Stuart Hudson to fill new Senior Director role

He will join the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) on 25 November from Brunswick Group LLP, where he was a Partner advising clients on mergers and acquisitions, regulation and public policy matters.

Stuart brings with him a wealth of knowledge from past roles in Whitehall and the wider Civil Service, including as a Special Adviser at 10 Downing Street and Head of Government Affairs at Ofgem.

He will have overall responsibility for our strategy, external communications, devolved nations and English regions activity, working with our Director of Communications & Strategy and Director of UK Nations & Scotland.

Reporting directly to CEO Andrea Coscelli, Stuart will be a member of our Executive Committee and will attend Board meetings in an advisory capacity.

Published 16 October 2019

UK and Commonwealth Services of Remembrance in Poland 2019

In these Commonwealth Services we remember all those of the Commonwealth of Nations who gave their lives at sea, on land and in the air in two world wars.

We also remember the brave people of the Polish Armed Forces who fought and died here on their soil and abroad alongside their comrades from the Commonwealth.

- Poznań — Old Garrison Cemetery, Tuesday, 5 November 2019, 10:40am
- Malbork — Commonwealth War Cemetery, Wednesday, 6 November 2019, 10:40am
- Lidzbark Warmiński — Commonwealth War Cemetery, Thursday, 7 November 2019, 10:40am
- Warsaw — RAF Liberator Memorial Stone in Skaryszewski Park, Sunday, 10 November 2019, 10:40am
- Kraków — Commonwealth War Cemetery (Rakowicki Cemetery), Tuesday, 26 November 2019, 10:40am

---

HMCI commentary: the initial teacher education curriculum

Introduction

The education inspection framework (EIF) has been underway for over a month now. Although it's early days, first impressions are that it's been well received by the leaders and staff at the providers we've inspected so far. This is down in part to the hard work and quality of our inspectors. It's also down to the work we carried out ahead of the framework change, both through consultation with the sector and our extensive research and piloting programme. The EIF is the most evidence-based inspection framework that Ofsted has ever produced.

A change of approach in one area also means that we have to think about the link through to other areas we inspect. The EIF has implications for the inspection of initial teacher education (ITE) partnerships.

Aligning the EIF with a new ITE framework

The link between inspection of education settings and the inspection of ITE has always been clear. This is as it should be. The core purpose of teacher training is to make sure that trainee teachers, in all sectors, are prepared to a high professional standard for a career in teaching. The ITE experience must equip trainee teachers with the knowledge and skills to teach all children well, whatever their background or barriers to learning.

It should come as no surprise, therefore, that we are planning to align the EIF and a new ITE framework.

The case for change

Much like our previous education framework, the current ITE framework places a lot of emphasis on data. For example, it focuses on employment rates, completion rates and individual trainees' effectiveness. Consequently, inspectors have put relatively little weight on what trainees are taught or

how well the centre-based and school-based training is combined into a coherent package of learning. The reliance on other outcome measures may, therefore, cover up some kinds of weakness across partnerships, or even mask strengths.

The sector has also continued to diversify since this ITE framework began. Our [inspection outcomes data](#) shows that, although four-fifths of trainees are still training in university-led partnerships, only around a third of inspected partnerships were university-led routes. There has been a large increase in school-led routes opening since 2015. These tend to be relatively small institutions, taking, on average, 50 trainees a year. As we approach the end of the current cycle, it makes sense to look again at the ITE inspection framework to make sure we can apply it across a more diverse sector.

Finally, inspection practice needs to keep pace with sector developments to ensure a consistent approach and to avoid confusion for course leads, teacher trainers and trainees themselves. The Department for Education has a new recruitment and retention strategy and a commitment to reducing workload. It has also created the [Early career framework (ECF)](#) and is developing a new framework for ITE core content to align with the ECF. These developments are welcome and suggest that now is the right time to re-assess the ITE framework.

Our research in this area

However, given the differing contexts and institutions, we still need to ask:

- what does curriculum quality look like in ITE partnerships?
- how can we best evaluate it?

Our research team has been carrying out a 2-phase study over the course of this year to answer these 2 critical questions.

The first phase attempted to define important components of curriculum quality in an ITE context that we could use to build a testable research model. Findings from phase 1 are summarised below.

Phase 2 will involve fieldwork to establish how well this research model assesses curriculum quality across different types of ITE partnerships.

