

University of Hull

Cottingham Road, Kingston-upon-Hull HU6 7RX

Inspection dates

30 and 31 January and 2 and 3
February 2023

Inspection judgements

	Primary age- phase	Secondary age-phase	Further education age- phase
Overall effectiveness	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate
The quality of education and training	Inadequate	Requires improvement	Requires improvement
Leadership and management	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate
Overall effectiveness at previous inspection	Good	Good	Good

What is it like to be a trainee at this ITE provider?

Trainees in the primary age-phase experience initial teacher education (ITE) curriculums that are poorly designed. For example, tutors do not equip primary-phase trainees to teach the full range of national curriculum subjects. Nor do leaders place sufficient emphasis on helping trainees to become proficient in the teaching of early reading, including systematic synthetic phonics.

Trainees in the secondary and further education and skills (FES) age-phases experience ITE curriculums that are variable in quality. This is because, in some subjects and specialisms, trainees are not adequately introduced to what is distinctive about their chosen subject disciplines. For example, some trainees do not experience a curriculum where the specialist subject content has been suitably defined.

Trainees are not exposed to adequate, pertinent research. They do not have enough opportunities to test out theoretical perspectives in their everyday teaching. Occasionally, trainees learn about discredited theories.

FES- and secondary-phase trainees learn the principles around adaptive teaching, including for those pupils and learners with additional needs. However, primary-phase trainees do not get sufficient training in this area.

Many trainees said that they benefit from suitable school-based experiences. However, some FES-phase trainees are frustrated because they do not have appropriate placements.

Trainees experience an uneven quality of mentoring across all phases. This is because leaders do not provide mentors with adequate training to understand their role in supporting trainees.

Trainees acquire important knowledge about managing pupils' and learners' behaviour, for example in how to establish a positive learning environment. Most trainees are well trained to identify the signs of potential harm in children and young people.

A number of primary-phase trainees have well-founded concerns about the support that they get on their ITE programmes. In other phases, trainees said that they benefit from pastoral care that is more responsive to their needs. All trainees are well supported to manage their workload.

More recently, newly appointed leaders are getting a better understanding of the weaknesses in the quality of training that trainees experience. These leaders have an appropriate vision for the quality of education and training across the partnership.

Information about this ITE provider

- In the 2022/23 academic year, the partnership provided training for 349 trainees over three phases: primary, secondary and FES.
- In 2022/23, the partnership trained a total of 247 trainees in the primary age-phase. This figure included 187 undergraduate trainees on the Bachelor of Arts with Qualified Teacher Status (BA QTS) route. These trainees were trained in the 5–11 primary age-phase and chose to specialise in English, mathematics or science. There were 60 primary-phase trainees studying towards a Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) through core or School Direct routes. Primary-phase PGCE trainees trained to teach on either the 3–7 or 5–11 age-ranges.
- In the secondary age-phase, there were 34 trainees in 2022/23. This included trainees following the university-led PGCE programmes and the PGCE School Direct routes. The PGCE subjects offered in 2022/23 were biology, chemistry, drama, English, geography, history, mathematics, physics and Spanish.
- In 2022/23, there were 68 trainees in the FES age-phase studying towards a level 5 Certificate in Education (CertEd), a Post Graduate Certificate in Education and Training or a Professional Graduate Certificate in Education and Training. These 68 trainees included 46 pre-service, full-time trainees and 22 in-service, part-time trainees. In 2022/23, trainees received all of their training at the University of Hull's partner colleges.
- The partnership usually offers assessment-only routes. In 2022/23, there were no assessment-only candidates.
- The provider works with a wide range of schools, colleges and other settings. The majority of these partners are inspected by Ofsted. In 2022/23, those settings that had been graded by Ofsted spanned the full range of judgements, including outstanding, good, requires improvement and inadequate.
- The partnership works with three School Direct partners across the primary and secondary age-phases. These partners span three local authorities.
- In the primary phase, the partnership works with approximately 243 schools in seven local authorities.
- In the secondary phase, the partnership comprises approximately 67 schools in eight local authorities.
- In the FES phase, the partnership includes four colleges and other settings that span four local authorities.

