

Please consider using these simple points when writing to Peers about the Children, Schools and Families Bill. Please consider putting them in your own words:

Basic Points:

HOME EDUCATION

Removal of a parent's right to educate his or her own child

- There is a legal, moral and God-given responsibility on parents to have their children educated. That responsibility is also a right that does not belong to the State.

Legislation based on rushed recommendations

- You object to home education monitoring and compulsory registration provisions being introduced in the Children, Schools and Families Bill, as they are based on the Badman recommendations—a review that was extremely rushed, failed to give due consideration to the evidence, failed to ensure the data it collected were sufficiently robust and failed to take account of the existing legislative framework.

Excessive and intrusive monitoring—remove home education from the Bill

- You request that the Peer you are writing to support the removal of the home education provisions from the Bill, because the important right of parents to educate their children at home without State interference or permission are being taken away in the latest (CSF) Bill. The Bill contains unwelcome registration, monitoring, interviewing and enforcement provisions.

State Intrusion on family life: interviewing a child alone

- You are alarmed that Government officials will have the right to interview a child alone, which is an intrusion on family life. Even worse is the fact that Government policy states that if a child or parent objects to the child being seen alone, it may be seen as a refusal to co-operate, which could result in registration being revoked.

Postpone introduction of home education provisions pending full inquiry and ensure current guidelines are followed

- Legislative measures on Home Education should be postponed pending a full inquiry and the Government should instead take the steps necessary to ensure that the existing Elective Home Education guidelines are followed.

PHSE

Remove PSHE from the Bill—it should not be made statutory

- PSHE should not be made part of the statutory curriculum, because it includes sex education and the subject matter of the curriculum will be contrary to the religious beliefs of parents, teachers and faith schools. The Government's amendment allowing schools of a "religious character" to teach PSHE in a way that reflects that character is vague and is unlikely to improve the situation.

SEX AND RELATIONSHIPS EDUCATION

Remove sex education from the statutory part of PSHE

- You strongly object to compulsory sex and relationships education being made part of the statutory PSHE curriculum.

- You object to the inclusion of human reproduction in the science curriculum, from which children cannot be withdrawn.

Restore parental right to withdraw child from sex education up to 19

- The parental right to withdraw his or her child from sex education should be kept at 19 and not reduced to 15 in England.

Remove the requirement to promote equality including homosexuality

- You do not believe that children in England should be taught against their parent's wishes and as part of the statutory curriculum, "the nature of civil partnerships", when many of the world's religions believe that the practice of homosexuality is wrong.
- The Government's own current *Sex and Relationship Education Guidance* says that it is "inappropriate teaching" to promote a sexual orientation. It is therefore doubly inappropriate to place such a requirement in this Bill where sex education is covered.

Remove "promote equality" and "acceptance of diversity" from Principle 3 of PSHE

- The Bill states that PSHE should be taught in a way so as to "promote equality". That principle should be removed from the Bill because in the context of sex education, it will require the promotion of homosexual practice contrary to many parent's and faith school's beliefs. The Government's amendment allowing schools of a "religious character" to teach PSHE in a way that reflects that character is vague and is unlikely to improve the situation.
- The Bill states that PSHE should be taught in a way so as to encourage the "acceptance of diversity". That phrase should be removed from the Bill, because it requires schools to teach children to adopt a politically-correct set of values. Christian teachers should not be forced to teach the acceptance of sexual relationships that are contrary to their religious beliefs.
- The third principle that is to regulate the teaching of PSHE could be used to victimise Christian teachers who do not wish to promote or to accept a certain view of sexual relationships or religious beliefs.
- All references requiring schools to "promote equality"; encourage "acceptance of diversity" and teach children the "nature of civil partnerships" should be removed from the Bill. Teachers' duties and the principles of PSHE should only amount to treating diversity with respect. This is the correct scope for such a curriculum. It is not right to expect Christian teachers to teach values contrary to their own beliefs.

Opposition to Children being Exposed to Teaching on Abortion and Homosexuality

- You object to all children having to learn about abortion and homosexuality, especially younger teenagers. Faith schools should not have to cover these topics and should not have to inform children how to access abortion providers.

Victimisation of Christian teachers who teach PSHSE

- The case of Jennie Cain, a primary school receptionist who is being investigated by her school after her 5 year-old daughter spoke to friends about Jesus, show how the equality and diversity agenda can be used to victimise Christians. Another example is that of Kwabena Peat, who was suspended for objecting to the promotion of homosexual practice.

- The equality and diversity aspects in the PSHE principles could be used gradually to remove from the teaching profession Christian teachers who may be required to teach PSHE, because they will be unable, in good conscience, to comply with its requirements. The Christian ethos motivates many of the profession's most valued, loving and caring teachers. In short, there is a danger that the profession will lose many talented and experienced teachers of PSHE who are currently an asset to the profession.

Christian teachers, parents and faith schools' difficulties in allowing sexual ethics contrary to their beliefs to be taught

- Teachers should not be required to promote or to encourage acceptance of sexual relationships that are contrary to their consciences and beliefs.
- "Diversity" should mean respecting the diversity of staff as well as that of pupils and/or parents. There is a huge difference between *respecting* diversity and teaching the *acceptance* of diversity.
- Christian teachers, prospective Christian teachers and faith schools would have great difficulty in complying with the third PSHE principle, which requires the "promotion of equality" and encouragement of the "acceptance of diversity".
- Christian teachers and faith schools should not be expected to teach sexual ethics that are contrary to their deeply-held beliefs.
- Christian parents in England should not have to stand by and watch their 15 year-olds being taught other viewpoints on sexual ethics with which they do not agree.