Identifying curriculum-quality criteria

The initial starting point for the study was our [research on curriculum in schools](#), which identified valid indicators of curriculum planning. We felt that these components would also be relevant in an ITE context. For instance, we would still expect curricular discussions between course leaders to take place on the sequencing, timing and depth of content, so that trainees' knowledge and skills of teaching are developed in a logical progression. However, we were also aware that, because of the structures of ITE partnerships and the needs of trainees, we would also need to identify curricular factors distinctive to ITE training programmes.

To help underpin the design of our research model, we commissioned a literature review from Sheffield Hallam University. We were looking for their review to establish:

- how ITE curriculums prepare trainees for their first years of in-service teaching
- potential best practice that we could use to develop the indicator design of our research model

A lack of references to the ITE curriculum

One of the more unexpected findings from Sheffield Hallam University's review was an absence of explicit references to 'ITE curriculum' within the research literature.

Instead, the research tended to look at different concepts related to ITE curriculum in isolation, rather than as a coherent whole. The authors could still extrapolate some useful features of ITE partnerships for our purposes.

However, the lack of detail in the literature of the broader aspects of curriculum remains interesting.

The consequence of this may be an unbalanced curriculum offer for trainees. For example, the review posits a curriculum model, aligned with the [Teachers' standards](), that provides coverage on 3 core aspects:

- learning to teach (generic pedagogy, including adaptive teaching and classroom management)
- learning to teach a subject (subject knowledge, subject pedagogies and curriculum)
- learning to be a teacher (professional behaviours and values)

However, the lack of overall discussion of ITE curriculum may mean that, in practice, these areas of learning are not always covered as deeply as they should be or that one aspect tends to take priority over the others. The time available on a course to cover all aspects, particularly in a single-year training course, is one possible explanation for this. An example of this is that some trainees are not fully prepared in understanding and applying effective practice for pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND). Curriculum balance, therefore, seems an important aspect of ITE curriculum that we need to investigate further.

Balance of theory and practice in the curriculum

The literature review also addresses similar issues around the balance of theory and practice in the curriculum.

The literature confirms that a joined-up approach to both classroom practice and theory is vital within an ITE curriculum. However, these links are not always explicitly made.

The review also touches on the responsibility that providers have for ensuring that trainees are well equipped for the classroom. Teacher educators

and mentors are just as important as the course content in ensuring curriculum quality, both from a practical classroom orientation but also in being able to link this back to relevant theory.

This suggests that we should consider better preparation and support for teacher educators and mentors as important factors of our quality model.

Our questionnaire for the sector

We also gathered views from the sector in the phase 1 research through a questionnaire in March and April 2019. This went to:

- course leaders (n=90)
- current trainees (n=468)
- newly qualified teachers (NQTs) (n=225)

This was to triangulate the evidence from the literature review with our previous curriculum work and our own internal knowledge of ITE. Because of the limitations of the questionnaire methodology, its purpose was not to provide an overview of the sector but to give us some assurance on the indicators we would test in phase 2.

Responses from leaders

Although the responses from course leaders revealed large variability in curriculum design across providers, we also identified a pattern that conformed to the literature review's account of curriculum balance.

The preference for courses of study to cater more towards one of the 3 domains specified in the review – learning to teach, learning to teach a subject, learning to be a teacher – was notable. In general, university-led partnerships tended to be more aligned to aspects of learning to teach a subject, whereas school-based partnerships focused more on learning to teach.

A few of the responses from leaders made it clear that, although one particular approach may be prioritised, the other domains were still largely threaded through the curriculum offer. For example, aspects of learning on behaviour management and inclusion were often specified as being embedded within a core focus of learning to teach a subject.

Other partnerships told us that curriculum progression starts with foundational pieces of knowledge for novices. In their view, this meant ensuring that trainees can 'cope and manage to know what they are teaching… and getting children to pay attention' before moving them on to thinking about better questioning and assessment practice.

We need to unpick this further in the fieldwork to determine how well curriculum balance and sequencing are sustained in practice.

Responses from trainees

Responses from some trainees, however, suggest that they experienced

curriculum imbalance. A few respondents clarified that:

> the course teaches you how to be a teacher, which is great, but not how to be a teacher of a specific subject.

