

OFFICIAL RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION

Use of reasonable force and other restrictive interventions guidance

About **Community Union**

This is an official response on behalf of members of **Community Union**

Community is a general Trade Union affiliated to the TUC and GFTU. We provide legal and casework support to our members and regularly engage with them in determining our response to policy proposals.

Community's Education and Early Years sector represent thousands of serving teachers and support staff, headteachers, lecturers, nursery and early years workers, nannies and other education professionals in schools and academies, nurseries and early years settings, colleges and universities across the whole of the UK.

This evidence was submitted to the Department for Education on behalf of our members and as such represents the views of a wide range of individuals from different backgrounds across England and the UK.

The information shared within this response may be used and quoted as appropriate for the purposes it was gathered, with Community Union acknowledged as the contributor. We would be happy to discuss the comments in this response further, please contact us using the details supplied.

This Official Response will be published on our website following the close of the consultation period.

This official response was prepared by:

Martin Hodge

Head of Education Policy

MHodge@Community-TU.org

Community

3rd Floor

67/68 Long Acre

Covent Garden

London

WC2E 9JD

About this consultation

This consultation is seeking views on the revised 'Use of reasonable force and other restrictive interventions in schools' guidance, including whether it adequately supports schools to:

- Meet the new statutory requirement to record every significant incident of use of force and report these incidents to the parents of the pupils involved, effective from September 2025.³
- Proactively minimise the need to use reasonable force and other restrictive interventions through prevention, de-escalation and data analysis to support improvement planning.
- Support staff to understand when and how to use force or other restrictive interventions safely and lawfully.
- Support staff who work with pupils with SEND.
- Support staff to meet their safeguarding duties towards pupils and other staff.

Rationale and guiding principles

There are times when the use of force is lawful. Section 93 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 provides all school staff, including non-teaching staff, with the power to use reasonable force in certain circumstances.⁴ The revised guidance provides clarification intended to help staff assess when the use of force is reasonable, sets out the circumstances in which reasonable force can be used, and aims to help staff feel more confident in using this power safely and appropriately.

The guidance also provides advice on the use of other restrictive interventions, which are defined in the guidance as "Any planned or reactive action which limits a pupil's movement, liberty or freedom to act independently. Restrictive interventions may include use of equipment, medication or seclusion. Restrictive interventions may or may not involve the use of reasonable force."

The Government recognises that the use of reasonable force and other restrictive interventions can have a significant and long-lasting effect on the pupils, staff members and parents involved, as well as the wider classroom. This can potentially hinder the creation of a calm, safe and supportive school environment. The revised guidance

³ [Section 93A of the Education and Inspections Act 2006](#)

⁴ [Section 93 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006](#)

focuses on prevention and de-escalation and should be considered alongside [Behaviour in Schools](#) (2024) which constitutes wider advice on prevention, through creating a supportive culture and managing behaviour effectively such that incidents are less likely and escalation avoided.

In 2021, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) launched an inquiry into the use of restraint in schools and using meaningful data to protect children's rights. The inquiry led to several recommendations for the UK government.⁵ These recommendations are as follows:

- Nationally agreed definitions of different types of restraint, accompanied by guidance on the various risks to children of different types of restraint, based on up-to-date research.
- National minimum standards for the recording of restraint should be set.
- Schools should be required to publish a policy on restraint which is accessible to parents. It should explain types of restraint, recording and monitoring and how restraint information informs behaviour management and is used in post incident reviews.
- Schools should be required to inform parents about all incidences of restraint of their child, unless it is likely to result in safeguarding issues for the pupil or danger to staff.
- Schools should be required to analyse restraint in post-incident reviews and to use that analysis in behaviour management planning with the aim of minimising its future use.
- National training standards for restraint should be developed, which: take a human rights approach, minimise the use of restraint, are tailored by school phase and type and involve schools, parents and children.
- Restraint data from schools should be collated, published, and analysed, including by protected characteristic. Disaggregated data should be made available.
- Ofsted should monitor national and school-level restraint data as part of its inspections. It should use this to develop new inspection frameworks and increase transparency and oversight.

