations into day-to-day practice.

Some respondents also highlighted a lack of clarity in certain areas of application, particularly where professional judgement is required.

Question 61

Is there anything missing from KCSIE that would help you safeguard children more effectively?

Government response

Responses to this question largely reflected requests for:

- additional practical guidance, including examples, scenarios, or case studies,
- clearer guidance on thresholds for action and decision-making, and
- further detail on specific safeguarding issues.

However, many of these suggestions were expressed alongside concerns about the overall length and usability of the document, indicating a tension between requests for additional content and the need to maintain a manageable document.

Overall narrative for Questions 59–61

A small number of responses raised issues relating to gender questioning, which are being considered separately.

Across these questions, responses highlight both the strengths of KCSIE and ongoing challenges in its use.

There is strong support for KCSIE as a clear and authoritative statutory framework, particularly in establishing consistent expectations and a shared understanding of safeguarding responsibilities across the sector.

At the same time, respondents raised concerns about usability, especially the length of the document, ease of navigation, and the accessibility of key information in practice.

As in previous consultations, views differed on the appropriate level of detail within KCSIE. Some respondents called for more practical guidance and clarity on how to apply expectations, while others emphasised the importance of maintaining a concise, high-level document that supports professional judgement.

Similarly, suggestions for additional content often sat alongside concerns about the overall volume of guidance, highlighting the ongoing challenge of balancing comprehensiveness with clarity and usability.

Overall, responses reinforce the importance of maintaining KCSIE as a high-level statutory framework, while continuing to consider how best to support clarity, usability, and accessibility, including through how information is structured and presented, alongside maintaining and continuing to refine a clear and usable core document. We intend to use these insights to help us to consider the future structure of the guidance.

Affluent neglect

“Affluent neglect” refers to situations whereby children from wealthy or privileged backgrounds experience neglect (particularly emotional or supervisory) despite having their material needs met.

Question 62

Are you familiar with the term *“affluent neglect”*?

Government response

Overall, a strong majority of respondents reported familiarity with the term *“affluent neglect”*. Of the 1,477 responses received, 68% (1,001 respondents) indicated that they were familiar with the term, while 32% (476 respondents) said they were not.

Notably, there was a high proportion of respondents who identified as parents or members of the general public, rather than education professionals who might reasonably be expected to be familiar with specialist terminology. In this context, the level of reported awareness suggests that the term has some wider public recognition, although the size of the minority who were unfamiliar indicates a continued need for clear explanation when it is used in consultation or policy contexts.

Question 63

If yes, do you believe “*affluent neglect*” is becoming a growing safeguarding concern and warrants explicit reference and guidance within KCSIE?’

Government response

The consultation responses show strong overall support for inclusion, with around 90% of responses to this question in favour, reflecting broad agreement that children’s needs can go unmet across a range of family circumstances.

However, the term “*affluent neglect*” was often misunderstood as neglect in wealthier households rather than a distinct form of neglect in which material provision masks unmet emotional, developmental, or supervisory needs. The descriptor “*affluent*” contributed to this confusion, with uncertainty about what level of affluence the term implies.

Respondents who were aware of the term, particularly those working in schools, also reported uncertainty about how such concerns could be identified and addressed, noting that they often do not meet existing thresholds for local authority or children’s social care intervention and that clear escalation pathways are lacking. Responses consistently emphasised the need for a clear definition and precise guidance, aligned with Working Together to Safeguard Children, to support confident and consistent professional decision-making. The responses received have raised a number of useful points for us to consider going forward on how best to support schools to deal with affluent neglect, and what helpful guidance might look like.

A number of responses also drew connections between affluent neglect and wider safeguarding concerns, including unmonitored access to personal devices and the internet outside school, which is something that we have been addressing through the statutory guidance banning mobile phones in schools, screen-time guidance for younger children and the ongoing work reviewing the impact of social media on children and young people.

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

We welcome your views on how KCSIE can best support staff in understanding and responding to the evolving risks posed by AI technologies.

Technology continues to play a significant role in both safeguarding risks and opportunities. As AI tools become more widely used, particularly AI-powered chatbots, there is growing concern about their potential misuse in ways that could harm children and young people. These risks are evolving rapidly and may not yet be fully understood by all staff working in education settings.

Question 64

Should KCSIE include specific reference to the emerging safeguarding risks associated with artificial intelligence (AI)?

Government response

An overwhelming majority of respondents supported the inclusion of explicit reference within KCSIE to the emerging safeguarding risks associated with artificial intelligence (AI). Many respondents highlighted that AI represents a rapidly evolving area of risk, and there was strong consensus that schools would benefit from clear, up-to-date guidance to help staff recognise potential concerns and respond to them appropriately.

A key concern identified was the risk that any detailed guidance contained directly within KCSIE could quickly become outdated given the pace of technological change. Several respondents noted that this could place additional pressure on DSLs to remain current with developments in this area. As a result, a number of respondents suggested that KCSIE should instead signpost to separate, dedicated guidance on AI-related safeguarding risks, which could be updated more frequently. The government recognises the merit of this approach and will consider it carefully when determining how best to support schools in addressing these risks.

A significant proportion of responses also expressed concern about children and young people's use of AI tools, including conversational AI and chatbots. Some respondents highlighted the potential for these tools to be perceived by children as 'friends' or trusted sources of advice. Others raised concerns relating to AI 'hallucinations', and the potential impact of prolonged or unmediated interaction with AI systems on children's wellbeing. This was most commonly raised by parents and carers, who called for accessible guidance to help families understand AI-related risks and support children to use technology safely.