Information about this inspection

- This inspection was carried out by seven of His Majesty's Inspectors and three Ofsted Inspectors.

- This inspection took place on four non-consecutive days due to industrial action taking place.
- During the inspection, inspectors met with the head of the school of education, other senior leaders, programme leaders, subject leaders and members of the partnership executive committees in the primary and secondary phases. Inspectors also met with School Direct and FES partner colleges and settings. Inspectors spoke with professional mentors, subject mentors, headteachers and senior leaders in partner schools. They also spoke with FES provider-based programme leaders and mentors.
- Inspectors reviewed a wide range of information, which included: documentation relating to the ITE curriculums across all phases; documentation in relation to safeguarding arrangements; audits of the provider's compliance with the Department for Education (DfE) initial teacher training (ITT) criteria and supporting information; training materials from across all phases; assessment materials; and course handbooks.
- Inspectors also reviewed a wide range of information relating to the leadership and management of the partnership. These documents included leaders' self-evaluation and improvement planning documents.
- The inspection was carried out through in-person meetings, virtual meetings and on-site visits to partner schools and colleges.
- In the primary phase, inspectors carried out focused reviews in the following subjects: art and design, design technology, early reading, history, geography, mathematics and science.
- In the secondary phase, inspectors carried out focused reviews in these subjects: biology, English, geography, history and mathematics.
- In the FES phase, inspectors carried out focused reviews in the following subject areas: art, health and social care, construction and joinery, and the teaching of learners or adults with SEND.
- During the visit, primary-phase and secondary-phase inspectors visited 11 schools. Inspectors in the FES phase visited three partner colleges.
- In the primary phase, inspectors spoke with 66 trainees and 18 early career teachers (ECTs) either in person or remotely.
- In the secondary phase, inspectors spoke with a total of 24 trainees and ECTs either in person or remotely.
- In the FES phase, inspectors spoke with 18 trainees either in person or remotely.
- Inspectors considered the responses to Ofsted's online survey for trainees. This comprised the views of trainees in the primary, secondary and FES age-phases. Inspectors also considered the responses to Ofsted's staff survey.

Primary phase report

What works well in the primary phase and what needs to be done better?

For some time, leaders have not ensured the adequate involvement of partner schools in the design, delivery or strategic oversight of the primary ITE curriculum. This has resulted in poorly thought-out ITE training curriculums for trainees on all routes in the primary age-phase. Recently appointed leaders have begun to identify some of the weaknesses in the primary ITE programmes. Nonetheless, trainees in the primary age-phase remain let down by poor-quality training. They are often underequipped to meet all the standards for QTS across the primary age-range due to the design and delivery of the curriculums.

Leaders have not designed an ambitious ITE curriculum for the primary phase. They have thought too little about what knowledge trainees must learn and by when. Leaders give scant attention to giving undergraduate and postgraduate trainees the knowledge that they need about several foundation subjects in the primary national curriculum. Similarly, the training that leaders provide to trainees in how to adapt the delivery of the curriculum for pupils with SEND, and for those pupils who speak English as an additional language (EAL), is weak.

The weaknesses in leaders' curriculum thinking means that trainees are not introduced to pertinent educational research. Leaders do not ensure that trainees discuss or debate theoretical perspectives about how to teach in early years and in key stages 1 and 2. Added to this, trainees said that they do not have enough advice and guidance on how to design and deliver a series of lessons in the full range of primary national curriculum subjects.

Tutors and mentors are unclear about what important curriculum knowledge underpins the ITE curriculums. This means that ITE training for trainees at the university and in placement schools is not carefully and seamlessly integrated. The quality of trainees' experiences in placement schools depends too much on the work of individual school leaders and mentors. Trainees' experiences are uneven and often weak.

Leaders give trainees too few opportunities to build their knowledge of teaching early reading and systematic synthetic phonics throughout their training and school-based placements. Too much of trainees' learning about teaching early reading is left to chance. Many trainees who are approaching the conclusion of their training have not yet had an opportunity to teach phonics. The ITE curriculum does not properly help trainees to understand the link between communication and language in early years and in early reading.

