



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

High Potential Middle Leaders (Primary) programme

Research report

May 2017

Sarah Knibbs, Claudia Mollidor and Lucy
Lindley
Ipsos MORI



Social Science in Government

Contents

Introduction	3
Objectives	3
Methodology	4
Findings	5
Starting the programme	6
Hearing about the programme	6
Importance of choosing appropriate participants	7
The application process	7
Aspects of the programme	9
Residentials	9
Seminars	10
Coaching	10
Programme type	11
Initiative project	13
Measurability and impact	13
Sustainability	14
Impact on participants	15
Cost-effectiveness	16
Recommending the programme	17
Conclusion	18

Introduction

The National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) commissioned Ipsos MORI to explore the views of primary participants on the High Potential Middle Leaders (HPML) (Primary) programme. The programme, targeted at high potential middle leaders working in schools in challenging contexts, is offered as a one-year or two-year programme. This report presents a summary of findings from this research.

The HPML programme is delivered by Ambition School Leadership (Ambition; formerly known as Teaching Leaders). The HPML (Primary) programme follows a different structure to the HPML (Secondary) programme, which has been evaluated separately. The Primary programme has been designed to support a range of participant & school development needs with two entry routes available, both designed to affect whole-school outcomes. The first year of the programme is an entry-level route generally aimed at groups of middle leaders from a school and this covers a foundation understanding of effective management skills in order to collectively improve teaching and learning and contribute toward whole-school goals set by the headteacher. The highly selective second year of the programme is targeted towards individual high-potential middle leaders and therefore is more intensive and includes a greater level of stretch and focus on leadership skills resulting in deeper in-school impact. Participants and schools can apply to take part in year one or two of the programme or progress from year 1 to year 2 and as mentioned above there is a rigorous assessment centre process to enter into the second year, through either route.

The programme blends intensive coaching, face-to-face training and online learning, it aims to help schools retain and develop high-potential staff, improve pupil outcomes and close achievement gaps for disadvantaged children. A number of delivery mechanisms are used to meet the learning outcomes, including seminars, residentials and coaching.

In addition, participants of the programme have the opportunity to put their skills and learning into practice in the form of an impact initiative project, where they set and track progress towards improved pupil attainment within their area of responsibility.

Objectives

The specific aims of this small-scale research project are to:

- Gain a high-level understanding of perceptions of the programme among participants and their headteachers.
- Understand which aspects of the programme are considered most valuable and why.
- Explore perceptions of the initiative project and its perceived impact on the school.

- Identify perceived impacts of the programme on the participant and school as a whole.

Methodology

Ipsos MORI carried out 42 in-depth telephone interviews between 15 November and 9 December 2016: 21 interviews were conducted with programme participants who completed the programme and 21 with their corresponding headteachers. In the sample, we ensured a geographical spread of programme participants across the three regions of the programme (6 interviews in the South, 5 interviews in the Midlands, 10 interviews in the North) and a spread across first year only (3), both years (14), and second year only (4) participants.

Interview notes were collated in a systematic manner and analysis sessions took place in which interviewers compared and contrasted the views of respondents and headteachers, and identified the core themes presented in this report.

All research respondents were made aware that they would remain anonymous and no responses would be attributed to them in reporting the findings of the research. Respondents were informed about the nature of the study before taking part and provided fully informed consent to participate.

This is a small-scale qualitative study which, by its nature, is not designed to be statistically representative. It is intended to be illustrative, providing insight into the perceptions of the HPML primary programme among a small selection of programme participants and their headteachers.

The study does not provide a robust assessment of impact as no quantitative methods have been used. Therefore, claims cannot be made about the extent to which the conclusions may be generalised to all participants in the programme and their headteachers. Instead, we present the broad range of views given and where appropriate make reference to the overall balance of opinion or general consensus. The paired interview approach is aimed at identifying similarities and differences in participants' and their corresponding headteachers' views of the value or impact of the programme. Verbatim quotes are used throughout the report in order to illustrate particular bodies of opinion, but these should not be taken to define the opinion of all participants.

Findings

Summary of findings

Perceptions of the programme among programme participants and headteachers

Overall the programme participants and headteachers who participated in this research describe the High Potential Middle Leaders (Primary) programme as being of 'high quality'; helping to improve participants' leadership skills and having a wider impact on their school through the initiative project.