We recognise that AI is an area of particular uncertainty and concern for parents and carers. To support families, we have established an online resource providing practical advice and guidance on keeping children safe online, including in relation to emerging technologies. This resource is available at: [Help your child stay safe online - Kids Online Safety](#).

British Sign Language (BSL)

Currently KCSIE is not available in British Sign Language (BSL), we sought views on whether there is a need for a BSL version to improve accessibility and equity in education settings.

Question 65

Do you feel there is a need for a British Sign Language (BSL) version of the KCSIE guidance?

Government response

While responses were mixed overall, a large proportion selected “not sure / no opinion” (35%) or did not answer (25%), suggesting many respondents did not feel sufficiently informed to express a view. Among those who did provide a clear opinion, the majority were supportive, with around 85% indicating there is a need for a BSL version.

Free text responses reflected a range of perspectives. Many respondents expressed strong principled support for improving accessibility and inclusion. Others raised questions about the level of need in practice and the proportionality of producing a full BSL version, particularly given the likely size of the audience and the nature of the workforce expected to engage with the guidance. Responses also reflected varying levels of familiarity with the use of BSL in education settings.

A number of responses also broadened beyond BSL to wider accessibility considerations, such as alternative formats and translations. While these issues are related, they reflect a broader theme seen elsewhere in the consultation regarding accessibility in general rather than views specific to BSL.

The department will continue to engage with BSL users and the deaf community to inform this work.

Domestic abuse

Feedback from the wider sector has highlighted the need for clearer advice and strengthened language around Children Affected by Domestic Abuse (CADA).

Question 66

To what extent do you agree that KCSIE should include more detailed information on Children Affected by Domestic Abuse (CADA), including clearer signposting to support services?

Government response

A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that KCSIE should include more detailed information on Children Affected by Domestic Abuse (CADA), including clearer signposting to support services, with a very small percentage disagreeing. There were mixed views, however, about the level of additional detail required with some suggestions

that adding further information runs the risk of KCSIE becoming so long/detailed that it will be unusable.

A number of respondents pointed to other relevant guidance, including the Domestic Abuse statutory guidance and Working Together to Safeguard Children, whilst others made the point that teachers may not always have the capacity to follow links to additional guidance.

We agree that there is a balance to be struck, and that KCSIE should as a minimum include information about the prevalence and impact of domestic abuse on children, key indicators that may be observed in school settings, and an outline of appropriate response pathways, including involving specialist services where needed. We acknowledge that teachers and DSLs are not therapists or specialist practitioners, and the focus in schools should be on identification, support, and appropriate referral.

Several respondents made the point that specialist support services for child victims are not universally available locally, and those that are available are often over-subscribed. We recognise this inconsistency which the Domestic Abuse Commissioner set out in her report 'Patchwork of Provision' and are working with Foundations, the What Works Centre for Children and Families, to identify what works best in supporting child victims. The Children's Wellbeing and Schools Act sets out a requirement for education to have an enhanced role, both operationally and strategically, in local multi-agency safeguarding arrangements, and we would expect this to enable schools to better access services for child victims of domestic abuse provided through, for example, the new Family Help arrangements being rolled out as part of the Families First Partnership programme, and through Best Start Family Hubs.

Several responses made the point that certain groups of children may be particularly susceptible to domestic abuse. Other respondents suggested that KCSIE should include reference to children who may harm, for example, child to parent or care giver abuse, including examples in the context of children with SEND who show challenging behaviour. We will explore how we can strengthen the guidance to cover these important points.

A small number of respondents made reference to an inconsistent experience with regards to Operation Encompass notifications. We will raise these concerns with Home Office colleagues who have responsibility for oversight of the scheme and the associated statutory guidance.

Grooming Gangs

Question 67

Should KCSIE include clearer guidance on safeguarding risks associated with organised networks or grooming gangs, including links to relevant statutory guidance?

Government response

We note that a number of respondents called for strengthened and more detailed content within KCSIE in relation to organised networks and/or grooming gangs.

We recognise the importance of ensuring that schools and colleges are equipped to identify and respond effectively to children at risk of exploitation. However, this is an area of active and ongoing cross-government policy development.

In particular, the Crime and Policing Act 2026, which received Royal Assent on 29 April 2026, introduces new provisions including standalone criminal offences of child criminal exploitation, cuckooing and internal concealment, as well as new child criminal exploitation prevention orders. Alongside this, the Home Office intends to publish statutory guidance for police and law enforcement, alongside non-statutory guidance for all professionals, to support understanding of the new offences and orders, and improve identification and protection of victims.

Given this new legislation, and the need to ensure alignment with forthcoming statutory guidance and wider cross-government work on safeguarding and exploitation, we consider that it would be premature to make substantive changes to KCSIE at this time. KCSIE continues to provide a safeguarding framework, including recognising children who may be vulnerable to exploitation. We will keep this area under close review and will consider whether future updates to KCSIE are required once the new legislative framework and accompanying guidance are fully embedded.

Gaming platforms

As children and young people increasingly engage with online platforms, the risks they face continue to evolve. While social media has long been recognised as a space where children may be targeted by offenders, there is growing concern about the use of gaming platforms as environments where grooming, exploitation, and contact by organised networks can occur.

