

Amanda Spielman at the Wellington Festival of Education

Good afternoon and thank you for inviting me once again to address this splendid festival. And I'm grateful too for the final slot of the day, after Lord Agnew, when I know I am pretty much guaranteed a good turnout!

Two years ago, I made my first speech at Wellington as Chief Inspector. From the beginning I was clear in my ambition for Ofsted and the direction I wanted us to take, during my tenure.

Taking on this role is a bit like taking on the role of Doctor Who. Each regenerated Chief Inspector has the same broad aim in mind, but we do have different ways of going about it. And it's worth noting that there are now women in both roles. I'll leave this thought with you, we've never been seen in the same place.

Back in 2017, I set out my priorities for Ofsted in my speech here.

I said that I wanted Ofsted to be seen as a force for improvement. I said that I wanted us to add real value to the education landscape, through our research work as well as through inspection, and to that end, I intended to strengthen our research function.

I said that I wanted us to focus on the curriculum, the substance of education. And I spoke about British values and the importance of schools bringing those values to life for the children who pass through their gates.

Now, two years on and at my half-way point, I want to reflect on the progress we have made and how we've been able both to contribute to and shape the debate around education issues. I would then like to consider some future challenges for our schools and young people, and how we collectively might evolve to meet them.

First then

How is Ofsted a force for improvement and what does improvement look like?

As the education inspectorate we're rarely loved, I'm not sure that any inspectorate is. It is our role to judge and to publish those judgements for all to see. There are those in the education world, and I'm sure in this room, who don't like it: but we remain the arbiter of quality in state education.

The four-point grading scale may not always find favour with schools, but it is proven, and it works. By that I mean it is readily understood by parents, it's workable (even allowing for the individuality of our inspectors) and it's seen as a best-practice model for inspectorates. The police and fire

inspectorate, the probation inspectorate and the Care Quality Commission are three of the inspectorates who assign the same grades as we do: outstanding, good, requires improvement and inadequate.

In our most recent parent survey, nine out of ten parents knew the grade of their child's school, college, nursery or childminder. That's quite a statistic.

Another impressive figure is the proportion of schools that are now rated as good or outstanding. Our most recent data tells us that 85% of all schools have reached that standard. That's a great testimony to the efforts made by everyone who works in schools across the country.

But it's only right to acknowledge that this success comes with caveats. As you will all know, current legislation doesn't allow us to inspect outstanding schools routinely.

That is undeniably problematic for us, for parents and for the schools themselves. Without some regular scrutiny, it's impossible to say whether an outstanding school is still hitting the same heights. And we know that when we do go back into outstanding schools, we often find that they are doing less well, even allowing for the fact that we are not visiting a random sample of outstanding schools.

This academic year, we have inspected more than 300 outstanding primary and secondary schools, about 8 per cent of the total number. Only 1 in 6 retained the top grade. That's concerning.

As we move into our new inspection regime it's only fair that we are able to test all schools against the same benchmark. It's certainly something that we're discussing with government.

So at one level, inspection itself, I think we have continued to be a force for improvement. But bald statistics are just one way of demonstrating progress. There are other ways we can make a positive impact.

Research

Our research function plays a couple of critical roles for us.

First, it allows us to add real value across education and social care. Cross-cutting research allows us to combine what we learn through inspections with new insight and fresh thinking.

For example, this year, we published our own research into knife crime in the context of London schools. The timing couldn't have been more tragically apposite. There have been over 30 fatal stabbings in London alone this year. And quite a number of the victims have been of school age.

As the media covered horrific cases, from the gang-related to the seemingly random, there has been demand from the public and politicians for something meaningful to be done.

In among many sensible suggestions, there was a worrying narrative that started to emerge around exclusions.

It is the sad truth, that there are children in schools, particularly those living difficult or chaotic lives, who are involved with gangs in their neighbourhoods. When these children are excluded, they take these gang connections with them into the next stage of their schooling. However, it started to become common currency that excluded children were turning to, or being turned on, to a gang lifestyle only after they were excluded.

As is often the case, this became caught up in the desire for a simple solution. A soundbite solution, that there should be no more exclusions. That we should turn off the tap for the gang recruiters, no longer send children to pupil referral units where they can be preyed on by the drug dealers and gang leaders.

Except that doesn't tally with what we see. Many PRUs are doing great work in very difficult circumstances. In some cases, they are turning young lives around and preparing young people not for a life of crime, but for a new chance to contribute and thrive.

And it's far better to be schooled in a PRU which is registered and inspected than end up in some of the poor examples of unregistered alternative provision that we highlighted earlier this year. Many of these places offer little in terms of education or support, many have serious health and safety issues and we estimate that as many as 6,000 children may be out of sight in unregistered, or illegal schools. Pupil Referral Units really are a much better bet for the children who might otherwise slip through the net of education.

I'm a realist though – and we know that the life chances for young people who are excluded are often limited, compared to those who remain in school. Exclusion should be a last resort, though it must be available to headteachers in extremis. Nobody should ever be a cheerleader for exclusion, but sometimes it's the only way to manage persistently unacceptable behaviour that threatens the education, or the safety of classmates. It must remain on the table.

Our [knife crime research](#) found no clear causal link between exclusion and knife crime. So we spoke out against the neat soundbites and we pressed local authorities, the police and other partners to include schools more readily in their existing partnerships to tackle knife crime and other kinds of serious youth violence. It wasn't radical thinking and it wasn't a silver bullet, but it was based on our research and on evidence.

