Independent Review of Oak National Academy

September 2025

Contents

Introduction

Background on Oak National Academy

Oak National Academy (Oak) is an executive non-departmental public body that was established as an arm's length body (ALB) to the Department for Education (DfE) in September 2022.

Oak's objective is to advance the education, training, learning and development of children, young people and learners (and those supporting them) for the public benefit in the UK. It aims to improve pupil outcomes and close the disadvantage gap by supporting teachers to teach, and enabling pupils to access, a high-quality curriculum whilst also reducing teacher workload.

The strategic aims of Oak, as set out in its framework agreement document[1], are to:

- work with schools, teachers and the wider education system to create, develop and support the use of free, optional, high-quality full curriculum packages that are available to teachers and pupils through a robust, accessible digital education platform
- continue to provide a national contingency for remote education should it be needed in the event of disruption
- provide a package of connected, stretching materials for teachers and pupils through the same digital education platform that is available across the four nations and draws on content and expertise from all areas of the UK
- establish Oak National Academy as a high-performing, well-respected sector organisation that:
  - o maintains its 'by teachers for teachers' approach
  - o contributes to the growing understanding of curriculum best practice
  - o is strategically aligned with, but operationally independent from, government
  - o delivers excellent value for money

Since being established Oak has been working to develop full curriculum sequences and supporting resources across all national curriculum subjects from Key Stage 1-4, plus Religious Education and Relationships, Sex and Health Education. These are being delivered in two cycles, covering different subjects and the first cycle was concluded in September 2024. Cycle two is due to be completed in Autumn this year.

Background on the Review

When Oak was established as an ALB in September 2022, the DfE committed to undertake a review within 24 months to ensure the body was operating effectively and efficiently.

---

[1] Oak National Academy Ltd - Framework Document

Lara Newman, Chief Executive of LocatED, was selected as the independent Lead Reviewer and the Terms of Reference set out the scope of the Review as follows:

a. Efficacy – to ensure that Oak has a clear purpose and the correct delivery model, that it is performing effectively and that it is delivering services that meet the needs of teachers and young people.
b. Governance – to ensure that Oak is meeting the expectations of governance arrangements for ALB boards, chairs and non-executive members.
c. Accountability – to review the relationship between the department and Oak, and the support and challenge offered to Oak via the critical 'sponsoring' relationship the department has with it.
d. Efficiency – to ensure that Oak is meeting the expectations for financial management processes in line with current guidance, and the expectations for the identification of cashable efficiency gains made through change in practices, for example, digitisation and the workforce.

Excluded from the scope of the Review was consideration of the impact of Oak on the commercial market, which was the subject of a separate Market Impact Assessment (MIA).

This report is structured in four sections, aligned to the four key focus areas in the terms of reference.

Review Process

The review was launched in December 2024 and concluded in March 2025. Evidence was gathered using a combination of interviews with key stakeholders, discussions with DfE reference groups, written representations and desk-based research, including a review of internal governance documents, and published plans and strategies.

In conducting the Review, the Lead Reviewer was supported by <REDACTED>, civil servants from the Department for Education.

Acknowledgements

The Review Team would like to thank all the stakeholders who generously gave their time to contribute to the Review.

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Oak is a well-run organisation with good financial controls and governance. It is a positive organisation to work for with a clear, embedded work culture.

Oak has made significant progress and, starting from Autumn 2025, will offer fully sequenced curricula with supporting lesson resources across all national curriculum subjects from Key Stages 1 to 4.

The support Oak provides is valued by teachers, saving them time and improving the quality of lesson planning for those that report using it.

The original rationale for establishing an ALB still holds, particularly ahead of publication of the Curriculum and Assessment (C&A) Review. There could be an important role for Oak in helping to mitigate the workload impacts of changes arising from the review, and we suggest that DfE clarifies expectations of this quickly.

Nonetheless, Oak has faced significant headwinds since being established. Several influential voices in the system expressed concern about its proximity to Government and there has been commercial challenge on the impact on the educational publishing sector. This, combined with restrictions on marketing activity, has hindered Oak's ability to increase awareness of their new offer and take on the system leadership role envisaged by the original business case.