In parallel, there is a rising trend in sextortion, particularly financially motivated sexual extortion, which disproportionately affects young males. Offenders often coerce victims

into sharing explicit images and then demand money under threat of exposure. This form of abuse can have devastating emotional and psychological consequences.

Question 68

Given these emerging threats, do you think that there is a need to consider explicit reference to a) the risks associated with gaming platforms as potential sites of harm and/or b) the growing prevalence of sextortion, especially targeting young males, and the need for schools and colleges to be aware of and respond to this form of abuse?

Government response

Responses were overwhelmingly in favour of consideration to include explicit reference to the risks associated with gaming platforms and the growing prevalence of sextortion within KCSIE.

Education professionals who responded to the consultation broadly acknowledged that safeguarding risks associated with gaming platforms are a relevant and growing concern. Within school settings, respondents noted that pupils are already supported through existing safeguards, including filtering and monitoring systems, as well as the statutory guidance on banning mobile phone use in schools. Many indicated that these issues are already addressed with pupils through RSHE. However, respondents consistently highlighted a key challenge: much of children and young people's engagement with gaming takes place outside the school environment. This limits the ability of schools to identify concerns and take direct action.

Respondents also raised questions about the availability of appropriate resources to support schools, including what guidance, support mechanisms or referral pathways exist where concerns arise. We recognise these challenges and will consider carefully how best to ensure that schools are provided with clear, practical guidance and support in this area.

Similarly, many parents and carers expressed strong support for the inclusion of gaming-related risks within KCSIE. Alongside this, there was a clear call for accessible, user-focused guidance to help families understand these risks and support children effectively at home.

We have already established an online resource to support families in keeping children safe online, which includes guidance on gaming and related risks. We will consider whether this resource can be further strengthened in light of the concerns raised through this consultation. This resource is available at: [Help your child stay safe online – Kids Online Safety](#).

Harmful sexual behaviour (HSB)

Currently, KCSIE focuses on child-on-child harmful sexual behaviour (HSB). However, school staff may encounter situations involving HSB that is not criminal in nature and may not always harm another child e.g. a child watching pornography. These behaviours may not always result in direct harm but can still indicate underlying vulnerabilities or risks.

This consultation aimed to ensure that school staff are equipped with the right knowledge and tools to respond confidently and appropriately to all forms of HSB, in line with best practice and evolving safeguarding needs.

Question 69

Would you welcome more specialist advice in KCSIE on harmful sexual behaviour including behaviours that are not criminal and may not always harm another child e.g. a child watching pornography, or would you prefer to be signposted to other sources of help?

Government response

Part five of KCSIE currently focuses on child-on-child harmful sexual behaviour (HSB), this question sought views on whether further advice should be included on HSB that does not involve another child and may not meet a criminal threshold.

The majority of respondents would support the inclusion of additional advice, alongside clear signposting to external guidance. Respondents highlighted that school staff may encounter a range of behaviours which, while not criminal or directed towards another child, may still indicate safeguarding concerns, including underlying vulnerability or risk.

We also noted that some respondents appear to have misunderstood the intent of the question. In particular, some responses interpreted the inclusion of the example of a child accessing pornography as suggesting that this would not constitute a safeguarding issue. This was not the intention. Such behaviours may still raise safeguarding concerns and require an appropriate and proportionate response. The question aimed to explore whether additional guidance would support staff in responding to behaviours that fall outside the current focus on child-on-child HSB.

The responses received have raised a number of useful points for us to consider going forward on how best to support schools and colleges to deal with this harm, and what helpful signposting would look like.

Self-Referral – harm towards a child

It is our expectation that schools' safeguarding policies and procedures would require individuals to disclose relevant information, including self-referral where they have harmed a child or are subject to safeguarding measures.

We are seeking views on whether KCSIE should provide clearer expectations around self-referral by staff. The current guidance requires staff to refer concerns about colleagues who may have harmed a child, but it is less explicit about situations where staff themselves may have harmed a child or are subject to safeguarding measures, such as a child protection plan.

We want to understand whether stakeholders believe KCSIE should make this expectation clearer.

Question 70

Should KCSIE include clearer guidance requiring staff to refer themselves to the headteacher or principal if they have harmed a child or are subject to a child protection plan, even where this has not resulted in criminal charges?

Government response

A clear majority of respondents supported the proposal on clearer guidance requiring staff to self-refer if they have harmed a child.

Those in favour generally recognised the importance of transparency and early safeguarding action. However, respondents also highlighted a number of areas that would need careful consideration. There were calls for clearer context and definitions, including what is meant by "harm," for instance, whether accidental harm would be included, and clarification that being subject to a child protection plan does not necessarily indicate that a person has caused harm to a child. Respondents also asked for clearer guidance on the steps schools should take following disclosure, with an emphasis on proportionate responses.

Many respondents stressed that any guidance should be framed within a supportive, sensitive and confidential approach, rather than being perceived as punitive, and questioned whether staff would feel confident to self-refer without this reassurance.

Respondents further noted that, if such a requirement were included, consideration should be given to its placement within Part one of KCSIE, to ensure it is read and understood by all staff. We will consider these views carefully when assessing how best to provide clarity while supporting fair, proportionate and effective safeguarding practice.