Common areas in which trainees felt they would have benefited from greater coverage were:

- subject-specific pedagogy
- behaviour management
- the teaching of students with diverse needs (such as SEND)

In particular, some primary school trainees felt that they did not receive enough training on the foundation subjects. This reflects the findings from our curriculum research from last year. Respondents told us that this had resulted in gaps in their knowledge and had a real impact on their preparation to teach.

In general, the trainees and NQTs were positive about their overall training experience. Responding to a question about whether the training had prepared them sufficiently well to teach, 79% of trainees and 76% of NQTs agreed that this was the case. However, the inspection profile for the ITE sector currently shows that all inspected partnerships have been judged either good or outstanding for overall effectiveness. We will investigate the reasons for this divergence in more detail during the phase 2 fieldwork.

Inconsistencies in mentoring and placements

Many respondents identified the pastoral and learning support they had received – particularly from course leaders at the centre of a partnership – as having been especially important in allowing them to make progress through the course.

They also highlighted that mentors and professional tutors from trainee placements were important to the success or otherwise of their course. In the main, the respondents regarded them as being central to establishing how theory from the centre-based provision can be applied in practice, allowing trainees to develop competent teaching skills.

That said, inconsistency in the quality of mentors and placements, often across the same partnership, was a regular concern identified by those trainees who felt that they had received a poor training experience.

For some, the workload balance of the mentor was a mitigating factor. Other priorities could often creep into the time they had reserved for teacher training, affecting how well they could support the trainee.

In other cases, weak communication between the central provider and the placement school or setting meant that mentors did not always have the required information to support the learning needs of trainees. As a few trainees mentioned:

mentors seem unaware of the training needs (from the course) and tend to focus purely on the content of the next lesson coming up, rather than on practising teaching techniques (learned during course modules).

This suggests that ensuring that mentors and professional tutors have adequate training, resources and time to support may be an important factor for ensuring the delivery of a quality ITE curriculum.

Sequencing of trainees' knowledge and skills

The responses to the questionnaire also highlighted issues relating to trainees from the same partnership receiving a varied experience in subject knowledge pedagogy sessions. These differences in experience tended to be largely dependent on the subject area and the expertise of the teacher educators involved. Importantly, this suggests that curriculum quality may vary by subjects within the same provider.

Trainees were clear that they valued well-considered sequencing of the knowledge and skills to be learned across the theoretical and practical dimensions. When this was managed effectively, trainees reported that it improved their understanding of practical application with pupils and learners.

However, responses from the small minority of trainees who were negative about their teacher-training experience highlighted that the quality of the training was affected when the curriculum focus in centre-based training and expectations in placements were out of kilter. As a few trainees mentioned:

Assessment and lesson planning training have both been delivered too little and too late. It would be beneficial to receive this training prior to the second placement, especially when it comes to planning sequences of lessons.

This tended to affect university-based and school-based partnerships in slightly different ways.

Curriculum focus in school-based partnerships

Trainees were critical of a few school-based partnerships that were front-loading their courses with more theoretical or subject-based content.

That's not to say this curriculum model should be avoided, but in these cases, trainees explained that content was rarely re-visited during their placements when it would have been timely and relevant.

It was, therefore, difficult for these trainees to fully understand the purpose of their practice in a responsive way that met their learning needs. This meant they often felt underprepared to teach.

Curriculum focus in university-based partnerships

By comparison, in a few university-led partnerships, some trainees were concerned that their courses focused too heavily on theory and academic debate.

In their view, not enough attention was being given to the training of 'novice' teachers and what this implies. Often, the theory was irrelevant because the trainees were given little instruction on how it could be used in practice. As a few suggested:

> They were not targeted towards anything tangible, rather they were largely all discussion and opinion based which was not helpful all the time. It would have been nice to be shown as told things rather than it always having been an unstructured lesson.

The importance of quality assurance

In addition, in both the school-based and university-based partnerships, a small minority of trainees and NQTs felt that the teaching, curriculum and learning theories they had been exposed to were outdated. It is important that this content effectively supports trainees' progression into the early career framework, so this is also something we will explore in the next phase.

In both situations, this appeared to be further compounded by weak oversight of some partner schools and settings. A few trainees told us that school curriculum delivery often took precedence over their training needs, meaning that the link between theory and practice was rarely matched in a logical way.

Along with the evidence collected on mentors and professional tutors, we can infer from this that the quality assurance mechanisms across a partnership are likely to be an important feature of implementing an ITE curriculum effectively.

What next?

