

“How do you know your Personal Development curriculum actually impacts safeguarding?”

We know our Personal Development (PD) curriculum impacts safeguarding because we systematically triangulate learning impact data, student voice, safeguarding records and curriculum audits, and all four show consistent, corroborating evidence of preventative safeguarding in practice.

1. We can evidence that pupils’ safeguarding knowledge and confidence increase measurably

Across KS4 and the whole-school Tutor Programme, we use entry and exit assessments to measure change, not just delivery.

Clear example – Year 10 Health & Wellbeing

1. Average confidence gain: +0.7 on a 5-point scale (3.60 → 4.32)

Strongest gains (application, not awareness):

1. Applying coping strategies: +0.88
2. Explaining factors affecting mental health: +0.86
3. Body image & self-esteem: +0.79
4. Evaluating media/social media influence: +0.66–0.73

This shows students moving from recognition to application, which is critical for safeguarding.

Across other KS4 modules

1. Living in the Wider World (Y10):
Average gain +0.84, with particularly strong improvement in:
 - Equality Act rights (+1.17)
 - Understanding democracy and civic responsibility (+0.9–1.3)
2. Ethics & Philosophy (Y10):
Average gain +0.77, strongest in:
 - Cognitive bias (+1.12)
 - Identifying misinformation (+0.97)
3. Believing & Belonging (Y11):
Average gain +0.90, particularly in:
 - Respectful discussion of difference (+1.14)
 - Understanding beliefs and worldviews (+1.57)
4. God on Trial (Y11):
Average gain +0.94, showing increased confidence engaging respectfully with complex moral and spiritual issues.

What this tells us:

Safeguarding learning is progressive, retained and applied, not superficial or repeated.

2. We can show this learning translates into real safeguarding behaviour (CPOMS)

We triangulate curriculum impact with half-termly and longitudinal CPOMS data.

Key CPOMS patterns

- Stable, proportionate reporting over time (no spikes or drops)
- Earlier, lower-level concerns logged, rather than crisis escalation
- Very low and stable levels of discriminatory language incidents
- Low and stable child-on-child abuse
- No increase in safeguarding incidents following RSE, Ethics or SMSC-heavy units (e.g. God on Trial)

This pattern is crucial:

- If PD were ineffective, we would expect either escalation (risk increased) or silence (under-reporting).
- We see neither. Instead, we see early identification and prevention.

3. Student voice confirms safeguarding is experienced, not just intended

We test safeguarding impact through large-scale student voice, not anecdote.

Whole-school safeguarding & wellbeing survey (514 pupils)

1. 92% feel safe in school
2. 91% say there is an adult they can talk to
3. 97% know how to report concerns

Disadvantaged pupils (Thornden Champions, 56 pupils)

1. 91% feel safe
2. 82% know who to talk to if worried
3. 79% believe bullying or unkind behaviour is dealt with effectively

These figures include positive + neutral responses, meaning very few pupils are expressing concern or risk.

Why this matters:

Ofsted and KCSIE are explicit that safeguarding must work for vulnerable groups, not just the majority. This data shows inclusive safeguarding, not uneven provision.

4. SMSC audits and Equality evidence explain why safeguarding is strong

Our SMSC, British Values and Diversity & Inclusion audits show safeguarding themes are embedded beyond PD lessons, across subjects, tutor time and assemblies.

Examples

1. Believing & Belonging, Ethics, Medical Ethics and God on Trial develop:
 - moral reasoning
 - respect for difference
 - ethical decision-making
2. Assembly programme reinforces:
 - belonging, respect and tolerance
 - equality, law and consent
3. Curriculum audits show protected characteristics are addressed explicitly across subjects.
4. This is reflected in practice:
5. Very low discriminatory incidents
6. No unsafe spaces identified by students
7. Confidence that prejudice and unkind behaviour are challenged

This is SMSC impacting safeguarding, not SMSC as a paper exercise.

5. We adapt provision based on safeguarding evidence

We do not treat PD as static.

We use:

1. entry/exit data to identify weaker confidence areas,
2. CPOMS trends to spot emerging risks,
3. student voice to identify perception gaps,
4. audits to refine coverage.

Examples of adaptation

1. More scenario-based work where application confidence is lower
2. Clearer visual safeguarding pathways where help-seeking confidence lags
3. Targeted Tutor Programme themes at pressure points (transition, exams, online risk)

This demonstrates safeguarding is kept under continual review, as required by KCSIE.

Overall conclusion

Taken together, the evidence shows that:

1. pupils know more about safeguarding,
2. pupils are more confident to seek help,
3. staff identify concerns earlier and more accurately,
4. incidents are prevented or de-escalated,
5. culture supports belonging, respect and inclusion.

That is the definition of effective, preventative safeguarding.

We know our Personal Development curriculum impacts safeguarding because we can evidence measurable gains in pupil confidence and understanding through entry and exit data, corroborated by stable CPOMS trends showing early reporting and low escalation. Student voice confirms that over 90% of pupils feel safe and know how to seek help, including disadvantaged pupils. SMSC and equality audits explain why this works, with respect and inclusion embedded across curriculum, tutor time and assemblies. All four strands align, giving us confidence that safeguarding is preventative and effective.