Teenage relationship abuse

Currently, KCSIE includes limited wording on teenage relationship abuse, despite growing evidence of its prevalence among young people. With high and increasing rates of abuse in teenage relationships, especially online and through technology, teachers and school staff may require clearer guidance on how teenage relationship abuse may present, how children may be abused or controlled by their partners, and what interventions are appropriate.

While KCSIE outlines signs of harm in the context of intra-familial domestic abuse, it does not currently support school staff in recognising or responding to abuse within teenage relationships.

Question 71

Do you agree that KCSIE should include more detailed guidance on Teenage Relationship Abuse (TRA), including how it may present in online and digital contexts, and how school staff can identify and respond to abuse and coercive control within teenage relationships?

Government response

Of those respondents who answered this question, there was a clear majority who agreed or strongly agreed that KCSIE should include more detailed guidance on Teenage Relationship Abuse (TRA). Examples of the type of information which respondents asked to be added included the impact of online and digital abuse, including coercive messaging, image-based abuse and exploitation, the role of social media, and the increasing impact of extreme pornography and misogyny on teenage relationships. There were also calls for greater clarity around what distinguishes teenage relationship abuse from typical adolescence conflict, and the importance of this clarity in ensuring a consistent, proportionate, and legally aligned response.

There were also a number of respondents who felt that the information currently provided in Part one and Part five of the guidance, covering safeguarding responsibilities, child-on-child abuse and harmful sexual behaviour, was sufficient and adding further detail risked KCSIE becoming too unwieldy.

We agree that there is scope to tighten up some of the language in KCSIE around teenage relationship abuse, and to add more detail on how such abuse may manifest itself. We are aware, however, that there is significant work taking place on this issue elsewhere in response to 'Freedom from Violence and Abuse', the cross-government strategy to build a safer society for women and girls. This includes an update to the Government's statutory guidance on domestic abuse to include bespoke information on teenage relationship abuse, and a review into the legal framework of domestic abuse to ensure it captures the

experience of adolescents, including a review of the age limit in the Domestic Abuse Act 2021. As such, we think further changes at this stage would be unwise.

Verbal abuse

KCSIE sets out different forms of abuse, including physical, sexual, emotional, and neglect. While verbal abuse is referenced within emotional abuse, we are interested in whether KCSIE should say more about verbal abuse as a distinct safeguarding concern. This could include clearer examples of harmful language, persistent derogatory remarks, or threats, and how these can impact a child's wellbeing and safety.

Question 72

Do you think KCSIE should provide more explicit guidance on verbal abuse?

Government response

Most respondents who expressed a view supported providing more explicit guidance on verbal abuse in KCSIE. Of the 1,493 respondents to this question, 819 said yes, 220 said no, and 454 did not express a clear view. Among those who gave a definitive response (yes or no), around 79% supported more explicit guidance, while 21% did not.

We recognise the strength of support among respondents who expressed a view and the importance of ensuring that verbal abuse is clearly understood within safeguarding practice. We will consider these responses alongside existing guidance and wider safeguarding frameworks when determining whether further clarification or additional guidance is appropriate.

Question 73

If yes, what additional content or examples would help schools and colleges identify and respond to verbal abuse effectively?

Government response

Respondents felt that, if included, guidance should include practical examples and case studies of verbal abuse, with clear guidance on how to respond in practice. Additionally, there was a request for support in distinguishing between behaviour that may be considered 'banter' and when that oversteps into verbal abuse, and when concerns move from a behavioural issue to a safeguarding matter.

Additional concerns raised were in relation to how staff could identify less obvious forms of verbal abuse that may be context-specific or reflect evolving language among children and

young people, the importance of clarifying what is age-appropriate, and ensuring guidance takes account of children with special educational needs and disabilities.

There was strong support for clearer information on appropriate escalation routes and referral options, particularly where concerns may not meet existing thresholds for intervention. Some noted that verbal abuse may already be addressed through existing categories such as emotional abuse or bullying and suggested that any new content could sit within those frameworks rather than as standalone guidance.

Some respondents suggested that KCSIE should make more explicit reference to verbal abuse directed at people with protected characteristics, including racism and antisemitism. We note that such forms of abuse have always been covered within the existing equalities and safeguarding framework, including the duties placed on schools under equalities legislation. Respondents supported the changes we made that referenced racism and acknowledged the crucial role that schools and colleges play in preventative education, and they also welcomed the signposting to the Educate Against Hate advice. We will continue to consider these themes carefully when assessing how any future references to verbal abuse could most effectively support safeguarding practice without duplicating existing guidance.

Designated safeguarding lead (DSL)

Previous engagement, including in the 2024 call for evidence and more recent stakeholder feedback, highlighted concerns around workload, emotional burden, recognition, and training. We sought views to help identify practical steps to better support DSLs and their deputies in schools and colleges.

Question 74

How were you recruited into the role of a DSL or deputy DSL (DDSL)? (select the option that best describes your experience):

Government response

Disregarding respondents who were neither a DSL nor a deputy, 68% reported taking on the role willingly, either by volunteering or because it formed part of their role on appointment or promotion. A further 23% stated that they were asked to undertake the role.

These findings are broadly positive and indicate that most DSLs and deputies assume the role through planned and transparent arrangements. The proportion of staff who were asked to take on the role reflects the different approaches used across settings to identify a suitably trained members of staff to give appropriate responsibility for safeguarding.