⁵ [Restraint in schools inquiry: using meaningful data to protect children's rights](#)

As part of our consideration of these recommendations, in 2023, the Department launched a call for evidence to better understand how reasonable force and other restrictive interventions are used in schools and how schools best use prevention and de-escalation strategies to minimise their use, particularly for pupils with SEND.⁶ The Department received responses from school leaders, parents, local authorities, charities, the EHRC and other organisations. The call for evidence received 580 responses (39% school leaders, 23% parents, 11% teachers and support staff, 4% local authorities and 23% other).

The call for evidence responses, along with independent qualitative research on the use of restrictive interventions in special schools and alternate provision, DfE's omnibus surveys and other stakeholder engagement, have informed revisions to the guidance. The revised guidance explains a new statutory requirement for schools to record and report significant incidents of the use of reasonable force. It clarifies when it may be reasonable to use force and other restrictive interventions and aims to help staff feel more confident in acting safely, appropriately and within the law. The revised guidance aims to minimise the need for all restrictive interventions by focussing on prevention and de-escalation strategies and data analysis.

The call for evidence highlighted the need for greater clarity to support staff in using reasonable force lawfully and appropriately. Many parents who responded reported instances where their child had been subjected to restrictive interventions, with most feeling that the level of force used was excessive and prolonged. Some parents felt that force was used because the school was unable to meet their child's need. Teachers and support staff reported mixed experiences, with some stating that force was rarely used and others stating they had witnessed excessive force on pupils.

Many respondents to the call for evidence (74%) were in favour of implementing national training standards as a means of providing consistency in approaches across the country. The revised guidance advises that staff who are likely to need to use reasonable force and other restrictive interventions should be adequately trained in its safe and lawful use and in preventative strategies, and that school leaders should choose the training, ensuring that it reflects the principles set out in the guidance. This is intended to ensure the adequacy and consistency of training and maintains school leaders' autonomy in deciding on training provision best suited to the school's circumstances and staff needs.

The publication of the revised guidance will meet the Department's public commitment to updating the existing 'Use of Reasonable Force' guidance (2013). Pursuant to the

⁶ Call for evidence: [Use of reasonable force and restrictive practices in schools](#)

Department's public commitment, we are also commencing the legal duty for schools to record and report each significant incident involving the use of force to parents. The Department's future work programme will use the collected evidence and consultation responses to consider whether the Department develops and delivers additional targeted policy interventions. At this stage we will also consider any outstanding EHRC recommendations.

Other ways to respond.

If for exceptional reasons, you are unable to use the online system, for example because you use specialist accessibility software that is not compatible with the system, you may request an alternative format of the form.

By email

- reasonableforce.CONSULTATION@education.gov.uk

By post

Behaviour and School Food Division
Department for Education
Sanctuary Buildings, 8th Floor
Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BT

Deadline

The consultation closes on 29 April 2025.

Terminology (pages 4-5)

This section explains what the guidance means by reasonable force, other restrictive interventions, and restraint. The short definitions are intended to be clear and comprehensive, but without giving exhaustive detail. It notes that these terms are not mutually exclusive. We have not listed additional definitions such as types of restraint due to their varied use across training providers and the sector.

8. To what extent are these definitions helpful?

- ☐ Very helpful
- ☒ **Fairly helpful**
- ☐ Not very helpful
- ☐ Not helpful at all

9. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

Community finds these definitions to be reasonably helpful as they provide a brief outline description of the three terms – ‘Reasonable Force’, ‘Restrictive Interventions’ and ‘Restraint’ – that are used throughout the guidance and consultation documents.

The descriptors are not comprehensive and are couched in conditional language which remains open to interpretation by schools and settings. Whilst this can be helpful as it allows settings to adjust their application to their own circumstance, it could also lead to confusion, especially where children are subject to, or staff are required to use reasonable force, other restrictive interventions, and restraint.

Therefore, we would be in favour of slightly more detailed definitions without trying to be exhaustive and cover every eventuality, which is unrealistic.

Who can use reasonable force? (page 6)

This section explains that all members of school staff have a legal power to use reasonable force in certain circumstances. It advises that staff who are likely to need to use reasonable force and other restrictive interventions should be adequately trained in its safe and lawful use and in preventative strategies, and that school leaders should choose the training, ensuring that it reflects the principles set out in the guidance. This is intended to ensure the adequacy and consistency of training, but without national training standards, in order to maintain school leaders' autonomy in deciding on training provision best suited to the school's circumstances and staff needs.

