

Guidance Consultation

If you only have a few minutes, skip every question but question 33, question 34, and question 35. If you have a bit more time, also include question 60 and 61.

If you have the time, please consider responding to the rest of the guidance. Particular questions of note have been added to this guidance at the end.

More guidance can be found here:

<https://genderedintelligence.co.uk/news/31-keeping-children-safe-in-education-our-thoughts-and-advice>

You can fill out the guidance here:

<https://consult.education.gov.uk/independent-education-and-school-safeguarding-division/keeping-children-safe-in-education-2026-revisions/>

Core Questions

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?

No, because:

- This guidance equates transgender identities and gender non-conforming behaviour in children, such as girls playing with trucks, under the label gender questioning behaviour and suggests that this is something that most children typically grow out of and thus should be avoided
 - Challenge this false equivalence and the failure to differentiate between gender expression and gender identity, emphasising that this reinforces rigid gender roles that undermines attempts to tackle misogyny more broadly
 - Challenge the false claim that most children grow out of it, as the vast majority of children (97%+) who identify as trans+ continue to identify as trans+ adults also
 - Challenge the fact that they do not use the term transgender at any point within their guidance, including failing to mention it under prejudice education (yet they feel the need to mention misogyny)
- This guidance suggests that social transition should be considered an active intervention that should be avoided in most cases, especially by primary school children, and otherwise suggests that the decision should be made by school staff and carers/parents, regardless of the child's own

wishes. It references the Cass review to suggest that social transition is harmful because most children who socially transition go on to pursue a medical pathway

- Challenge the idea that social transition (name, pronouns, clothing) is harmful, when it is an entirely reversible step, and includes aspects of changes that even cisgender students may undertake for other reasons
- Provide clear guidance on different ways schools can support social transitions, not focusing instead on why they shouldn't
- Highlight that the Cass Report has been heavily criticised and does not hold up to scientific scrutiny
- Emphasise that the idea that social transition should be avoided because it encourages children to eventually medically transition is suggesting that they think it is a bad thing if children continue to identify as trans+, which is transphobic
- This guidance suggests that the designated safeguarding lead should be involved in the majority of cases where a young person is questioning their gender, but asking questions about gender or identifying as trans should not be treated as an automatic safeguarding issue
- The guidance fails to provide insight into how staff can support a student who is trans, and discusses making a decision based on the impact on staff and other students, even to the extent of ignoring a child's own wishes. It suggests making a decision that is in the best interest of the child, with parents/carers taking a leading role, but fails to weight the consequences of refusing support against the risk of providing it
- In this guidance, staff who hold transphobic beliefs will be empowered to refuse to support a trans+ child, without recourse. This will lead to discriminatory treatments
- This guidance suggests recording of 'biological sex' and informing staff, even when children have been living in stealth, and not permitting access to toilets and changing rooms. This does not consider how to protect this sensitive data, and prevent outing a trans+ child through visible exclusion or shared information.
- It does not provide guidance for schools' legal obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and Human Rights Act 1998, or data protection responsibilities. It suggests that it is difficult to know who is covered by the protected characteristic of gender reassignment, and provides no further guidance; this is nonsensical, and the same approach given to the protected characteristic of sexuality should be applied here
- It suggests that parents/carers should be informed in most circumstances, and does not provide guidance on what presents as a risk factor, or the impact that happens through a child's trans+ identity being disclosed without permission. There should be more support for schools in facilitating positive conversations between pupils and families about gender identity, without forcing dangerous disclosures of potential trans+ identity.
- It fails to define what is considered as a social transition, and presents it as a medical and extreme active intervention.

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?

No, because:

- This guidance suggests that children should only be allowed to access the single-sex spaces of their 'biological sex'. The term biological sex is scientifically illiterate and meaningless. There is no definition of what this actually means in practice.
 - For instance, what provisions exist for a child that has ovotesticular syndrome, or congenital adrenal hyperplasia, or partial androgen insensitivity syndrome, or any other variation caused by differences in sexual development in utero?
 - How would this be applied to asylum seekers/refugees/immigrants from countries that legally recognise them as a third sex on identity documents?
- The guidance suggests that those leaving in 'stealth' and those who have previously been allowed to socially transition should have these decisions reviewed. This does not acknowledge the risk of outing students, and the exclusion that is likely to occur and impact their access to education.
- The guidance suggests that alternative facilities should be provided to trans+ students where possible, but fails to acknowledge how schools can accommodate trans pupils in compliance with equality and human rights law when many schools lack space or resources to provide alternative facilities. Blanket exclusion is unlikely to meet the Equality Act requirement of being "proportionate and legitimate."
- trans+ children forced to use the facilities of their natal sex face increased risk of assault and health issues such as UTI, bladder, and kidney infections. Guidance ignores the psychological and social harm of excluding trans pupils from peer space.
- This guidance suggests that trans+ children in these spaces are inherently a safeguarding risk, but does not provide justification for this, and fails to provide guidance on how safeguarding in these single-sex spaces should be managed in a way that focuses on behaviour, rather than identity policing. This guidance assumes that young people of the same natal sex are incapable of posing a risk to each other.

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?

No, because:

- This guidance suggests that sex segregation should be done in PE lessons to ensure safety where an average woman would be at risk from an average man, and once more says that schools must force children to only partake in PE lessons for their "Biological sex". As above, this term lacks scientific scrutiny and this provides no clarity on how this should apply to intersex students.