Question 75

How long have you been in the DSL/DDSL role?

Government response

Comments were not invited for this question, which simply sought to understand how long individuals remain in the role of DSL or deputy. Of those who responded, 56% reported having been in the role for more than five years. This indicates that a substantial proportion of safeguarding leads and deputies remain in post over an extended period, providing continuity and accumulated experience within safeguarding arrangements.

Question 76

What is the most rewarding part of your role as a DSL/DDSL?

Government response

This question was directed to DSLs and deputies. It is encouraging that the overwhelming majority identified clear and meaningful rewards associated with the role. Responses consistently highlighted that the greatest source of professional satisfaction lies in improving outcomes for children and young people. This included building trusted relationships, gaining children's confidence, enabling them to speak out, and seeing children feel safer and thrive because of timely safeguarding interventions. Many respondents also described a strong sense of fulfilment in supporting families and reducing future risk through early identification and effective multi-agency working. A further key theme was the positive impact that DSLs and their deputies can have across the wider organisation.

The role is particularly rewarding when they can train and support staff, embed professional curiosity, and influence a strong, proactive safeguarding culture. Many said that such an approach contributed to the development of vigilant, skilled safeguarding teams who are better equipped to identify, manage, and escalate concerns at the earliest opportunity.

Question 77

What would make your role even better?

This is addressed at Q78 below.

Question 78

If you could change one thing to improve support for DSL/DDSLs, what would it be?

Government response

We are interested in measures which could help support or improve challenges faced by DSLs and their deputies. Responses to both questions 77 and 78 raised common themes relating to capacity, workload, training, emotional demands, and multi-agency working. As such, they are addressed together in this response.

KCSIE is clear that DSLs should be given the time, funding, training, resources, and necessary support to fulfil their role effectively. The guidance does not set prescriptive requirements on DSL capacity or specific staffing models, recognising that individual schools and colleges are best placed to manage their own safeguarding arrangements.

Consistent with feedback from previous consultations, respondents highlighted increasing demands relating to the DSL role. Some, especially those in larger settings, called for greater capacity, including the option for a standalone or full-time role. While KCSIE does not mandate this, we recognise that some settings have chosen to structure safeguarding leadership in this way to reflect local needs.

Respondents emphasised the emotional impact of the role and supervision was frequently cited as a form of support. Feedback from settings where supervision is in place was positive. Decisions regarding access to supervision remain for schools and colleges to determine locally.

Variation in access to, and quality, of training was another recurring theme, with some respondents calling for a nationally funded or standardised provision. KCSIE deliberately allows flexibility in training arrangements so that settings can select provision appropriate to their local safeguarding risks.

Finally, respondents highlighted challenges in multi-agency working, particularly around consistency and thresholds. While responsibility for thresholds and processes rests with local safeguarding partners, strong collaboration remains central to effective safeguarding.

We are grateful for these insights and suggestions. While the policy position set out in KCSIE remains unchanged, the views expressed provide valuable evidence on the realities of the DSL and deputy role and will help to inform future policy development and sector engagement.

Question 79

How confident do you feel in your role as a DSL/DDSL?

Government response

This question was directed at DSLs and deputies. Of those who responded, 94% reported feeling confident in their role. Respondents identified a range of factors associated with their confidence levels. These included having supportive teams and greater experience in the role. Responses also indicated that confidence increased over time as individuals became more familiar with safeguarding processes and emerging risks. There was broad agreement among respondents that the role requires continuous learning, and that safeguarding practice evolves in response to new and emerging risks. Training, ongoing professional development, and clarity around multi-agency thresholds were referenced as relevant contextual factors influencing confidence.

A minority of respondents reported lower levels of confidence. Reasons given included having limited time in the role, feelings of professional isolation, and the ongoing demands of managing complex and evolving safeguarding risks.

Overall, the findings indicate a strong level of professional confidence among DSLs and deputies, underpinned by experience, collaboration, and a sustained commitment to safeguarding practice.

Conclusion

We welcome the fact that the number of responses to the 2026 consultation was significantly higher than in previous years, reflecting the high level of interest and engagement with KCSIE. We are extremely grateful to all those who took the time to respond and share their considered and constructive views. The breadth and depth of feedback has provided valuable insight into how the guidance is understood and applied across the sector.

We believe that the changes and refinements made to the guidance in response to this consultation will provide greater clarity and strengthen support for schools and colleges in carrying out their safeguarding responsibilities. In turn, this will help ensure that children continue to receive the high-quality safeguarding and protection they deserve.

Given the detailed and, in some cases, complex nature of a number of responses, there remains areas which warrant further consideration. These include areas where views were mixed, where evidence is still emerging, or where stakeholders have highlighted practical challenges in implementation. We recognise the importance of engaging further with interested parties, including respondents, to explore these issues in more depth.

We will draw on these elements to inform the future development of the guidance. This will include continuing to strengthen the evidence base, considering whether further clarification or revision is needed in specific areas, and ensuring that KCSIE remains clear, accessible, and responsive to the needs of the sector.