Leaders have not established a coherent assessment system to help trainees to measure their learning and progress against the ITE curriculum. Added to this, the quality of mentors' feedback and support to trainees, including through target-setting, is too variable and often poor. Leaders and mentors are unclear whether trainees know and remember more of the intended ITE curriculum. Nor do they check that all trainees receive an equitable experience on their school placements.

Leaders' checks on the quality of their primary ITE programmes are ineffective. For example, leaders are unclear about how the DfE's core content framework is integrated into ITE curriculums. Leaders do not assure themselves of how well university tutors' expertise is translated into designing and delivering an effective ITE training curriculum. Leaders assume too much.

Leaders do not understand the strengths and weaknesses of the primary-phase ITE training curriculums. They do not spot the significant and negative impact of the many weaknesses on trainees' knowledge. Overall, leaders' plans for improvement are weak.

What does the ITE provider need to do to improve the primary phase?

- The centre- and school-based elements of the primary ITE curriculum are not well thought out, and nor are they properly woven together. Programme leaders do not ensure enough shared emphasis on developing trainees' subject- and phase-specific or specialist knowledge, such as early reading, phonics, SEND or EAL. Leaders do not make certain that trainees understand and remember pertinent educational research. As a result, trainees lack depth in their knowledge, including of primary national curriculum foundation subjects and of phonics and early reading. Leaders must ensure that the ITE curriculums are designed to train trainees to teach their chosen age-phases successfully.
- Schools have a weak understanding of the centre-based ITE curriculums. This is because programme leaders do not make sure that mentors are fully trained and that they understand what trainees have been taught. As a result, trainees receive a poor-quality training experience. Leaders should make sure that school-based mentors know the key information that trainees have been taught and by when. They should ensure that mentors revisit, build on and extend trainees' knowledge, including of subject curriculums.
- Leaders' assessment systems are not fit for purpose. Weaknesses in the primary ITE training curriculum mean that, despite their best efforts, mentors and tutors do not assess trainees' learning effectively. Therefore, the quality of feedback and targets set by mentors for trainees is poor. Leaders should support mentors and tutors to use assessment systems confidently. They should also ensure that mentors and tutors set appropriate targets for trainees.
- Programme leaders do not involve schools in the design, teaching or strategic overview of the primary ITE programmes. There is no successful management oversight of the primary ITE programmes. This means that the quality of the primary-phase ITE training curriculum is not adequately supported by expertise from partner schools. Added to this, the mechanisms for holding all partners to account are missing. Leaders should make sure that partner schools are fully involved in the work of the primary-phase teacher-training programmes.
- Leaders' arrangements to quality assure and to improve the primary-phase ITE programmes are ineffective. This has a detrimental effect on the quality of training that trainees receive. Leaders should identify the strengths and weaknesses of their primary-

phase teacher-training programmes. They should ensure that information about how well trainees are learning the ITE training curriculum is used to set specific and ambitious actions for improvement.

Does the ITE provider's primary phase comply with the ITE compliance criteria?

- The partnership does not meet the DfE statutory compliance criteria.

The partnership does not meet the following criteria:

- criterion C2.1, which requires ITT partnerships to ensure that the content, structure, delivery and assessment of programmes are designed to: enable trainee teachers to meet all the standards for QTS across the age range of training
- criterion C3.1, which requires ITT partnerships to ensure that their management structure ensures the effective operation of the training programme
- criterion C3.4, which requires that ITT partnerships monitor, evaluate and moderate all aspects of provision rigorously and demonstrate how these contribute to securing improvements in the quality of training and the assessment of trainees.

Secondary phase report

What works well in the secondary phase and what needs to be done better?

Leaders are committed to developing ambitious secondary-phase ITE curriculums that extend beyond the DfE core content framework, and that introduce trainees to relevant critical theories. However, while senior leaders have a clear vision for a fully aligned, ambitious ITE curriculum, this vision has not been realised. This is because there is a misunderstanding among some course leaders as to what constitutes a suitable ITE curriculum. Course leaders are not given sufficient training to develop the non-negotiable knowledge in their curriculums. As a result, the leadership of some PGCE secondary-phase courses is fragile.