10. Thinking about this section, to what extent do you agree with the approach taken regarding training?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

11. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

Community recommends that all staff who may be required to implement reasonable force must be properly trained. For most staff this will be best achieved by following an approved course and that this should be refreshed on a regular basis. We believe that this is essential to give staff the confidence to carry out their expected duties and to protect the school and senior staff from risk.

We acknowledge that staff training is costly, but we fear that failure to ensure proper training would place staff and children at unreasonable risk. It could also increase the likelihood of an incident escalating and serious injury resulting. This failure to train can lead to a decline in staff confidence and morale and increase stress levels needlessly.

Community would not wish to see any one or other commercial course become the default national standard, but it is important to recognise that training courses are not interchangeable, and someone trained in one can give confusing advice to someone trained in the other and therefore it is key that training is consistent for all.

Understanding when to use force and/or other restrictive interventions (pages 6-7)

This section provides support for school staff in assessing when the use of force and other restrictive interventions is reasonable. Given that this depends on the individual circumstances of each situation and therefore all relevant factors cannot be pre-empted or prescribed, this section lists some important factors staff may want to consider, such as whether the use of an intervention is likely to reduce the relevant risks, the age and size of the pupil and the need to promote pupils' welfare.

12. Thinking about this section, does it support school staff to assess whether the use of force is reasonable?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ **Not sure**

13. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

The three factors identified are vitally important, but on their own they do not adequately support staff when evaluating a situation that may require the use of reasonable force.

Staff will often be making decisions at speed and working in a high-pressure environment, so it is important that process is able to be followed. This is why it is key that the setting has a robust behaviour strategy which has been tested and evaluated, and that this strategy is fully supported by all staff. This should be regularly reviewed, and risk assessed, to ensure that it continues to meet the demands of the school and the pupils and supports the school staff to feel confident that their actions are safe and have been recently evaluated.

It is important to consider the impact that any aspect of the behaviour strategy may have on the child's wellbeing – both physical and mental – and to identify the risks associated with implementing or not implementing the strategy. It is also important to consider the impact that this may have on the school staff and the wider class.

As a result of the risk assessment, any practices which are unsuitable, or no longer suitable can be withdrawn and alternatives introduced.

The revised guidance defines seclusion as a type of restrictive intervention which involves the supervised confinement and isolation of a pupil, away from other pupils, in an area from which the pupil is prevented from leaving of their own free will. The decision on whether it is reasonable to use seclusion or other restrictive interventions depends on the individual circumstances of each situation, however restrictive interventions are never to be used for the purpose of punishment. Seclusion is distinct from removal. Removal is covered in the '[Behaviour in Schools](#)' guidance and is defined as where a pupil, for serious disciplinary reasons, is required to spend a limited time out of the classroom at the instruction of a member of staff, in a setting where they can continue their education.

14. Seclusion is covered in this section as a type of restrictive intervention. Considering this, do you think the guidance on seclusion is clear?

☐ Yes

☒ **No**

☐ Not sure

15. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

Firstly, these are children, no matter how large, strong, or physically developed they are, and this means that there may be capacity issues because they are children. For some there will be additional capacity issues because of disabilities or learning impairments they may have.

Whilst Community understands the need to seclude children for their own and the safety of others ideally, they should not be isolated from their learning and the work they undertake should progress in the same way.

There is a risk that isolation will store up further issues – resentment, mental health, withdrawal, and social difficulties – which will add to school staff workload and pose a greater ongoing risk.

Therefore, it is virtually impossible to divorce 'seclusion' as a restrictive intervention from 'removal' as a behavioural tool. Parents, pupils and even staff will rarely understand the differences, and this risks them being conflated.

16. Do you think this section should include further advice on when and in what circumstances the use of seclusion is appropriate?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not sure

17. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

As mentioned in the previous question, Community would like to see much greater clarity around the use of 'seclusion' to prevent conflation between it and 'removal' as a behaviour sanction.