Annex A: Organisations that responded to the consultation¹

4myschools

5 Education Agency working in 3 Dimensions School last term and this term St George's Catholic School

Abbey Academies Trust

Abbey College Malvern

Abi HA Research

Accrington St Christopher's

ACE Learning

Ackworth School

ACM Psychology Ltd

Action4Youth

Activate Learning

AfC

AJC Education

Albury and Puller Memorial federation

Alder Tree Primary

Alderman Payne Primary School

Aldridge Education

Aletheia Academies Trust

Alexandra Park School

All Saints' CE Primary School, Newmarket

Alperton Community School

Alpha School

Amnesty International UK

Anti-Bullying Alliance (Part of the National Children's Bureau)

Applefields

Ark All Saints Academy

Ark Schools

As I am now retired from the business this question is not pertinent

Ash Field Academy

Ashton Sixth Form College

Association of Christian Teachers

Association of Colleges

¹ 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.

Aston Manor Academy
Aston University Engineering Academy
AudioActive
B BRILLIANT LIMITED
Badbury Park Primary School
Barnes Primary School
Barnet and Southgate College
Barnet Education Learning Services (BELS)
Barnsley College
Barton Peveril
Barton Peveril 6FC
Bath & Wells Multi-Academy Trust
Batley Grammar School
Bayswater Support Group
Beacon Academy
Beauchamp College
Beechwood Primary School
Belmont Grosvenor School
Beyond Equality
Biology in Medicine
Birkenhead High School Academy Junior School
Birkenhead Sixth Form College
Birmingham City Council
Bishop's Stortford College
Bispham Spencer Academy
Blackburn with Darwen Children's Services and Education Department
Blackpool and The Fylde College
Blades Down
Blue Gate Fields Junior School
BMet (Birmingham Metropolitan College)
Board of Deputies of British Jews
Bolton Primary School
Bolton Sixth Form College
Bootham School
Boston College UK
Bourne Consultancy
Bracknell Forest Council - Early Help
Bradford Diocesan Academies Trust
Bradley Stoke Community School
Bramcote College
Bramley C of E Infant and Nursery School
Brigantia Learning Trust

Bristol LGBTQ+ Coalition
British Rabbinical Union
British Society of Paediatric Dentistry (BSPD)
Broadhurst School
Brockholes C of E J & I School
Brockington College
Brockington College
Bromley Youth Music Trust
Brook
Brookhurst primary school
Broomgrove Junior School
Burstwick Community Primary School
Burton Morewood CE Primary & Nursery
Bury College
Busbridge Junior School
BWCET
C.C.I. Education
Calm and kind
Cam Everlands Primary School
Cambian Somerset School
Cambourne Village College
Cambridge Nursery Federation
Cambridge Regional College
CAPE (Child Protection in Education)
Carden Nursery and Primary School
Cardinal Newman College
Careers & Enterprise Company
Carmel College
Castle View Enterprise Academy
Castleford Academy Trust
Caterham School
Catherine Irving Consultancy Ltd
CCG
Charterhouse School
Chaucer School
Chester University School of Education
Chesterfield College
Chichester College Group

Childhood Bereavement Network
Children of Transitioners
Children's Services, Royal Borough of Greenwich

Chingford Foundation School
Chinuch UK
Chorus Education Trust
Christ the Rock Fellowship
Christian Concern
Christian Orthodox Church Coventry
Christopher Hatton Primary School
City of London Academy (Southwark)
City of London Freeman's School
City of Portsmouth College
Clifton College
Climate Cares Centre, University of Oxford & Imperial College London
Clinical Advisory Network on Sex and Gender
Clitheroe Royal Grammar School
Cockermouth School
Colchester Institute
Collingtree Church of England Primary School
Collingwood College
Combined Cadet Forces
Commission into Countering Online Conspiracies in Schools
Community
Confetti College
Conservatives for Woman
Coop Academies Trust
Coop Academy Priesthorpe
Coram Life Education
Cornerhouse (Yorkshire)
Counselling in Northumberland
Cranleigh CofE Primary School
Crofty Education Trust
Crookhorn College
Crownfield Infant and Nursery School
Croydon College Group
CSPA
Cuddington Primary School
Culverhill School
Cumberland Council
Davenant Foundation School
De Le Salle School
De Montfort University
Dean Trust Ardwick
Debbie Innes Safeguarding

Define Fine
Diocese of Chichester Academy Trust
Diocese of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich
Dishforth CE Primary School
Diverse Paths
Diversity Role Models
Dixons Academies Trust
Doncaster College
Downlands Community SCHOOL
Dr Challoners Grammar School
Dudley College of Technology
Dunkirk Primary and Nursery School
Dunston
Ealing Alternative Provision
Early Years Alliance
East Coast College
East Lancashire Learning
East Preston Infant School
East Sussex County Council
Eastburn Primary School
ECP Safeguarding
Edgewood Primary School
Education Partnership North East (City of Sunderland College)
Education South West
Eleos Group LTD
Ella Savell-Boss Ltd.
Eltham College
Elworth CE Primary School
Emily's Art and Photography Courses
Emmaus CAT
Endeavour Learning Trust
Endeavour MAT
Enjoy EY
EP
EqualiTeach
Equilibria
Essex County Council
Eton College
Excellence girls academy stoke on trent
Exeter Maths School
Faithguard
FFLAG