Overall, the evidence from phase 1 of the research has provided a good account of some of the things that appear to matter when it comes to identifying ITE curriculum quality and that will be essential areas of further investigation for the fieldwork.

These are:

- curriculum balance
- the sequencing of theory and practice
- mentor support and guidance
- the training of teacher educators
- the quality of communications between centre-based provision and

placements

This evidence has also contributed some ideas to the methodology for phase 2. Trainee and NQT responses to the questionnaire were particularly rich, which suggests that speaking to a range of trainees during the fieldwork may be an effective means for determining the quality of curriculum. This could move us neatly away from an over-reliance on employment and completion data when making accurate assessments of impact. Additionally, variation within the same partnership in how well some subjects and aspects are taught to trainees suggests that the model of the deep-dive process from the EIF is worth testing in an ITE context.

I am very encouraged by these initial findings. They put us on the right track for designing a model of inspection for ITE that reflects the increasing diversity of provision.

We will report on the further research of this model early in the new year to support the public consultation on the new ITE framework.

[Report 14/2019: Fatal accident involving a train passenger at Twerton](#)

PDF, 4.1MB, 35 pages

If you use assistive technology (such as a screen reader) and need a version of this document in a more accessible format, please email enquiries@raib.gov.uk. Please tell us what format you need. It will help us if you say what assistive technology you use.

Summary

At about 22:04 hrs on Saturday 1 December 2018 a passenger was leaning out of the window of a moving train when her head came into contact with a lineside tree branch near Twerton, a suburb of Bath. The passenger suffered fatal injuries. The train, a Great Western Railway service from London Paddington to Exeter St David's, was travelling at approximately 75 mph (120 km/h) at the time.

On the type of coach making up the train, opening windows are provided to allow passengers to reach through and operate the external door handles when the train is in a station. This is the only means by which passengers can open the train doors. However, other than warning signs, there is nothing to prevent passengers from opening and leaning out of such windows when trains are away from stations and moving. The accident occurred because the

passenger did this when branches from a lineside tree were in close proximity to the train.

A possible underlying factor was that Great Western Railway's risk assessment process had not historically identified the risk of passengers or staff being injured as a result of putting their heads out of windows on moving trains. Consequently, Great Western Railway had not provided adequate mitigation measures to protect against the risk.

Recommendations

The RAIB has made four recommendations and identified two learning points.

One recommendation is addressed to operators of mainline passenger trains, including charter operators, and seeks to minimise the likelihood of passengers leaning out of droplight windows when a train is away from stations. A second recommendation, is addressed to operators of heritage railways and seeks to improve their management of the risks associated with passengers leaning out vehicles.

The third recommendation is addressed to Great Western Railway and seeks to reduce the potential for hazards associated with its operations being overlooked.

The fourth recommendation is addressed to RSSB and seeks to ensure that its advice on emergency and safety signs reflects the level of risk associated with the hazard being mitigated.

The learning points reinforce the importance of undertaking regular tree inspections and the value of train operators having well briefed procedures for dealing with medical emergencies on board trains.

Notes to editors

1. The sole purpose of RAIB investigations is to prevent future accidents and incidents and improve railway safety. RAIB does not establish blame, liability or carry out prosecutions.
2. RAIB operates, as far as possible, in an open and transparent manner. While our investigations are completely independent of the railway industry, we do maintain close liaison with railway companies and if we discover matters that may affect the safety of the railway, we make sure that information about them is circulated to the right people as soon as possible, and certainly long before publication of our final report.
3. For media enquiries, please call 01932 440015.

Newsdate: 16 October 2019

[UK House Price Index for August 2019](#)

The August data shows:

- on average, house prices have risen by 0.8% since July 2019
- there has been an annual price rise of 1.3%, which makes the average property in the UK valued at £234,853

England

In England, the August data shows on average, house prices have risen by 0.8% since July 2019. The annual price rise of 1.1% takes the average property value to £251,233.

The regional data for England indicates that:

- the North East experienced the greatest monthly price rise, up by 3.1%
- London saw the most significant monthly price fall, down by 1.3%
- the North East experienced the greatest annual price rise, up by 3.3%
- London saw the largest annual price fall, down by 1.4%

Price change by region for England

Region	Average price August 2019	Monthly change % since July 2019
East Midlands	£197,682	1.8
East of England	£294,192	0.3
London	£472,753	-1.3
North East	£134,736	3.1
North West	£168,221	1.3
South East	£326,232	0.8
South West	£260,901	0.7
West Midlands	£201,510	1.5
Yorkshire and the Humber	£165,767	0.2

Repossession sales by volume for England

The lowest number of repossession sales in June 2019 was in the East of England.