We know that many students who suffer with neurodivergence or those who find it difficult to manage their emotions are at greater risk of experiencing 'removal' as a behaviour management tool yet are also more likely to benefit from 'seclusion' as preventative and supportive strategy. However, there needs to be very clear guidance to schools on ensuring these two strategies are different, amongst other things, in location, design and practice so that they cannot become conflated in the minds of students, parents and staff.

18. Thinking about this section, alongside the 'Behaviour in Schools' guidance, is the difference between seclusion and removal clear?

☐ Yes

☒ **No**

☐ Not sure

19. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

Again, as mentioned in the previous question, it is vital that there is greater clarity around the use of 'seclusion' to prevent conflation between it and 'removal' as a behaviour sanction.

Pupil and staff support (page 8)

This section advises schools on how to follow up on each significant incident of use of force or other restrictive intervention, including ensuring that where needed, pupils and staff receive medical treatment and that their wellbeing is monitored to identify whether additional support is needed. It emphasises the importance of the debriefing process following a significant incident of use force or other restrictive intervention, to understand what happened and why, and facilitate reflection and learning.

20. To what extent is this section helpful?

- ☐ Very helpful
- ☒ **Fairly helpful**
- ☐ Not very helpful
- ☐ Not helpful at all

21. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

Community has previously responded to consultation highlighting the vital importance of following up on each incident of use of force or other restrictive intervention, not just those considered 'significant.' This debriefing process is critical to understanding the situation and learning from it in the hope that the necessity for it can be minimized in future.

The need for intervention to be 'significant' before it is recorded and followed up introduces unnecessary risk into the system and may mean settings interpret the guidance differently. We would recommend that whenever an incident of force, restraint, or other restrictive practice has been deployed basic details should be recorded followed by appropriate debrief which may differ in scope depending on the level of intervention.

Where physical intervention has been implemented, we would expect any debrief to gather details of the event – time, date, location and may include witness names, though these should not be shared with any outside parties. This should always be recorded in writing.

We acknowledge the guidance contained on page 8 especially in regard to medical assessment and treatment for injury, but not all injuries are visible, and mental trauma may also be experienced.

Developing a school policy on the use of reasonable force and other restrictive interventions (pages 11-12)

This section outlines that schools should develop a policy on the use of reasonable force and other restrictive interventions, either as a standalone policy or as part of the school's behaviour policy. It highlights the importance of creating a culture that seeks to minimise the use of reasonable force and other restrictive interventions by developing prevention and de-escalation strategies. This aims to emphasise the importance of prevention and gives some short practical examples of how this can be implemented by schools.

22. Thinking about this section, does it support schools to develop a policy on reasonable force and other restrictive interventions?

- ☒ **Yes**
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure

23. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

As already noted, it is vital that settings have a clear and unambiguous policy to oversee the use of reasonable force. This should be integrated within the behaviour management strategy and should be widely understood by all staff and implemented alongside robust risk assessments.

It is clear that there are circumstances in which reasonable force must never be used, and techniques of restraint which must never be practised. Therefore it is better to focus on what systems the policy does espouse so that they become second nature.

Community have previously noted the following in regard to policies:

- Every school is required to have a policy and to make this policy known to staff, parents, and pupils. The governing body should notify the head teacher that it expects the policy to include the power to use reasonable force.
- Any policy on the use of reasonable force should acknowledge schools' legal duties in relation to children with special educational needs and disabilities.
- Schools should not have a 'no contact' policy. There is a real risk that such a policy might place a member of staff in breach of their duty of care towards a pupil.
- Reasonable force can be used to prevent pupils from hurting themselves or others, from damaging property, or from causing disorder.
- Schools should speak to parents about serious incidents involving the use of force and to consider how best to record such serious incidents.
- It is always unlawful to use force as a punishment.

24. Is it clear how school staff can apply the information in this section in practice?

☒ **Yes**

☐ No

☐ Not sure

25. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

Consideration for pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) (pages 12-13)

This section provides guidance for staff working with pupils with SEND, offering specific strategies to proactively support those pupils and reduce the likelihood of needing to use reasonable force or other restrictive interventions.⁷

26. Thinking about this section, to what extent does it successfully support staff to work with pupils with SEND?

- ☐ Very successfully
- ☒ **Fairly successfully**
- ☐ Not very successfully
- ☐ Not successfully at all

27. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

All behaviour strategies must begin before intervention becomes necessary, particularly in regard to pupils with SEND communication where understanding the individual needs of the child are paramount. This is why risk assessments are so critical as they can identify the risks before they present themselves.