In some subjects, leaders have not systematically thought through their ITE curriculum content to prepare trainees to understand what is unique about their subjects. Even in courses where the curriculum design is stronger, there is a lack of clarity around the specific knowledge that trainees will learn. Despite this, some trainees have an emerging understanding of how pupils learn because of more effective school-based mentoring. As a result, some trainees are better prepared to embark on their career. However, leaders do not close the gaps in trainees' subject-specific knowledge as effectively as they should.

Leaders are attempting to develop a curriculum that aligns the centre- and school-based learning. Some of the content of the generic pedagogy sessions is useful in preparing trainees for the secondary-phase classroom. For example, managing pupils' behaviour is woven throughout ITE curriculums. However, leaders have not thought enough about the order in which trainees learn other key content. All too often, training sessions are delivered in isolation. These sessions do not routinely build on what trainees already know and can do.

There is minimal and ineffective oversight of the secondary ITE programmes from senior leaders at the university. For example, there are limited checks on what course leaders are delivering at the centre. Added to this, leaders are not checking how well the different parts of the ITE curriculum are integrated. Too much of the training programmes is left to chance. For example, mentors in school-based placements do not know what trainees have been taught at the centre.

Many mentors try to fill in trainees' subject knowledge while they are on placement. However, mentors design their school-based curriculum with autonomy and in isolation from the centre. University leaders and tutors are often unaware of what content mentors are delivering. This means that trainees' experiences are uneven.

In several secondary-phase ITE programmes, leaders have not fully defined how trainees should be assessed. Where course leaders have not defined their assessment systems and procedures, they are less clear about where trainees have gaps in their knowledge or where mentoring is weaker.

Pertinent and up-to-date research does not routinely underpin the secondary-phase ITE curriculums. Some leaders' outdated thinking means that trainees are introduced to misconceptions. Furthermore, trainees do not have the opportunity to debate key educational ideas critically. For example, they are not taught sufficiently well about principles of cognitive science or how pupils learn.

Trainees have many opportunities to build and develop themselves as reflective practitioners. Mentors are expected to coach trainees in being reflective. However, leaders do not check how well this happens.

Trainees are clear about their wider professional responsibilities. Trainees know how to keep themselves safe and seek advice when necessary. Trainees fully understand their role in promoting a strong culture of safeguarding in schools.

Leaders' improvement planning is ineffective. Although leaders have identified some of the overarching key weaknesses in the quality of education and training for trainees, they have not understood the root causes of these weaknesses. Some leaders do not have the knowledge or skills required to lead developments in the curriculum.

Recently appointed leaders are resolute in their determination to improve the quality of education and training. For example, in recent months, leaders have successfully prioritised trainees' well-being. Added to this, relationships between trainees and many course leaders are strong. Trainees said that they felt well equipped to support pupils' emotional health and well-being.

What does the ITE provider need to do to improve the secondary phase?

Information for the provider and appropriate authority

- Leaders have not identified what they want trainees to know and remember in the subject-specific aspects of the centre-based ITE curriculums. This means that some trainees have gaps in their knowledge. Senior leaders should ensure that course leaders are fully equipped to design ITE subject curriculums that support trainees to systematically develop their knowledge and skills to teach in the secondary sector.
- Leaders have not ensured that the ITE curriculum across all PGCE courses is underpinned by pertinent and up-to-date research. Neither do they ensure that trainees have opportunities to debate this research. As a result, some trainees are introduced to misconceptions and outdated teaching practices. Senior leaders should ensure that course leaders are up to date with current educational research and that this informs trainees' learning.
- Mentors do not know what leaders intend trainees to learn in the centre-based aspects of the ITE curriculum. Mentors are also left to plan the school-based training with autonomy and with limited guidance. As a result, the component parts of the ITE curriculums are not purposefully integrated. Leaders should ensure that mentors get the support that

they need to understand the centre-based ITE curriculum and that they are guided in how to plan the school-based training programme.