The highest number of repossession sales in June 2019 was in the North West.

Repossession sales	June 2019
East Midlands	48
East of England	13
London	37
North East	104

Repossession sales	June 2019
North West	107
South East	40
South West	37
West Midlands	51
Yorkshire and The Humber	83
England	520

Average price by property type for England

Property type	August 2019	August 2018	Difference %
Detached	£386,466	£376,560	2.6
Semi-detached	£236,162	£231,992	1.8
Terraced	£204,062	£201,469	1.3
Flat/maisonette	£223,130	£228,736	-2.5
All	£251,233	£248,620	1.1

Funding and buyer status for England

Transaction type	Average price August 2019	Annual price change % since August 2018	Monthly price change % since July 2019
Cash	£236,098	0.8	0.8
Mortgage	£258,838	1.2	0.8
First-time buyer	£209,603	0.4	0.4
Former owner occupier	£286,692	1.6	1.3

Building status for England

Building status	Average price June 2019	Annual price change % since June 2018	Monthly price change % since May 2019
New build	£301,678	0.8	0.5
Existing resold property	£243,442	0.8	0.6

*Figures for the two most recent months are not being published because there are not enough new build transactions to give a meaningful result.

London

London shows, on average, house prices have fallen by 1.3% since July 2019. An annual price fall of 1.4% takes the average property value to £472,753.

Average price by property type for London

Property type	August 2019	August 2018	Difference %
Detached	£908,197	£912,509	-0.5

Property type	August 2019	August 2018	Difference %
Semi-detached	£579,593	£583,664	-0.7
Terraced	£503,279	£498,383	1.0
Flat/maisonette	£408,728	£420,693	-2.8
All	£472,753	£479,550	-1.4

Funding and buyer status for London

Transaction type	Average price August 2019	Annual price change % since August 2018	Monthly price change %since July 2019
Cash	£492,700	-2.4	-1.5
Mortgage	£466,491	-1.1	-1.3
First-time buyer	£411,720	-1.8	-1.4
Former owner occupier	£536,680	-0.9	-1.2

Building status for London

Building status*	Average price June 2019	Annual price change % since June 2018	Monthly price change % since May 2019
New build	£477,195	-3.0	1.1
Existing resold property	£471,747	-1.6	1.6

*Figures for the two most recent months are not being published because there are not enough new build transactions to give a meaningful result.

Wales

Wales shows, on average, house prices have risen by 2.3% since July 2019. An annual price rise of 4.5% takes the average property value to £168,318.

There were 38 repossession sales for Wales in June 2019.

Average price by property type for Wales

Property type	August 2019	August 2018	Difference %
Detached	£255,278	£242,125	5.4
Semi-detached	£162,226	£155,148	4.6
Terraced	£130,870	£125,188	4.5
Flat/maisonette	£115,782	£114,920	0.7
All	£168,318	£161,024	4.5

Funding and buyer status for Wales

Transaction type	Average price August 2019	Annual price change % since August 2018	Monthly price change % since July 2019

Transaction type	Average price August 2019	Annual price change % since August 2018	Monthly price change % since July 2019
Cash	£163,628	4.6	2.6
Mortgage	£171,094	4.5	2.1
First-time buyer	£144,961	4.1	2.0
Former owner occupier	£195,683	5.0	2.5

Building status for Wales

Building status*	Average price June 2019	Annual price change % since June 2018	Monthly price change % since May 2019
New build	£214,751	4.1	0.8
Existing resold property	£160,598	4.3	1.0

*Figures for the two most recent months are not being published because there are not enough new build transactions to give a meaningful result.

[Access the full UK HPI](#)

UK House Prices

UK house prices grew by 1.3% in the year to August 2019, up from 0.8% in July 2019.

The [UK Property Transaction Statistics for August 2019](#) showed that on a seasonally adjusted basis, the number of transactions on residential properties with a value of £40,000 or greater was 99,890. This is 0.9% higher than a year ago. Between July 2019 and August 2019, transactions increased by 15.8%.

House price growth was strongest in Wales where prices increased by 4.5% in the year to August 2019, up from 3.8% in the year to July 2019. The lowest annual growth was in London, where prices fell by 1.4% over the year to August 2019.