A second role that our research function plays, is the gathering of [intelligence and insight to underpin the development of our inspection model](#). The curriculum research we carried out ahead of crafting the [new inspection framework](#), was crucial.

It underlined why we were right to concentrate on the curriculum in our thinking. We saw that, even in some very good schools, which were scoring

well at inspection, something was getting lost in terms of the curriculum.

We saw that years of over-emphasis on exam performance by a number of agencies, including Ofsted, were having a corrosive effect in some classrooms. This focus on performance had the unintended and unwanted effect of curricula being narrowed across the age groups.

For example, at key stage two, we saw the depressing impact of teaching to the test. Some primary schools are spending a disproportionate amount of time on maths and English, to the detriment of science – and indeed other humanities, arts and practical subjects, which were often lumped into rather nebulous topic work. That's not good preparation for life in year seven, when children should be ready to enjoy a wider menu of lessons – and have opportunities to tackle new challenges and wrestle with new ideas.

And all that for the SATs, which are fundamentally for the benefit of the school. I have nothing against the SATs per se, as tests they serve a purpose. But, as I have said before: it's wrong and unnecessary to ratchet up the pressure on young children as they approach them, when they ought to barely register they are being tested at all. And it's certainly a great waste of children's last year in primary school, if their curriculum experience is mostly limited to two subjects.

So the first challenge for us was to recognise the part we had played in creating this unwanted culture and to see what could be done to put the curriculum back at the heart of education. And the second challenge was to do that without undermining or reversing the very many improvements that we have seen over recent years. We really wanted to bring about a positive change carefully and responsibly. I hope we have succeeded.

Curriculum

Which brings me on to the curriculum and the changes we're making to the inspection framework.

I have spoken many times in recent months about the framework and what it means, so I don't want to talk about the nuts and bolts of it here. For those of you who hanker for detail, my colleagues Sean Harford, Matthew Purves and Paul Joyce will be speaking here tomorrow afternoon, so please do go along.

This is a good moment to stop and thank everyone, individuals and organisations, who has helped develop this new inspection model. Many thousands have contributed to a process that really has drawn on the full spectrum of expertise and insight from every quarter, and has helped to make this framework strong and valuable to parents and schools (and of course all other kinds of education provider) alike. For myself and all my colleagues, I can say that this has been an enriching experience.

But this afternoon, I would rather reflect on the shift that has happened since we started to talk meaningfully about the curriculum.

Three years ago, education discussions tended to linger not on what was

taught, but on how it was taught. Debates on pedagogy raged, and for many, where you stood on the traditionalist or progressive debate defined your character forever more.

Now though, the curriculum is the hot topic. There are any number of sessions here at Wellington discussing what a strong curriculum should look like. And that reflects many discussions that are going on across education publications and online as well as in schools. And rather than seeing the curriculum focus as a challenge, it seems that many school leaders and teachers alike are energised by the opportunity to think harder about what they teach as well as how they teach it.

I see that as an example of the soft power that Ofsted undoubtedly wields. Inspection is often seen, wrongly in our view, as something of a big stick. But, incorrect or not, the perception that you carry a big stick, as Roosevelt observed, does mean people will listen to you.

Above everything else we have achieved over the past few years, prompting a resurgence of interest in a strong curriculum and a rigorous debate about what children should learn, has been the most satisfying. And I hope it will have a lasting impact on education and on the lives of the children who are currently passing through school.

British values

I also talked about British values in my 2017 speech, about the importance of embedding them within the wider curriculum. And I spoke about the need for a true civic education. Both of those remain just as true today. It's so important that all these values are taught, understood and lived. None of them is an easy concept for young people to grasp, and none of them is as universally recognised as we might like to think. They don't just rub off on children without ever being taught. School is how and where we make sure that every young British citizen ends up with the same level of understanding.

I'm not going to put you on the spot and ask you to tell me the four British values that are particularly referenced by DfE: instead I'll remind you that they are: democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs. And they are each being tested by a combination of events and social changes.

While I am not one of the siren voices claiming that democracy is under some sort of existential threat, it's true to say that it's not in rude health at present.

The rule of law does remain a clear bedrock for society at large. However, equalities law is clearly coming under strain, especially where some of the different rights that we value and protect in law bump into each other.

I have spoken recently about the protests at some primary schools over the teaching of relationships education that includes some recognition of same sex relationships. I have been very clear that the laws of the land don't allow us to pick and choose which protected characteristic under the Equality

Act we actually want to protect.

We are a highly diverse country. We place equal legal value on the rights of women, equality of opportunity for people with disabilities, and on respect for people of different race, religion, or sexual orientation.

There is no hierarchy in the legislation, but with so many deeply entrenched positions there can be a tendency for 'cause wars', as in 'all characteristics may be equal, but my characteristic is more equal than others'. Different groups often view the concept of tolerance and respect through their own particular lens.

Within schools, we're starting to see how damaging it can be to have this sort of self-determination of what 'acceptable', 'tolerant' and 'respectful' looks like. It thwarts attempts to reach the kind of consensus between schools and parents that is so important.

More generally, in education we often talk about preparing young people for life in modern Britain. We certainly use the phrase a good deal at Ofsted. It runs through a lot of what we're about as an organisation because it neatly encapsulates one of the important roles of education.