- Guidance does not address how to include trans+ children in PE, when trans pupils' have poorer school attendance and lower sports participations; the impact on exclusions is not well considered, such as loss of peer connection, impacts on self-esteem, school engagement, and physical and mental health
- Mixed-sex and trans-inclusive PE lessons do not carry significantly greater risk than trans-exclusionary same-sex lessons when considering the large variation in physical attributes within people of the same natal sex; professional sport tends to separate based on weight/height and disability; this is not typically appropriate for a school environment due to the social impacts and lack of practicality; the idea that a trans student is thus a greater risk, when you could quite easily have two 15 year boys, where one is over 6ft and the other is just above 5ft and has underlying health conditions competing in the same class

Additional Key Questions

Question 60: What aspects of KCSIE do you find least helpful or most challenging?

- Guidance discourages teaching about transgender identities and transphobia. Where is HBT bullying guidance?
- Document conflates gender non-conformity with transgender identity rather than distinguishing between them.
- Guidance suggests schools should out trans+ students, including those living "in stealth."
- Recommendations appear designed to exclude trans+ students or encourage de-transition.
- Guidance gives schools power to determine whether a student is "allowed" to be trans+.
- Advice appears politically motivated rather than evidence-based.
- Recommendations will discourage educators from supporting LGBTQ+ youth, leaving them isolated.

Question 61: Is there anything missing from KCSIE that would help you safeguard children more effectively?

- Guidance fails to explain how to safeguard trans+ children.
- Document conflates questioning gender stereotypes with transgender identity. These are not the same.
- This conflation makes tackling misogyny impossible without treating gender role questioning as a safeguarding risk.

- Guidance falsely claims being trans+ is something most children grow out of, contradicting research.
- Claims that identifying gender reassignment is "difficult" are unclear. How does this differ from sexuality?
- Guidance denies children bodily autonomy over their own identity.
- Language and framing appear designed to empower transphobic staff without proper safeguarding oversight.

Further Questions if you have time

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)?

Yes, but:

- Fund external facilitators to deliver misogyny training rather than relying on staff capacity alone, as not a lot of teachers have had specialist training in challenging prejudice
- Include incel mentality in guidance and consider it within the Prevent duty framework, considering the link to mass violence, and explicit reference violence against women and girls (VAWG)
- Acknowledge that rigid gender roles are contributing to misogyny, men's mental health, and contribute to violence against women and girls (VAWG)
- Acknowledge that tackling misogyny often involves tackling rigid ideas of sex and gender; that this guidance equates gender non-conformity, such as girls playing with trucks, with being gender questioning and considers that a potential safeguarding risk, makes it much harder to conduct this prevention work for all students and actually reinforces this misogyny we are trying to tackle
- Acknowledge that this approach must be intersectional, and that trans people are experiencing higher rates of this violence and abuse, and are not the perpetrators of VAWG .

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?

Partially:

- Mostly this is fine, the inclusion of the definition of rape and sexual assault by penetration is sensible, but it would be better for the sake of clarity for them to use they/them pronouns, as the use of the 'he' pronoun in legal documents is typically intended to be gender neutral, thus they should look to align with how this law is typically presented. Likewise, while rape requires penetration with a penis, cisgender women can be charged with rape under joint enterprise as an accomplice so the use of the exclusive he pronoun is confusing here
- Likewise s/he notation is clunky compared to they/them, which will align with more official police materials for public awareness
- The guidance should clarify that whilst rape and sexual assault by penetration are legally distinct, they carry similar sentences and are typically grouped together in crime statistics; this is important, because some people believe that the legal definition of rape is artificially inflating male offending rates which it is not

Question 29: If KCSIE were to include more guidance on recognising and preventing child-on-child violence, what would be most helpful?

Training resources or similar, as:

- Signpost more clearly to DEI and RSHE resources when addressing violence linked to protected characteristics, acknowledging that prejudice drives a lot of this behaviour
- Explicitly include homophobic, biphobic, and transphobic (HBT) bullying.
- Add guidance on racial abuse and ableist bullying.
- Connect the guidance to violence against women and girls (VAWG) to misogyny and domestic abuse in teenage relationships
- Add in more detail about child criminal exploitation, and the likelihood of peer violence and knife crime where there's a likelihood that the perpetrator is also the victim of grooming and exploitation
- Provide specific guidance on sibling abuse, which is often normalized as "sibling conflict."
- Prioritize training resources to help staff recognize intersecting forms of abuse.

Question 41: Does the revised wording in paragraph 170 and additional paragraph effectively communicate that cyber security is an integral part of safeguarding practice?

No, because:

- Guidance on social transition conflicts with data protection obligations. Schools record transition decisions and 'biological sex' but guidance doesn't protect this data.
- No guidance on secure storage of trans status information or who can access it, potentially suggesting this should be given to all staff.
- Guidance forces disclosure of trans status without data protection protocols.
- Puts students' privacy and sensitive data at risk.

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?

- Provide more detailed guidance on TRA in online and digital contexts.
- Make explicit the connections between TRA, VAWG, misogyny, consent, and healthy relationships.
- Schools benefit from partnering with external domestic abuse agencies unless the DSL has specialist training.
- Without proper training, schools risk making situations worse.
- Dispel the "model victim" myth and recognise that victims may fight back, and thus provide guidance on how to handle dual allegations
- Provide guidance on supporting victims, addressing perpetrator behavior, and prevention.
- Regular workshops from external agencies are most effective.

Question 72–73: Do you think KCSIE should provide more explicit guidance on verbal abuse? If yes, what additional content or examples would help schools and colleges identify and respond to verbal abuse effectively?

- Maintain zero-tolerance for certain terms (racial slurs, dehumanizing gendered insults).
- Recognize that children will find new language to circumnavigate rules while causing harm if underlying issues aren't addressed.
- Reframe verbal abuse as coercive control, gaslighting, and degradation rather than focusing on "bad words."
- Train staff to recognize harmful intent: Is this undermining the person's sense of self? Is this designed to make them feel guilty or obligated?
- This approach is more effective long-term than word-policing alone.