See the [economic statement.](#)

Background

1. The UK House Price Index (HPI) is published on the second or third Wednesday of each month with Northern Ireland figures updated quarterly. The September 2019 UK HPI will be published at 9.30am on Wednesday 13 November 2019. See [calendar of release dates](#).
2. We have made some changes to improve the accuracy of the UK HPI. We are not publishing average price and percentage change for new builds and existing resold property as done previously because there are not currently enough new build transactions to provide a reliable result. This means that in this month's UK HPI reports, new builds and existing

resold property are reported in line with the sales volumes currently available.

3. The UK HPI revision period has been extended to 13 months, following a review of the revision policy (see calculating the UK HPI section 4.4). This ensures the data used is more comprehensive.

4. Sales volume data is also available by property status (new build and existing property) and funding status (cash and mortgage) in our downloadable data tables. Transactions involving the creation of a new register, such as new builds, are more complex and require more time to process. Read revisions to the UK HPI data.

5. Revision tables have been introduced for England and Wales within the downloadable data. Tables will be available in csv format. See about the UK HPI for more information.

6. Data for the UK HPI is provided by HM Land Registry, Registers of Scotland, Land & Property Services/Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency and the Valuation Office Agency.

7. The UK HPI is calculated by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and Land & Property Services/Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency. It applies a hedonic regression model that uses the various sources of data on property price, in particular HM Land Registry's Price Paid Dataset, and attributes to produce estimates of the change in house prices each month. Find out more about the methodology used from the ONS and Northern Ireland Statistics & Research Agency.

8. The UK Property Transaction statistics are taken from HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC) monthly estimates of the number of residential and non-residential property transactions in the UK and its constituent countries. The number of property transactions in the UK is highly seasonal, with more activity in the summer months and less in the winter. This regular annual pattern can sometimes mask the underlying movements and trends in the data series so HMRC also presents the UK aggregate transaction figures on a seasonally adjusted basis. Adjustments are made for both the time of year and the construction of the calendar, including corrections for the position of Easter and the number of trading days in a particular month.

9. UK HPI seasonally adjusted series are calculated at regional and national levels only. See data tables.

10. The first estimate for new build average price (April 2016 report) was based on a small sample which can cause volatility. A three-month moving average has been applied to the latest estimate to remove some of this volatility.

11. Work has been taking place since 2014 to develop a single, official HPI that reflects the final transaction price for sales of residential property in the UK. Using the geometric mean, it covers purchases at market value for owner-occupation and buy-to-let, excluding those purchases not at market value (such as re-mortgages), where the 'price' represents a valuation.

12. Information on residential property transactions for England and Wales, collected as part of the official registration process, is provided by HM Land Registry for properties that are sold for full market value.

13. The HM Land Registry dataset contains the sale price of the property, the date when the sale was completed, full address details, the type of

property (detached, semi-detached, terraced or flat), if it is a newly built property or an established residential building and a variable to indicate if the property has been purchased as a financed transaction (using a mortgage) or as a non-financed transaction (cash purchase).

14. Repossession sales data is based on the number of transactions lodged with HM Land Registry by lenders exercising their power of sale.

15. For England, this is shown as volumes of repossession sales recorded by Government Office Region. For Wales, there is a headline figure for the number of repossession sales recorded in Wales.

16. The data can be downloaded as a .csv file. Repossession sales data prior to April 2016 is not available. Find out more information about [repossession sales](.).

17. Background tables of the raw and cleansed aggregated data, in Excel and CSV formats, are also published monthly although Northern Ireland is on a quarterly basis. They are available for free use and re-use under the Open Government Licence.

18. HM Land Registry's mission is to guarantee and protect property rights in England and Wales.

19. HM Land Registry is a government department created in 1862. It operates as an executive agency and a trading fund and its running costs are covered by the fees paid by the users of its services. Its ambition is to become the world's leading land registry for speed, simplicity and an open approach to data.

20. HM Land Registry safeguards land and property ownership worth in excess of £7 trillion, including over £1 trillion of mortgages. The Land Register contains more than 25 million titles showing evidence of ownership for some 86% of the land mass of England and Wales.

21. For further information about HM Land Registry visit www.gov.uk/land-registry

22. Follow us on [Twitter](.), our [blog](.), [LinkedIn](.) and [Facebook](.).