Headteachers perceive the training to be an important way to strengthen their leadership team and develop the skills of ambitious teachers. Although by its nature the programme is targeted at *high potential* middle leaders, headteachers give careful thought to selecting the right applicant or group of applicants for the programme. Not only do they need to be at the right stage of their career with regard to wanting to develop further, they also need to be highly committed and have aspirations to a leadership position. The programme is seen as a big commitment and it is important applicants are motivated to participate rather than being told to attend.

Those headteachers who paid for the programme through their own budget consider it expensive, but good value for money given what they describe as its high quality.

The analysis of paired interviews reveals no general differences in the views of programme participants and their headteachers with regard to the need for commitment, extensive workload/impact on participants' time and quality of the two-year programme.

Views on which aspects of the programme were considered most valuable and why

With regard to programme content, the year two residential week is considered the most valuable aspect of the programme with many respondents citing the inspirational seminars and opportunities to share ideas and best practice. Coaching is also well received and in many cases directly applied in schools (for example, when managing difficult colleagues). For some respondents, evening seminars are the least popular aspect of the programme due to the travel time to locations and that they take place after the school day. In addition, the content of some seminars did not meet participants' high expectations as they reportedly were not inspiring or covered topics they already knew about (e.g. making best use of teaching assistants). Attending the programme alongside teaching takes commitment. However, the high quality of the

programme overall and inspiration gained, especially from the second year, is said to make up for this investment.

For some respondents, the first year of the programme is not considered as useful or as high quality as the second year. Issues with the first year were mentioned both by respondents who completed the first year only and by those who completed both years. Given that the week-long residential (a popular part of the programme) only forms part of the second year, this may, in part, explain the more positive perception of the programme among two-year (and/or second year only) participants. The higher number of (popular) coaching sessions in the second year (six as opposed to three in the first year) of the programme may also add to this explanation.

Perceptions of the initiative project and its perceived impact on the school

The most useful aspect of the initiative project is reported to be learning about the importance and use of data to improve pupil outcomes. Some respondents are able to attribute an improvement in pupil attainment to their initiative project, although many respondents report that more time is needed to be able to measure the impact and sustainability of the project.

Perceived impacts of the programme on the participant and school as a whole

Respondents report that the programme increased their confidence as leaders and gave them time to reflect on their own leadership style, how to motivate other teachers and manage 'difficult' colleagues. It also pushed them to think more strategically, beyond the classroom, about the overall management and direction of the school.

Most respondents consider it too early to attribute any impact on pupil outcomes to the programme, although as mentioned above a few respondents report an improvement in pupil attainment in phonics and numeracy as a result of the initiative project.

Starting the programme

Hearing about the programme

Most headteachers report first hearing about the programme through an e-mail received from Ambition. Other channels through which headteachers are made aware of the programme include headteacher conferences, cluster meetings and, in Multi-Academy

Trusts (MATs), through other colleagues. Respondents said they were most likely to first hear about the programme from their headteachers.

Importance of choosing appropriate participants

Evidence indicates that headteachers generally suggest the training to participants rather than participants asking to attend the programme. They are aware that selecting the most suitable applicants to go onto the programme is key for getting the most out of the training, both for the school and the selected participant. Often selected participants already have subject or key stage responsibility, but not the necessary knowledge and experience to hold a broader leadership position in the school. Suitable applicants would be “at the right stage” in their career, i.e. having reached their capacity in their current roles, or being ready for a new challenge. They select ambitious and dedicated teachers with passion for their profession and drive to take their career forward.

Headteachers reported having a number of different motivations for putting participants forward. They perceive that having middle leaders participate in the programme is a way to strengthen the leadership team, retain teachers who may otherwise leave the school, as well as retaining teachers in the teaching profession. Yet, with regard to retaining teachers, headteachers were conscious that completing the programme would potentially motivate participants to move schools and obtain a more senior role elsewhere.

“I needed to build the capacity of my leadership team and identified an individual who wanted to be a leader not a manager. It became clear that she had the capacity to make a good leader; she just lacked the confidence and support.”

Headteacher #10H North (2nd year only)

“The children in this area come from very deprived backgrounds; it takes such a long time to make them think they can get a job or go to university in the future. Middle leaders have such an impact on their attainment. I just want to do my best for them.”

