

Written evidence submitted by Laura Skeldon to The Children's Wellbeing and Schools Bill Committee (CWSB251).

1. Local authority members must have experience long term within the chosen profession, for example Elective to home education and missing in education must have home education experience to avoid biased behaviours and lack of knowledge and understanding for a choice being made.
2. You really need to understand how much already the local authorities step out of lawful boundaries and to give them parental responsibility straight away is a grave safeguarding concern.
3. There is nothing that states any investigations must have cause to begin the investigations in the first place.
4. Define local authorities to specific people, departments and on registers throughout the whole document to avoid unqualified and unregistered other local authority member overstepping their role and instead these must report information to the noted departments who are registered, experience and qualified in the field.
5. Publishing information as a demand that it 'must' be followed by local authority for anyone to find and see and put at risk people at risk to found by those they chose to hide from.
6. Modern society brings more resources and easy access to resources before going to support networks or local authorities for help and support – this needs to be acknowledged.
7. Put an end to local authorities setting their own terms and conditions for each borough and make them follow the guidelines set by government. Make it clear that the support stated is for those who have or are in care because nothing supports this in this section like it is written in others. Local authorities again given control over all these things with no experience in the sectors they are assessing needs to be addressed. How do you expect people to assess things if they do not have a greater understanding of what's involved based on experience and qualification. The assessments that local authorities do to assess home educators is quite troublesome already, with not only them making their own policies to follow that do not match the guidelines and laws in place to protect children and families, but in the past they have done things like mentally manipulate/abuse children into disobeying parents, confusing them to their wants and even demanding alone access to children of all ages and time alone in their bedrooms and claim it is of their policies to do such things. This is a great safeguarding concern for parents and why so many ask for things in writing to stop such madness behaviours and breaking laws – when it is in writing we have proof you see so this then stops and discouraging the local authorities to act in such manners – so stating parents have nothing to worry about if they have nothing to hide well we sure do have plenty to worry about regardless.

8. Care leavers deserve privacy from the past. Once they leave care they deserve a fresh start and not to have it follow them and be defined by it.
9. Again, giving local authorities full control and assessment over peoples lives, even though these local authorities have no experience, knowledge or qualifications to begin the job in the first place, but they are expected to assess the needs of others. And where is the individual involved in decisions for their own life? This section gives full control over someones life to local authorities with no input to be expected from the individual themselves – where is their human rights here for even the slightest it of freedom? And this is for up to the age of 25 years? Don't you think at 20 they could have say over their own lives or even at 13 have some say? This bill gives all choices to the LA.
10. Only make life easier for the LA and not the individual. Stripping individuals of their basic human rights and opening up massive pathways to grooming and bullying from LA members, with nothing in place to complain to and be investigated should any grooming or bullying from LA occur – of which they do happen now, all of the time. Its like being 'trigger happy', some people just cannot handle the power they hold.
11. Giving power to local authorities to dictate how families live without cause is the ultimate safeguarding problem in itself and by far does not protect children.
12. Local authorities do not have the experiences or the qualifications and use the powers they do have already to bully, harass and overstep families for no reason. Local authorities are based on a 'opinion system' rather than evidence. It is of the opinion of local authorities who report opinions only and based everything around proving their opinions right rather than anything else. There is nothing at all anywhere to state evidence needs to be built, only opinions gathering. Opinions do not protect children. Opinions of one is different to another because no one is ever the same. This ultimately puts up barriers and causes safeguarding problems as the local authorities' intent on proving themselves right rather than allowing children to be children takes control far too often.
13. This is all entirely about finance and is the biggest section so far. This section does not belong under education and children wellbeing since it does not directly affect them and applies only to those seeking finance and since children have no say on this it does have any concern in this bill. Should something like this be needed to be arise then it should go to the financing department and not the education department. This section would place safeguarding issues from sharing indirect personal information to those not qualified or experienced to handle it, to assessing and implementing it, putting unnecessary strain on families – unnecessary strain causes effect on the family therefore this section itself too is a safeguarding concern.
14. This section treats those in care like they are a business and even issues limitations on foster carers and how money they can have to look after the foster children.
- 15.

1 - Family group decision making

Local authorities have very little knowledge on home education, how it works and why it works and are biased to believe education can only happen in schools – asking them to act as a co-parent in decision making with very little knowledge will have safeguarding concerns placed on the child and not follow what is best for them – no stranger can judge what is best for a child. A child who needs help and support needs parents who are there every day to pay attention to their needs rather than judge an individual based off a general consensus.

Therefore 'grouped meetings with the local authorities' do not follow children's best interests.

Offering grouped meetings on the understanding of it is only an offer/opportunity then this is fine – but right now schools, headteachers and local authorities tell parents it is mandatory, and they must accept or be reported to social services – this is not ok – this is bullying and harassment based on the grounds of simply wanting to choose another path in life.

The duty does not apply if a random stranger thinks it all looks ok on paper – this authority given to biased people. Take my local authority person – she is rather dumb founded in regards to home education and made it very clear she pays no attention to own kids, as well as that she sees home education as 'children missing in education and must be seen as if they were already under care' she basically acts like she is social worker and you wish to give her that power and control over my child – it will be throwing my child to the wolves. My local authority person would take this opportunity to quiz children and demand it be without a parent present. Why does she deserve authority like that over my child? Why should she be considered a co-parent in a meeting to decide what is best for my child? Why should she be the first port of contact to explain what home education is to a potential new family when she doesn't even know what it is and how it works?

Local authority has very little education and run as if they are a different department and treat families as if they are already abusing their children and you wonder why families do not want to make contact with them and why parents demand things be in writing – to cover our own backs and have everything in black and white. How are strangers supposed to know the welfare of a child they do not know and meet? They can't!

A 'family network' is already there – home educators have communities and build on it every year, across the nation and the world.

Local authorities already now do not write letters to families with accuracy as stated in the Local Authorities guidelines – I myself complained about this and obviously had written proof of letters sent to me and the guidelines and made a complaint – a year later I had a response claiming nothing was wrong but this Local authority member had a promotion and

was writing official letters as stated in the guidelines – she had an habit of not leaving contact information to reply back to her, or her name, on contact letters and was promoted! This is the state of the local authority and one of many reasons why parents choose not to get involved with them.

Children may attend meetings – that sounds like insanity – you want to give an uneducated local authority member the power to enforce a child attend meeting about them and here all the things that would be said about their needs and so on – this is mental abuse for so many. Scenario – suicidal teen (which is very common right now) wants to leave school and be home educated, she is then forced to sit in a room and talk about herself, thoughts and feelings to a bunch of strangers and then have them tell their thoughts and feelings where they have the power to mentally abuse this vulnerable child based on their own thoughts and feelings, and they do make this very clear. This vulnerable child then spends a lot of time over thinking things and getting more and more confused because she is having multiple different people telling her different things she should be thinking or feeling and then having to wait for them then to give permission for their life to change – this is ground zero for child grooming. Very wrong – once again giving more safeguarding concerns then helping them. To have faith in the ability of local authority but not in the parents to raise their child really shows a lack of understanding and personal vendetta from the government there.

All the child needs to potentially be a apart of is if they want to give something a try and give a simple yes or no answer and that is only after gaining an education and perhaps experience – there is a reason why children are considered children who need to be taken care of, because they have a lack of want of understanding along with the ability to understand situations.

Suggested solution – Local authority members must have firsthand experience within home education, either previously or currently for longer than 3 years, because then they have a better understanding and knowledge and experience of what they are in ‘charge’ of discussing and decision making. Otherwise, it is asking a pear to decide if an apple is allowed to grow from a tree. Check in with families to simply ask if they are settling ok into home education and state there if there is anything needing help with under formal letter heads, including names, dates and address.

2 – Inclusion of childcare and education agencies in safeguarding arrangements

Here I would like to remind you that children learn best with education suitable for them so forcing any agency just because it registered, does not make it suitable to ‘force’ attendance and so on.

3 – Multi-agency child protection teams for local authority areas

Here I would remind you that it is already the job of social services to be notified of any suspected child abuse cases and for them to investigate – these social workers would be qualified and experienced in dealing with certain cases.

I would also like to notify you of how local authority members are not social workers, they are not trained as them and don't have the experiences, but they already act like them – this section here would give them ideas of thinking they have the control already and support not matter what the case.

Suggestion solution – reword to state local authorities must refer any concerns and the relevant departments must act and act in a way that they see fit, this could be further investigations or just reporting. Relevant departments include the police department for unlaw crimes and social services for abuse crimes and local authorities' education department for education problems. It is not the duty of departments to act without cause, therefore a report must be made before action is taken – a self-referral can be made. (This then stops any potential bullying and misuse of the departments acting out of their boundaries.

4 – Information sharing and consistent identifiers

Again, there is nothing with specifics – investigations and sharing need cause to begin the process for example a complaint made against someone or a family, then an investigation can begin, and files and relevant departments notified.

Within communications with local authorities there is a great lack of following these guidelines, including how to write letters, when to communicate to others agencies and when not to – more education is needed for local authorities and qualifications made to be able to have such control past doing simple referrals to relevant departments, such as spotting signs and Autism.

5 – Information: children in kinship and their carers

Local authority must publish information – breaking confidentiality to publish anything about people, there is also a lack of understanding how local authorities are very much lacking in education for relevant cases. Due to this lack of knowledge and so on, any information published would be quite inaccurate. It should be duty of professionals such as social services aka relevant departments, to share any information with relevant and not publish confidential information for all to see. The word publish implies heavily of it being free to share private information, which is incorrect without permission now, unlawful, you cannot over right this law by simply changing this word here to 'publish'. Local authorities

would use this to demand information about people in their areas such as anyone who home educates and attends workshops and group sessions, the local authority would use this to demand private information, and the persons involved could still demand it is unlawful and then in turn sue the places involved and so on. Creating bad publicity for the organiser involved. All just because of this one word 'publish'. Human rights in turn protect this information from being shared.

Treating people who are carers like they abusers who need information published and so on, as in the wording stated here in the bill and amendments will encourage more into hiding.

Again, local authorities are too uneducated and inexperienced to provide relevant information to people and would rather use this to take control over families as they do already, acting like social workers instead of the true focus of local authority members.