- Leaders' formative assessment processes remain undefined in several subjects. This hinders how well leaders and mentors identify and remedy gaps in trainees' knowledge. As leaders develop their subject-specific curriculums, they should ensure that formative assessment processes match the knowledge in the curriculum and that these processes are communicated effectively to trainees and mentors.
- Leaders do not quality assure the ITE curriculum sufficiently well. This means that trainees' experiences across centre- and school-based training are uneven. Leaders should ensure that both the centre-based and school-based training are effectively quality assured. This is so that they accurately evaluate the quality of centre- and school-based training and mentoring.
- Leaders' improvement planning lacks rigour and specificity. This means that leaders are not cognisant of the extent, or the root causes, of the weaknesses in the secondary-phase ITE curriculums. Leaders should ensure that detailed and rigorous evaluation leads to accurate and successful improvement planning.

Does the ITE provider's secondary phase comply with the ITE compliance criteria?

- The partnership does not meet the DfE statutory compliance criteria.

The partnership does not meet the following criteria:

- criterion C3.1, which requires ITT partnerships to ensure that their management structure ensures the effective operation of the training programme
- criterion C3.4, which requires that ITT partnerships monitor, evaluate and moderate all aspects of provision rigorously and demonstrate how these contribute to securing improvements in the quality of training and the assessment of trainees.

Further education and skills phase report

What works well in the further education and skills phase and what needs to be done better?

Leaders have not ensured adequate oversight of the FES-phase ITE programmes. They do not know whether trainees benefit from a suitably ambitious FES-phase curriculum. This is because there are no meaningful quality assurance processes in place. Communication between the university and partners is also poor. Added to this, leaders' improvement planning is ineffective. Leaders expect to close the ITE programmes in the FES age-phase at the end of the 2022/23 academic year.

Leaders do not provide partner colleges with enough information and guidance about the content of the programmes that they are asked to deliver. Partner colleges are left to use their own expertise to interpret programmes and to design and implement the curriculum. They do this with varying degrees of success because of a lack of guidance from university leaders. For example, partner colleges introduce trainees to very different reading, research and thinking. This is because leaders do not check that all trainees get an equitable offer. Consequently, the programme content is sometimes outdated. Some parts of these programmes lack ambition and rigour.

Most trainees gain and consolidate the appropriate generic pedagogical knowledge and skills for the programmes that they are preparing to teach. However, leaders do not ensure that all trainees benefit from high-quality, subject-related training throughout their courses. Some trainees do not receive enough subject-specific support and guidance to prepare them fully to teach their chosen subject when they first embark on their career.

Some trainees have a secure understanding of adaptive teaching practices and how these can be used to support learners or adults with SEND. They learn some of the principles about how to adapt the delivery of the curriculum for pupils with additional needs.

In-service trainees specialising in SEND put into practice what they have been taught in their centre-based training and they confidently build their skills in adapting their teaching for individual learners' needs.

University leaders do not ensure that mentors receive the training that they need in order to understand what their role entails. As a result, the quality of mentoring that trainees receive is mixed. This is because leaders do not ensure that some mentors focus sufficiently well on supporting trainees to learn what is unique about their subjects.

Leaders do not carry out adequate checks on the quality or suitability of mentoring arrangements. Leaders do not have any knowledge of where mentoring is not as effective as it should be. As a result, the quality of help, guidance and support that mentors receive is poor.

The quality of trainees' placement-based experiences varies considerably. Leaders do not ensure that all trainees are provided with suitable placements. Some trainees, including those on pre-service routes, do not get the experiences that they need to apply their

learning to subject or specialist practice. A few trainees who do not yet have a placement are falling behind in practising their knowledge and skills to teach their specialist subject. These negative experiences are hindering some trainees' learning and development.

In the main, trainees feel well supported by tutors and mentors in partner colleges. For example, trainees benefit from tutors at partner colleges who deliver behaviour and classroom management training in a logical order. Most trainees spoke highly of what tutors and mentors do to help them learn about healthy working practices. However, a very small number of in-service trainees are overburdened with unreasonable workloads. Tutors and mentors for these trainees do not do enough to understand, manage or support these concerns.

What does the ITE provider need to do to improve the FES phase?