Participant #6T South (both years)

The application process

Headteachers describe the initial application process as involving a fair amount of administration and back and forth conversations with Ambition. Headteachers also report that some aspects of the online application are not intuitive. The application process seems particularly difficult for Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs) where participants going on the programme are not necessarily based at the administrative centre.

Respondents said they consider the first year application to be much easier than for the second year. Indeed, the prospect of an assessment day as part of the second year application appears to be a barrier to some participants' willingness to apply¹. Respondents report the presentation to be a challenging, and sometimes off-putting, aspect of the assessment day. Nevertheless, for some respondents the anticipated benefits of completing the second year outweigh their reservations. Those who complete the assessment day report finding it helpful and relevant to middle leader roles.

“You get an Ofsted pack to work through for ten minutes and then have to present to 'staff meeting' [role play] with difficult staff members. This was good as this is what school life is like.”

Participant #2T Midlands (both years)

Case study 1:

Jane had always wanted to be a teacher, and after studying for an English language degree, she completed her PGCE and has now been teaching for 6 years.

Having heard about it at a conference, Jane's headteacher recommended that three members of staff apply for the HPML primary programme. Jane found the application process for the first year of the programme relatively straightforward, and the application for the second year more rigorous. She commented that she had been apprehensive about having to complete tasks at an assessment centre and considered withdrawing at this point. The programme challenged her time-management skills; juggling programme commitments with a full teaching timetable.

Overall, Jane found the second year to be better than the first; she felt it was linked directly to what she was doing in the classroom, whilst the first year felt too broad for her. She has used what she learnt in the second year almost every day in school, from managing having difficult conversations to effectively using the resources available to her within the school.

Before participating in the programme Jane considered herself to be well equipped to take on a leadership role, after completing the programme, she realised that she had been naïve and had learned a lot from participating. Jane is now actively looking for a promotion.

She recommends the programme to other colleagues, so long as they appreciate the challenge and time involved. Jane's headteacher would also recommend the programme, which they did consider an expensive but quality development opportunity.

¹ The assessment process for the second year has been intentionally designed to identify leaders who will welcome challenge and are willing to stretch themselves beyond their day-to-day working experiences.

Aspects of the programme

Views of the three main aspects of the programme are outlined below.

Residentials

A week-long residential is available to those participants who are taking part in the second year of the programme; it takes place in the summer holidays prior to the start of the second year². This is one of the most popular aspects of the programme. However, before going on the residential, respondents were concerned about giving up a week in the middle of their summer holidays. They suggest that placing the week at the beginning or the end of the holidays would have been preferable (the residential currently happens at the end of the holidays). Notwithstanding this concern, respondents report coming back refreshed and inspired. Headteachers also noticed participants' renewed enthusiasm.

“[The] most impactful element was the residential course at Warwick Uni – understanding how to change our leadership style to motivate colleagues and not just be an authoritarian leader... Having time to think about the different personalities that you manage and what might make them tick.” Teacher #2T Midlands (both years)

The week-long residential in the second year, is considered more valuable among some respondents than the weekend residential in the first year. Among a small number of respondents, the speakers on the weekend residential were not considered as inspiring and insightful, and the content not to be as useful. Indeed, some of the reluctance of giving up a week during their holidays (for the second year residential) stemmed from respondents' experience of the weekend residential. In contrast, following the week-long residential participants overwhelmingly reported their positive experiences.

“Those two days were very hectic and packed and I didn't think I could come away with insight into how to put anything into practice. The second year residential was amazing though and because I hadn't enjoyed the first year at all I had considered quitting but after this week I was really glad to have stayed. The second year was much more tailored and really helpful.”

Respondent #13T North

Residentials were also considered a good opportunity to learn about practices in other schools as well as discussing initiative projects with other participants. Headteachers

² There is also an alternative residential available to participants unable to attend the week-long element; this is a condensed version of the week-long residential, run over a weekend.

recognised the value of networking opportunities that the residential training events presented for their participants.

Seminars

Some respondents are less enthusiastic about evening seminars than they are about other aspects of the programme. They report long journeys after a full day of teaching to reach seminar venues and their high expectations of the seminars not always being met. Evening seminars also impacted on the next day's teaching, as respondents described limited or no time to prepare for lessons, or being tired from the previous late night.