You keep using the words local authorities but fail to be specific enough to which local authorities you refer to – Local authorities members include very uneducated people who are not any registers but your giving them control with no experience or qualifications, and not on any safety registers or even DBS checked - the only title they hold is 'local authority in their job titles and you insist on giving them all this power in your words. This is not ok.

Suggested solution: Change wording from local authorities to those on registers lists such as in the departments in previous sections. Be specific and not open to interpretation. Stop giving control to those not on safety registers. Any published information must be between relevant departments and change the word 'publish' to shared following legal requirements on date sharing. (Eam again, Local authority member of the elective to home educate and missing in education team who are local authority members but already over step and make up their own rules per area, which often contradict the guidelines and laws set by the government – how can these local authorities who make up- their own terms and implement over the laws like this set up in place to protect and serve – be given more authority and not monitored or punished in some way if they don't refer to departments set up who do follow the laws).

6 – Promoting educational achievement

Using the word 'publish again and not being specific to what that means. It is also not clear enough 'kinship care' it sounds like because I am a single parent then the local authority will be attacking me and sharing our information, opening it to the public and as a victim of spousal abuse and parental abuse throughout my lifetime, this is rather unsettling. This would mean the local authority would have to publicise our information for her dad to find us and ruin our safe home and lives we worked hard to achieve. This is very dangerous to demand information made public because you use the words 'publish', going against law that protects us once again. This would actively put more safeguarding in place as opposed to prevent safeguarding from growing.

Elective to home educators often have information and direction already, especially since google searches make things so much easier to find, therefore there should be a part that states people can refuse information and it is not a cause for concern if they already have the information they need themselves but if a person asks for help and support then it must be followed through until they withdraw any communication of help. Right now, we are treated like we home educating families are under scrutiny because we resourcefully find information, we need ourselves and then the local authority complain about us and demand these actions to be taken – it should be considered a good thing we are resourceful and stop treating us and our children like abusers. You must be resourceful to home educate.

7 – Provision of advice and other support

Again, you are giving local authority who have minimal experience, education and not on any registers the duty of assessing situations to make judgments on who needs help and who don't. Wrong departments and people allocated for such a position. You state the 'staying up close support' well the local authorities deem anyone home educated on this list regardless of a complaint or report or case being made to suggest they need support or investigating in the first place. Just because someone home educates does not mean they need to be on these special measures – this needs to be made clear. It was made clear in the guidelines for EHE previously and not taken seriously by local authorities, so it needs to be clear again now – home educators do not abuse their children just because they do not conform to modern schooling and conformity so stop treating them as such (local authorities again have their own terms and conditions they set out to follow and it does not match the guidelines set out by the government – so make it clear they must).

Local authorities assessing and then establishing if something is needed is another thing stated in various guidelines and bills but local authorities again abuse and decide that everyone needs to be checked every year because they home educate and not because it is needed, other than wasting resources it is also unlawfully treating home educators like abusers without cause. This needs to end. If these things are only looked at in this section as a child in care/homeless situation then it sounds great but in the grand scope of things it covers so much more than this including us home educators and treats people immorally wrong without cause for any concerns. Has I said we are treated like we are abusers and deemed as such to be regularly investigated by local authorities without cause for any concern past just home educating and this is not a good reason for concern to investigate on a yearly basis – again this is used in the guidelines and ignored by local authorities who demand full accessing to our children (this in itself is a safe guarding concern to demand such access to our children for no reason and without cause. It is very unsettling and very concerning to invade on children and make demands of them without cause, causing safeguarding concerns from parents of home educated children towards the local authorities

who make such demands without cause!). Once an investigation is made, as stated in the guidelines for EHE, then the requirement is to leave the family be and not harass them further because there is no concerns, until any further reports are made then another investigation is undertaken – well the local authorities do not do this now and make their own rules to investigate on a 12 monthly basis declaring themselves that because someone home educates it is cause for concern, whether the assessment failed or not previously. This harassment is truly unlawful as it is, and this bill change does not protect our children but adds more scrutiny for our children and creates a worrying state of harassment purely just because we home educate. Why worry more well local authorities version of assessment also includes – with experience I say this – demanding being left alone with a child and no parent around to ensure safety, where they have mentally manipulated children to go back to school, worry of friendships and even demanded access to their childrens bedrooms and be left alone with them their – there is plenty to worry about even when we do not nothing wrong because this is already what life is like now and it is big concern for parents around safe guarding because we protect our children and right now we have to protect them from local authority members who make such unruly demands and claim it is their policy to do so.

8 – Local offer for care leavers

When you have been in care and leave, you want a fresh start. In this section the bill declares information to be made accessible even by housing associations after leaving care. This information being available to all will mean the care leaver will get forced to live in their past for even longer, rather than simply just move and have a fresh start in life. They would be held back by everyone knowing their past. I can understand housing associations having some information such as knowing they came from care, but further details that this bill gives them access to is not needed. As someone who has been in this position myself, it made it hard to move on again and have the fresh start I was promised. Moving on accommodation is different to housing associations and this bill could benefit from defining this. Moving on accommodation should have more access to information, while housing associations do not need to. Housing associations would simply be the same as renting any home – would you expect your landlord to know everything about you? Or imply just be able to prove you can pay the rent? House inspections will let them know if they can look after the property. I myself am in a very old house and have 6 monthly inspections. It works just fine. I can tell them whatever I want in general chit chat because I do not live in my past and am very different to that now.

This bill is forcing care leavers to still be defined by their past and not move on.

9 – Accommodation of looked after children: regional co-operation arrangements

There is more putting all this trust, faith and authority to 'local authorities', yet no assessments requiring local authorities to have experience or qualification to be able to do these assessments to begin with. There are so many local authority members that have no clue any of these procedures exist to follow, therefore leading to many mistakes, children slipping through the cracks and so on. Handling matters without knowledge has had drastic effects on society already, spanning back decades.

The individual are giving no rights to what happens to them at all here. They are human beings and deserve to be treated better. As someone has dealt with a small portion of being in care, these uneducated, unexperienced people having full control over my life is very threatening to my basic human rights. Even in moving on accommodation, these people did not always have best interests at heart and are easily mentally manipulated in conversation – anyone can sweet talk anyone and this has led to deaths to children from abuse such as Sarah Shariff and my own experience which led to me attempting suicide and no one even noticing while I was in care as a child and then because I moved areas, everything was made area based, and I lost the one psychologist who actually helped me. There are many things wrong within this system and giving more duties to those so easily manipulated WILL lead to having negative effects on those in care. We the people deserve better!

10 – Use of accommodation for deprivation of liberty

As someone who was bullied by an authority member while in womens refuge, I see many negatives here that once again give power for decisions to these people who are supposed to protect us. These people who are left to judge whether we are harmful etc use their roles to bully people and even commit fraud by keeping items that are supposed to be going to those in need. Tis bill is giving these authorities lawful permission to take things away and deny children of their basic rights not give it to them. You do not know what it is like to live in these places and they are not following the law, there is a lot of abuse and this bill gives them more reasons to claim. Let me give you an example - the authority member in charge decides that workshops are not suitable for a child, lets say this child loves to cook secretly and expressed it to them in private. They then make these cooking workshops available but then deny this child the right to do it and express its due to safety of harm as per the bill states. That child then missing out, gets put down, may even get so upset to get violent because it is all they are given the opportunity to do. They then do not thrive or even get given the chances. (This is actually based on a true story and this boy ended up in care for longer as they claimed he was not capable, so when he finally got out he thrived, he had to cook for himself and so on, he got a job, he supported himself, but all 10 year too late because of the system constantly putting him down because they constantly feared harm in some way – luckily he had a friend in me to listen and give him breaks away so he could be treated like a human being – but those in charge put a stop to that too by telling him he could not visit so he lost that too in the end). This is the authority you give to people over

OUR lives and children do not know better because they have not been taught it yet, but they sure as hell don't learn anything in care other than to be treated like a piece of meat and children must obey or else they get bullied and abused – this bill makes that so much easier to do – the children cannot claim discrimination now with this bill.

Giving authorities all these rights mean less people will get help – it means people can call up and ask for help and then they say no because we fear you may cause harm to yourself or others and then that is that. If this was said to me both me and child would be suicidal and stuck in a domestic abusive relationship because I was easily refused help with no cause or anything. This would stop more people getting the help they deserve.

These amendments make only life easier for the local authority and not for the child/individual involved. Just because they want an easier life does not mean it deserves to be law!

There is an amendment that switches the narrative completely from 'secure accommodation' to 'derived of their liberty in relevant accommodation' – this changes the narrative from protection to they need their basic human rights stripped. Secure would include security for them, to safeguard them and keep them safe, to depriving them of the liberties, their basic human rights and needs. This opens up doors for local authorities to once again abuse power from safety to 'you deserve what you get' placing great safeguarding on the child who does not have their security in mind. This does not restrict to children in detention centres, it opens up for any local authority to choose for themselves who is more deserving than the last and makes it law. This is something we fight against in general – how local authorities do their work based on their opinions rather than facts far too much.

11 – Powers of CIECSS in relation to parent undertakings

Firstly it begins giving instant power again to a complete stranger who can judge and assess something they have no experience in or qualification. This strips instantly parents of their rights to be parents of their own making parenting 'one size fits all'. Everything must be to CIECSS standard and not the child's standards or needs. A parent spends everyday with their child, to know them best, some may even abuse their child and still know them better than a complete stranger who is literally giving all power to themselves like some sort of control freak. If you cannot understand life is not one size fits all then are you fit for purpose in the job of ordering these educational changes?

I have personal experience of this, when social services judged me based on their own basis which then misjudged everything and caused more upset than helping the child. Plans issued without communication and thought causing more unwarranted stress. A child so upset to even ask to go to the toilet so she would wet herself and taken from her parents over night because one social workers thought my home should be to her standards –

spotless like a show home. When my child needed to learn to be messy and have her toys lying around a mother who gave her the attention first before cleaning the home that never had mould, dust or bacteria growth but only toys and a few bags of rubbish built up for the tip. The social worker spent a year trying to argue her assumptions and that our parenting plan needed to follow her parenting plan but that is not what my child needed. She needed a parent who was there and not cleaning constantly but actually present with her. I gave her that and social services didn't feel that was a good parenting plan. This is the power you keep giving to local authorities who are complete strangers in people's lives and you're giving them full control like it is the dark ages. All just because people are control freaks and think others should be too. It is like trigger happy people who simply cannot control themselves, another word would narcissist.