Structured positive behaviour support training is key as a central focus of behavioural planning. Staff need to be comprehensively supported in their roles through high-quality training which gives them the ability to understand questions such as “what causes the incidents?” “What are the triggers?” “What preceded the incident?” and how to apply this theory to their own everyday practice.

A school which has a positive focus on managing early interventions which can be used to help prevent the need to use reasonable force, restraint, or a restrictive practice, will also support staff and lead to positive morale. Schools which fail to have this positive focus, where there is a lack of clarity from management, can lead poor mental attitudes (reminiscent of going into battle) and lead to unnecessary risks and dangerous professional behaviours.

28. How does the revised guidance impact on children with SEND? (maximum 1000 characters)

As the revised guidance notes, any support plans should be reviewed with the pupil and their parent/carer periodically and *particularly* following any incident, so that changes can be made based on evidence of what has worked and what has not worked in practice.

The risk assessment model will only work if it is regularly reviewed and if there is support from the child together with support and buy-in from their parent/carer and the school.

⁷ There is also existing guidance available for special educational settings on reducing the need for restraint and restrictive interventions, see [Reducing the need for restraint and restrictive interventions: children and young people with learning disabilities, autistic spectrum conditions and mental health difficulties in health and social care services and special education settings.](#)

Recording and reporting the use of force by members of staff (pages 14-15) and Other physical contact with pupils (pages 9-10)

These sections provide guidance on the new legal requirement (which will commence in September 2025) to record and report each significant incident in which a member of staff uses force on a pupil.⁸ It defines significant incident as “any incident where the use of reasonable force goes beyond appropriate physical contact between pupils and staff as described in ‘Other physical contact with pupils’ in this document”.

29. Thinking about this section of the guidance and the new legislation, is it clear when schools must record the use of reasonable force?

☐ **Yes**

☐ No

☐ Not sure

30. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

As previously noted, Community believes the use of the word ‘significant’ is unhelpful and may further cause confusion. It is our position that where physical restraint and the use of force has occurred, it must be recorded. We would expect this to include details of the event – time, date, location alongside witness names, though these should not be shared with any outside parties.

Whilst it may seem unnecessarily bureaucratic, gathering the key information is important and should happen as soon as practical after the intervention. This information is critical in informing debriefs and will contribute to learning from events to reduce future incidents.

Software reporting systems which pre-populate pupil and staff data meaning staff only need to give a brief description of the events would help to reduce the workload burden of recording such situations and likely increase the timeliness of its completion.

31. Is it clear from the guidance when schools must report to parents the use of reasonable force?

☒ **Yes**

☐ No

☐ Not sure

32. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

It is vital that the professional dialogue between the school and parents is open and honest. Where parents are alert to incidents in a timely manner, this can also reduce instances of complaint. When there has been an incidence of physical intervention then ordinarily parents should be informed, ideally no later than by the end of the day with a follow-up discussion arranged.

However we also recognise that there may be circumstances where this would place the pupil at risk of further significant harm. We would expect this decision to have been judged and recorded before any such incident could occur so that the communication is not confused in any way.

We would still expect school records to be completed and reporting to leadership, governors, and LA to be made as appropriate.

We would not expect reporting to the Department to be normal practice.

⁸ [Section 93A of the Education and Inspections Act 2006](#)

Guidance for governing bodies and proprietors on using data on reasonable force and other restrictive interventions (page 16)

This section describes how governing bodies and proprietors should use data on reasonable force and other restrictive interventions to identify patterns and implement improvements. This is intended to support schools to minimise the use of reasonable force, without the need for national data collection.

33. Thinking about this section, to what extent do you think the suggested data analysis will support schools to minimise the need to use reasonable force and other restrictive interventions?

- ☐ Very successfully
- ☒ **Fairly successfully**
- ☐ Not very successfully
- ☐ Not successfully at all

34. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 1000 characters)

As noted, governing bodies, trustees and proprietors of schools and other registered settings should regularly review their records on reasonable force and other restrictive interventions. This should be done alongside leadership staff which may include specialist SEND staff to ensure that the context is understood and the limitations of the recorded data recognised.