(Information for the provider and appropriate authority)

- There is little coordination between the centre- and placement-based training. Leaders do not ensure that trainees benefit from high-quality, subject-related training. This means that ITE programmes often lack ambition and rigour, and trainees are let down. Leaders should ensure that trainees benefit from well-designed and well-coordinated ITE curriculums that fully prepare them to teach their specialist subjects in the FES sector.
- Leaders have not ensured that the programme specification is underpinned by ambitious and pertinent research. Partner colleges rely on their own interpretations and expertise to select and introduce opportunities to learn about relevant teaching theory and practice. This results in uneven experiences for trainees. Leaders must ensure that they are clear about the important reading, research and debate that all partner colleges should introduce to trainees.
- Some trainees do not get the experiences that they should from placement-based training. Added to this, some pre-service trainees do not benefit from suitable placements. This means that several trainees are unable to hone their knowledge and skills about how to teach their chosen subjects. Leaders should ensure that in- and pre-service trainees are given suitable placements that provide them with opportunities to observe and learn from expert colleagues.
- Leaders do not ensure that mentors receive the training that they need in order to understand what their role entails. Leaders do not carry out adequate checks on the quality or suitability of the mentoring support that trainees receive. As a result, there is too much variability in the quality of mentoring throughout the partnership. Leaders should ensure that mentors are provided with suitable training and information to understand their role. This is so that they are able to plan training that develops trainees' ability to teach their specialist subject.
- A very small minority of in-service trainees' workloads are overburdensome. As a result, these trainees are more vulnerable to anxiety and stress. Leaders must ensure that

partner colleges support trainees more effectively to manage concerns about trainees' workload and well-being.

- Leaders do not have sufficient oversight of the FES-phase ITE curriculums. As a result, trainees get an uneven quality of training, and improvement planning is weak. Leaders must develop systems to have a clear oversight of the quality and effectiveness of their ITE curriculums.

ITE provider details

Unique reference number	133824
Inspection number	10250088

This inspection was carried out in accordance with the 'Initial teacher education inspection framework and handbook'.

This framework and handbook set out the statutory basis and framework for initial teacher education (ITE) inspections in England from September 2020.

Type of ITE provider	Higher education institution
Phases provided	Primary Secondary Further education and skills
Date of previous inspection	18 June and 8 October 2014

Inspection team

Michael Pennington, Overall lead inspector	His Majesty's Inspector
Tim Vaughan, Phase lead inspector (Primary)	His Majesty's Inspector
Rachel Goodwin, Phase lead inspector (Secondary)	His Majesty's Inspector
Chloe Rendall, Phase lead inspector (FES)	His Majesty's Inspector
Felicity Ackroyd	Ofsted Inspector
Fiona Burke-Jackson	Ofsted Inspector
Elaine Mawson	His Majesty's Inspector
Sonja Oyen	Ofsted Inspector
Andrea Shepherd	His Majesty's Inspector
Janette Walker	His Majesty's Inspector

Annex: Placement/employment schools and colleges

Inspectors visited the following schools and colleges as part of this inspection:

Name	URN	ITE phase(s)
Adelaide Primary School	144672	Primary
Biggin Hill Primary School	139508	Primary
Brough Primary School	117842	Primary
Gilshill Primary School	147259	Primary
Griffin Primary School	144605	Primary
Hall Road Academy	138679	Primary
Hallgate Primary School Cottingham	135078	Primary
Inmans Primary School	117911	Primary
Cottingham High School and Sixth Form College	136921	Secondary
Beverley High School	118072	Secondary
Hull Trinity House Academy	138082	Secondary
Hymers College	118131	Secondary
Kingswood Academy	139118	Secondary
Grimsby Institute of Further and Higher Education (TEC Partnership)	130585	FES
Rotherham College (RNN Group)	130527	FES
East Riding College (TEC Partnership)	130585	FES

Any complaints about the inspection or the report should be made following the procedures set out in the guidance 'Raising concerns and making a complaint about Ofsted', which is available from Ofsted's website: www.gov.uk/government/publications/complaints-about-ofsted. If you would like Ofsted to send you a copy of the guidance, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, further education and skills, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for children looked after, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may reuse this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available at www.reports.ofsted.gov.uk.

Interested in our work? You can subscribe to our monthly newsletter for more information and updates: <http://eepurl.com/iTrDn>.

Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 1231
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.gov.uk/ofsted

© Crown copyright 2023