This section does not define cause is needed to issues these plans. People may need support and guidance but this is making full demands without any room for common sense to include the child's needs.

Rejecting the plan is to be taken that the parent failed to comply. So you want to mentally manipulate people basically. Tell them they can help shape the plan but before it is sent off you to be given as a plan of action you already want to fail them! Do you know what a plan is exactly? A plan is an action of the future intent, not past. You cannot have past plans because they would have come to past for you to then reject them – furthermore proving the narcissistic value of this bill, which is shown again by a parent having to write a detailed plan to request to be a parent. This bill shows how the government has lost the ability to actually help, support and guide, instead it is 'do what I say because only my words matter, or I will punish you' – again rather narcissistic.

I notice no end dates are to be in this plan neither implying they go on for life and go on for as long as someone decides – a complete stranger decides which could be years or days, while at the same time stating they can cancel the plan at anytime and a parent be seen at being rejected and failed to comply. Where is the safety element here exactly for humans other than the complete take over of CIECSS?

28 days to appeal is not a suitable time for anything to be properly written out and researched.

Denying the appeal of a parent instantly dismissing their appeal – how is this fair? It is taking away the right of a parent again to be able to prove their case fairly to a tribunal. Even this appeal process puts full control over parent and child to the CIECSS. This is not ok. It is giving no one else a chance to do anything fairly. There is again nothing of support and guidance just punish and raise mental illness across the nation who are already feeling abused by the system well this bill increases more abuse by the system.

This bill still puts all balls in the corner of the CIECSS – where is the protection for those who abuse this power of authority? Even when people appeal and seek justice, they are abused

and put back again because all roads lead back to the CIECSS aka the problem which is the case in far too many cases. Cases of those in authority taking liberties, abusing their powers, grooming made easy and control issues over those they are supposed to be 'helping' rather they treat them only like criminals. Too many authorities judge based on their opinion rather than facts across all authorities in charge – this is the safeguarding concern, not always the common folk/parents. I should not myself have experienced so much abuse from the system as I have and the most boiled down to the opinion that one cannot not be different to another, to reach the same results. There is also the opinion that abused children grow up to abuse because it is all they know, when simply it is case of those who know hurt can go both ways, the same as those who only know well. There are no certainties in life.

12 – Power of CIECSS to impose monetary penalties

This section begins with saying 'impose a monetary penalty on a person if the CIECSS is satisfied' – so satisfied but because they would do things in a different way, they can legally bully and harass people to do it their way! Narcissistic. That breach of power and control – when did protect and serve disappear? Instead, now it is abuse even if there is no reason to abuse. Literally making it law that every parent can be abused by the system if they choose to do so based on their opinion. This right here is what we have battled with as common people for years, authorities abusing us based on their personal opinion is different to another, because another would lead life differently. It doesn't make someone bad for living life differently. People still follow laws to do no harm and your still abusing them here, very blatantly in this section, in the first two sentences of this section.

This is far too much power for any authority to have over society. Again, there is already a problem of those in power abusing, grooming and bullying children, as well as the same and bullying of parents. Putting families through necessary drama because they believe families should live as they do. Not everyone thrives in a clean home. Not everyone thrives in uncluttered spaces. Not everyone thrives with utter natural sunlight in the home. Not everyone thrives the same way and quite frankly the authorities as a whole, not just local authorities, are not capable of making this judgement call because they can sweet talk, we all know it is just tell them what they want to hear and they go away because they only care about what looks good on paper. People do not trust authorities because of abuse of power.

Solutions would include: building trust not attacking the people. Supporting rather than completely taking over. Local authorities must show proof and not share anything, including in family court, based on their opinion. And this blatant attack on home educators to say they can by law be monitored even if they are deemed satisfied, well, that is enough in itself, or it should be, to show the blatant abuse of power to control and bully the people without cause.

This section in regard to home education gives power to the local authorities to control our entire lives based on how they see it should be and not what is best for us. To impose reports on how we should live, be and act. Our childrens education suits them and for a local authority member who has experience and no qualifications in home education is supposed to tell me how to live and educate my family! You call this safeguarding, having a complete stranger dictate how our lives should be – no good parent would allow for a stranger to have so much control over their children.

A local authority can impose a monetary penalty on me and at the same time I cannot be convicted of an offence because of it. What! Penalise me for having my childs best interest at heart and fighting for their right to learn and live in an environment in which they thrive. Naturally that is obviously safeguarding them better than I ever could – she said as her eyes rolled across the room. Punishing parent for being parents is your answer to safeguarding concerns. I have never heard something so moronic in my entire life. There is no line at all what so ever that specifies anything here to protect the common people from the authorities – all rights and laws go to the authorities to run the peoples lives whether there is cause to or not. A great problem is when local authorities think it is their duty to tell people how to live rather than help them to be better, with cause. There is nothing here to protect people from local authorities who can lawfully now make these things happen to people whether their be cause or not.

No parent should be ordered, threatened and bullied in such a way without cause! Nothing in this bill says cause is needed.

Nothing in this bill says anything about cause cannot be based on the local authorities personal opinion.

Nothing protects the people from the local authorities!

If a parent had been unlawfully abusing their child then of cause act, but this bill does not specify this anywhere, it targets all for the one and punished all. It strips good parents are their titles just because someone somewhere does not like them for some reason – this is the growing problem already. This bill punished parents for standing up for what's right and saying so.

This bill is supposed to have childrens education and wellbeing at heart, since it is a schools and wellbeing act set up by the education secretary but it is not. It targets all and nothing in the purpose of educating a child or improving their wellbeing by punishing their parents for being parents.

13 – Financial oversight

This section straight away gives rights to educational/group providers to apply for funding whether it is used, need or not. There is already a great problem with such groups apply for funding and using childrens names, but not using that money fraudulently to help the children or its intended purpose. Let me give you an example, last year my child attended a film group. Its ethos was to teach and guide young women into film, however this was not the case. What was supposed to a developing a film production to educate children across the nation and sounded great on paper, about the environmental impact, turned into a fashion show. Yes a fashion show. There was nothing about impact on the environment. Children literally met up to not learn anything and just talk about their lives, which my child did not enjoy as she wanted to actually learn, but all there was constantly was my child left listening to everyone's everyday lives instead of actually learning film. The group had applied for all this funding and said it would be the childrens ideas and the children working on it but everything narrowed down to the person running the session in charge of everything and discouraging ideas and doing all the work in the background rather than teaching the children. The children learnt nothing at the end of every session. But because these groups sounded good on paper they were able to apply for all sorts of funding and no nothing beneficial with it. I can understand your well intentions here but it is not the time for them. There is enough defrauding the state and using children to do it. To be honest, I am beginning to understand how much mental manipulation there is from these providers to the government for the government to believe there is a great problem when there is not, it is really just greed and corruption more than anything else. Let me also add that on this groups budgeting for their application, the mast chunk of it was to pay the leaders wages and not just for one thing, she earnt a lot of money for doing multiple jobs on that list as the leader and camera coach and so on. She should not be able to apply for her wages and say it is for the children.

Let me also share another funding from another group that already defrauds the state and charities enough – womens refuges. These organisations have access to all these children with their parents and use it to apply for funds. When I was in refuge, they used our names to ask for food then locked the food away. Then they applied for tech under our names and then charged us to own them and charged us to borrow them.

There are homeless centres who will refuse donations or then accept them and throw them in the skip as rubbish, or charge residents for them. I have seen prams charged for else they went in the skip and freshly cooked food that would have benefited the 22 families sharing one tiny kitchen would have benefited, but instead those in charge who claim there is such a big issue that they need funding for, throw these things away. There is a lot of corruption in these areas and I do not wish for my country to abused further in this way. Sop the greed and defrauding the state and do not give them further laws for them to be able to defraud it even more.

As a home educator we are subjected to financial oversight and this has worked well for years. I do not see why it needs to change now while there is still so many gaps to cover. I would agree though for providing where any financial help goes. It should be for all really, but it is the abuse of power that concerns me. It may not go there for example. Such as in my examples above, it did not go to the people it was meant for. My solution would be that if a home educator applies for funding then it goes to the place they intend to spend the money on, just like any other charity you would be expected to show receipts. Organisations apply for funding show pictures of what they want but that we see everyday is not entirely accurate. Until other matters are in place such as dealing with those who defraud the state then I would state this is not possible to do and any funding needed they must apply for personally from other organisations, just ensure you give the reason of establishing fraud organisations and putting measures in place for security and the process will be available again when it is done so.

The criteria for application for person here also leaves many subjected to more than others. Its basis things like on location, well location means less than you think, as well as others. An example for home educators under this section would also leave local authorities open with our childrens information to apply for grants without our knowledge and without justification as it states for local authorities' discretion.

The oversight states that once a 12months is up, then it can be renewed for another 12 months – when will this actually end? It is not ok to keep leaving people in limbo. Either deal with the application or don't but don't leave people in limbo unknowing.

Although this section (13, 30ZG) is supposed to be about finances, I can already predict the Elective to home educate local authorities once again misreading and taking this to assume they can write plans about us and our children and expect us to follow it, based off past experiences, as well as demand these plans of us. If it is not written straight forward then they tend to take whatever they like and misinterpret things, and this is one I can picture being abused by the local authorities, rather than being so straight forward. Let me make it very clear – home educators do not, nor never should they, have to write reports for approval from the local authorities, this is quite dangerous for the child's ability to thrive and establish their own personalised route because local authorities cannot know this or follow this. Furthermore, educational providers being approved by the local authorities – this is a parental duty to ensure they are suitable for the needs of the child and not a complete stranger. Giving these parental responsibilities to strangers is just bad parenting and no good

parent would agree to it, none the less home educating parents who's besotted with care and educating their children.

The local authorities have one tracked minds of following the national curriculum and one size fits all, but this is not home education and this poses a great risk to the child. If a child already did not fit well under the national curriculum, then why on earth should that be recreated at home? Intruding on the safe place that is home? This is one sure way to create great mental instability in a child – by forcing them to go down the same route they did not do well in. Local authorities who do not understand home education is a very big risk and it is why so many parents stay away from them.

