

## LGBA Response to Ofsted Consultation – “Changes to the publication of statistics on further education and skills inspections and outcomes”

### 1) NO.

This could potentially make research easier and classification more efficient so overall this seems like a good move to make information more accessible to parents and childcare sector workers alike as well as for inspection purposes but we have reservations about the category "not for profit" being relabelled as " independent learning provider" as this is a misnomer.

An example of a problem with a not for profit organisation being called an " independent learning provider" is apparent in the prolific lobbying, incentivising, wide use and unquestioned acceptance of groups such as Stonewall who have been spreading misinformation and do not have any educational background as such.

There are many other not-for-profit groups who claim to be acting in the interests of LGBT people but as one of the most well known and respected organisations and was set up by lesbian and gay people to defend the rights of lesbians, gay men and bisexual people , most notably over the last decade Stonewall has actively promoted the interests of people who describe themselves as transgender and currently is continuing to put this most recent and questionable addition of transgender people to the LGB family above and at the cost of the lesbian, gay and bisexual community.

.In addition to this, Stonewall, amongst many other not-for-profit "LGBT" organisations of varying sizes and capacities across the country such as Mermaids, the Kaleidoscope Trust, The Proud Trust, the Allsorts Youth Project, Diversity Role Models, EqualiTeach which all profess to be working for the benefit of "LGBT youth" while demanding and spreading use of language and behaviour harmful to all children with the conflation of "sex" and " gender" (the sex based stereotypes that dictate the behaviour and character of and oppress girls and women especially) or the complete erasure of "sex" as a biological reality.

This reckless promotion of a "gender affirmative" ideology puts at risk the boundaries that safeguard children which are clearly connected to this category of sex which is a protected characteristic, but especially children who may have special needs, gender non-conforming youth and children who very likely will be lesbian and gay themselves who are clearly more vulnerable.

This is misleading in the least and this category should not be changed.

We at the LGB Alliance are here to affirm and celebrate women and men who are same-sex attracted and we take many different views from these groups on a number of issues. We would not want to be lumped together with these groups who have a vested interest in children becoming "trans-identifying" when the time comes that we are providing services.

In fact, it would be more constructive to require evidence of more rigorous adherence to safeguarding principles and transparency about their expertise from such organisations before any one not-for-profit organisation is allowed to approach educational establishments claiming expertise on a subject.

2) NO.

We at the LGB Alliance support full transparency and data is key to that.

History provides context and removing access removes context.

A data cleanse would be detrimental to obtaining a wholesome picture.

Historical inspection information can also be used to chart the progress of an organisation and see if there are any skeletons in the cupboard as it were, that may lead to undesirable outcomes.

This is especially important in regards to childcare providers that have been deemed unsatisfactory previously in terms of their quality of service.

A full picture is necessary in regards to tracking individuals in leadership positions who may be moving within the childcare sector with bad records.

The same principle applies to not for profit organisations which need to be monitored with much more scrutiny due to the fact that they are not educational establishments but organisations with a view to connect with the education sector for a variety of reasons and do not have the consciousness, expertise, moral investment and understanding around child development, safeguarding and special needs as educational establishments are expected to be proficient in.

For example Stonewall's work on PSED in schools strongly promotes gender identity ideology and the notion that one can be "born in the wrong body" which is nonsensical and extremely harmful to the healthy personal, social and emotional development of children.

Removing data that exposes such a dangerous position would be a serious dereliction of duty in our opinion.

3)

a) **Would the additional reporting on the quality of provision be welcome and meet your needs?**

YES

We would welcome a more thorough assessment and reporting of the quality of provision.

This would be conducive to making available to the public a more intricate collection of data and effective handling of information which is vital to safeguarding and equal opportunities.

More detailed inspections would also be useful for improvement and monitoring purposes.

When delivering services to young people it is imperative that all providers are scrutinised to ensure only fact-based content is taught.

We cite once again Stonewall promoting an unscientific notion of a 'gender identity' whilst simultaneously attempting to remove the

protected characteristic "sex" from the Equality Act 2010 in their explicitly stated objectives.

This is an abuse of their position, the public funding they receive and does not foster good relations at all between the protected characteristics in The Equality Act.

**b) Would you find it helpful to have these new measures broken down by provider group?**

YES.

**Additional comments**

**Do you have any additional comments on our proposed changes to our statistical release on further education and skills inspections and outcomes?**

We believe this will provide more clarity and providers can be assessed more easily within the group and if a provider is delivering education and/or training regionally and/or nationally.

Essentially, we support further scrutiny of external education providers such as not-for-profit organisations.

**c) Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010)**

For more details, please refer to the draft [equalities, diversity and inclusion statement](#) (opens in new window).

**Please provide any representations/evidence of the impact of our proposals for the purposes of the Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010).**

We see no issues around the proposed changes but support all three proposals, in particular point 1 regarding the Equality Act 2010 (which notes "sex" not "gender" or "gender identity") and 3.

We support clarity around, adherence to and any further strengthening of the Equality Act, particularly around the protected characteristic of sex, as this is often mistakenly and misleadingly replaced with the term 'gender' which causes confusion and gross misrepresentation of the law,

as noted in the example of Stonewall who we have previously mentioned.

We cite the Equality Act to illustrate our point which follows:

- In order to “eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it”

Several groups that support ‘gender identity’ Stonewall, Gendered Intelligence and others are openly and actively seeking to remove sex and single sex exemptions from the Equality Act. (please see <https://womansplaceuk.org/references-to-removal-of-single-sex-exemptions/> ).

We urge that the term "gender" is removed from all EYFS documents and replaced with "sex" for accuracy and to prevent any further conflation of "sex" with "gender".

**d) How you use our official statistics on further education and skills inspections and outcomes.** To help us understand how our statistics on further education and skills inspections and outcomes are being used, please tell us how you use them.

Disaggregated data is always useful for further understanding. We support having methods to obtain data and measuring gathered data with clear and accurate reference to the categories of the protected characteristics and maintaining the integrity of that data.

**e)What do you use our official statistics on further education and skills inspections and outcomes for?**

**f) How often do you use them?**

**g) Feedback h) We are committed to making sure that our consultations are accessible. To enable us to improve our consultation processes and reach would you be willing to tell us a bit about yourself and how you found this survey?**