“Sometimes I felt the seminars were a bit pointless ... and 3 hours felt a bit long.”

Participant #5T North

Respondents feel that some seminars could be combined to cover more content within one session to reduce the overall number of seminars and travel time. Their willingness to attend a seminar if they thought the previous one was relatively poor was also reduced. Many respondents would have liked to see more content related to the specific needs of their schools.

Headteachers recognise that participation in the programme requires middle leaders to work additional hours outside school and on the whole feel that participants need to be prepared to do this in order to progress to more senior roles. A few mentioned that they offered staff the morning off after the seminars but no participants took up this opportunity.

Coaching

In the first year of the programme, participants receive three coaching sessions³. Those participating in the second year receive a further six coaching sessions.

Coaching is a popular aspect of the programme. Respondents find it relevant to their roles as developing middle leaders; they commented that they are able to apply what they learn directly in their work and pass on learning to other teachers. This direct application in school takes a number of formats, for example:

³ Participants on the Primary HPML programme receive 3 x 1hr individual coaching sessions in Year 1 (one per term), all delivered remotely. In Year 2, participants receive 6 x 1hr individual coaching sessions (two in each term), all delivered remotely. In the pilot and consecutive programme years, the coaching sessions were delivered face-to-face. In year 1 of the programme these were group coaching sessions in School or Learning Groups (local pairings linked by role/subject area if they entered the programme without a peer group). From the 2016 cohort the coaching model moved to remote individual coaching for both programme years.

- Coaching mostly takes place within subject areas, key stages or phases; on an individual level or through working on the initiative project.
- In some schools, the programme participant would speak about coaching at staff meetings to pass on knowledge to the wider staff team.
- In one school, the programme participant would provide one-to-one coaching to colleagues every morning during assembly time. This is said to be well received by other staff and a positive experience for the participant.

“Hard to find positives from the programme apart from the coaching aspect. The model at the school is very much ‘top-down’ management so it was great to see other methods of leadership. Coaching is now used a lot with other members of staff, especially the Early Years Team.”

Participant #21T Midlands (1st year only)

“They found the mentoring sessions very powerful and always came out of them passionate, driven and excited.”

Headteacher #4H Midlands (both years)

Evidence from this study suggests that coaching is also helpful for providing useful techniques such as those for managing difficult colleagues, including having tricky conversations.

Programme type

Evidence from this study suggests that the first year of the programme is not considered as useful or high quality as the second year among some participants. Issues regarding the first year were mentioned both by respondents who completed the first year only as well as by those who completed both years.

There are a number of reasons why this may be the case. The week-long residential is one of the most popular aspects of the programme and is available only as part of the second year. This may mean participants of the second year are more enthusiastic about the programme overall. As mentioned above, coaching is also a popular part of the programme and, as the two-year programme participants receive more coaching sessions, this could also account for the more positive perceptions of the second year of the programme.

Some respondents also report that while the first year is considered to be broader, covering more known material, the second year is seen as being more structured and tailored to their needs.

Some respondents contemplated not continuing to the second year due to the first year experience not being as rewarding as expected, but were later glad to have persisted. Both headteachers and respondents suggest that, depending on the stage in their career, middle leaders should go straight into the second year of the programme, especially those who have been in teaching for several years and would benefit less from the group setting than more inexperienced middle leaders. This option is already made available to prospective participants.⁴

“The second year has had a greater impact than the first because it was more bespoke... some teachers should just be directed to the second year and skip the first as it's not necessary for all.”

Headteacher #19H South (both years)

One common reason for continuing from the first year into the second was the effort already put into the programme up to this point:

“At one point ... I did [feel like withdrawing] as I felt I wasn't getting anything... that I could take back to school. I stayed because I've done so much already, put so much time in it already.”

Participant #1T South (both years)

Case study 2:

Laura is in her 15th year as a teacher and is a subject lead in science, maths and enterprise.

The High Potential Middle Leaders (Primary) programme came recommended to the headteacher, as the school was in special measures and there was a high staff turnover. Three applicants were identified as suitable and Laura completed the first year of the programme with them. Laura found that the first year lacked relevance to her everyday teaching and the weekend residential was unhelpful. The two days felt very hectic and she did not come away with any insight into how she could put what she had learnt into practice. Additionally, the headteacher believed there were other impractical elements from the first year.