Field Junior School
Fladbury Church of England Primary School and Preschool
Flutterflys Childminding
Formby high
Fowler Academy
Framwellgate school
Free To Be Me Wakefield
Freedom Parents and Carers Peer Support Group
Future Horizons Leeds
Galop
Garden International School
Gateshead College
Gecko Community
Gender Identity and Research Organisation
Gendered Intelligence
Global Action Plan
Gloucestershire County Council
Gloucestershire Engineering Training
Grange Primary School
Grayrigg CE Primary School
Guisseley School
Halesowen College
Hallow school
Hampshire County Council
Handforth Grange Primary School
Hanley Castle High School
Harris Academy Merton
Hatfield Academy
Havering LA
Havering School Improvement Service
Hayes Primary School
Hebden Green School
Henrietta Barnett School
Herne Bay High School
High Oakham
Highcrest Academy
Highdown School and Sixth Form Centre
Highfield Church of England Primary School
Highfield Nursery and Children's Centre
HILT Academies (Milwards & Henry Moore Primary Schools, Harlow)
Himbleton CE Primary School and Nursery
HISP

HMC
Holwell Primary School
Horwood Coombe Inspire Ltd
Hove Park school and sixth form
Hull Collaborative Academy Trust
Hulme Grammar School
Hungerhill School
Huntington School
Hurstpierpoint College
IGLYO - International LGBTQI Youth and Student Organisation
Ilford Country High School
Inclusive Practice
Independent Schools Association
Independent Schools Council
INOVA
Inspire Education Group
Intake Primary School
Islip Manor High School
Iver heath infant and Nursery school
IW College
James Alleyn's Girls' School
James Calvert Spence College
Jancett Childcare & JACE Training LTD
Jennifer Gooch
Jews United
Jo Pearce Clerking
John Perryn Primary School
Kensington Avenue Primary School
Keswick School
King Ecgbert School
King Edward VI College
Kings Furlong Junior School
King's Lander Primary Academy
Kintore Way and The Grove Federation
Kirton Academy
Labour Women's Declaration
Ladies Ski Club Ltd
Lady Eleanor Holles School
LAMP Leamington
Lancaster University
LASI
Launcelot Primary School and Nursery

LB Hackney
LDE UTC
LEADINGFUTURESEUCATION
Learn Sheffield
Let's Be Blunt
Leyton 6th form College
LGB Alliance
LGBT Foundation
LGfL
Liberal Voice for Women
Liberate
Light Oaks Junior School
Lighthouse School Leeds
Lincoln Anglican Academy Trust
Little Chalfont Primary School
Little Loves Wellbeing
Liverpool City Council
Living in Light
London Borough of Havering Education Services
London Borough of Redbridge
London Design and Engineering UTC
Longfield Academy
Lord Derby Academy
Loughton School
Lovewise
Lower Halstow and Newington CEP Schools Federation
Loxwood Primary School
Luton Sixth Form College
Lynne Pinches
MacIntyre Academies Trust
Maiden Erlegh Trust
Maidstone Grammar School
Malden Oaks School
Malden Oaks School & Tuition Service
Manchester High School for Girls
Manchester Metropolitan University
Manchester Virtual School
Mandate Now
Mander Portman Woodward
Manor Wood Primary
Maplewell Hall School
Marches Academy Trust

Matford Brook Academy
Mellers Primary School
Mercian Trust
Michelle Buggins Childcare
Middlesex University
Millfield
Milton Keynes College
Minsthorpe Community College
Moor End Academy
Morley Victoria Primary
Mossbourne Port Side Academy
Moulton College
NAHT (National Association of Head Teachers)
NASS (National Association Special Schools)
NASUWT - The Teachers' Union
National Governance Organisation
Natspec
Navigators
NCG
ND SEND Specialists Ltd.
NetSupport
NEU (National Education Union)
New Bridge
New City College
Newcastle College
Newcastle University
Newfield primary school
Newhaven School (PRU) King's Park Campus
NHW Psychotherapy
NLC
North East Surrey College of Technology
North Ormesby Academy
North Petherton Community Primary School
Northpoint
Nottingham City Council and Nottingham Schools Trust
Nottingham College
Nottingham High School
Oak Cottage
Oakfield C of E Primary School
Oakley School
Oasis Academy Oldham
Off the Record (Croydon, Sutton, Merton)

Orchard Hill College & Academy Trust
Organisation Intersex International Europe - OII Europe
Ormiston Academies Trust
Ormiston Forge Academy
OTR Bristol
Oulder Hill Leadership Academy, Rochdale
Oulton Primary School
Our Duty
Our Time
Outcomes First Group
Outwood Grange Academies Trust
Oxfordshire Advanced Drivers
Pace
PANS PANDAS UK
ParentPower
Park Community Academy (specialist provision)
Park Primary School
People Change Minds
Peter Symonds College
Pevensey and Westham CE Primary School
Pipworth
Plantsbrook School
Plus Importance Project
Plymouth CAST Multi Academy Trust
Plymouth College
Polaris Community
Porter Croft Primary Academy
Prince Henrys Grammar School
Principal Resourcing
Priory School Lewes
Priory School of Our Lady of Walsingham
Progression Services
Prospect Training Services - Youth Team
Prosper Learning Trust
Protect and Teach
Puffins of Exeter Ltd
Queen Ethelburga's
Queens College London
Queensbridge Primary
Rakegate Primary School
Reclaim Childhood
Red Balloon Learner Centre Cambridge