It is a great safeguarding concern that local authorities who are employed for elective home education, without qualification and experience in home education, but then expected to assess home educators and decide what routes are best for them. This is very concerning and no one in their right mind would put a chef in the roll of a police officer, or a singer in the roll of a fire fighter, yet it is ok to employ unqualified and unexperienced here to then be given parental responsibility for no reason, just because you fear the unknown. That is not a good enough reason. With wellbeing concerns on the rise change is needed and you really think giving parental duties to strangers unqualified, unfit for purpose if the answer? That makes no sense at all!

Section 13 30ZH Again this supposed to be about finance but it is instantly misinterpreted to assume local authorities can abuse elective home educating families and ask for all sorts of information and take on parental responsibility. Actually, they already have been using this across the nation as a set law and telling families they need to comply. This is the great problem with local authorities in home education – they create their own terms and conditions and then tell people they are law and they must comply else face an SAO order. This is abuse, this is bullying, this is not lawful and as you claim all these things are ok for safeguarding reasons, teaching children its ok to bully, harass and to create their own laws and force people to follow them, the children are far from safe guarded. Local authorities have an habit of doing this and you have a duty to make sure they follow the laws, not make up their own and then fight really hard to make them law by mentally manipulating the house of commons into their way of thinking.

'The power' this repeats a lot – giving power to another is taking it away from another. This section talks further about giving full financial access to the local authorities – and no where does it say anything about security of the information or the fact that information DOES NOT have to be supplied. Again, for home educating families this section furthermore takes away basic human rights and gives 'the power' to the local authorities where power is not needed

to be given. You have literally started to give all this power over peoples finances to the local authorities for assessments and for them to put in applications and so on for no reason at all. Home educators never need to supply this information, but they are already asking for it like it is law – furthermore of local authorities over stepping towards home educating families. There is no guarantee neither that these families would ever even benefit from it and that corrupt people in the meantime don't abuse the power – which already happens.

This entire section 13 is about finance however it does not read that way. It reads of demanding and taking on far too much information because of its lack of specifics but it mentions 'oversight' a lot which out great specifics to what that is. For example, it deems locations and so on, however it gives all the power to decide with local authorities and their visions of who is in need and who is considered an 'oversight' – Local authorities are not qualified or experienced across the board to be given this much power. Local authorities already abuse this system, and bully parents based on what they think something should look like, for example, having a show home all the time, meanwhile a happy home is not a show home, a happy home is lived in however constantly local authorities deem more on cleanliness than happiness. Some people are happy and feel safe in all different ways, this is a growing world and to be dictated by any group so much as never worked well in history, SO LEARN BY PAST MISTAKES. Stop trying to control everyone and stop giving power to control to those who do not deserve it. Try living under these local authorities for a year and getting involved with their methods because they are most certainly not law abiding – **the entire system relies on opinions and that is why it does not work.**

Section 13 30ZI is also already being looked at by elective to home educate local authorities as a lawful way to straight forwardly ask home educators for financial information and other information and say that it is means for investigating anyone they choose – whether applied for finance or not. They already deem home educator's poor in life before anything else and act like it. And if you do not please the local authority to suit their wants and desires regardless of the impact it has on the child, then the local authority threaten once again with an SAO order. This is lawfully abuse of power I know, yet there is no department to complaint to when this happens who will investigate ethically and enforce corrections of not abusing power. Local authorities still apply for things without the permission and knowledge of the home educating families.

This section also gives powers to local authorities to act if they think a business is about to fail rather than support, they can close it down. You really underestimate how much of an opinion-based authority these are – you created an opinion-based system and that is its failure. You cannot alter, you can only create a new from scratch. You never listen to the people neither so listen to us who have to live with these conditions and follow them lawfully, better than so many of those in power do and fail once again to take responsibility,

yet we who do take responsibility are having our rights stripped and given to the irresponsible. How is that safeguarding?

I cannot stress how once again local authorities are being given all this power yet have no qualification and experience. There are no specifics for departments neither. Once upon a time the guidelines were simple enough – education deals with education and welfare deals with welfare – now its all local authorities can have the same powers and do the same jobs as they please whether qualified or experienced. Elective home educating local authorities said they deal with only education and must report anything else to the relevant departments, but now they can do financial reviews, business assessments, assess SEND needs and so on in this bill – yet when I ask my local authority member for a letter to apply for an exam centre booking they are so dumbfounded and don't even know what is required – that is who you are giving all this power to.

This section also states 'children under local authorities' well, elective to home educate local authorities consider anyone on their register is under their care instantly, with no cause and already act like social workers where it is not needed and they are supposed to be solely education focussed, however they are not already and it has caused lots of safe guarding concerns not only amongst parents and the children themselves, but also educational providers. **I must make it very clear that just because local authorities assume all under there care, it does not mean that it is appropriate for them to do so.**

This section talks further of local authorities having full control to decide a person 'financial stability' – a person version of being poor varies from person to person, further encouraging this opinion system that is ruining our country as it is. When will this end exactly? Most people think people on universal credit are poor thus a financial instability even though the intent was to provide a basic financial security for living. What gives anyone the right to decide this? What makes local authorities qualified to assess this? This should be only something for a qualified experienced accountant to decide someone business finance suitability. I would like a briefing on how someone's business finances are the responsibility of local authorities to begin with and not for the decision of an accountants. This is supposed to be a bill for improving childrens education decided by and education secretary, yet it covers a wide range of things that do not benefit children if they were to be different, if anything I see this causing more harm due to unqualified, unexperienced people and constant messing around for applications, causing strain on a family. It seems the right questions were not asked when this bill was being designed, and the house of commons were mentally manipulated to think it was all safeguarding children and those were the only answers needed to be given to abuse the people in general in this way.

'All such information must be given to a qualified person may reasonably require' – again qualified is not established prior to this and doesn't establish anything further a qualified person, in fact it states local authorities every time prior to this. Rightly so a qualified experienced person would have more power but only to their field and not as a whole and this bill is not fit for this purpose. This bill is supposed to be about education and not finances furthermore. There is a lack of knowledge shown in financial matters here.

Section 13 30ZJ states the secretary of state can issue warnings to local authorities to cease however these companies are already understaffed and underfunded, as well as using people's information for their own job satisfaction. These local authorities have previously just before this also been given the 'power' to assess individuals, however. If they are not capable themselves now, then this bill would mean most of these local authorities could be lawfully shut down instantly due to financial oversight.

14 – Power to limit profits of relevant providers

The title alone for this section shows it as nothing really to do with children. They cannot profit or earn too much by various other laws so what does this have to do with education children and safeguarding them?

One law that is also in place for establishments is that the advertised prices are the ones by law that need to be paid – therefore once again there is no relevance to this needed in this bill. Excepting local authorities also from this when they are also ones who apply for financing is not ethical.

It speaks of foster carers as if they were a profit-making business, even using the word 'profit' on multiple occasions.

This 'power' word is being used again and often. Authorising local authorities with so much power that they cannot handle now and the lack of concern the house of commons have in the constant complaints made about these authorities over stepping and bullying the people, instead you want to give them more power – this is the opposite of safeguarding and causes great concern for the people. It is shocking how the government does not consider local authorities never overstep beyond their powers.

15 – Power of secretary of state to impose monetary penalties

Once again giving power to others and stripping it off the people. It states 'persons' and open to interpretation vastly from local authorities and as previously, elective to home education local authorities already believe this section applies to them because it states 'persons' and therefore they can use this section to ask for financial statements and apply fines and so on towards home educating families, even if they find no cause.

That should be a problem in itself too 'even when deemed satisfactory by the local authorities' – local authorities are such a broad range of people with different qualifications and experiences. There are even job adverts for local authorities that say, 'no qualification or experience required'. Yet they are being given instantly these powers.

I can see your trying to target more along the lines are foster care places here, but this is not obvious enough, especially for people are inexperienced and unqualified such as elective to home educate local authorities, especially since it states 'local authorities' and not a specified department in the bill.

16 – Procedure for imposing monetary penalties

Since educational providers for elective to home educating families fall under this of imposing fines, again the local authorities already overstep towards home educating families and misinterpret this furthermore. They rush to threaten families in the first contact and that is no way to open lines of communication. Now this is adding fuel to the fire sort of speak and telling them they can also issue fines at will, not only to families but educational providers they use. This then leads to educational providers closing down communications with home educators and forcing home educators back into their homes after fighting years to change this, as well as local authorities posing the threat of talking to educational providers unprofessionally and providing incorrect information – of which they have done so already regarding speaking to many colleges who provide 14-16 year courses for home educating families. Local authorities have already gone to college and told them this is going to be the case, and this year have begun to close down their programs because of it. This is another case that home educating families keep fighting against – this is a great safeguarding concern that local authorities share incorrect information and tell educational providers to cease activity under new laws coming in to force – that should be a big concern in itself from the government. And all to avoid fines and extra dealings because local authorities stated they would be fined! This is what home educating families been by saying the local authorities overstep their job roles.

28 days is not enough for anyone to create reports these days.

Home educating families also do not deserve fines for educating their children in a different way that the local authorities do not understand because it is not the national curriculum.

A section here in the procedure states that a failure to comply with the fine of section 30ZH or 30ZM again is supposed to apply to foster care providers but again it is not specific and it opens to attacks on the home educating community due to elective to home educate local authorities overstepping and misinterpreting the information – they assume these things give the rights to ask home educating families because they home educate for financial information, regardless of anything else such as cause. They do not but it is not clear on that. This states local authorities which is vast area of departments and include local authorities whose job adverts stated ‘no experience or qualification required’. But your giving them all this power to assess and issue fines of which is intended already to be used against the home educating community to further bully and harass families just because they choose to live life a little differently.

- This section states clearly that (part 3 subsection 2, section 16) failure to comply cannot be issued again after 6 months after the LA are satisfied or if it has taken 3 years (whichever comes first) – what exactly is it that your envisioning here? Because as an home educator I can predict years of messing around with local authorities who cannot understand what home educating is to prove we do know and years of bullying and harassment for fines.
- It also states finding evidence however the big problem is that the system is an opinion-based system and then local authorities with grow based on their personal opinion and call it evidence.