Because education is about a lot of things: it's about the acquisition of knowledge, for its own sake, it's about the broadening of horizons through that knowledge, it's about the development of the skills needed to make a success of adult life, it's also about socialisation, encouraging harmony between different people, and it's about the advancement of civilisation.

Education pioneers across the world knew this as they began to formalise state education systems. The founders of the common school movement in the United States in the 19th century wanted to mould fine upstanding citizens of the Republic, as much as they wanted to instil knowledge and a habit of reading and learning. Preparing children for life in 19th century America, if you will.

More recently, conversations with our Ofsted counterparts from France, Sweden and the Netherlands have showed us how the same debates are echoed in other countries.

So it's important to have this sort of wider thinking in mind, when considering what preparing young people for life in modern Britain really means.

The phrase is often used about the role of schools in teaching children to respect people who may be different from them.

That is certainly part of the aim, but it would be wrong to narrow the work down to a discussion about equalities, or even about wider British Values.

We need to consider the influences and interactions that Britain and the wider world bring to bear on a modern child.

The range of influences on children has changed out of all recognition in the

last couple of generations. Children's consumption of information is very different, and the context provided by the world around them is different too.

Starting with the last point: in recent years we have watched the fragmentation of the traditional political tribes, not just here, but across the world. We have seen the rise of single-issue campaigns and campaigners.

Looking at the world through a single lens can lead us to lose sight of the bigger picture. Complexity is shunned and political discourse narrows and becomes more polarised.

Of course, simplicity is not of itself a bad thing. Simple narratives are the gold standard in politics, they help connect otherwise disengaged voters with the complicated world of statecraft. They achieve cut through and there are some parallels here with teaching: making the complex understandable and bringing dry facts to life.

But what we increasingly see is not a simple narrative, but a simplistic one that isn't good for anyone. A narrative in which the world's problems have a single, neat solution, where scapegoats abound and critics are seen as the enemy, to be discredited, discounted or disowned.

There is an anti-education narrative in this as well. 'The elites can't be trusted. The educated may have learned a lot in their ivory towers and among their dreaming spires, but they'll never understand the real world.'

Narrowing and polarising is happening on many fronts. We see universities coming under pressure to withdraw invitations to speakers that the student body decides it cannot abide.

And pressure groups are not always political in the traditional sense. Recently there have been at least two instances where schools have faced fierce protests from animal rights and vegan protestors, for raising animals on school grounds and encouraging the children to learn about, and be involved in, their care. The objectors were outraged because those animals would in time be slaughtered to provide meat for the school canteen.

It's relatively easy in the modern world to build a considerable head of steam from a single-issue campaign. The ubiquity of social media, makes it a matter of a few clicks to sign up to the latest cause, add your name to a rapidly-growing petition, or spread the word about the next protest march.

In education, there are often sophisticated campaigns that seek to add topics to the curriculum and quickly garner support. The media is awash with stories inspired by these campaigns and the list of things that schools 'really must cover' grows: sleep lessons, farming, first aid, online relationships, sign language and gardening are among the list of suggestions in recent months.

I'm certainly not saying that these ideas lack merit, but they highlight a wider point about the role of schools. It's something we have raised concerns about.

The role of schools

For every new responsibility that gets loaded on to schools, something has to give. Curriculum planning is a challenging job and we are encouraging schools to strike the right balance between different subjects. Adding the latest hot topic can result in a trade off, something with potentially wider merit for young people being squeezed out. Schools have a finite amount of time to educate and so what we demand of them must be manageable.

We had calls from a number of campaign groups to add additional checks into the inspection framework. Again, many of them sounded perfectly reasonable, until you stop to think about the practicalities and the kinds of specialist expertise that would be required to do them justice. Not to mention what a long list of new checks would do to the time it takes to carry out an inspection.

And we are already accustomed to balancing many expectations within inspection. But we don't come under as much pressure as some schools. We know that some schools have had campaigners intimidating them to prevent certain lessons from being taught or to bring about changes in schools, and leaning on parents to give the impression of a united front, in order to close down debate. That cannot be allowed to stand.

In our pluralistic society, we are seeing a worrying trend towards an intolerance of different opinions and attitudes. And what characterises this new single-issue reality, is confrontation. If you fervently believe in one simplistic answer to all the world's problems, then it follows that all other solutions and actions are wrong. Debate is shouted down.

And nowhere is it shouted down more, than on social media.

For many years, when we have discussed the need to prepare children for life in a digital world, we have focused on developing the skills required by a modern, digital workforce. In more recent times, as the darker side of the online world has started to affect young people in terrible ways, through bullying, grooming or child abuse, there has rightly been an increasing effort to educate children about online safety.

But there's more to equipping children for their online life than teaching them how to avoid the predators and the dangers that undoubtedly exist. In an online world that mirrors and reinforces the simplistic narratives and aggressive campaigning that we see elsewhere, there is a need for intellectual rigour and knowledge too.

It's no exaggeration to say that young people now grow up online. In 2017, Ofcom reported that half of all 11 and 12 years olds had a social media profile, despite the minimum age on all major platforms being 13. And 2017 was two years ago, a long time when you consider that Facebook and Twitter are barely teenagers themselves.

Some studies suggest that children are very good at spotting 'fake news' and are more inherently untrusting of online sources of information than some

older people. But 'fake news', of the malevolent foreign government variety, is just part of a wider issue.