Redland Green School
Reed Learning
Reed Specialist Recruitment
Reflexions Care Group Limited
Regency High School
Ridgewood Community High School
Riverview CofE Primary and Nursery School
RMBC School Effectiveness Service
Rochdale Training
Rodenhurst
Roedean School
Rookery School
Rosewood Free School
Rugby High School
Safe Schools Alliance
Safe to Learn
SAFEcic
Safeguarding and Child Protection Association (SACPA), BSA Group
Safeguarding Network
SafeHaven Alternative Provision of Excellence
Safer Recruitment Consortium
SafeScreens
Sam Hope Therapy, Training and Consultancy
Samuel Pepys School
Sarah Turner Consulting
School 180
SCiES - Cheshire East
SDBE
SEA Inclusion and Safeguarding
SEEN in Sport
Select
Sensei Education Ltd
Services For Education
Sex Education Forum
Sex Matters
Shaw Education Trust - Streethay Primary School
Sleaford Newlife Prechool
smile4helena campaign
Smoothwall
Somerset county council
South Bank Colleges
Southend Adult Community College

Southfield SEN School
Spectrum
Speech and Language UK
Spen Brook School
Spencer Clarke
Split Banana Education C.I.C.
Sponne School
St Angela's Ursuline school
St Anne's Catholic School
St Anselms school
St Bernadette's Catholic Primary school
St David's Preparatory School
St Egwins CE Middle School
St George's Studio
St George's CE Foundation School, Broadstairs
St George's School Windsor Castle
St Giles School
St Helens Council
St Helens primary school
St Hilda's School
St John Fisher Catholic College
St John Fisher Catholic High School
St John the Baptist CE VC Primary School
St Joseph's Catholic Primary
St Lawrence College
St Leonards CE Primary Academy
St Leonards Church Oakley Basingstoke
St Mary's School Ascot
St Matthew's High Brooms Primary school
St Michael's Easthampstead Primary School
St Nicolas CofE Academy
St Pauls Church
St Peter's School
St Philip's Catholic school
St Teresa's
Stafford Junior School
Stand Against Racism & Inequality
Starbank School
Staveley Junior School
Stoke Mandeville Combined School
Stradbroke High School
Strand Primary Academy

Students Organising for Sustainability UK
Suffolk New College
Summerhill Infants
Sussex Learning Trust
Swale Academies Trust
swgfl.org.uk
Talking Heads Supervision
Tender Education and Arts
TerraLigo
Testbourne School
The African Caribbean Education Network (ACEN)
The Alliance Multi Academy Trust
The Charter School East Dulwich
The Charter Schools Educational Trust
The Children's Trust School
The Christian Institute
The Clare Project
The Compton School
The Essential Safeguarding Company
The Gateway Academy
The Gender Identity Research & Education Society
The Girls' Schools Association
The Golden Thread Alliance
The Good Shepherd Trust
The Grammar School at Leeds
The Harbour School Partnership
The Heath School
The Highway Primary School
The Holme CofE Primary School
The Hub School
The Keystone Academy
The King's School
The Kingsbrook School
The Latymer School
The Learning Partnership
The Legacy Learning Trust
The Lilya Lighthouse Education Trust Ltd
The Manchester College (LTE Group)
The Old Vicarage School
The Paragon School
The Portsmouth Grammar School
The Proud Trust

The Reconnections Project
The Sheffield College
The Traveller Movement
The Unicorn School
The Vyne Community School
The Waterloo School
The Westbrook Trust
The Westminster School
Thelwall Community Junior School
Thirtyone:eight
Thomas Tallis
Thomas Telford UTC
Thurrock Virtual School
Thurston Community College
Tiffin School
Titus Salt School
Toftwood Infant and Junior school Federation
Trafford Council
Transgender Trend
Transparent Action
Transwidows.com
Treloar School & College
Trentham Academy
Trinity Grace Church, Ramsbottom
Trinity School
Trull Primary School
Trusted Governor Services
UCS College Group
UET Pathfinder Rosebery
UNISON
Unite for Education
United Colleges Group
United Schools Federation
Unity Schools Partnership
University College School
University of Birmingham School
University of Chichester
University of East Anglia Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research
University of Liverpool Mathematics School
University of London
University of Oxford
University of Reading

University of Reading, Institute of Education
University of Warwick
Up Holland High School
Uppingham School
Upton By Chester High School
UTC Sheffield City
Vernon Terrace Primary
VIAT
Walney School
Walsall College
Walter Halls Primary School
Waltham Leas Primary Academy
Warberry CofE Academy
Warrington Primary Academy Trust
Warwickshire Governor Services
Watercliffe Meadow
Waverley Primary
Wellington College
Wellspring Academy Trust
West Exe School
West Nottinghamshire College
West Sussex County Council
Westcountry Schools Trust
Western Primary School
Westfield Junior School
Westfield Primary School
Westminster School
Weston College
Wheatfield Primary School
Wheelers Lane Technology College
Whiston Preschool
Wigan Council
William Howard School
Willow Bank School
Wilson's School
Wirral Met College
Wollaston School
Wolverhampton Girls' High School
Women of Dorset
Women's Sports Union
Woodeaton Manor School
Woodpecker Court

Woodrow first
Wycombe Abbey School
Xaverian College
Yew Tree Primary School
York College
Young Epilepsy
Young Persons Advisory Service
Youth Endowment Fund
YPAS



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2026

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0, except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

About this publication:

enquiries www.gov.uk/contact-dfe

download www.gov.uk/government/publications

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

Connect with us on Facebook: facebook.com/educationgovuk