‘A penalty fine may be any amount’ – this means any local authority can issue a fine of any amount they so choose. The unqualified and unprofessional and unexperienced local authority members across every single department as free reign in issuing any fine they choose in any amount they choose and then as per procedure harass and bully people for it and issue more fines on top every less than 6 months – this is what the procedure states in this bill.

There is more dictation focused on individuals paying money from penalties rather than fixing any problems there may be. It seems no one else can do anything but must put all responsibility onto the local authorities for ours lives and futures, truly the nannied state.

(16, section 4, subsection 4) this section states clearly that relevant authorities are given the power to decide the fates of penalties which is ethically wrong in itself and why so many are against the local authorities further making it an opinion-based system. They get to decide the fate, outcomes, factors, the past and plot future impacts. All based off opinion and without specifying which are relevant local authorities.

- Home educating families have the elective to home educate local authorities whose job was supposed to be about education making them a relevant authority here. They are being given the power of authority for all of these things, and they don’t even have qualifications, experience or even agree that home education is a viable lifestyle, in fact they bully and harass home educating families to get the results they

want rather than anything else. They act like social workers for welfare even though their duty is to report any welfare concerns to the relevant authorities but instead overstep and take it upon themselves. Meaning relevant authorities do not matter in the eyes of this authority. The bill needs to be a lot clearer and state names of departments specifically that these things affect and ensure that those given power to have the same expectations, experiences and qualifications relevant. There is even a qualification now in basic home education – every elective to home educate authority should have this qualification yet many of them don't even know it exists, and these people are being given all this power in this bill. Home educators live in this world already to know how it works and what the authorities are like and the education team do fancy themselves social workers rather than reporting issues to relevant departments and it is big issue because when they do report it reports back are not of a welfare concern because all they reported was a bit of clutter or doing chores on the family farm etc. Then the ehe authorities bully further to prove their vendetta against the families they don't trust. We can predict this being so much worse here. The interview in the house of commons January 2025 proved this when an home educator called Clare came across the EHE LA Bev who was very clear in her intent to be a welfare worker rather than an education worker. Her job is to report welfare to the relevant department, but she made it very clear that she did not see it that way and which is why she was making these demands. She in herself should be sacked for not reporting by law what she was supposed to which was any welfare concerns to the relevant department instead of acting like a social worker she should be the education worker she is supposed to be. This is an example of the overstepping the education team do and act like social workers, but they are unqualified and inexperienced to do so resulting in many wasted social workers hours and funds.

Next is the interest being charged again with no set structure and all power given the local authorities. Section 17 of the 1838 Judgement Act quoted in this bill states that the courts are to decide interest or if any interest, yet this bill states entirely different and counteracts courts ruling and gives the power to the local authorities. The judgements states clearly that it is courts ruling to decide on interest. Therefore, using this act in this bill is not relevant.

This relevant authority again is not specified which means to home educators for example, that the EHE LA can give penalties, fines, charge interest and arrange for debt collection for anything they see fit and since they are already harassing parents without cause this seems rather dumbfounded.

Right to appeal is supposed to help the individual who disagrees with the decision, yet straight away this section goes into relevant authorities and making their lives easier, not the

other way around. There is heavy focus on local authorities getting what they want with no care for the individual who may even have been unlawfully issued a debt relief order for penalties for example. 28 days to appeal and cannot appeal after that – how is that protecting the person should they need it?

17 – information sharing

Specify ‘connection with the Secretary of State functions’ – this could mean anything it is so broad, even businesses will state for the function of their work only or contacting in reply, or delivery information and so on relating to their service but not here – literally giving full control and power to oneself with no limitations, another definition of narcissism.

Define relative information. Functions of a person does not answer the question neither.

May include personal data is not good enough. This is the 21st century with breeches in information being used against us every day!

The basics in GDPR law seem to not apply here – quite unprofessional to not even consider this in your sharing of personal information being made mandatory.

What data protections are in place? These are breached consistently with the Elective to home educate team – why should we be lawfully made to keep breaching our basic privacy rights for it to be breached?

This section is not fit for purpose and doesn’t even include the basics in data protection – not even a single mention of GDPR – a law in place to protect us the people! Obviously the people do not matter as shown once again here. Power hungry and greed come to mind.

We the people cannot even argue as stated in this section about refusing to hand over our information based on privacy laws. We have to prove the law is being broken as apposed to the local authorities following the law to begin with.

18 – Use of agency workers for children’s social car work (care workers)

What regulations? You just give yourself power to enforce regulations yet what are they? This is supposed to protect the young from local authorities who act of order right? So be more specific – how are you going to enforce that local authorities do what they are supposed to do and act accordingly and why are you only targeting care workers here? There are many local authorities who need to be monitored and learn not to be the opinion-system, but you specifically target care workers – what about the Elective to Home educate

team who has had numerous complaints which are dealt with in house only, biased and in long periods of time such as one year after the complaint was made.

It is made very clear in this section that outside agencies are not approved of by the government and local authorities shall be punished for using them. This is bullying the local authorities who may need those outside sources and approved of them already, to care for an individual child. If the care of a child is involved that is supposed to be top priority yet you are punishing people for having that care of that child as their priority!

This section is supposed to be about care workers, however for the Elective home educators their Local Authorities see themselves as social workers and will act and share their job titles as such, even though their only focus is education and although it does not mention educational providers here the EHE LA team have already stated to misinterpret this further and demand all this information from educational providers of home educating families which is not lawfully accurate neither. (Leaving so much to interpretation does not safeguard children in anyway).

19 – Ill-treatment or wilful neglect: children aged 16 and 17

Regulated establishment interprets to jail basically. I feel this wording creates a bad instant judgment - a home is still a home not an establishment and the same word for a detention centre is being used. This will cause opinions to be obscured and because we are an **opinion-based-system** words mean a lot, so it is important to use them correctly.

Wording does not need to change – regulated care in place of everything else implies more issues and again on an opinion-based system such as care, this has negative effects on the outcome of a child's needs. For example, a person will see the word regulated and assume 24/7 locked up care due to behaviour problems because that is wording used for detention centres, as well as summing they need that sort of care. The family and child would then be treated as such and not as an individual with individual needs. Wording matters!

20 – Employment of children in England

To be honest I had to read this section a few times since there was a few contradictions between ages and work hours a day compared to a week.

I do feel like this may also be a little high – children over 15 can work legally for 35 hours a week and get only 2 consecutive weeks holiday in a year – this seems like an awful lot allowance to children, especially children not in school – I feel that children not in school should have to apply to do this many hours really and only be allowed to any child if they are not following a route of gaining multiple qualifications to attend school. With allowances for apprenticeships’ for those not in school, but they can attend earlier apprenticeships than 16-18 and gain a qualification while on the job. Licenses are already required and insurances to cover the jobs but make it easier to obtain – right now people are unsure where this stands to be able to do. The bill even states its legal for a child to work, however it doesn’t specify any other legalities that come with it like how the processes work. Work permits need to be obtained from the local authorities, but nowhere does it tell you which authorities or anything else – by the logic of this bill no permits is needed now from the age of 14 – which was previously from 13.

It is like this section was written by someone who has no knowledge of current regulations and just assumed there was none.

Elective to home educate authorities also see home chores as work, even though it is unpaid, and have bullied/ issued SAO orders on home educating families for doing chores in the home. For example, many families who own small farm with a handful of animals work together to cook, clean and maintain the farm – a child has had the chore to do washing at home and clean the kitchen which parents clean the stables and vice versa totalling less than 2 hours a day and are already implied typical family living. However, EHE LA have claimed it to be child slavery. Families have taken it to court and won but that is not the issue, the issue is local authorities being uneducated in even what is considered law but being given the power to enforce them and do assessments based on no qualification and experience, or understanding of the chosen family life style, but judged it based on their own personal opinion of what constitutes law. Overstepping their job roles which are supposed to be based on education and not welfare.

Agan no knowledge on procedures on how to even apply for permits! My elective to home educates local authority does not even know a work permit exists let alone how she is supposed to write one or apply for one etc.

Section 20, subsection 17B, in section 21 it states ‘insert or regulations. Making regulations laws as well as the laws which is vastly open to interpretation by local authorities – local authorities create their own regulations without permission of the government and you would imply that their regulations count as law even though they were not approved or regulated to imposed within accordance to human rights laws, protections laws and so on. Are you going to regulate these regulations each local authority creates that you are making law here?

The same occurs for section 28 insert.

(SCHOOLS)

21 – Free breakfast club provision in primary schools in England

The biggest problem with breakfast clubs is what is being provided and how much. Lunches in schools are already a big issue, and parents are even sending their kids to schools with a packed lunch as well as having their school dinners, on top of having snacks when their children are picked up from school for them because it is so common for your child to be starving when you pick them up from school. Schools see this as job well done because quote ‘they have obviously been running around so much it has made them hungry again’. But as parents we know this not to be true. There have been many reports of school lunches being unfit. Just another profit-making scheme and this breakfast club puts more money in the pockets of those greedy schemers rather than the childrens bellies.

Regardless that this bill only helps those schools that qualify and that the local authorities are expected to fund these clubs too and not schools – where is the money coming from?

Some meals provided by schools are as follows:

A single piece of toast no butter

A single piece of toast with butter

Two pieces of toast no butter

A piece of toast with a spoonful of jam (teaspoon)

A single jacket potato no butter

A single jacket potato with beans

A single jacket potato with butter

A single jacket potato with cheese

A sandwich

A slice of pizza

A piece of fruit

Chips and gravy

Chips and beans

Chips and a fish finger

Mash potato and a fish finger – sometimes with a spoonful of beans (tablespoon)

---- sometimes a piece of cake may be provided for desert in some schools for lunch or a piece of fruit along side their lunch

----- a drink for lunch is a bottle of water charged at around £1.15 or children are told to bring their own or get tap water – no squashes allowed or fresh fruit in the water bottles as a regulation put in place by schools.

Would you serve this as lunch to your growing child, in small portion sizes that use tablespoons and alike?

Do you think that breakfast clubs at schools would make the difference? They already eat so much less at schools and for a child to then have to go to school earlier and miss a meal with their parents at home before school. And then there are the children who cannot eat in the mornings but prefer a snack at break time and then lunch at normal to help with their digestion needs – how will these children benefit from those breakfast clubs?

22 - Food and drink provided at academies

It seems that it is the school food standards act that needs to be changed and not enforcing people follow it.