As children grow up they are influenced above all else by their friends and peers. And that is true online. They see what their friends share with them, both of themselves and of the wider world. To a great extent, their online lives are curated for them by their friends, creating an echo chamber. This is reinforced by the algorithms of social media platforms, directing advertising and content that is likely to chime with their existing likes and opinions.

Knowledge is the answer

What is taught in schools takes on even more importance if the wider influences on young people are too often simplistic, over curated or fake. It's an important answer to those who say that school classrooms are not the right place for children to learn about same-sex relationships. Parents may want to shelter their children from the truths, half-truths and lies that exist in the wider world, but the same will not always be true of their peers. Isn't it better to learn about the world from a reputable teacher, than from their friends in school playgrounds, or online?

The importance of a strong curriculum lies in its ability to broaden and strengthen the minds of young people.

Knowledge is a key component when preparing young people for life in modern Britain. It's not just about schooling children to spot things that are fake, it's about teaching them what's real.

In a world where children (and adults for that matter) are being told that the answer to all the world's problems is simple: build a wall, destroy capitalism, prevent immigration, cancel Brexit, carry out Brexit, it falls to schools to broaden their outlook, not narrow it.

A wide, rich curriculum, well taught, arms children with knowledge. That knowledge allows them to contribute to discussions about the world around them and the issues faced by society. It enables them to look again at what they are told is the 'truth' and challenge it where appropriate, not just parrot the latest lazy narrative, or conspiracy theory.

And for teachers, the challenge is to cut through the noise that assails young people on all sides and make knowledge even more seductive and compelling. Well-informed children are resilient children.

Developing an engaging and rich curriculum, imparting knowledge, encouraging a healthily critical eye and instilling strong values will turn out the rounded and resilient citizens of the future. This country needs them.

Thank you

Government convenes latest Honda Swindon Task Force

- Task Force discussed support for Honda workers, the supply chain, and the future of site
- Group also agrees future priorities to secure continued economic growth of Swindon

Business Secretary Greg Clark convened the latest meeting, 19th June, of the Honda Swindon Task Force bringing together civic leaders, local partners and MP's, Honda, Unite the Union, sector representatives and leading government officials.

Meeting in Swindon, the Task Force reviewed ongoing work of the group and agreed further priorities and work.

These included – matching the highly sought after skills of the workforce to local opportunities; support for the supply chain; future opportunities for the site; and Swindon's continued economic growth. Honda also confirmed its commitment to support the next phase of the work of the group.

During the meeting, Greg Clark reiterated the Government's commitment to growing the competitiveness of the automotive sector and its supply chain, as well as supporting suppliers and workers to identify new opportunities. The Task Force will continue to meet on a regular basis.

Business Secretary Greg Clark said:

Honda's decision to close manufacturing operations in Swindon was clearly not the news we hoped for – and came despite the best efforts of everyone to keep the site open for the long-term.

I have been struck by the resilience, commitment and hard work of Honda's talented workforce and the local community.

Swindon is a great place to invest and create high-skilled jobs, and our Task Force will continue to support this, ensuring that Honda workers and suppliers are supported and able to seize new opportunities now and in the future.

DfT's role in shaping the future of the railway

Good morning everyone.

I'm delighted to join you all today (19 June 2019).

This is quite an unusual engagement for me.

We permanent secretaries are shy folk who usually prefer to stay in the shadows.

Occasionally emerging blinking into the spotlight to be grilled by MPs and select committees.

Or as I do today, to offer a perspective from their department.

I'm afraid I won't be offering any predictions today about the strange drama that is British politics.

Except to say that whatever happens, I will continue to make the case for rail investment together with my team.

Including for the long-term certainty that is so important to the supply chain.

Like many of you I regularly read Rail Magazine.

While I am probably not as excited as some Rail Magazine aficionados by photos of trains, I know that it's essential reading in the industry.

And it's always interesting to catch up with Nigel's opinion pieces.

But much as I respect his views, I don't always agree with them.

Of course it's part of my job to take criticism about the Department for Transport on the chin.

I've done quite a bit of that.

But I hope that Nigel will forgive me for challenging some commentary which has questioned the abilities of colleagues in my department. Suggesting that they lack 'competences' and 'skills'.

Which couldn't be further from the truth. I am extremely proud of the commitment, professionalism and dedication of people who work for the department.

I count myself lucky to have such a fantastic team, focussed on achieving excellence across every aspect of the rail network. Many of the civil servants in DfT have deep rail industry expertise. And I believe that many of you in the industry share this respect for my colleagues.

I've also been intrigued on one or two occasions, to see that Nigel has even ventured some insight on what I think about the Keith Williams review, and the role of my department.

So I thought this might be a good opportunity to speak for myself.

And maybe set the record straight about how we in DfT see our job in helping to guide and protect the future of the railway.

I also want to highlight the importance of collaboration between government and industry in rebuilding performance, trust and confidence in the rail industry.

But let me start by turning the clock back almost 4 years to the moment I became Director General for Rail at the DfT in 2015.

We were then, as often in rail, in a moment of crisis – in this case, dealing with the unravelling of Network Rail's electrification programme.

Two things struck me most forcibly about the railway at the time.

First, although I had worked in many hotly contested areas of government, I hadn't quite appreciated the strength of feeling I would encounter.

From people in the industry passionate about the railway.

From passengers who often seem to love and hate the railway in equal measure.

From businesses who rely on the railway.

From friends, family and random strangers at social events

And of course from politicians, MPs and local leaders for whom better rail services are critical to the people they serve.

So railway is never far from the political debate. And certainly not now.

Of course people should care about the railway, because of the crucial contribution it makes to our economy, to the lives of millions of people, to our environment, to the quality of our cities and communities, and to how well our nation is connected.

But it also means when things go wrong – as they have all too publicly over the past couple of years – that debate can become polarised, overshadowing all the good things that the industry has achieved.

Including the impressive fact that we have one of the most well used and safest rail networks in the world, despite also having some of the oldest infrastructure.

My first engagement as Director General for Rail was attending the opening of New Street Station in Birmingham – a transformational project in my home city.

Last year saw London Bridge Station unveiled at last.

And tens of thousands of people now enjoy better trains and services – including on Thameslink, GWR, and LNER every day.

The culmination of years of investment and industry effort.

But even though these and many other achievements are rightly celebrated in the pages of Rail Magazine, the story in our national media is very different.

Here, only bad news can be relied upon to make the national headlines.

Sometimes justified, of course – passengers have every right to demand more reliable performance.

But sometimes stoking the narrative of an industry in turmoil.

The second thing that struck me was the extraordinarily long reach that the government and the Department for Transport has into the operational management of the railway.

In those early months as Director General, much of our focus was on issues which were rightly a matter for government attention.

Major strategic decisions about public investment in rail.

What our priorities for investment should be.

And how could we ensure that Network Rail was set up to deliver these priorities.

But if these were the type of questions you'd expect us to be considering, there were others which took me by surprise.

I was amazed to find myself presiding over discussions about what colour to paint the trains. Pages of analysis assessing whether to paint the IEP trains destined for GWR grey or green.

Decisions on detailed stopping patterns for particular services around the country.

And ministerial meetings debating whether rolling stock on certain routes should have flip-back tables or not.

Now the people working in the department's rail team care profoundly about the quality of rail services delivered for passengers and the public.

They do an excellent job in often very demanding circumstances operating within a system which requires many decisions, both great and small, to be

made by ministers.

And as I have said, I am proud of what they do.

But I believed then, and I believe today, that when Whitehall is so deeply immersed in the minutiae of delivery, it stifles the innovation we would normally expect the private sector to provide, and disempowers the very people outside central government who are paid to do that same work.

While also undermining the accountability of the industry to passengers.

In what other sector would you find a service provider responding to customer criticism about the comfort of their seating by stating this was a requirement of central government?

This is at the heart of what needs to be addressed by the [Williams Review](#).

But please don't misinterpret this as a comment on public or private ownership within rail.

That's largely irrelevant to this discussion.

Whatever system we use to run the industry. Whether services are operated by franchises or the state, locally or nationally, I do not believe that it makes sense for civil servants in London to make detailed decisions regarding the specification of rail services across the country.

I've mentioned these examples to illustrate a wider point.

That in contrast to some of the speculation I read about my team at the DfT.

We are far from wedded to the status quo.

We recognise that the current system has serious flaws.

So if anyone is wondering whether there's an appetite for change within the department, to find better ways to make decisions, to reduce fragmentation and encourage better local delivery, I can tell you, the answer is a resounding 'yes'.

Far from being resistant to proposals to make the industry work better, we welcome them.

It's why the Secretary of State asked Keith to do this work, with my enthusiastic support.

Though it's also important to recognise that government commitment will be only a part of the solution.

Lasting reform can only be successful when there is genuine and extensive engagement with the people most affected.

Including passengers, freight users, rail employees, and those in the industry who make decisions.

So I am hugely supportive of the way in which Keith Williams has gone about his work.

Of course, it would be wrong for me to pre-empt or second guess Keith's recommendations – or the subsequent decisions that the Secretary of State and ministers, current and future, will take.

I'll leave the speculation to newspapers.

But I do have views on the necessary conditions that should be in place if any industry restructure is to prove enduring and successful – including any reform to the department itself.

First, however the railway is reorganised, the government and ministers of the day must continue to be responsible for key strategic decisions.

This must include how much public investment can be afforded.

How trade-offs are to be made between investment options.

And how the legislative and regulatory framework should evolve to serve the best interests of passengers, freight, the wider economy and the public.

There are clearly important choices to be made here.

About where to draw the line in defining which decisions should be taken by ministers, and which should be delegated to others.

Including regional and local government leaders, the rail industry, independent public bodies, and regulators.

But ultimately, the government will continue to play a critical role in the railway.

And so my department must play a key role too – but in partnership with those who are entrusted to run the network.

Second, accountability and responsibilities must be clear, and easily understood by everyone across the system.

[Stephen Glaister's excellent dissection of the May 2018 rail timetable chaos](#) demonstrated what happens when there's a lack of clarity about who owns system-wide risks.

On the other hand, while I've learned there are lots of different opinions on why the Strategic Rail Authority failed, a common theme is that it overstepped its authority.

What's obvious is that this time, we have to get it right.

Clarity of accountability. Which is fully transparent to users and funders of the railway.

And preferably to the wider public too.

So passengers need to know who is in charge and how they can seek redress.

Combined with political accountability where it is needed. But not political micromanagement.

But of course, if the DfT steps back, the rail industry must be ready to step forward and deliver the quality of service the public expects and deserves, along with value for money, a continuous commitment to innovate for the customer and a willingness to demonstrate its responsibilities to communities and wider society.

And to own the tough decisions that all of this entails.

Third, however we structure the railway, fragmentation and interfaces will remain, so we need strong incentives to promote collaboration in the interests of users.

Fourth, Any plan for reform must be credible and realistic.

And must take with it the people on whose hard work the future of the railway depends.

And fifth, as this will take time, and patience is already running out, we must find ways to improve the railway in the meantime – as Andrew Haines is doing at Network Rail, by moving decision-making to the regional level, by boosting partnerships between local communities and stakeholders, train companies and infrastructure managers and by strengthening timetable planning, which is so central to the railway delivering on its promises to customers.

There is of course a risk, of which I know Keith is acutely aware, that his review focusses on structural changes which fascinate many in the industry, but are a huge turn-off for passengers and the public.

So it's vital that whatever emerges puts passengers, and rebuilding public trust in the railway, front and centre.

And I hope too that he can take a fresh look at some of the outdated systems and practices which have acted as a barrier to progress in the past.

We need to see more rapid technology-led change on basics like smart ticketing.

And some deeply ingrained aspects of railway culture that are holding it back.

For me, one of the biggest challenges is to transform the way the railway approaches recruitment and progression, to get people from every background joining the industry, and thriving in a variety of roles, from junior positions to the boardroom, so the railway workforce starts to reflect its customer base and the diversity of the communities it serves.

I really hope Keith Williams will propose recommendations in this area too.

Like collecting better data on women and other underrepresented groups in the industry.

Benchmarking the sector against the best of the rest.

Reaching out to a new generation.

Modernising working practices.

And tackling the pay gap.

And I hope the industry will step forward and show a determination to act.

I recently heard a respected commentator not a million miles from this stage ask when the government would give control back to 'the railwaymen'.

A small slip, but a telling one.

I expected to find myself addressing an overwhelmingly male audience today. And guess what – I am.

Too many women, too often in this industry, will find themselves the only female in a meeting or a room or a team.

And whilst some will relish that challenge, we shouldn't be surprised if others decide to make a career elsewhere.

If the rail industry is to attract the talent it needs to drive the modernisation that the public wants to see, this must change.

There is, of course, some great work going on this front.

Improving diversity is at the heart of the Rail Sector Deal.

I know the [RDG](#) and many of the businesses and organisations represented here have great programmes.

It was good to see Aslef calling for more diversity among train drivers on Monday.

But I'd love to hear every industry leader championing diversity with the same energy and passion which they invest in debating the Williams Review.

And with a firm commitment to ensure rail's workforce and management reflects the customers and communities it serves.

And that includes the DfT.

While I'm pleased we've made progress, Rail Group still has fewer senior women than any other part of my department.

So we must do our bit too.

Before I finish, let me say that I don't think any of the points I've made

today are particularly controversial or radical.

I'm confident they are well understood by Keith and his expert panel.

Identifying a solution that the government, industry, employees and public can rally around will be harder.

Implementing it, harder still.

So I don't underestimate for one moment the challenges ahead for ministers, my department or the industry.

But I believe that if we can take the review forward in a spirit of collaboration, not treat it as a power struggle.

We have a chance to make a real change for the better.

Change that will not only benefit passengers, freight users and the industry.

But the supply chain too.

Allowing it to seize the opportunities that will flow from a stable and flourishing rail sector.

We've seen scores of rail reviews over the years.

Many of which have left only a modest imprint on the industry.

So I hope that this time we can bring about change for the better.

And deliver the performance, investment, confidence and trust in the railway we all want to see.

Thank you.

[DfT's role in shaping the future of the railway](#)

Good morning everyone.

I'm delighted to join you all today (19 June 2019).

This is quite an unusual engagement for me.

We permanent secretaries are shy folk who usually prefer to stay in the shadows.

Occasionally emerging blinking into the spotlight to be grilled by MPs and

select committees.

Or as I do today, to offer a perspective from their department.

I'm afraid I won't be offering any predictions today about the strange drama that is British politics.

Except to say that whatever happens, I will continue to make the case for rail investment together with my team.

Including for the long-term certainty that is so important to the supply chain.

Like many of you I regularly read Rail Magazine.

While I am probably not as excited as some Rail Magazine aficionados by photos of trains, I know that it's essential reading in the industry.

And it's always interesting to catch up with Nigel's opinion pieces.

But much as I respect his views, I don't always agree with them.

Of course it's part of my job to take criticism about the Department for Transport on the chin.

I've done quite a bit of that.

But I hope that Nigel will forgive me for challenging some commentary which has questioned the abilities of colleagues in my department. Suggesting that they lack 'competences' and 'skills'.

Which couldn't be further from the truth. I am extremely proud of the commitment, professionalism and dedication of people who work for the department.

I count myself lucky to have such a fantastic team, focussed on achieving excellence across every aspect of the rail network. Many of the civil servants in DfT have deep rail industry expertise. And I believe that many of you in the industry share this respect for my colleagues.

I've also been intrigued on one or two occasions, to see that Nigel has even ventured some insight on what I think about the Keith Williams review, and the role of my department.

So I thought this might be a good opportunity to speak for myself.

And maybe set the record straight about how we in DfT see our job in helping to guide and protect the future of the railway.

I also want to highlight the importance of collaboration between government and industry in rebuilding performance, trust and confidence in the rail industry.

But let me start by turning the clock back almost 4 years to the moment I became Director General for Rail at the DfT in 2015.

We were then, as often in rail, in a moment of crisis – in this case, dealing with the unravelling of Network Rail's electrification programme.

Two things struck me most forcibly about the railway at the time.

First, although I had worked in many hotly contested areas of government, I hadn't quite appreciated the strength of feeling I would encounter.

From people in the industry passionate about the railway.

From passengers who often seem to love and hate the railway in equal measure.

From businesses who rely on the railway.

From friends, family and random strangers at social events

And of course from politicians, MPs and local leaders for whom better rail services are critical to the people they serve.

So railway is never far from the political debate. And certainly not now.

Of course people should care about the railway, because of the crucial contribution it makes to our economy, to the lives of millions of people, to our environment, to the quality of our cities and communities, and to how well our nation is connected.

But it also means when things go wrong – as they have all too publicly over the past couple of years – that debate can become polarised, overshadowing all the good things that the industry has achieved.

Including the impressive fact that we have one of the most well used and safest rail networks in the world, despite also having some of the oldest infrastructure.

My first engagement as Director General for Rail was attending the opening of New Street Station in Birmingham – a transformational project in my home city.

Last year saw London Bridge Station unveiled at last.

And tens of thousands of people now enjoy better trains and services – including on Thameslink, GWR, and LNER every day.

The culmination of years of investment and industry effort.

But even though these and many other achievements are rightly celebrated in the pages of Rail Magazine, the story in our national media is very different.

Here, only bad news can be relied upon to make the national headlines.

Sometimes justified, of course – passengers have every right to demand more reliable performance.

But sometimes stoking the narrative of an industry in turmoil.

The second thing that struck me was the extraordinarily long reach that the government and the Department for Transport has into the operational management of the railway.

In those early months as Director General, much of our focus was on issues which were rightly a matter for government attention.

Major strategic decisions about public investment in rail.

What our priorities for investment should be.

And how could we ensure that Network Rail was set up to deliver these priorities.

But if these were the type of questions you'd expect us to be considering, there were others which took me by surprise.

I was amazed to find myself presiding over discussions about what colour to paint the trains. Pages of analysis assessing whether to paint the IEP trains destined for GWR grey or green.

Decisions on detailed stopping patterns for particular services around the country.

And ministerial meetings debating whether rolling stock on certain routes should have flip-back tables or not.

Now the people working in the department's rail team care profoundly about the quality of rail services delivered for passengers and the public.

They do an excellent job in often very demanding circumstances operating within a system which requires many decisions, both great and small, to be made by ministers.

And as I have said, I am proud of what they do.

But I believed then, and I believe today, that when Whitehall is so deeply immersed in the minutiae of delivery, it stifles the innovation we would normally expect the private sector to provide, and disempowers the very people outside central government who are paid to do that same work.

While also undermining the accountability of the industry to passengers.

In what other sector would you find a service provider responding to customer criticism about the comfort of their seating by stating this was a requirement of central government?

This is at the heart of what needs to be addressed by the [Williams Review](#).

But please don't misinterpret this as a comment on public or private ownership within rail.

That's largely irrelevant to this discussion.

Whatever system we use to run the industry. Whether services are operated by franchises or the state, locally or nationally, I do not believe that it makes sense for civil servants in London to make detailed decisions regarding the specification of rail services across the country.

I've mentioned these examples to illustrate a wider point.

That in contrast to some of the speculation I read about my team at the DfT.

We are far from wedded to the status quo.

We recognise that the current system has serious flaws.

So if anyone is wondering whether there's an appetite for change within the department, to find better ways to make decisions, to reduce fragmentation and encourage better local delivery, I can tell you, the answer is a resounding 'yes'.

Far from being resistant to proposals to make the industry work better, we welcome them.

It's why the Secretary of State asked Keith to do this work, with my enthusiastic support.

Though it's also important to recognise that government commitment will be only a part of the solution.

Lasting reform can only be successful when there is genuine and extensive engagement with the people most affected.

Including passengers, freight users, rail employees, and those in the industry who make decisions.

So I am hugely supportive of the way in which Keith Williams has gone about his work.

Of course, it would be wrong for me to pre-empt or second guess Keith's recommendations – or the subsequent decisions that the Secretary of State and ministers, current and future, will take.

I'll leave the speculation to newspapers.

But I do have views on the necessary conditions that should be in place if any industry restructure is to prove enduring and successful – including any reform to the department itself.

First, however the railway is reorganised, the government and ministers of the day must continue to be responsible for key strategic decisions.

This must include how much public investment can be afforded.

How trade-offs are to be made between investment options.

And how the legislative and regulatory framework should evolve to serve the best interests of passengers, freight, the wider economy and the public.

There are clearly important choices to be made here.

About where to draw the line in defining which decisions should be taken by ministers, and which should be delegated to others.

Including regional and local government leaders, the rail industry, independent public bodies, and regulators.

But ultimately, the government will continue to play a critical role in the railway.

And so my department must play a key role too – but in partnership with those who are entrusted to run the network.

Second, accountability and responsibilities must be clear, and easily understood by everyone across the system.

[Stephen Glaister's excellent dissection of the May 2018 rail timetable chaos](#) demonstrated what happens when there's a lack of clarity about who owns system-wide risks.

On the other hand, while I've learned there are lots of different opinions on why the Strategic Rail Authority failed, a common theme is that it overstepped its authority.

What's obvious is that this time, we have to get it right.

Clarity of accountability. Which is fully transparent to users and funders of the railway.

And preferably to the wider public too.

So passengers need to know who is in charge and how they can seek redress.

Combined with political accountability where it is needed. But not political micromanagement.

But of course, if the DfT steps back, the rail industry must be ready to step forward and deliver the quality of service the public expects and deserves, along with value for money, a continuous commitment to innovate for the customer and a willingness to demonstrate its responsibilities to communities and wider society.

And to own the tough decisions that all of this entails.

Third, however we structure the railway, fragmentation and interfaces will remain, so we need strong incentives to promote collaboration in the

interests of users.

Fourth, Any plan for reform must be credible and realistic.

And must take with it the people on whose hard work the future of the railway depends.

And fifth, as this will take time, and patience is already running out, we must find ways to improve the railway in the meantime – as Andrew Haines is doing at Network Rail, by moving decision-making to the regional level, by boosting partnerships between local communities and stakeholders, train companies and infrastructure managers and by strengthening timetable planning, which is so central to the railway delivering on its promises to customers.

There is of course a risk, of which I know Keith is acutely aware, that his review focusses on structural changes which fascinate many in the industry, but are a huge turn-off for passengers and the public.

So it's vital that whatever emerges puts passengers, and rebuilding public trust in the railway, front and centre.

And I hope too that he can take a fresh look at some of the outdated systems and practices which have acted as a barrier to progress in the past.

We need to see more rapid technology-led change on basics like smart ticketing.

And some deeply ingrained aspects of railway culture that are holding it back.

For me, one of the biggest challenges is to transform the way the railway approaches recruitment and progression, to get people from every background joining the industry, and thriving in a variety of roles, from junior positions to the boardroom, so the railway workforce starts to reflect its customer base and the diversity of the communities it serves.

I really hope Keith Williams will propose recommendations in this area too.

Like collecting better data on women and other underrepresented groups in the industry.

Benchmarking the sector against the best of the rest.

Reaching out to a new generation.

Modernising working practices.

And tackling the pay gap.

And I hope the industry will step forward and show a determination to act.

I recently heard a respected commentator not a million miles from this stage ask when the government would give control back to 'the railwaymen'.

A small slip, but a telling one.

I expected to find myself addressing an overwhelmingly male audience today. And guess what – I am.

Too many women, too often in this industry, will find themselves the only female in a meeting or a room or a team.

And whilst some will relish that challenge, we shouldn't be surprised if others decide to make a career elsewhere.

If the rail industry is to attract the talent it needs to drive the modernisation that the public wants to see, this must change.

There is, of course, some great work going on this front.

Improving diversity is at the heart of the Rail Sector Deal.

I know the [RDG](#) and many of the businesses and organisations represented here have great programmes.

It was good to see Aslef calling for more diversity among train drivers on Monday.

But I'd love to hear every industry leader championing diversity with the same energy and passion which they invest in debating the Williams Review.

And with a firm commitment to ensure rail's workforce and management reflects the customers and communities it serves.

And that includes the DfT.

While I'm pleased we've made progress, Rail Group still has fewer senior women than any other part of my department.

So we must do our bit too.

Before I finish, let me say that I don't think any of the points I've made today are particularly controversial or radical.

I'm confident they are well understood by Keith and his expert panel.

Identifying a solution that the government, industry, employees and public can rally around will be harder.

Implementing it, harder still.

So I don't underestimate for one moment the challenges ahead for ministers, my department or the industry.

But I believe that if we can take the review forward in a spirit of collaboration, not treat it as a power struggle.

We have a chance to make a real change for the better.

Change that will not only benefit passengers, freight users and the industry.

But the supply chain too.

Allowing it to seize the opportunities that will flow from a stable and flourishing rail sector.

We've seen scores of rail reviews over the years.

Many of which have left only a modest imprint on the industry.

So I hope that this time we can bring about change for the better.

And deliver the performance, investment, confidence and trust in the railway we all want to see.

Thank you.

Execution of deeds by corporate bodies

From 20 September 2019, HM Land Registry will not accept 'signed as a deed' as an acceptable form of wording in prescribed form deeds executed by companies and limited liability partnerships. Where a disposal is in a prescribed form that must be executed as a deed (such as Form TR1 or CH1) we will require that the forms of execution set out in Schedule 9 to the Land Registration Rules 2003 are used. For example schedule 9 requires the following form:

Executed as a deed by (name of company) acting by [a director and its secretary] [two directors].

This change better reflects section 44 of the Companies Act 2006 and the provisions in the Land Registration Rules 2003, which require particular forms of execution to be used on prescribed forms of Deed.

We know this issue has caused some confusion for customers recently. We hope this now provides clarity and we apologise for any ambiguity and inconvenience this caused previously.

To help you prepare for the change, we are giving customers 3-months' notice to adopt the wording set out in Schedule 9, in respect of prescribed deeds. Within this period, we will not raise a request for information when 'Signed as a deed' is used in the execution of prescribed deeds by corporate bodies. The notice period will end on Friday 20 September 2019.

The Land Registration Rules 2003 do not prescribe forms of execution where a

non-prescribed form of deed is used. However, wherever possible, we ask that you adopt the wording set out in Schedule 9 of the Land Registration Rules 2003. We believe doing so will help avoid requests for information and improve consistency.

Read [Practice Guide 8](#).

If you would like help on this, you can watch a [14-minute recorded webinar](#). This gives examples of correct and incorrect execution by corporate bodies. Alternatively, a [31-minute recorded webinar](#) gives more information about execution requirements generally.

Find out more information about the whole range of our [live and recorded webinars](#).