Subreena Kazmi Principal Stationers' Crown Woods Academy 145 Bexley Rd London SE9 2PT

12th April 2023

Dear Ms Kazmi,

RE: Formal Complaint about
In light of a recent recording on Social Media, I am writing to raise my concerns about a lecture on LGBT issues my son was subjected to by during form-time. This was in February with as tutor. It is unclear whether was invited to speak on this specific issue or whether it happened spontaneously.
I have been told by my son that the impetus for the lecture was the objection of a Muslim pupil to viewing a video which affirmed children coming out as gay, lesbian or bisexual. I am not familiar with how the pupil framed his objection, or with how strong his language was in making his comments, but I am told that the substance of his objection was because of his religion.
Whatever the case, someone of the comments during form-time were indefensible. If there was an issue with the specific pupil, this should have been dealt with privately rather than using form-time to air his grievance.
During the recording, separately and is speech was overly personalised and inappropriately emotive. He linked LGBT identity to British values and his own life. He told the students in the room that if they have an issue with LGBT education or him than they have an issue with British values. He chastised the pupils, instructing them to discuss with their parents how their views were essentially anti-British. He also issued a naked threat telling the form-time pupils that the law required them to learn the material as he was framing it and that there would be serious repercussions for them if they objected.
In essence, we are complaining that abused his position of trust in using his platform as a teacher to threaten and shame pupils, none of whom apart from one student, made any comments about LGBT education. Whatever the young man said to trigger this lecture, was the adult in the room and should have measured himself far more professionally. This is especially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and specially the case since there was a cooling down period between the pupil's comments and special the case since the case specially the ca
I have several concerns as to why speech was inappropriate.

First, the school owes a statutory duty to ensure that the education it delivers respects the manner in which parents wish to raise their children in accordance with their own religious convictions [Protocol 1, Article 2, European Convention on Human Rights]. The European Court of Human Rights has laid out how Protocol 1, Article 2 is to be applied in practice: "the second sentence of Article 2 (P1-2) implies on the other hand that the State, in fulfilling the functions assumed by it in regard to education and teaching, must take care that information

or knowledge included in the curriculum is conveyed in an objective, critical and pluralistic manner. The State is forbidden to pursue an aim of indoctrination that might be considered as not respecting parents' religious and philosophical convictions. That is the limit that must not be exceeded." [emphasis added] [Kjeldsen, Busk Madsen and Pedersen v Denmark, Judgment, Merits, App No 5095/71 (A/23), [1976] ECHR 6, IHRL 15 (ECHR 1976), 7th December 1976, European Court of Human Rights [ECtHR], § 53] The term 'State', as used by the Court, would also include a reference to individual schools. The European Court has also held that the school environment must also be calm and free from any misplaced proselytism. Hasan and Eylem Zengin, application no. 1448/04, judgment of 09/10/2007, para 52.

A teacher using his position of authority, emotion and threatening language to tell children that if they do not agree with him or affirm him then they are less than British is highly manipulative and inappropriate.

To be clear, no statutory definition of British values exists. It is not found in the 'Prevent' strategy of 2011 nor in the 2014 guidance from the Department for Education requiring schools to promote British Values. The requirement to promote British values cannot be read as giving school's *carte blanche* to override respect for parental rights on sensitive moral issues. Nor do the concepts of individual liberty and mutual respect of those with different faiths or beliefs justify such a speech. Mutual respect is a two-way street. Mutual respect means accepting that we live in a society with widely different religious and political beliefs and views, some of which, however moderately expressed, may cause distress among the holders of deeply felt opposite views. What happened during form-time was the oppositive of that. My son was told in no uncertain terms that he was to believe the viewpoint he was being told or else face the consequences. I cannot think of anything less consistent with British values than giving such an ultimatum to children.

Like the British value of having tolerance for different faiths and beliefs, the Education Act 2002 requires schools to have due regard to the religious backgrounds of pupils when delivering relationships education. [Section 80(2)(b)] The school further owes a public sector equality duty to eliminate harassment and discrimination. What happened in that classroom was nothing short of bullying. Pupils were harangued to accept 's ultimatums and threats, with no regard to what their religious or moral views may be on the matter.

Again, I come back to this idea that not accepting someone un-British, as well as their parents. Such a proposition is offensive. and it is shocking.

My family and I are Christians. We love our proverbial neighbour as we are called upon by our faith and Scripture to do so. Nevertheless, also in accordance with our faith and Scripture, we no not accept same-sex relationships or relations as being prescribed by God. We accept that we live in modern Britain but it is highly upsetting to be told that our beliefs do not accord to British values. It is equally upsetting that my son was shamed in this manner despite not having made any negative comments about anyone in the LGBT community.

The school has recently embarked on several LGBT promoting events and educational enterprises. This has included Pride flags and badges as a means of showing allegiance to the LGBT cause.

Beyond 's lecture, we are therefore also concerned about the focus of the school and the manner in which it has approached LGBT issues. We believe that this has infringed upon our rights as parents to raise our son in accordance with our deeply held Christian beliefs.

As the first stage in the complaints procedure as outlined at https://scwa.org.uk/contact-us/ is to contact you at first instance, as Principal, I am now doing so. I draft this letter as a formal complaint and wish to engage the complaints procedure by doing so.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,