⁴ Ambition do allow participants to enter only the second year of the programme and present this to headteachers and potential applicants as a year targeted at those with more experience and aspiring to senior leadership.

The seminars were located some distance from the school and for a teacher working in a school in special measures there was a lot to take on – the additional burden of evening seminars was too much. Despite this, Laura moved into the second year. She found it to be incredibly beneficial and the residential ‘amazing’.

Overall, Laura felt that the second year was more tailored to her needs; it taught her how to prioritise her workload and had a strong focus on coaching, which she thought was one of the key benefits of the programme. However, Laura’s headteacher felt that the coaching model which she described as ‘brilliant’ would have had more impact on the school if all three participants had stayed into the second year. The headteacher was unsure of how helpful the coaching had really been.

There were some mixed messages from Laura and her headteacher illustrating the need for a considered joint decision before committing to join the programme.

Initiative project

In both years of the programme, participants are asked to provide a rationale for why they have selected their specific initiative project. This project should be focussed on a predetermined school improvement objective, at least one aspect of which should focus on literacy or numeracy.

As reported by programme participants, in most cases, headteachers are heavily involved in choosing the topic, either individually or in collaboration with the participant; some respondents report proposing a topic and then discussing it with their head. As is a requirement of the programme, in all cases, relevance to the current situation and needs of the school are a high priority in designing a project. Almost exclusively, projects are linked to each participant’s subject focus and cover improvements in numeracy, literacy or phonics.

Measurability and impact

Initiative projects are reported to be most useful when directly linked to the school improvement or development plan (where one is in place), or Ofsted recommendations. According to one headteacher, it is crucial for the initiative project to be linked to the school improvement plan in order to be worthwhile, others also strongly believe this to be the case. The programme requirements ask participants to, wherever possible, link their initiative project to their school improvement plan.

“I was assistant headteacher at the time, worked with the Y3 cohort, a lot of staff turbulence (staff leaving) at the time and stepped in to take on that class ... We

had an Ofsted inspection at the time, the feedback of which also fed into the initiative project focus.”

Participant #1T South (both years)

A requirement of the programme is that the initiative project’s outcomes or outputs are measurable; both qualitative and quantitative methods are supported.

Some interviewees provided data on how pupil attainment has increased in numeracy or phonics as a result of the initiative project while others believe that, with time, positive outcomes will emerge. However, many respondents and headteachers are reluctant to attribute outcomes solely to the initiative project as many other projects and interventions are running concurrently and could influence pupils’ and the school outcomes in many ways. Further, in many cases they report that it is too early to measure or report impact.

Nevertheless, participants learning to analyse and use pupil attainment and other data is considered one of the most important outcomes from the initiative project. Headteachers report this being a key element for their schools with regard to developing the skills and expertise of the leadership team. Similarly, respondents report that actively engaging with data broadened their perspectives with regard to the importance of being able to interpret and act upon data to improve outcomes.

“It enabled them to address areas of responsibility more effectively, identify immediate needs and clarified thinking about how to achieve the results”

Headteacher #10H South (2nd year only)

Sustainability

For some respondents a key benefit of the programme is coaching and sharing learning which helps increase the sustainability of the learning.

For example, in one school, the participant who led an initiative project in phonics coached another teacher to take this on in order to implement another initiative project in numeracy.

“They’ve had to work with colleagues to coach and identify practice, which is sustainable”

Headteacher #29H North (both years)

This, however, was not the case in all schools. Instead, a headteacher states that:

“Writing and reading improved but [if the teacher left] we would lose expertise and a good teacher.”

Headteacher #8H North (both years)

Finally, there is the shared view that the training programme is designed to develop the leadership skills of participants so that they can develop and improve their practice to achieve better outcomes for pupils. As such, some respondents (programme participants and headteachers) consider sustainability to be independent of the project.