23 – School uniforms: limits on branded items

The other day I was waiting for a bus with my daughter on our way back from some regular home education activities. Knowing I was to review this bill I noticed the school uniforms of those getting on other buses in front of us. The regulated school uniforms which had girls skirts that were so short regulated above the knee, designed and made to suit the regulations of the schools – I was shocked by just how short these regulated skirts were and they were not turned up, rolled up or held up higher, they fit around the waist with a short length regulated above the knee which was really a mini skirt and if the girl bent over I am sure everything would have been on show. Then there was the girls shirts which were blouses as regulated uniform – blouses that are cut to curve around the female body and have low cuts – once again school regulated uniform flaunted girls bodies, while the boys had nice long trousers as there regulated uniforms and shirts that buttoned all up to their necks.

I would rather buy unregulated uniforms and have my daughters body covered up with branded gear than that – she deserves that dignity and to be encouraged self-respect.

Now let's talk shoes of that regulated uniform which allowed for cheap brands that have no quality of life. The girls were dolly shoes and boys were so called proper shoes that were professional. The boys were falling apart at the seams because of the lack of quality in them. It has been 4 months of school, and I could not believe how much they were falling apart – I honestly do not know how those things stuck together on that poor boys feet because he wasn't allowed branded more quality fitting shoes. And the girls shoes were fully open with no soles/grip to them leaving them without comfort, barely anything on their feet and if was to rain or snow then that would be totally left without shoes and most likely feet or a back because they feel over so much.

These are school regulated items that are not themselves fit for purpose and all you care about is branded items. That is not safeguarding children All this section is about is bullying parents and children so the schools can stop doing it. They didn't need to do it in the first place. Schools do not need to be sending children home from school because they don't like the children are wearing something of better fit and quality – schools choose to do these things and then now they are using you so you can make it law and excuse all their blatant bullying of students because they chose comfort and quality. Branded clothing is not the issue and with financing quite frankly they are easy to obtain now for any parent if they so choose, the problem is that teachers are bullying children, and you are letting them get away with it. If you truly cared for safeguarding children, then you would stop teachers from dismissing children and sending them home because they do not follow what their idea is of a uniform – meanwhile its ok to regulate mini skirts as unfirm and low-cut blouses for girls. Your rather backwards here and not safeguarding the children at all – you are allowing bullying of children to carry on by teachers and schools by agreeing with them. Children do deserve better, and they are not going to get it with this section at all.

23 – School uniform: limits and branded items

Branded items are easy to obtain more than ever now with financing should it be actually wanted. I feel like the problem here is just the fact that children have this option to own branded items when schoolteachers don't and they are taking it out on the children and parents instead – bullying. Perhaps give them better budgeting tips instead to better control their finances, or keep on being co-conspirators to bullying which happens daily and be mentally manipulated by schools to not even be able to recognise what bullying is – obviously by this bill you would rather be the bully towards children and support the bully than allow children to be safe guarded. Nothing here safeguards a child from bullying. In fact, I think uniforms should be abolished all together or at least state it can be any black trouser or grey and white shirt, no leggings and a jumper for colder times. That is the basics of professional working clothing after all and that is what schools claim uniforms are needed

for. If its not that simple, then why not? Because bullying is at play and some people just have to be control freaks and greed – show off their school logos for example and make out like they are better – when focus should be actually on the safety of the children who when they show off their uniforms stick out to the general public who can use it to track them down.

Uniforms are a big safeguarding concern – not brands.

(Children not in school)

24 – ‘Causing the child to receive education otherwise than at school’ – the terminology in this bill is shocking and the fact you have a personal vendetta against home educators is showing.

You stated that this clause only applies to those on an ehcp to the house of commons but this clearly states differently and applies to anyone! You said it would only be for those already under social services, but it is not – it is a straight violation of parental rights!

You stated in the house of commons that it is a parents right to deregister from school period, full stop, yet written in this bill that all must ask permission – no conditions.

Now, these elective to home educate local authorities – are the trained in home education that are saying we have to ask permission to parent from? Are the skilled in home education? NO! Yet you are giving them all this power- you lied Miss Secretary of State to your fellow men in the houses of parliament!

Under section 434A – you mentally manipulated the fellow MPS in the debates of houses of commons and should be ashamed!

You used words that abusers use to control their victims in the house of commons and used our children to get what result you wanted!

Tehe elective to home educate local authority do not have social services experience, their jobs have always been with he focus on education and any welfare concerns are to be passed to the welfare department of social services.

Just because ehe local authorities have abused home educating families in the past and failed after reporting it to social services welfare, does not mean it is ok to make it lawful to abuse them now. You are not safeguarding the children at all; you are giving power to the bullies!

Are these EHE local authority members skilled, qualified or experienced in welfare or home education – no. The job titles say, ‘no experience and qualification required’ and some recently have said ‘qualified in teaching may be helpful but not essential’. So why on earth are you giving these people this power to control when they cannot control now? Their focus is supposed to be education and report welfare concerns – you are giving them the power to legally do all with no safe guards in place to protect the children – it is literally only their personal opinion!

What do the local authorities see when they invade the home of an home educator – they may see some mess or clutter which is common for home educators to have vast crafts, books and so on – in the past may local authorities have deemed this welfare concerns and this is what they still claim today - because they have no experience or skills in welfare or education to determine these things.

In the past EHE local authorities were to ensure that parents knew what they were doing and supported if there was anything needed – this worked well for many years. Then these local authorities come along who fancy themselves social workers and begin making all sorts of demands for change based on what they think a family should look like. Then when families begin to clock on to them being investigated for welfare and not education, families demand all be kept professional and in writing as in accordance to the national guidelines. So the local authorities began to demand change to the elective home education guidelines, mentally manipulating government that it is needed based on statistics and opinions they have created and taking focus off the childrens education which is what they are supposed to be focussing on!

Duties that worked well for years of the local authorities:

Establish families in the area

Ensure they are aware of the laws and guidelines

Offer support should it be needed

If a report is made against the home educating families, then investigate further

If welfare concerns are raised than report them to the welfare department of social services.

These all worked well for years as I said – until some social workers who wanted to obviously work in welfare and disagreed with home education decided they were going to declare all home educators’ abusers and must be investigated regularly. This is bullying by definition, and this is not ok and this is what we home educating are fighting against. We do not deserve to be ridiculed as abusers without reports made and without cause, but simply just

because we home educate. That is not ok. That is unlawful by means of slander and a breach of human rights.

The local authorities demanding so much power over our children does not even give you the slightest cause for concern about the local authorities themselves, who cannot simply refer a welfare concern to the appropriate department and instead demand the power for themselves knowing they are not qualified, skilled or even understanding home education – **biased and unethical.**

Every local authority officer would be skilled, experienced and qualified within their chosen department and not demand their department changes to suit their idea of what it should be. That is the equivalent to a demanding child throwing their dummy out of the pram.

It is unethical, discriminatory and a breach in human rights that Elective to Home educate local authority members disagree with home education and do not have any qualification in home education itself, but they are given power to assess if someone is suitable to do it.

Local authorities responsible for children – when did this become a thing? They are our children, and it is unethical and discriminatory to place every home educated until welfare concern because they just home educated.

What happened to this being fair, equal and justified – assuming all need welfare checks on a regular basis and then ignoring anything about education.

This department of EHE was created purely for education purposes and as gotten completely off track!

How can you give power to consent to home educate to local authorities for all families when they don't even agree to home education?

How is that safeguarding a child by having to ask permission to be a parent?

It is bad parenting to give parental responsibility to strangers!

Schools not removing children from the deregistration list – well that is giving the school permission to keep defrauding the state of funds for that child and washing away any further human rights! Schools harass families of those who do not attend schools, visiting their homes and issuing fines – so you are giving school permission to also do this until a local authority decides something she knows nothing about. That really makes safeguarding sense to you to bully and harass a family as well as force them into debt all just because they wanted to change their lives and deregister their child from school. You really have no understanding of home education and how this country works do you? You make the laws

but don't seem to understand how they are used in the real world. You use abusive words and claim safeguarding but really you are having the opposite effect and your too narcissistic to even notice.

Subsection 9b – do you know what you have given consent by law for here? What schools do to enforce a child goes to school? Well, they attend the family home and try forcibly remove the child from the family home – this is what you have given permission for by law – how is that safeguarding a child? We live in the real world here and we suffer the implications everyday of your laws and this is them – manual handling of its children.

25 – Registration

436A Local authorities have breached GDPR laws on multiple occasions – where is the guarantee to keep all of this information safe? Where is the protection and law enforcement against them to safeguard the children?

Do you not understand that if a child is registered at school but arranged to do home education, they are still on the register list of the school and the school is still profiting from the government for this child, but the child is not benefitting from the funds? This is defrauding the state that you are making legal here.

I notice no reference to online schooling here which is now a growing thing that home educators will advise against but new to home educating are encouraged to do by local authorities, although these children are then forced to be home all day for the online school days and hours, plus home work and additional activities – this is local authorities encouraging isolation and your ok with that? Furthermore, showing your lack of understanding of home education.

Elective to home educate local authorities cannot determine if a child is falling behind or not – the whole point in home education is centralised education to suit the child, which includes at their own pace and constant monitoring of them to randomly test that they understand what they know, which can be often done verbally – it is a safe guarding concern that local authorities do not understand this which places a child at risk of self-harming, feeling unsafe, hating life and so on, which is a growing concern for home educating families against local authorities, because they do not understand home education and its varieties and it demand it in the form of written work only, it intrudes on the education and causes delays quite often while the parent is forced to resettle a child back into a suitable routine for them and not the local authority who demand everything their way not the child's – again this is harmful to child's development.

436C again this demanding of personal information to do what with and share it where and protect it how? Local authorities have already breached data protection on multiple occasions due to a lack of skills and experience, I myself have experienced this more times

than I have fingers in my almost a decade of home educating, and that is only to me receiving other people's information, I don't know if others have received mine but even once is enough.

This information data to be collected furthermore shows the uneducated behaviour regarding home education – hours to learn, well every experience is an opportunity to learn so we learn all day every day so you would be receiving very long lists and a bill at the end of each as to time wasted on these reports that could have been better spent educating my child. You want addresses of all the people involved in educating, well that would be the bird in that tree over there, the gas engineers working outside, the water rescue team on our travels to the beach, random strangers in the bus stop who want to teach my child mandarin because they have been waiting hours for a bus that never turned up – you want me to ask all these strangers, every single person that comes into contact with us for their names and addresses and contact information because they happened to teach my child something that day – again, showing how uneducated you are in home education to demand such stupidity. You focused heavily on time spent again – what do you not understand about learning happens all the time everywhere? Really, get an education in home education because this is just ridiculous now.

This shows the clear lack in understanding that the local authorities have surrounding home education, and you want to give them basic parental responsibilities – they are too dumbfounded to even write a letter let alone anything else! Your logic is taking parental responsibility from the knowing willing parent and give it to the unknowing, unskilled, unqualified, uneducated local authority member who is a complete stranger to the child involved and you do not see the safeguarding issue there? Then you don't know what safeguarding children is!

Again, you are giving power to the local authorities and now it is on SEND children and being able to assess them – do you know what qualifications the local authorities have to judge this? None. That is a great safeguarding concern for parents who seem to be the only ones who care enough to learn these things and the implications these laws would have society.

Local authorities for elective to home educate are NOT QUALIFIED OR EXPERINCED TO BE ABLE TO ASSES MY SHOW LACES!

It is a great safe guarding concern to give the power to asses needs, special needs, in there is a child in need, whether arrangements are suitable – you are outright treat home educators with discrimination by assuming them abusers and treating them this way based off unqualified opinions – it is insane! To consider these things a leap forward in safe guarding, you are the safe guarding concern against children.

Furthermore, more proof that the education team of the local authorities have gotten off track and are not education focussed. They cannot even educate themselves. Here is another example of my local authority person, I asked her for information on exams – she said I don't know. This is the person you are giving my parental responsibility who cannot even educate herself and she has been in the job for at least 3 years and that is not long enough to educate oneself in home education to actually be able to assess and support parents. Nope, instead it is take over the role of parent because it is easier then educating yourself and changing your opinion on something.

I am seriously gobsmacked and so furious at all this power you are making lawful to give to the EHE LA – you are supposed to be smart people and you cannot see the harm this would do to a child. For the first time in my life, I AM ABSOLUTELY ASHAMED OF MY GOVERNMENT. I have supported my society and my government my entire life, and now, I cannot see any possible future for England. All these laws that claim progress and the complete obvious mental abuse I have witnessed in the house of commons videos once compared to this bill – I am outraged. This is not my country anymore, It is not moving forward, It is being taken apart little by little and now we notice it as it reaches its final pieces. There is no faith in the government anymore and this is why. The opinion-system state running itself for very few generations left to come.

Well, you cannot mentally manipulate me. I see your abusive shocking words and I see you outrightly destroying human rights, risking the safeguard of children to power hungry unskilled local authorities and schools. My child already wants to move somewhere else to be away from this government when she grows up. I am not denying that right at all because there would not be a country in which I could safely expect her to raise my grand children in, in England.

The only thing in this section that protects the child is by declaring all information be kept private and not shared – this is the only safeguard put in place – unbelievable.

436D parents

15 days to register with the local authorities even though you declared previously local authorities must approve of said childs notice to deregister from a school – counteracting again in the bill. Alos, 15 days to comply of anything – so people who apply for finance must wait at least 6 months for a response, but local authorities must only wait 15 days or face penalties – unbelievable. Clearly there is vendetta here. This bill is an obvious attack on the people, parents and home educators. It is outrageously ineffective and most certainly does not safeguard children at all. The guidelines used to be fair and stated time frames must be agreed between parents and local authorities, so local authorities demand this be taken

away from us parents to suit their wants – and you call that safeguarding – I call it a breach in human rights, discrimination and stupidity.

436E education providers

Local authorities have already been in contact with educational providers, especially those of colleges who offer 14-16 years provision and told them that the new bill would be making home education illegal and forcing children back into school. Over my dead body did spring to mind, but none the less, it is outrageous for them to act in such a manner. Local authorities advised these colleges to drop the courses and not offer them anymore – but you keep calling it a safeguarding concern of us parents, yet these local authorities are going around misinforming and taking away our childrens options of college provision and more. You call that suitable safeguarding? By this bill yes you do.

How does it make sense to issue educational providers with demands and fines, so they then do not want the hassle and extra paperwork of dealing with home educating children so then they refuse to cater for them – how is this safe guarding children?

You are even demanding ‘out of school education’ information – are you asking this of schooled children? Nope, because this is a blatant attack on home educators by bullies who insist on controlling us because they do not know how to support or educate themselves. They lost sight of their job roles of education first and foremost and decided themselves it was all about welfare. So how exactly does having this information to just hold and do nothing with actually safeguard my child? It doesn't! it is utterly pointless but local authorities say it is helpful for safeguarding for what reason? Their egos? Because they do not agree with home education and think everyone should live as they did and have the opportunities they did. What about jealousy? Some common words that home educators get from Local authorities include ‘I wish I had when I was at school! While these so-called authorities of determining education who think they should be in welfare checks have gotten over their egos – where do children stand here exactly? They stand with having no educational providers outside of the home and pushed back into hiding because someone somewhere decided it should be that way, and everyone should be like them. Where is the safeguarding? There is none!

Why does the words ‘out of school education’ need to be sued as well? Other than showing the lack of understanding in education, it also shows this one tracked mind of school hours and what they need to be – someone who cannot understand education should not be working as someone who is to assess educational needs of children. Of which this bill orders to be law very stupidly!

Home educators attend various different workshops that may be even just one offs – how would that work here? You cannot answer because you are not educated on home education, I see, this is becoming a very recurring pattern of not having sufficient knowledge

in home education from these local authorities while they are making demands of law changes that need to implement. Why is the house of commons agreeing to this? It solves nothing and puts no safeguards in place whatsoever!

Home educators even attend most things during the day while schoolers are at school, but apparently, they don't count, just out of school hours – unbelievable.

436F so this section states that the information is to be used by the secretary of state to build up information and be used however the secretary of state sees fit. EGO!

And now its claiming to share information with Ofsted – you do know that Ofsted do not deal with individual cases, right? When you ordered this demand.

Sharing information for the purposes to promoting or safeguarding the education or welfare of the child under 18 years of age. Let me just stop laughing first. So, these unskilled, uneducated, unqualified local authority members are supposed to be able to judge me who does actually know what home education is and what welfare my child needs and when and how, to then decide using only their opinions, the future of my family and share the information of my family to whomever they like and all they have to do is say 'at the time I believed it was in the best interest of the child due to safety or welfare concerns' – no evidence required, no nothing. Yes, that is great safeguarding there of course – not at all concerning for any parent who loves their child. A bad parent would agree with this immorality.

Then you share no limitations but give power to this local authority and I am supposed to just get raped by it? Yes, I think rape is a good word to use here. Raped by my own government for making such travesty law and then accusing me of safeguarding concerns without cause. And yes I have been sexually assaulted before and that did not feel like such an invasions on my body as this bill does to my family. I could stand up in defence of myself then too – this bill gives me no legality to defend myself against this invasion – this rape!

Basic human rights do not take all of this away from us as parents and human beings. Human rights do not give strangers rights to our information and to share it with whomever they choose. Human rights do not give to the stupid and ignorant and take away childrens rights. Human rights do not abuse children lawfully.

This monitoring is what you would expect from an abusive parent – are you saying this is needed because all home educators are abusers? No, then all this information is not needed without cause and again should be education dealing with education and welfare department dealing with welfare issues. Home educators are not abusers because you would not live that life. Someone living different to you is ok and to not instantly causing harm to anyone just because someone is different.

436G support – parents are not being support by local authorities. Local authorities dictate and judge but in no way shape or form do they now support like they used to. Local authorities just 5 years ago used to offer outings and supply news letters for home educators about what was available and so on. This was the understanding between parent and local authority, to support! However, even as stated in this bill, there is no offer of support anywhere because local authorities don't have information to share, they have no knowledge, they do not even understand their supposed to be education instead of welfare. They do not care about support which was further proven in the meeting with the committee and Bev made it very clear their intentions were focused on welfare rather than education and they did not follow through with reporting welfare concerns to the relevant departments. While Clare for home education reminded of laws for safeguarding already in place that Bev for the local authority smirked at. Yes, we watched of course. We saw things. We saw faces of other people too who were not happy of questions being asked and how the schools representative grew frustrated with not having any spotlight. We saw there were lots of questions trying to understand but feared for the word safeguarding being mentioned and welfare, it was all that was needed to be said to begin this fiasco in the first place, don't even need to show evidence just claim it is there and that's it. I have still not seen any records of safeguarding within home education that was not deemed malicious by social services or was not already aware to social services. The point though is that the ehe team are supposed to be solely focused on education and have a duty to report to the relevant departments for welfare and instead they fail to report which in turn breaks the law already in place, but nothing has been done about that, and instead punish parents as an whole. There is literally nothing here at all that changes anything, you have just given permission to bullies to bully. They bullied, we moaned, they had to justify their actions by telling you there is bad problem where there is not.

Advice – they do not even know what elective to home educate means or that it is the lawful terminology, they still even use home schooling. How on earth can this person give me advice? My local LA is too dumbfounded to even give me the name of local website for exams that we all use – how on earth is she give me advice? How can these people give anyone advice when they do not even follow the law and because they don't follow the law they demand you change it to suit them?

Information for sources – how ridiculous. Do they have a list of home educators to contact? Nope. Groups? Websites to use? Are they even capable to explain what home education is and how it works? Nope so how on earth can these people by law define to anyone anything. They don't even think home education should exist so how on earth can they by law be trusted to give correct information to home educators when they don't do it now and don't give correct information to educational providers. WE DO NOT TRUST THEM TO DO THESE ETHICAL AND TRUTHFULLY.

This bill is solely about demands of parents to suit local authorities.

Oh luck more demands and no support or ethics – nope its warnings by bullying local authorities who forget they are supposed to be about education and choose to claim to know about welfare instead and supposed to be able to tell me how to home educate who has 10 years’ experience and actually believe in home education and helped many families through the change over the years, including through lockdown – and then there are these local authorities who deem all abusers because they think home education should exist.

More threats to bully carry on in this section – failures to comply with local authorities bullying harassment and demands. Then the local authorities decide how much, how its paid and the person directly it imposes. They have powers to make all these decisions and you don’t think that is a problem or opens grounds for bullying? So how is my child exactly by this law? Is she safe because you have money? Wow I am so glad your allowing this bullying because god knows what would happen if I didn’t give you pointless information to do whatever you liked with and then if I was harassed – gosh my daughter might actually have spending money, or a chance for a day trip or holiday. The disaster that would cause to her safety having a parent who is present in her life! THIS LITERALLY SOLVES NOTHING! All this does issuing fines is gives bullies permission to bully and me to get upset more often and cause mental instability long term, as well as anxiety and stress of where the money is coming from and for my child to know she is missing out on things because that money has to be wasted on paying penalties to bullies. So how on earth is this stupidity keeping her safe and well by taking money out of her mouth? By taking money out her education/ By taking experience out of her life? Because you do not understand home education you cannot even begin to understand what impact all this would have negatively and because you do not know, you should not process the bill until you do know for sure. It is utterly reckless to pass a bill into law without doing all investigations to ensure the law is actually safe as you claim.

14 days given notice to pay penalties! What world do you live in because it clearly is not the real world!

Local authorities further get the power to decide to cancel penalties – why on earth are you giving them all this power? Power hungry demands spring to mind. Anyone who has to have this much power as in this bill has some serious issues and should not be employed within the local authorities.

26 – School attendance orders

I will remind you that in the past many of these have been issued to home educating families without even meeting the families, just judged based off opinion. I myself have been threatened by an La who never met, never put her name or contact information on my

warning letter and just purely threatened me, even though I had contact with my previous LA just fine. This woman just shot in and threatened everyone without cause. We complained and she got promoted and we got no justice – this is how distrust began with local authorities. The quick to judge and outright bullying for no reason and having no justice.

436H Local authorities already bully home educating families for living a different way and are biased towards home education – if someone is biased then it would be unethical to give them the power to issue orders. There is also nothing here that suggest evidence must be built in a case of SAO but just the opinion-based system again routing its evil. **I personally would rather fight to a court judge that my education provision is fine than to the unethical and dumbfounded local authorities. This is the case for so many people and naturally would cost a lot of money, but I have been preparing for this for 10 years, I have plenty of evidence of progress – all you have in one person’s opinion who is unskilled, unexperienced and biased. I would also share my experiences of these local authorities happy in court and how dumbfounded they are, unqualified and inexperienced as to my reason why, as well as showing my daughter how to stand up to bullies!**

What measures are in place to ensure the local authorities can ethical and competently asses whether a childs receiving a suitable education? There is none. It is a job literally anyone could have applied for. They are not expected to even have a qualification in home education, but they are expected to judge it? **Only experienced home educators can competently do all these educational duties of the local authorities.**

436H This section is supposed to be about home educators yet subsection 6 part b states, an SA order may be issues ‘if the child is not regularly attending school’. Another hint there that there is bias towards home education and there is a clear lack in understanding of home education.

Only the parent can know what is best for their home educating child with having spent everyday with them assess them for their personal education.

Let me enlighten you on a home educators point of view here to asses and advise. Once a child is deregistered from school they are naturally nervous and in a vulnerable position mentally because everything they were taught in the past about school routine and alike has instantly changed and a whirl of emotions begin to circulate – this is equally the same if not worse for parents who often say they fear they have done the right thing to which the advice is that is goof, because fear shows you care for your child and that is step one in home education, to care for your child, it will ensure you do what is right for them. That is called being supportive. Verses the Local authorities which is more like ‘obey us, share all your future plans and you must do it within two weeks else you will face an SA order’. Further

following to this home educators advise to spend time together to reconnect as a family. During this time naturally you would learn hobbies, interests and establish how a child learns best, as well as establish social circles. This can take up to 12 months to get settled into a routine depending on the age of the child and length of time in school. Instantly the family are reassured and begin their journey safely for the child. But when the local authority come here, they pounce quite quickly which installs more fear into the parents and delays the process of establish a suitable education for the child as well as social circles. 5 years ago, local authorities knew this and understood the implications and waited time before making contact to allow to a settling period. This was safeguarding the child a hell of a lot better than pouncing on the families as quickly as possible. Scared parents do not socialise well and begin to hide away, and this is dangerous for mental stability and as I said causes delays. Local authorities therefore are the safeguarding concerns and if they bothered to understand home education then they would know this! Home educators encourage communication and spreading truth, not fear. Inciting fear is to bully so my terminology of bullying is quite accurate.

So, where is my reassurance in allowing this bill to pass that there is going to be any knowledge and ethics and not bullying towards home educators – there is nothing in this to protect us home educators against the bullying local authorities.

436I How can you guarantee the local authorities will not use the SAO to threaten and abuse us which they have been doing vastly in recent years and you're just making it legal to bully us?

'Opinion of the local authority' it is made official of being in the opinion-based system. Opinion is not evidence!

The opinions of these uneducated, unexperienced, unqualified are above the parents who have been there every day, and this does not pose a safeguarding for that a stranger as so much power and control over a child? No decent person would think this is ok. It is completely unethical.

Subsection two – must consider where the child lives – you have no right to impose someone into our private homes without cause. Unless an investigation as been reported then there is never a reason no demand entry into anyone's home. Must consider how a child learns and what the child is learning – where is the protection for an educator here? In the previous guidelines it was stated that the local authorities must accept all forms of education since home educators is about an education to suit the child, however where is that here? How is that safeguarding a child if they cannot even be guaranteed to be judged on their learning via methods, they use best? That poses a great safeguarding concern.

An order takes immediate effect! And as to only be the school named on the order – well that once again shows being uneducated in education – you cannot order a school to instantly accept a child – what if they are full?

Local authorities given the power once again – all the power, open to bully and harass families – if the SAO is so important it cannot wait then why should the local authorities have power to change it at their will anytime? Because they have to leave it open to fix their mistakes for being so ignorant in the first place.

436K – when they finally realised schools might not even have space available, so it invents something to make up for it and be used to mentally manipulate parents into line at the same time. You're trying to push children back into school for what? To be in unsafe positions rather than safe at home with loved ones? Have you even considered school places available and even how over stretched they already and what safeguarding that would lead to, once again claiming to impose safeguarding but in the real world it increases the chances of harm to the child thus becomes the safeguarding concern.

Now we are repeating ourselves across this section with 436I-436L subsections

This does not give any answers of procedure if there are no school spaces available – it just says to keep nominating a school every 5 days. This is not acceptable and would keep people in limbo and under scrutiny for months because there are no school spaces available. If you are going to issue this crap then at least account for every possibility instead your only solution is to amend the order. Well if it can be amended so easily to benefit only the local authority and not the family who have been messed about, then it just shows to utter nonsense in which it was issued and therefore didn't need to be issued of importance and such instantly.

436N this is the first time that families were considered and can request a school to attend, otherwise there is no say and no thought for the child's wants, but apparently you have the child's interests at heart when you're giving a stranger's complete control over their futures and not the parents who have had no reason to be treated like abusers.

436O just about satisfying the local authority, if they feel better then they will revoke the order regardless of the child. Big ego trip there again. If it was so easy then the order didn't need to be issued in the first place, it literally boils down to more of a power trip than anything for the child involved. It's notice in place again to force the local authority to reply or deal with any such requests neither. Parents have 15 days well then the local authorities need to be put in their place too, after all it's about the efficiency for the child and not an ego trip right?

Well, it certainly does not read like it is in this bill, being heavily focussed on pleasing the local authority in every section rather than the actual child.

Those who need this much power in the law to change is because they have not been effectively doing their jobs and cannot control the families they bully and harass and in turn then have wished for all safeguards in place to be removed so they can have an easier job at bullying people.

436P failure to let us bully you 'then you are guilty of an offence'! Local authorities will love to use that one to bully us, again if you need that much power to do your job then you are not effective in your job and shouldn't be doing because you have become the safeguard problem. Where is the justice? Nope just instantly guilty of breaking the law and should be treated the same as anyone else who actually commits an offence – putting parents in jail for this is despicable. Removing all safeguards that were in place to prevent harm to the child – **you call it safeguarding by sending their parent to jail!**

You seriously do not live in the real world, do you? To think it is ok to treat people this way, to call it safeguarding when all safeguards are actually removed and all that is left is the chance to bully and arrest children.

Where is the evidence for proving us unfit parents? In this opinion-based scheme you have going on – then where are the safe guards in place? There are none – it is purely bully and please the local authorities but local authorities do not need to prove there is a lack of education actually happening. How it that safeguarding children?

You outright call it an offence and tell parents they are found guilty but that is not for you to decide – that is for the courts to decide – outrightly calling a parent guilty for not complying is not acceptable behaviour but it is bullying.

Subsection 7 – the ego power hungry local authorities can still lawfully bully and harass parents even if found innocent in a court of law! This is not ok! There are no safeguards in place to protect from the local authorities.

There is nothing in place that protects the child who may even refuse the order themselves – are parents expected to physically abuse their children to force them to go? That is not ok and it is not a position that safeguards the child to be put into – like everything else in this bill nothing actually protects the child.

There is mention of fines reaching level 4 – there has been no mention of levels of fines before – is it levelled? Or is it just to be turned into debt relief? Make up your minds. Fines are not humane in modern society.

You even go above a judge and say 6 months in jail – 6 months in jail to protect my child from you!

There are no safe guards in place for the child here – only ease for the local authorities to be bullies and have their egos wet wiped. Clearly children are not in mind else they even have been considered and them actually referenced more instead its local authorities can do this and that – where are the actual benefits for the children. Where are even the safeguards to protect bullying from local authorities – you are giving them all of this power yet having no monitorisation or statement of referrals to ensure they are actually in the right with their opinion-based system implementations.

27 – data protection

Although this has already been discussed and noted there is great concern already due to data breaches and you obviously felt it more important to mention all of the information before this section, because that is more important to you than actual safeguarding and following the laws already in place. This is hwere we stand as commoners in your eyes – losers suitable to be bullied while your above the law and find it acceptable for local authorities to be above the law since there ais nothing in place to ensure they are effective in their jobs. There have been already no re-precautions for local authorities already breaking law in data protection and your not bothered they break the law, thus you are telling them they are above the law.

February 2025.