General:

35. To what extent does the guidance successfully support schools to:

a) proactively minimise the need to use reasonable force and other restrictive interventions through prevention, de-escalation, and data analysis.

- ☐ Very successfully
- ☒ Fairly successfully
- ☐ Not very successfully
- ☐ Not successfully at all

b) meet the new statutory requirement to record every significant incident of use of force and report these incidents to parents of the pupils involved.

- ☐ Very successfully
- ☒ Fairly successfully
- ☐ Not very successfully
- ☐ Not successfully at all

c) support staff to understand when and how to use force or other restrictive interventions safely, reasonably, and lawfully, including consideration of pupils with special educational needs or disabilities.

- ☐ Very successfully
- ☐ Fairly successfully
- ☒ Not very successfully
- ☐ Not successfully at all

d) meet their safeguarding duties towards staff and pupils.

- ☐ Very successfully
- ☒ Fairly successfully
- ☐ Not very successfully
- ☐ Not successfully at all

36. Please explain your answers, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 2000 characters)

37. Does the guidance support schools to meet their duties under the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010 including the Public Sector Equality Duty?

☒ **Yes**

☐ No

☐ Not sure

38. Please explain your answer, providing suggestions for improvement where applicable. (maximum 2000 characters)

Further Questions:

These questions are not about the draft guidance, but about the wider statutory framework. Responses to the questions will inform the Department keeping the wider issue of the use of reasonable force and other restrictive interventions under review.

39. The revised guidance defines reasonable force as “Physical contact by a member of staff on a pupil to control or restrain their actions/movements. Reasonable means using no more force than is necessary for the least amount of time, the application of which will depend on the circumstances. Any use of reasonable force is an example of a restrictive intervention and may or may not involve the use of restraint.” Under what circumstances do you agree that members of school staff should have a legal power to use reasonable force. Please tick the relevant boxes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | To prevent a pupil from committing a crime |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>To prevent a pupil from harming themselves, or someone else</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | To prevent a pupil from damaging property |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | To ensure the maintenance of good order and discipline at the school |

40. Please explain your answer. (maximum 1000 characters)

Community believes whilst the definitions are reasonably clear the way that they are interpreted and implemented could leave headteachers and other school leaders vulnerable if they make poor decisions.

For example, using physical intervention to prevent a crime may seem reasonable, but it may be that the person undertaking the restraint is unable to deploy force for *‘the least amount of time’* if it means that there is continued risk after the use of force has ceased.

Some of the instances described above are instances which may not be predictable and therefore might not be covered under any risk assessment or prepared behaviour plan.

This is why we believe that every member of staff who may be required to implement physical restraint should be fully trained and certificated through an approved course and that this should be refreshed on a regular basis so that it is a practised and natural response to minimize risk to the pupils and the staff member.

41. Section 93 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 covers the use of force, however a restrictive intervention may or may not involve the use of force. Where a restrictive intervention does not use force, under what circumstances do you agree that members of school staff should be able to use restrictive interventions. Please tick the relevant boxes.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>To prevent a pupil from committing a crime</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>To prevent a pupil from harming themselves, or someone else</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>To prevent a pupil from damaging property</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	To ensure the maintenance of good order and discipline at the school

42. Please explain your answer. (maximum 1000 characters)

As discussed above, physical intervention should never be used as a form of punishment, however, the use of restrictive interventions to protect a pupil from their own actions by guiding them, or by locating them away from situations thereby reducing the risk to others and themselves may be covered in this scenario.

As with all of the scenario identified in the consultation, it is important that guidance is clear and unambiguous to ensure that staff and school leaders are not vulnerable to misinterpretation which could lead to them taking action unwisely.

In particular, Community would like to see much greater clarity around the use of 'removal' since it is likely this would be used *to ensure the maintenance of good order and discipline*. There needs to be very clear guidance to schools on ensuring 'removal' and 'seclusion' are different and seen to be different so that they cannot become conflated in the minds of students, parents and staff. It is our view that it is very difficult to divorce 'seclusion' as a restrictive intervention from 'removal' as a behavioural tool.

43. Please provide any further comments on the revised guidance you would like to share that have not been captured above. (maximum 1000 characters)

--