“Originally I wanted to progress towards head but doing the programme made me realise how much more there is to being a head, like all other skills needed for leadership, including paperwork, etc. I decided I wanted to keep the link with the children and not just the management side of things. If I hadn't done the course, I might have applied for something not suitable for me like deputy head”

Participant #6T North (both years)

“Very sustainable – what they've developed is leadership skills”

Headteacher #26H North (both years)

Impact on participants

Respondents report that the training programme increased their confidence in being leaders, citing the “inspirational” talks as helping with this. It gave them more awareness of different leadership styles, how to work effectively in a team and provide feedback to colleagues who are not performing as required. It gave them an awareness of how to change leadership styles to motivate people in different ways. They also report that it gave them time to think about how to manage different personalities within their teams.

“It gave me confidence to lead and put forward ideas in leadership meetings.”

Headteacher, Midlands, #21HT (2nd year only)

The programme provided participants with an important opportunity for “reflection”. It helped with better strategic thinking, looking beyond their own classrooms and thinking more about the overall management and direction of the school. This was helped to an extent by closer engagement with data; enabling them to develop data driven approaches to school improvement.

“Data interrogation was interesting. Not to do with teaching, but assessing. Identifying what was showing up red and what you do to address these areas of need.”

Participant #1T South (both years)

“We still take a child-centred approach but [the course] has helped me look at bigger issues”.

Participant #3T North (both years)

Many respondents mention that the training programme directly impacted on their career aspirations. For example, some report that before the programme they did not feel equipped to be a middle leader and they are now actively looking for a promotion.

“Made me convinced that I did want to go on to leadership”

Participant #21T Midlands (2nd year only)

For other respondents, the programme did not have an impact on their career aspirations as they would have aspired to other positions even if they had not participated in the programme.

A few respondents reported not wanting to progress into leadership as a result of the programme, instead preferring to specialise in other aspects of teaching (e.g. SEN roles).

Cost-effectiveness

The programme is generally considered to be good value for money. Some headteachers did not pay for it as the cost was covered by the MAT or subsidised in another way. Those headteachers who had to find the funds within their budget, thought it was relatively expensive compared with other training programmes⁵; however, they considered it money well spent given the high quality of the training, and as long as the right person went on it.

“On the face of it, it seems a lot of money... [we are] restricted by budget, but if it’s quality people [going on it] it will pay for itself, and I think it has.”

Headteacher #12H North (both years)

“The fact that the second year was free to the school also made a massive difference.”

Headteacher #18H North (both years)

The programme being cost-effective is caveated by headteachers as it would only be money well spent if participants stayed in their school, or at least another deprived

⁵ Participants’ schools are charged £1000 for the first year the participant is on the programme (whether they join in Year 1 or Year 2), equating to £500 per year if they complete both years of the programme.

school, rather than obtaining another position in a less deprived school, or worse, outside of teaching, afterwards.

Recommending the programme

Headteachers are generally pleased that their middle leaders have completed the programme and on the whole feel the quality to be high; many of those interviewed (both participants and headteachers) as part of this study felt that the second year was most appropriate for many participants.

The programme is targeted at “high potential” middle leaders. Headteachers interviewed explained the importance of ensuring active engagement of the middle leaders selected to participate in the programme. They are very careful of whom they select to participate in the programme, believing it to be only suitable for certain types of (highly motivated and committed) middle leaders who actively want to participate (rather than being told to).

A small number of headteachers believe that more than one middle leader from each school should participate in the programme as they can help support and encourage each other, given the commitment required.

In addition, headteachers mention the availability of other programmes which should be considered as they may be better suited for teachers depending on the stage in their career and career prospects.

Conclusion

Findings from interviews with respondents who have completed the HPML Primary programme and their corresponding headteachers suggest that the programme is considered to have a particularly positive impact on participants and their leadership skills, as well as their confidence. It gives participants a more strategic outlook so they can contribute to the overall management and direction of the school.

Respondents perceive the initiative project to be helpful, particularly learning how to use data to improve pupil outcomes.

Most respondents and headteachers felt it was too early for the programme to have had any measurable impact on pupil attainment at this stage, although some report that pupil attainment in numeracy or phonics has increased as a result of the initiative project.

Despite the cost of the programme being considered relatively high, both headteachers and respondents would recommend the programme to others, especially based on its high quality of speakers and the inspiration they have been able to instil (or rekindle) in participants.



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

© Ipsos MORI 2017

Reference: DFE- RR717a

ISBN: 978-1-78105-795-7

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

college.evaluation@education.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications