



DEENWAY MONTESSORI
SCHOOL & UNICITY COLLEGE
DEO VOLENTE VINCIT QUI SE VINCIT

3-5 SIDMOUTH STREET, READING, BERKSHIRE, RG1 4QX UK
WWW.DEENWAY.ORG | +44(0)118 9574737

Person Responsible for Handling Complaints
OFSTED
Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

22nd December 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Anne Henderson HMI's No Notice Inspection (22/09/2015)

I am writing to make a formal complaint regarding the above no-notice inspection carried out by Anne Henderson HMI at our school in September. Specifically I wish to bring to your attention grave concerns regarding the conduct of Ms. Henderson during the course of the inspection as well as procedural irregularities that have raised cause for alarm. I trust that the matters raised in this letter will be taken seriously. In the event that we have not received a formal response from you within fourteen clear days from the date of this letter, we will take the necessary steps to obtain formal legal advice to seek whatever remedies are available under the law.

Procedural Irregularities Related to the Inspection

1. Ms. Henderson did not explain the reason for the no notice inspection on arrival. Neither did she further explain or reiterate the reason for the inspection to the headmaster when she met him. This is a breach of Para 121 and 124 of the Handbook for Additional Inspections of Independent Schools (Sep. 2015) [HAI2015]. When she was asked about this several times by the Headmaster she simply said there had been a complaint and refused to elaborate on the nature of the complaint or when it was made. The headmaster was clear that he understood that Ms. Henderson was not at liberty to reveal the identity of the complainant, but that she should at the very least explain what the complaint was about. Ms. Henderson refused to do this.
2. Ms. Henderson did not confirm any arrangements for meetings with staff or those responsible for governance of the school in breach of para 124 [HAI2015]. Instead at a random point in the day she demanded to speak to staff. I explained that almost all staff were in class with pupils and that she could meet them at the end of the day. She was not pleased with this and mumbled something about having to 'get back.' She then demanded to see whichever teachers were available at lunch-time.



3. Ms. Henderson did not confirm arrangements for providing feedback at the end of the inspection in breach of para 124 [HAI2015]. Instead she arbitrarily announced that the inspection was over and she would now give her feedback.
4. Ms. Henderson did not request information about staff absence and other practical issues, once again in breach of para 124 [HAI2015]. The headmaster attempted to explain to Ms. Henderson that
 - a. today most pupils were not in uniform as they had just come in to celebrate Eid festivities;
 - b. School had not yet formally started for older pupils (Yrs 7 and above). They had come in last week for orientation and actual lessons would begin from the following week.
 - c. He would be teaching all morning which would therefore be a good time for Ms. Henderson to undertake observations if she felt that would help and he could then arrange to collect any evidence Ms. Henderson wanted to see later in the day (after lunch time).

Ms. Henderson completely ignored this and later the headmaster found an arbitrarily made up timetable on the inspection website. This timetable was not presented to the headmaster at any time during the inspection and was not followed by the inspector herself. Because of these two reasons it is clear that first, the timetable had not been agreed between the inspector and the headmaster; and second, the inspector had falsified her timetable—rather like a pupil who might backfill their school diary.

5. Ms. Henderson was surprised to learn that we had secondary aged pupils at our school and admitted complete ignorance of the fact that the school had been approved to teach children up to 16 years old. It seems Ms. Henderson had therefore also disregarded para 113 [HAI2015] related to Inspector's planning and preparation and had not properly 'done her homework' about the school. She requested a formal letter from the DfE which the headmaster presented her with later in the day. Ms. Henderson said "the DfE had not notified me about this."
6. Para 126 [HAI2015] states that the Inspector will follow up issues raised in the DfE's commissioning form and that they will inspect against any "particular focus that the DfE specifies." Ms. Henderson did not seem to have any focus at all in what she was inspecting and kept on moving the goalposts when she was questioned about this.
7. Para 129 [HAI2015] states that the issue that triggered the inspection to be commissioned is "used as a line of enquiry" and that the inspector will "consider and report on... [i] how effectively the school has dealt with the issue, [ii] whether the issue is resolved, [iii] whether it is a one-off instance or represents a whole school issue." However throughout the course of the day Ms. Henderson did not even mention the issue, refused to elaborate on it when asked and then at times stated that her investigation had nothing to do with the issue and that it was a normal Ofsted inspection!

8. In breach of para 140 [HAI2015] Ms. Henderson did not explain that the judgments she was making are 'provisional' and that they may 'change as a result of quality assurance procedures or moderation.'
9. Also in breach of para 140 [HAI2015] Ms. Henderson did not explain that on receipt of a draft report the school must keep it confidential. Rather she would not say at all whether she would recommend a report or not or what she would mention in her advice note.
10. Also in breach of para 140 [HAI2015] Ms. Henderson made no mention, let alone 'encourage' or 'invite' the school to complete a post-inspection survey.
11. And in a further gross breach of para 140 [HAI2015] and paras 156 and 157 Ms. Henderson refused to explain the procedure for making a complaint even after the headmaster made it clear that the school would be making a formal complaint.

Conduct of Ms. Anne Henderson HMI

1. Intimidating Pupils

Ms. Henderson asked to speak to pupils privately. When the headmaster explained that this would be better done in one of the classrooms where pupils would be more at ease; Ms. Henderson insisted instead that pupils see her in the Board Room with its adult sized chairs and imposing Board Room table.

The headmaster explained that pupils are currently in lessons. Ms. Henderson insisted that they be taken out of lessons and see her now as there wasn't much time.

Later pupils reported feeling intimidated by Ms. Henderson. Some of their comments recorded after the meeting were:

- a) "She told us to sit down, stared at us all and then said, 'I am Her Majesty's Inspector and I've come to inspect your school.' Then she sat back and stared at us some more." (All pupils). [Why didn't she say something like *'Hello, good morning my name is Anne Henderson and my job is to see how well your school is doing. I work for Ofsted and I am an inspector'*? Instead her words seemed to be calculated to make the children feel uneasy.]
- b) "She kept on asking us random questions. If we answered her question she would quickly ask another one like she was looking to catch us out." (Yr 8 pupil);
- c) "She was asking nursery children how government works. We answered her." (Yr. 10 pupil);
- d) "She asked little Noor [5 years old] 'Do you do R.E?' How would Noor know what R.E means? But Noor understood and said 'we learn about other

religions. Then we all told her about the other religions we were studying in different classes.” [Yr 4, 5 and 6 pupils];

- e) “She asked us ‘How does Local Government work?’ We told her we studied Parliament for six weeks.” [Yr 4, 5 and 6 pupils] [Please see note below].
- f) “She asked us if we ever went to the local library. We told her we went to the library.” [All pupils. Please see note below]
- g) “She was asking us weird questions like she was trying to choose a subject that we don’t know. But she couldn’t find one.” [Yr 5 pupil].
- h) “That lady looked very angry. She’s come to shut down our school, hasn’t she?” [Year 9 pupil]
- i) “We told her there was no bullying in our school but if there was we would tell a teacher.” [all pupils]
- j) “We told her about the school council and who won the elections for the council. She looked surprised.” [all pupils]. [Please see note below].
- k) “She asked us about careers guidance. I told her I just started the school 5 days ago.” [Yr 7 pupil].
- l) One of the children in the meeting with Ms. Henderson returned to class and promptly announced to everyone: “You are all racists!” Investigation by the class teacher revealed that the boy’s behavior was a direct result of Ms. Henderson’s questions. This type of name calling has never previously been used by any pupils at our school which made it particularly shocking. Ms. Henderson literally planted this idea in the boy’s mind. Given everything else that happened we cannot help but wonder whether this was a deliberate ploy to allow Ms. Henderson an opportunity to discover the presence of racism in the school. Thankfully mutual respect and tolerance is at the heart of all that we do and we have never had any racist or discriminatory incidents of any kind.

Intimidating Staff

Ms. Henderson’s intimidation was not confined to pupils. Teachers reported that she did not allow them any time to respond to her barrage of questions. Whenever a teacher did attempt to respond to a question Ms. Henderson replied, “I am not satisfied with your answer,” and then refused to allow the teacher to explain further by saying “I don’t want to talk about that anymore!”

2. Falsifying Evidence

Ms. Henderson claimed at the end of her inspection that pupils “could not explain how local government worked.” The headmaster asked Ms. Henderson if *she* could

explain how local government worked. Ms. Henderson clearly could not. The headmaster then pointed out that actually pupils had been studying Parliament in great depth and spent around 6 weeks or more doing so. Ms. Henderson claimed she had no evidence of this and the pupils had not mentioned this! (please see para 1(c) above). Ms. Henderson was clearly not telling the truth.

Ms. Henderson claimed that the school did not “do enough to *promote* other faiths.” The headmaster ignored the fact that schools are not required to ‘promote’ other faiths, and instead pointed out that in our school pupils *learn* about other faiths all of the time. He referred to the Montessori lesson plans, the pupils’ own work, and lessons that Ms. Henderson had herself observed. In fact, earlier in the day, after repeated requests Ms. Henderson had reluctantly sat in a lesson being delivered by the Headmaster. In that very lesson pupils were discussing a quote from Mark Twain about the stars; a passage from Genesis regarding creation; a quote from the Hindu *Vedas* and from a Guatemalan scripture known as the *Popol Vuh*. All of these scriptures and the quote itself were discussed and elaborated on at length.

Ms. Henderson’s response to all this was to say that when she asked pupils if they learn about other religions they had said no. This is clearly not true (please see 1(d) above).

3. Ignoring Evidence

During the course of the inspection it became clear that Ms. Henderson was willfully ignoring the volumes of evidence being presented to her. At the end of the day Ms. Henderson claimed that in “talking to children, looking at books, from what i’ve seen around the school, the school is not giving them sufficient preparation for adult life.” When asked what preparation for adult life meant Ms. Henderson said: “It’s about learning how to make decisions, how you make plans...” The headmaster pointed out the following pieces of evidence that had been shown to Ms. Henderson:

1. The Next Action Cards and *Pomodoro Technique* journals kept by pupils in Upper Elementary (Yrs 4,5 and 6). [The *Pomodoro Technique* is a well known time management and project planning method used by professionals all over the world. It has been featured in *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Guardian*, *The New York Times* and other prestigious publications. Over 2 million professionals have studied Francesco Cirillo’s book by the same name and just as many use the method in the daily work. Children aged 9-11 at Deenway Montessori School are amongst such people!]
2. The Secondary School diaries based on David Allen’s Getting Things Done Methodology. [In 2005, Wired called GTD "A new cult for the info age" describing the enthusiasm for this methodology among information technology and knowledge workers as a kind of cult following. Allen's ideas have also been popularized through the Howard Stern Show (Stern referenced it daily throughout 2012's summer) and the Internet, especially via blogs such as *43 Folders*, *Lifehacker*, and *The Simple Dollar*. In 2005, Ben Hammersley interviewed David Allen for The Guardian article titled "Meet the man who can bring order to your universe", saying: "For me, as with the hundreds of thousands around the

world who press the book into their friends' hands with fire in their eyes, Allen's ideas are nothing short of life-changing" In 2007, Time Magazine called Getting Things Done the self-help business book of its time. In 2007, Wired ran another article about GTD and Allen, quoting him as saying "the workings of an automatic transmission are more complicated than a manual transmission... to simplify a complex event, you need a complex system". A paper in the journal Long Range Planning by Francis Heylighen and Clément Vidal of the Free University of Brussels showed "recent insights in psychology and cognitive science support and extend GTD's recommendations"].

3. Stephen Covey's 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teenagers and the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People (studied by Secondary school pupils).
4. Franklin Covey's *The Leader in Me* which is a 7 Habits for Highly Effective People programme taught to young children at Deenway; including the displays made by pupils aged 4 and 5 years old. [The 7 Habits are so well known in industry they form part of the leadership training programme in many major global organisations].
5. Tony Buzan's Mind Mapping courses taught to pupils from 9 years old onwards.
6. The fact that we are a Montessori school-in the morning work periods from 9am to 12 noon pupils are freely selecting work throughout the school, making their own plans, initiating their own projects, organizing and recording their own learning in an environment that encourages and nurtures independence.

Ms. Henderson's response to this was "Yes but those are things you have developed yourself."

Judging from that response all this was clearly beyond Ms. Henderson's comprehension. Which begs a question: *How well prepared are Ofsted inspectors in understanding the challenges that face our young people in the modern workplace and in modern life?* (As a side note Ofsted inspectors and the entire DfE could experience an immediate improvement in efficiency if they applied even one of the above methods to their work. The school is happy to arrange for some of our pupils to deliver this training if so required).

The headmaster then pointed out that Ms. Henderson had already been made aware that Upper Elementary pupils (aged 9-11) had been planning, researching, presenting and producing their own radio show live in local community radio all last term. Surely that is impressive evidence of how we prepare our children for adult life. Most adults would not be able to manage that. Ms. Henderson's reply was "Yes well that's just one aspect."

She said the same about all of the following:

Primary school pupils aged just 8 and 9 years old rehearsing lines from *Beowulf* (which just happens to be one of the most important works of English literature)

[Ms. Henderson was in one of the classrooms when this was happening. I wonder if she even noticed?];

A historical time line containing among other things research by pupils on aspects of the life of Sir Isaac Newton, Robert Hooke, Stephen Hawking, Greek Philosophers, the Magna Carta etc.;

Essays written by pupils about the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II;

Creative letters written by pupils to Galileo;

An imaginary dialogue between Galileo, Copernicus and ancient Greek Philosophers;

Studies by younger children on Victorian Britain including poems, mind maps and a dramatic performance featuring Queen Victoria and Prince Albert;

A Display about Roman Britain and the Celts;

Labour Party and Conservative Party flags that formed part of a presentation on the General Election;

Literary analyses that led to presentations on (among other things) World War II and the role of Noor Inayat Khan (one of Churchill's special operatives in Vichy France); Giridiridas's a *Tale of Two Americas: When Two World's Collide* (which was featured in a special Ted Talk) about a 7-11 store owner who showed compassion to the man who nearly killed him; the transmission of global cuisines across countries etc. etc.;

Articles and radio shows on life in France, British History and comedy;

Permaculture and hands on work in helping build and maintain the school garden which has plants from different parts of the world, including harvesting and then cooking some of the vegetables to share among the school community;

The fact that the school won first prize in the first ever **Go Givers Make a Difference Challenge** in Reading for the work pupils did in making a difference in the world. (The competition is supported by the Citizenship Foundation and the Cabinet Office and pupils showcased their work publicly in front of the Queen's representative at a local church).

...

For Ms. Henderson all the above was "just one aspect."

Ms. Henderson then attempted to argue that the school was not sufficiently preparing pupils for adult life because the secondary pupils had not received careers guidance. The headmaster pointed out that they had only been here for less than 5 days and both the headmaster and deputy head teacher attempted to explain the

school's plans for careers guidance. Ms. Henderson simply ignored all of this and refused to see the evidence claiming the inspection was now over.

4. Lack of Awareness of Current Legislation

Ms. Henderson claimed that the school's Safeguarding Policy does not refer to the latest legislation. When asked what that legislation was she could not say and tried to look it up on the internet. The headmaster asked her how she could judge that our policy did not have regard to the latest legislation when she herself, an Ofsted inspector, was not aware of what that legislation was?

5. Inability or Unwillingness to Clarify Judgments and Offensive Remarks

At one point Ms. Henderson said to the Headmaster, "Children should learn to respect the law of the country they choose to live in." This shamefully insulting remark would make a brilliant question for one of our Rhetoric lessons at Deenway. *Discuss how this remark suggests Ms. Henderson considers children at the school to be foreigners whose willingness to adhere to the laws of the country are suspect.*

In general, by the self-declared end of the inspection Ms. Henderson was unable or unwilling to explain precisely what her judgments were, why she had reached them and why she had simply ignored all of the evidence in front of her and around the school.

Procedural Irregularities Post-Inspection, Judgments and the Report

Following the inspection, the school eventually received notification of a draft Ofsted report. The purpose of sending the draft report to the school before it is published is in order for the school to be able to carry out a Factual Accuracy Check. The school completed the factual accuracy check and submitted its comments on the draft report, which no doubt are already with you. However it seems that all of the school's comments regarding the report were completely ignored. The school understands fully that some of the comments the school gave in the factual accuracy report may be considered as not related to 'factual matters' and more related to how judgments were derived as well as other matters highlighted elsewhere in this letter. Nevertheless comments that the school submitted which are indisputably matters of pure fact, such as the role and title of teachers, were also completely ignored. The result therefore is a completely fictional report that bears no resemblance to our school in fact or theory. One of the most striking examples of this is reference in the now published report to two 'Islamic Studies Teachers'. The school does not have any Islamic Studies teachers and does not have 'Islamic Studies' lessons! In fact the school as a matter of curriculum policy does not consider 'Islamic Studies' a subject but rather takes a holistic approach to faith teaching which is based on inculcating positive values rather than preaching. From where did Ms. Henderson conjure up Islamic Studies teachers?

By publishing a self-contradictory bogus report which is neither factually accurate nor founded on sound judgments Ofsted have made a travesty of the whole inspection process.

At the Deenway Montessori School we take all forms of bullying very seriously. I am proud of the fact that our pupils themselves report that bullying does not exist in their school and if any body did try to intimidate them or bully them, or someone else, they would not allow it. They would report it immediately to the relevant person and take action themselves to let the bully know that that sort of behavior is just not welcome here. At our school we are not afraid of bullies. As headmaster I believe that adults should model the behavior they hope to see in the children under their trust. It is in this spirit that I have written this letter and highlighted many of my concerns with the so called 'no-notice' inspection that was carried out by Anne Henderson HMI at our school. I have had occasion to work with many HMI's as an educator in different roles and settings. Often their feedback has been critical—that is the nature of their work, and it is only natural that it should be so. But the criticisms have always been constructive and, I feel, genuinely helpful. Most importantly they have been founded on some reasoned basis with a sense of integrity and fairness. On this occasion things have been quite different. I am not afraid to say that I feel the recent epidemic of no-notice inspections targeting faith schools—particularly Islamic schools—is politically driven and has little to do with safeguarding the interests of children and a lot more to do with safeguarding the interests of certain political agendas. It is a shame that some Ofsted inspectors have so easily become willing pawns in this dirty game. One cannot help wonder whether that willingness is a direct result of the governments restructuring of inspection contracts.

Of course schools should be inspected, and of course sometimes those inspections need to be carried out urgently when there is a genuine cause for concern. This is vital in safeguarding the welfare of the children and young people at those schools. But bogus witch-hunts in the guise of inspections are a cynical exploitation of people's genuine concerns for the welfare of children. This no notice inspection needlessly disrupted the entire day's lessons for those children; the inspector in question barely understood, enquired after or acknowledged all of the great learning, outstanding work and extraordinary achievements of the children that were evident to be seen throughout the school; and shamelessly tried to intimidate both children and staff. All Ms. Henderson succeeded in doing was discrediting Ofsted and displaying a great deal of ignorance concerning the very rules under which she was supposed to be inspecting. What a travesty! May I suggest, as one of our pupils did to me, that instead of "sending Her Majesty's Inspector to our school, why don't they send Her Majesty's Prime Minister. We would be happy to show him all the cool things we do. We've got lots of questions for him too."

Since I very much doubt this will happen, I would like to hereby make a formal request to see a copy of the 'Inspection Commissioning Form' that triggered this inspection and all other correspondence, documentation and communication related to our school. I understand that some of the information—particularly the identity of the alleged complainant—if it is contained on the form will be confidential. In which case I will be satisfied to see a redacted official copy of that form.

For your convenience I have attached with this letter my comments submitted as part of the Factual Accuracy Check, which as mentioned were completely ignored by Ofsted.

The Deenway Montessori School

3–5 Sidmouth Street, Reading, Berkshire RG1 4QX

Inspection dates

22 September 2015

Overall outcome

Unmet independent school standards identified

Reason for the inspection

- This inspection was conducted by Ofsted at the request of the registration authority for independent schools.
- It was carried out with no notice.
- The school was last inspected on 4–6 February 2014. A material change inspection took place on 7 November 2014.
- The purpose of this inspection was to check the school's compliance with Part 1 of the independent school standards – Quality of education provided, Part 2 – Spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils and Part 8 – Quality of leadership and management of schools. Her Majesty's Inspector also checked the school's safeguarding arrangements and aspects of Part 3 – Welfare, health and safety and Part 6 – Provision of information.
- Her Majesty's Inspector was taken on a tour of the school by the headteacher. She visited six lessons to observe the quality of education and walked around the school with the headteacher to check on the quality of education and the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils. Meetings were held with the headteacher and a group of 12 pupils, selected by the inspector, aged between five and 15 years. A meeting was also held with three teachers. A range of documentation was scrutinised, including curriculum plans and policies and procedures for safeguarding, including the single central record of checks on staff. The inspector also scrutinised pupils' work.

Main findings

Part 1 – Quality of education provided

- The school provides information to parents about the curriculum for children in the Nursery, Children's House and Elementary classes. Parents have also been provided with information about the curriculum for older pupils in the secondary classes. Published schemes of work are used to support the delivery of the curriculum, which is suited to the ages and stages of pupils' learning.
- The school curriculum enables pupils to develop a suitable understanding of British values, the rule of law, tolerance, mutual respect and individual liberty. However, pupils are not provided with enough information about a broad range of different faiths and beliefs. This limits their ability to develop mutual respect for and tolerance of people with faiths and beliefs that are different from their own and does not prepare them well enough for life in modern Britain.
- The inspector observed pupils learning together in mixed-age, mixed-gender classes. During the inspection, younger pupils were selecting activities and enjoyed the opportunity to explore their own interests. Older pupils in Years 7 to 10 were engaged in more formal mathematical and language work. The school timetable shows that the secular curriculum is taught for the majority of the school day, with the Islamic curriculum forming a proportion of the afternoon curriculum time.

- The curriculum gives pupils a wide range of experiences with a particular focus on English literature and the development of speaking and listening, numeracy and scientific skills.
- The curriculum does not provide opportunities for pupils to explore thoughts and ideas of all kinds. In particular, the school has not paid sufficient attention to helping pupils to understand about people with different personal, protected characteristics. This could result in pupils' disregard of or prejudice against people with protected characteristics. It is not preparing them well enough for life in modern British society.
- The school is providing opportunities for pupils to take responsibility for organising themselves and their possessions and making choices and decisions. However, older pupils are not provided with enough information about how to prepare for life beyond school. The school has made insufficient effort to plan and prepare impartial careers guidance that will enable pupils to make informed choices and enable them to reach their full potential.

Part 2 – Spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils

- The school ethos promotes pupils' development of self-esteem, self-confidence and self-respect. Pupils are polite, courteous and well-mannered.
- Pupils have a good understanding of right and wrong and make a positive contribution to the local and wider community through fund-raising and supporting charity work.
- Pupils are provided with opportunities to understand about public institutions through visits to the local library, the police station and the fire service.
- There are opportunities for pupils to understand and participate in the democratic process by electing members of the school council. Pupils enjoy making decisions about how the money they raise should be spent.
- The school does not actively promote respect for and tolerance of a broad range of other religions. As a result, pupils' understanding of other religions and their traditions and beliefs is limited.

Part 3 – Welfare, health and safety of pupils

- Inspection preparation established that the school's website did not contain a safeguarding policy. Scrutiny of the policy during the inspection showed that the policy was not fit for purpose because it is out of date. It does not have regard for the most up-to-date guidance issued by the Secretary of State. In addition, not all staff have attended training in child protection, and the headteacher, who is the lead child protection officer, was unable to confirm the date or level of his child protection qualification.

Part 6 – Provision of information

- Inspection evidence established that the requirements for the information to be published on the school website, namely the arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of pupils and to publish the school inspection report, were not met. The headteacher was made aware of this information. As a result, during the inspection, the headteacher took down the school's website.

Part 8 – Quality of leadership and management of schools

- The proprietor has not ensured that the Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014 are met. The proprietor has not kept up to date with current guidance issued by the Secretary of State, particularly in relation to safeguarding and child protection. As a result, the well-being of pupils is not promoted well enough.

Compliance with regulatory requirements

The school must take action to meet the requirements of the schedule to the Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014 and associated requirements:

- Ensure the proprietor's written curriculum policy, plans and schemes of work do not undermine the fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect for and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs (paragraphs 2(1), 2(1)(a) and 2(1)(b)(ii)).
- Ensure the proprietor includes the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, careers guidance and sufficient preparation for opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of life in British society in the written curriculum policy (paragraph 2(2)).
- Ensure the provision for personal, social, health and economic education includes information on protected characteristics and encourages respect for other people, paying particular regard to the protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010 (paragraphs 2(2)(d) and 2(2)(d)(ii)).
- Ensure that pupils receiving secondary education access accurate, up-to-date careers guidance and that it is presented in an impartial manner to enable pupils to make informed choices about a broad range of career options and to encourage pupils to fulfil their potential (paragraphs 2(2)(e), 2(2)(e)(i), 2(2)(e)(ii) and 2(2)(e)(iii)).
- Ensure that all pupils are provided with effective preparation for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of life in British society (paragraph 2(2)(i)).
- Ensure that teaching at the school does not undermine the fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect for and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs (paragraphs 3 and 3(i)).
- The proprietor must ensure that the standard about the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils is met by actively promoting pupils' mutual respect for and tolerance of a range of different faiths and beliefs, actively promoting the principles of the Equality Act 2010 and encouraging pupils to respect people with protected characteristic (paragraphs 5, 5(a), 5(b) and 5(b)(vi)).
- The proprietor must ensure that the safeguarding policy is up to date and refers to the most up-to-date guidance issued by the Secretary of State. The proprietor must also ensure that all staff are trained at a suitable level to safeguard pupils' welfare and that this also complies with the most up-to-date guidance from the Secretary of State (paragraphs 7, 7(a) and 7(b)).
- The proprietor must ensure that all required information is provided for parents, including the arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of pupils and publish the school inspection report (paragraph 32(1), 32(1)(c) and 32(1)(d)).
- The proprietor must ensure that persons with leadership and management responsibilities demonstrate good skills and knowledge appropriate to their role so that the independent school standards are met consistently. They must fulfil their responsibilities effectively, and actively promote the well-being of pupils (paragraphs 34(1), 34(1)(a), 34(1)(b), 34(1)(c) and 34(2)).

School details

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| Unique reference number | 135995 |
| Inspection number | 10006750 |
| DfE registration number | 870/6016 |

This inspection was conducted at the request of the registration authority for independent schools. It was carried out under section 109(1) and (2) of the Education and Skills Act 2008.

| | |
|--|--|
| Type of school | Montessori day school |
| School status | Independent school |
| Age range of pupils | 3–16 years |
| Gender of pupils | Mixed |
| Number of pupils on the school roll | 89 |
| Number of part-time pupils | 27 |
| Proprietor | The Deenway Company Ltd |
| Chair | Mr Munawar Karim |
| Headteacher | Mr Munawar Karim |
| Date of previous school inspection | 4–6 February 2014 |
| Annual fees (day pupils) | £3,600 |
| Telephone number | 0118 957 4737 |
| Email address | connect@deenway.org |

Information about this school

- The Deenway Montessori School is an independent Islamic day school for boys and girls from three to 16 years. The school opened in 2009 and is registered for up to 110 pupils. It is situated in a Grade II listed building located in the centre of Reading, Berkshire. The school uses local facilities for physical education. It is owned by The Deenway Company Limited, a not-for-profit social enterprise. The school was last inspected in February 2014. A material change visit in November 2014 recommended the increase in numbers to 110 and ages from 11–16 years. The Department for Education approved these changes in June and July 2015.
- There are currently 89 pupils on roll. None has a statement of special educational needs. The 19 secondary-aged pupils started on 14 September 2015. There are 27 children who attend part time in the Early Years Foundation Stage. Pupils have diverse heritages. Some pupils speak English as an additional language. Not all pupils are Muslim.
- The school uses no alternative provision.
- The school teaches the Montessori curriculum to children up to the age of 11. Pupils aged 11–16 are taught the liberal arts curriculum. Pupils are taught in eight classes: the Nursery (three- to four-year-olds); the Children’s House (five- to six-year-olds); the Lower Elementary class (six- to nine-year-olds); and the Upper Elementary class (nine- to 11-year-olds). Pupils aged 11–16 are taught in the Unicity College in four classes. There are no pupils in Year 11.

- There are 12 members of staff. The headteacher, deputy headteacher, two early years Montessori teachers, two Montessori teachers, two Islamic studies teachers, two early years teaching assistants, one Montessori teaching assistant and a school bursar/business manager.
- The school aims to 'nurture the mind, body and spirit of each child' and to prepare them to be able to direct their own learning and development throughout their lives.

Inspection team

Ann Henderson, lead inspector

Her Majesty's Inspector

Any complaints about the inspection or the report should be made following the procedures set out in the guidance 'Raising concerns and making a complaint about Ofsted', which is available from Ofsted's website: www.gov.uk/government/publications/complaints-about-ofsted. If you would like Ofsted to send you a copy of the guidance, please telephone 0300 123 4234, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.



You can use Parent View to give Ofsted your opinion on your child's school. Ofsted will use the information parents and carers provide when deciding which schools to inspect and when and as part of the inspection.

You can also use Parent View to find out what other parents and carers think about schools in England. You can visit www.parentview.ofsted.gov.uk, or look for the link on the main Ofsted website: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted.

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

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

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

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted.

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

Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 4231
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.ofsted.gov.uk

© Crown copyright 2015