There remains a significant "pandemic legacy" issue acting as a barrier to greater take up of Oak resources, and teachers are not always aware of how the offer has changed since the pandemic. A refresh of the Oak branding and website, including potentially the removal of the "National Academy" name, would reinforce the evolution of Oak.

2025 is an important year for Oak. Matt Hood, the current Chief Executive, who has been at the helm since Oak was first established, and Sir Ian Bauckham, Chair of Oak's Board, are both moving on. This change of leadership, combined with the publication of the remaining updated materials by the Autumn, provides an opportunity to work with the outcomes of this report and reposition the organisation and its strategic aims.

Having invested in the development of high-quality materials, the DfE should now demonstrate confidence in this offer and ensure that Oak is appropriately resourced to promote it to ensure maximum value for money through wide and diverse use. More work is needed both to maximise the positive impact of the high-quality resources already paid for and available, and to fully realise the ambitions of the original business case.

In this report, we also make recommendations about increasing the inclusiveness of Oak's resources, building on the strong foundations it has already established, and ensuring that Oak supports wider government objectives – for example by prioritising publication of materials on Relationships, Sex and Health Education, encouraging greater

use by users not in a mainstream setting and exploring the possibility of embedding existing Oak resources in International Development interventions.

Whilst we are very mindful of the pressures on public spending, we have identified limited scope to realise budget efficiencies, as Oak already operates on a lean model. Indeed, it is our view that a small level of further investment is necessary to ensure that Government maximises the benefit of the significant assets that Oak has already created and increase the return on investment.

List of Recommendations

1) The DfE's guidance on providing remote education should make clear that Oak is funded by Government to provide a remote education service for use in the event of disruption and that schools are encouraged, though not required, to use it in those circumstances.

2) The DfE should consider how Oak can best support the implementation of the Curriculum and Assessment Review with the aim of helping to mitigate the workload impacts on teachers.

3) Oak should continue to emphasise that its materials are optional and fully adaptable (including using the content with most or all of the Oak branding removed if desired). It should consider how to target these communications to secure the buy-in of leaders, as well as teachers, and build confidence that the use of Oak materials is not inconsistent with professional autonomy or skills.

4) Oak's strategic aims should be updated to clarify its future role.

5) The DfE should use the opportunity of the publication of cycle two materials and the C&A Review in the Autumn to demonstrate public support for Oak and set out the future direction for the organisation. This messaging should recommit that Oak will remain optional and adaptable to allay sector concerns.

6) The provision of connected, stretching materials for teachers and pupils across the four nations should be removed from Oak's strategic aims.

7) "National Academy" should be removed from the name of the organisation as part of a wider brand update.

8) The DfE should review Oak's marketing and communications budget to ensure it is sufficient to deliver really good quality, consistent and engaging interactions with all potential user groups.

9) The DfE and Oak should work with partners to stimulate a professional debate about the ways accessing high-quality curriculum resources can support teachers' professionalism and drive improvements in practice.

10) Oak should provide a greater range of language translations on video lessons to support pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL).

11) The DfE should review the case for updating pandemic legacy content for children in specialist settings and for the Early Years Foundation Stage.

12) Oak should build on the work it has already done to understand its teacher users, to improve understanding of the needs of teachers in particular settings, such as alternative provision, hospital schools or the justice system and identify any gaps in support.

13) Oak should develop a pupil impact strategy, considering the different pupil use cases ("personas"). This should include promoting Oak's use for homework help and revision.

14) Oak should release materials on Relationships, Sex and Health Education as soon as new statutory guidance is available.

15) The DfE should consult with the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office on the possibility of embedding Oak resources in appropriate International Development interventions

16) Oak should evaluate whether the lesson format and style should sometimes be varied, especially for younger pupils.

17) Guidance for teachers on effective use of the Oak curriculum should be clearly accessible both from within individual resources and on the home page, perhaps in a guidance hub.

18) The pupil area of the Oak website should be significantly refreshed to make the interface more engaging.

19) Oak should seek agreement from its curriculum partners to display their branding more prominently on lesson resources they have developed.

20) Oak's board should accelerate its Board Effectiveness Review to ensure completion as soon as possible in 2025.

21) The Sponsorship Team would benefit from more breadth of skills, and additionally access to specialists, Edtech and AI. We also suggest that the Sponsorship Team should join up more widely with other DfE policy areas to maximise opportunities for Oak to support DfE objectives.

22) The DfE, with Oak, should review the process for setting performance measures, including who is responsible for setting KPIs, the timing of these in relation to OKRs and where these two systems could work more effectively together.

23) Oak's board should put a formal succession plan in place for key roles in the organisation.

Efficacy

This section considers how Oak is performing against the ambitions that were set for it in the original business case to establish an ALB. In doing so, due consideration has been given to the short length of time Oak has been in operation as an ALB and to the fact that it has been assessed part way through a major programme of delivery, that cannot yet be expected to have realised all its intended benefits.

In this section we consider:

a. The rationale for establishing Oak as an ALB and whether this rationale holds;
b. Users' experience of the services Oak provides and the extent to which Oak support is having an impact in support of wider government objectives; and
c. The appropriateness of Oak's delivery model and whether it has the right systems and knowledge in place.

Mandate and purpose

National contingency for remote education

Oak was originally established in response to the pandemic and stakeholders have commented positively on the support Oak provided to the sector as it adjusted to remote education. As an ALB it continues to provide a national contingency for remote education, should it be needed in the event of further disruption. While the circumstances that led to Oak being established have thankfully not been repeated, Oak remains part of the national contingency for a pandemic or a similar scenario. Furthermore, Oak usage data shows that usage increased during extreme weather events and periods of industrial action, so it continues to be used as a contingency resource.

However, as Oak's resources are optional, DfE guidance on providing remote education[2] only signposts Oak as a potential provider for schools to use instead of recording their own lessons "if preferred." Oak materials are not signposted in wider DfE guidance on emergency planning and response for education, childcare, and children's social care settings. It is the Review Team's view that not making clear in guidance that Oak is intended to be the national contingency provider of remote education, risks duplication of effort and cost at the local and national level.

> **Recommendation 1: We recommend that DfE guidance on providing remote education makes clear that Oak is funded by Government to provide a remote education service for use in the event of disruption and that schools are encouraged, though not required, to use it in those circumstances.**

---

[2] Providing remote education: guidance for schools - GOV.UK

Rationale for a curriculum body

The strategic case for establishment of a curriculum body was made in the Full Business Case published in October 2022[3]. This identified two main problems: weaknesses in curriculum design and delivery, as evidenced by Ofsted research on the enactment of the 2014 National Curriculum reforms; and excessive teacher workload driven by time spent searching for quality resources or creating lessons from scratch where these were not readily available.

The solution proposed by the business case was to support rapid improvements in curriculum delivery through getting teachers to engage with high quality curriculum resources. It argued that this was most likely to succeed if such resources were made freely available and easily identifiable to teachers. This has been the primary focus of Oak since its establishment as an ALB and, even though Oak is still partway through a programme of delivery to replace pandemic content with higher-quality, fully sequenced curricula; we have heard much evidence that this support is welcomed by teachers and seen as a legitimate government intervention. User views of Oak are discussed further in the next section.

It is the Review Team's view that the original ambition for an ALB to provide this kind of support to teachers remains relevant. Teacher workload remains a pressing issue and, in the Working Lives of Teachers and Leaders 2023 survey[4], 48% of classroom teachers and middle leaders reported spending too much time on planning or preparation of lessons across the school year.

In our engagement, stakeholders raised concerns about the potential additional workload associated with updating lesson plans and curricula that may arise from the recommendations of the Curriculum and Assessment Review (C&A Review). The original business case for Oak's establishment as an ALB argued that changes to the National Curriculum introduced in 2014 were implemented with comparatively little practical support, which contributed to subsequent weaknesses in curriculum. If similar changes result from the C&A Review, Oak would be well placed to support schools and trusts to respond and to help mitigate the impact on curriculum quality during the implementation period.

> **Recommendation 2: We recommend that the DfE consider how Oak can best support the implementation of the Curriculum and Assessment Review and help to mitigate the workload impacts on teachers.**

The business case also argued that a curriculum body would need to do more than just provide high-quality resources. It would also need to act as a system leader, working with

---

[3] Oak National Academy business case - GOV.UK
[4] Working lives of teachers and leaders – wave 1 - GOV.UK

the sector to secure teacher buy-in to using high-quality resources and helping to grow the comparatively immature evidence base underpinning effective curriculum thinking. The need to carry out this central, public role was a key part of the rationale for establishing the curriculum body as an ALB, rather than procuring an organisation to develop materials through commercial routes.

Barriers to system leadership

Establishing Oak as a high-performing, well-respected sector organisation has been part of its strategic aims from the outset, but it is the Review Team's view that more work is needed for Oak to fully realise the system leadership role envisaged by the business case. This is not surprising given that Oak has only been established for two years and has, with the agreement of the DfE, focused its resource primarily on delivering new resources to replace those produced at pace during the pandemic. These new, more robustly quality-assured resources will provide necessary foundations for system leadership, supporting Oak's credibility as a centre of curriculum expertise. However, when the second cycle of delivery is completed in September, a clear steer will be needed on how the DfE expects Oak to fulfil the wider ambition for a curriculum body.

As well as challenges around timescale and resource, Oak has also faced significant headwinds from the challenging context into which it was established as an ALB. The move to establish an ALB was, and continues to be, opposed by the commercial market, and ongoing legal proceedings from the commercial market have cast a long shadow. Carve outs intended to preserve areas of activity for the commercial market have been interpreted cautiously, impacting on Oak's ability to influence practice. To give an example, Oak and the DfE have been clear from the outset that Oak is not a provider of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for teachers but this has had the effect of limiting the scope given to curriculum partners (organisations contracted by Oak to develop curricula for a particular subject and phase) to provide additional guidance alongside the standard resources. We believe that curriculum partners could be given more scope to provide suggested activities and other guidance without straying into the arena of providing actual CPD.

Oak has also been opposed by other influential stakeholders, for example education unions and prominent trust leaders, who had concerns about a provider being closely tied to government, impinging on teachers' professional autonomy and being used to impose certain pedagogies. Oak has made concerted efforts to improve stakeholder relationships, with some very notable successes, but there remain strong, critical voices in the system. A perception that Oak is tied to certain approaches persists, with some stakeholders raising concerns in our engagement. However, others reported that concerns on that score had been allayed by new materials.

More widely, there is a culture, particularly among school and trust leaders, that mistrusts the use of ready-made resources in general despite many trusts providing such materials as good starting points to be adapted for individual cohorts etc. In our stakeholder

engagement this was often linked to concerns about deskilling teachers and lesson quality being impacted if off-the-shelf resources were used without adaptation. This was not reflected in our engagement with teachers, who were clear that they would always adapt materials to the needs of their class. Furthermore, Oak is clear, both internally and in external communications, that use of its materials is optional and has made significant, practical efforts to ensure they are as adaptable as possible. However, more proactive comms are needed to ensure that this message really cuts through and Oak needs to consider targeting messaging at leaders, as well as teachers, so that it is understood that Oak really can equip teachers with a clear starting point for lessons – and that there is absolutely no shame in making use of that.

> **Recommendation 3: We recommend that Oak continues to emphasise that its materials are optional and fully adaptable (including using the content with most or all of the Oak branding removed if desired). It should consider how to target these communications to secure the buy-in of leaders, as well as teachers, and build confidence that their use is not inconsistent with professional autonomy or skills.**

One area where Oak has demonstrated significant system leadership is in the field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education, with the development of its AI Lesson Assistant (Aila). This was not part of the original business case for Oak, but demonstrates how Oak has recognised a potential user need and harnessed its quality-assured curriculum resource bank to deliver a highly innovative service to teachers. Aila has the scope to significantly enhance the workload reduction benefits sought by Oak. However, stakeholders also recognised that Oak's contribution was significant in terms of setting a high quality and safety bar for the use of an emerging technology in education. The DfE's digital strategy going forward is likely to emphasise market shaping rather than the direct creation of products by DfE and its ALBs, but Oak has played a helpful role by breaking new ground, setting high standards and sharing the learning. The Review Team believes that Oak should be encouraged to follow a similar approach in the curriculum space – continuing to identify gaps in support and exposing more of their process for developing high-quality curriculum resources so that others can learn from their approach.

Repositioning Oak

In the Autumn there will be a key opportunity to reposition Oak - it will complete the roll-out of the full suite of curriculum packages; recruitment will be underway for a new Chair and CEO and the final report of the C&A Review will be published.

As part of repositioning Oak, the DfE should review the strategic aims of the organisation. Completing the publication of cycle two materials will free up Oak resource currently focused on delivering those new curricula to focus on new priorities. As set out earlier in this report, the Review Team considers that Oak is well positioned to support

implementation of the C&A Review and recommends that the DfE clarifies its intentions in this respect as soon as possible. At the very least, Oak will need to ensure its current materials are updated, considering any changes and other potential areas of focus are suggested later in this report.

The Review Team also think it would be helpful for the DfE to provide greater clarity on its expectations of Oak in relation to system leadership and how it is expected to interact with the wider sector and commercial market. This will allow Oak to step into this role more confidently. However, clear and public backing from the DfE will also be needed. Communications around the publication of the C&A Review and publication of the cycle two materials will provide a key opportunity to reinforce the ambition for Oak and set out the future direction for the organisation make clear the role it will play in C&A Review implementation and reinforce messaging around Oak resources being optional and adaptable.

> **Recommendation 4: We recommend that Oak's strategic aims be updated to clarify its future role.**
>
> **Recommendation 5: We recommend that the DfE uses the opportunity of the publication of cycle two materials and the C&A Review in the Autumn to demonstrate public support for Oak and to set out the future direction for the organisation. This messaging should recommit that Oak will remain optional and adaptable to allay sector concerns.**

Repositioning Oak also provides an opportunity to clarify the intended geographical scope of Oak. Oak's strategic aims reflect a commitment given in the Levelling Up White Paper in 2022[5] to establish a "UK National Academy" and require Oak to develop connected, stretching materials to provide pupils across the four nations of the UK with an opportunity for study beyond their school's curriculum.

Work on stretch materials was postponed in 2023 to allow Oak to focus on delivering the first cycle of curriculum packages for England, but initial scoping work had identified challenges in developing a cohesive set of resources that would work with different curricula across the UK. The project was also seen by the Scottish and Welsh Governments as counter to the devolution of education policy and work has therefore not recommended following delivery of cycle one. Given the position of the devolved administrations, the Review Team considers that this aim should be removed.

---

[5] Levelling Up the United Kingdom: Executive Summary

> **Recommendation 6: We recommend that the provision of connected, stretching materials for teachers and pupils across the four nations be removed from Oak's strategic aims.**

As part of repositioning the organisation, the Review Team recommends that firm consideration is given to the Oak brand and, in particular, the "National Academy" element of the name. While making any wholesale changes to the name of the organisation would come at a cost, both in terms of making practical changes like reworking code and in terms of brand awareness, we believe removing the "National Academy" branding could help to shift perceptions of Oak being a means to impose a government-favoured pedagogy. This could also counter some lingering misconceptions that Oak has been established as an academy trust. This should be part of a wider brand update, considering also the look and feel of the website.

> **Recommendation 7: We recommend that the DfE removes "National Academy" from the name of the organisation as part of a wider brand update.**

Impact

Different use cases

The Review Team's engagement confirms that Oak is delivering the intended benefits for existing users. In an independent annual evaluation commissioned by Oak and carried out by ImpactEd[6], nearly three quarters of teachers who regularly use Oak reported that it saved them time, and just over half agreed that it had improved their confidence and the quality of their lesson planning. It also found that Oak was more frequently used in disadvantaged areas, with 19% more downloads occurring in the most deprived areas than in the least, suggesting Oak has the potential to support closing the disadvantage gap.

In the time available, the Review Team was not able to independently validate these quantitative findings, but our stakeholder engagement did echo many of the qualitative findings reported in this evaluation.

In our stakeholder engagement, where teachers had used Oak resources, they were generally positive about the quality. They described the resources as a starting point and were clear that they would always adapt resources before using them. As well as using Oak as part of general lesson planning, teachers reported that Oak resources were particularly helpful for setting work for cover lessons and pupils unable to attend school, for example due to exclusion or illness. The ImpactEd evaluation also noted these

---

[6] [Oak National Academy 2023/24 Evaluation Report](#)

"emergency uses" but noted a trend in 2023/24 towards greater usage for general lesson planning, driven by an increase in user numbers.

We also heard some examples of schools or trusts using Oak's curricula as a comparator to review their own curricula and making improvements as a result. The latter suggests that Oak has the potential to drive improvements in curriculum quality as envisaged in the business case, but this activity does not seem to be widespread.

Barriers to increasing use

The available data gives a mixed picture of Oak usage. The ImpactEd evaluation calculated that 1 in 3 teachers use Oak, which is based on a combination of user numbers from the Oak website with an assumption about offline sharing applied. It also reported that Oak had experienced significant growth, with a 115% increase in users from February 24th to July 24th, 2024, compared to the same period the previous year. Conversely, findings from the School and College Voice (SCV) survey in September 2024 found that 12% of teachers used Oak in the 23/24 Academic Year (AY) and overall usage had decreased since the previous AY.

It should be noted that the results of the SCV survey are not directly comparable to the findings from the ImpactEd evaluation, and that neither would have captured any increase in usage following the publication of the first cycle of new materials in September 2024. Data shared with the Review Team by Oak indicates the availability of these new materials has resulted in a significant increase in usage over the last six months. Assuming this increase is, at least in part, driven by the availability of new resources, a similar increase might be expected once cycle two materials have been made available in Autumn 2025. Trends in recent Oak usage are discussed in more detail in the new Market Impact Assessment, conducted alongside this review.

However, there is a significant issue with the understanding of Oak's offer. In our stakeholder engagement, where they were not active users of Oak, teachers were often unaware of the changes that had been made to its content since the pandemic and were interested to explore the new resources. This can be attributed in part to restrictions on marketing activity around the election, and the fact that the full suite of cycle one materials has only been available since September 2024. However, the ImpactEd evaluation also found that the association of Oak with emergency use during the pandemic continued to act as a significant barrier to teachers using Oak, particularly in primary schools. The Oak team is well aware of this "pandemic legacy" issue and has been working to address it through communications, but these efforts need to be sustained if Oak is to positively impact on workload and the curriculum quality at the system level, as envisaged by the original business case. Proactive communications around the publication of cycle two materials will be particularly important to ensure that teachers, who could benefit from the new materials, are aware of them.

Oak has carried out a helpful exercise to consider the needs of different teacher users based on a range of use cases. This included both addressing situational problems, for example disruption to learning due to absence, and addressing systemic problems, such as issues with curriculum quality or lack of specialist knowledge. As part of this exercise, the Oak team has considered the channels through which teachers will find their way to Oak resources and the messaging that is relevant to each group.

Recommendation 8: We recommend that the DfE reviews Oak's marketing and communications budget to ensure it is sufficient to deliver really good quality and engaging interactions with all potential user groups.

In our stakeholder engagement, trust and school leaders often reported that Oak wasn't being used in their organisations, emphasising that they had developed their own curricula and the importance of this for teachers' development. As discussed in the previous section, this is reflective of a professional culture that emphasises the creation of resources and design of curricula from scratch as integral to teachers' professional identity, creating a stigma around using ready-made resources. Some stakeholders disputed this view, arguing that there wasn't capacity in the system for teachers to develop all lessons in this way and that we should look to other professions that use technology and resources to work more efficiently. Where school leaders had found Oak helpful, they often chose to share this in writing after the stakeholder event instead of in an open forum with peers – which the Review Team calls the "shy Oak user".

Recommendation 9: We recommend that the DfE and Oak work with partners to stimulate a professional debate about the ways accessing high-quality curriculum resources can support teachers' professionalism and drive improvements in practice.

Inclusion and Early Years

Oak's intention is that the standard National Curriculum-aligned materials it provides should be accessible for all students, both through following an evidence-based approach to lesson design and through using the additional features afforded by a digital platform to support accessibility. For example, Oak video lessons are pausable and rewindable, and Accessible Rich Internet Application (ARIA) hints throughout the website support screen readers and other assistive technologies. Oak has also started to provide British Sign Language interpretation for English and Maths lessons for KS1 and has previously implemented subtitle translation to support schools welcoming pupils from the Ukraine. It is the Review Team's firm view that Oak should continue to build on these successes to support a wider cohort of pupils accessing lessons with English as an Additional Language (EAL).

Recommendation 10: Oak should provide a greater range of language translations on video lessons to support pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL).

In line with the inclusive approach set out above, Oak does not provide differentiated materials for pupils with SEND, but feedback has been positive about the use of Oak's resources with this group. In our stakeholder engagement, teachers and schools leaders reported using resources to support interventions and to address learning gaps for individual pupils. Teachers and leaders working with pupils with SEND or in specialist settings such as hospital schools or alternative provisions pointed out the usefulness of being able to access resources across different years, key stages and subjects. The fact that resources are not badged by year group was welcomed when working with children with different starting points or learning gaps.

Oak also provides resources specifically intended to support remote learning for children, who are not able to access the National Curriculum and attend specialist settings. These were developed during the pandemic with a consortium of Specialist Education and SEND experts. They have not been updated since publication and the current expectation is that they will be retired when the licence expires in August 2027, unless Oak is commissioned by the DfE (and funded) to update them, as they have done for the standard curricula. Usage of these materials is low, but this is in part due to the more limited target user group (the majority of pupils with SEND would be expected to access the National Curriculum).

Similarly, materials created in the pandemic to support the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) are expected to remain on the Oak website until the licence expires. While concerns have been raised about the suitability of Oak lessons for younger learners (these are discussed in more detail later in this report) it is anomalous that early years materials, targeted at reception, have not been included in their wider work to update materials. Under the 'Best start in life' pillar of the Government's Opportunity Mission there is now a renewed focus on early years outcomes, with a target set for 75 per cent of 5-year-olds reaching a good level of development in the EYFS Profile Assessment by 2028. It should therefore be considered whether there is a role for Oak to support reception teachers with lesson and curriculum planning to drive improvements in quality. It has not been possible to determine, within the timescales for the review, whether there is sufficient appetite from the sector for these materials to be updated. However, there has been a modest increase in usage of EYFS materials since late last year, likely driven by activity to raise awareness of the new KS1-4 materials, and this suggests that there does remain some interest in EY materials.

Continuing to host legacy material for the term of the current licences has only a small cost implication. However, if this material is not updated in line with the approach taken to KS1-4, there is a potential reputational risk if it falls out of line with best practice, as well as a missed opportunity to better support learners in reception or with SEND.

> **Recommendation 11: We recommend that the DfE reviews the case for updating pandemic legacy content for children in specialist settings and for the Early Years Foundation Stage.**

Pupil impact

It has not been possible from the available evidence to fully assess the impact of Oak materials on pupils. In most cases, teachers are using Oak materials alongside other materials and strategies, therefore it will always be challenging to quantify the impact of one resource or set of resources.

Oak does measure its impacts on pupil outcomes through the annual ImpactEd evaluations, which compare the percentage of pupils performing above and below expectations between Oak users or non-users. This is based on their teachers' perceptions. In the latest ImpactEd evaluation, teachers who used Oak reported no significant difference in their perception of their pupils performance compared with non-users. While it is important to have this headline measure, which also forms part of the DfE's benefits management strategy for Oak, it may be helpful if future evaluations seek to understand if there are any differences in outcomes for the different use cases for Oak. For example, some of the commonly cited uses are intended to mitigate potential negative impacts on pupil outcomes, for example using Oak materials for cover lessons, or pupils unable to attend school. Even where Oak resources are used for general lesson planning, if the same outcome is achieved with less workload for the teacher that would still be an overall benefit.

The gold standard for evaluating impact on pupil outcomes would be to run a Randomised Control Trial (RCT), but this would be a significant undertaking. Oak is helpfully collaborating with the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) on an RCT to assess the impact of Aila While this is also likely to measure pupil impact in a similar way to the ImpactEd evaluations (through teacher assessment), the Review Team welcome this as step towards a more robust demonstration of impact.

Maximising impact

It is the Review Team's view that, having invested significantly in the development of Oak's resources, the DfE should now maximise the potential benefits by considering the full range of potential use cases and maximising awareness of Oak's offer.

As discussed above, under Repositioning Oak, a key precondition to maximise Oak's impact will be the DfE sending a clear message to schools and other stakeholders in the education system about Oak's role. DfE should also seek to embed use of Oak resources into other DfE interventions for school improvement. In our stakeholder engagement, we heard that it was unclear whether DfE-funded actors, for example Maths Hubs, were allowed to direct schools to Oak resources or whether this always needed to be included

with a range of other commercially available resources. This is a missed opportunity, especially given the close alignment of the Oak maths curricula, developed by Mathematics in Education and Industry (MEI), with the work of the Maths Hubs, in which MEI is a key partner.

Oak should also continue to build on the work it has already done to understand better its teacher users, looking in more depth at how it can support teachers in particular settings, e.g. alternative provision or hospital schools. Oak has already identified some opportunities to do this, working with HM Prison and Probation Service to enable access to Oak's lessons within the prison and youth justice estates to support offender education.

> **Recommendation 12: Oak should build on the work it has already done to understand its teacher users, to improve understanding of the needs of teachers in particular settings, such as alternative provision, hospital schools or the justice system and identify any gaps in support.**

We also think that more consideration should now be given to pupil usage. Since being established as an ALB, Oak's main focus has been on reworking its materials to support their use in the classroom, so their primary audience has understandably been teachers. However, pupils remain a key audience for Oak's materials, which has not had the same level of focus. We heard some evidence in stakeholder engagement that teachers find it helpful to direct parents and pupils to Oak to help with homework and revision. We consider that this could be promoted more widely, again given the resources are already available, paid for and signposted on the Oak website. The Oak team is cautious about this, on the basis that high quality teaching has the greatest impact for pupils, and communications emphasise that parents should follow the advice of schools and teachers. However, as there is a clear 'pupil' tab adjacent to the 'teacher' tab on the Oak homepage and there are extensive resources available; we see no reason why this wouldn't be better promoted.

One use case that Oak has distanced itself from, is the potential use of Oak resources in homeschooling. Oak resources are not intended to replace in-class teaching beyond contingency scenarios. We have not heard evidence of Oak materials being used for homeschooling in our engagement, so cannot comment on the extent of any existing usage. However, it seems likely that increasing awareness of free, quality-assured, national curriculum-aligned materials among parents, who choose to homeschool could only be of benefit to their children.

While the Review Team agrees that the use of Oak should not be promoted as an alternative to attending school, there will always be pupils who cannot or do not attend school for a variety of reasons, for example exclusion, illness, school refusal, etc. Stakeholder feedback suggests that Oak can help to ensure these children are able to access a high-quality curriculum. Rather than shy away from this, it is the Review Team's

view that Oak should build on previous work to understand the needs of different types of pupil user and ensure the product works for the full range of use cases, even if not all will be actively promoted.

> **Recommendation 13: We recommend that Oak develops a pupil impact strategy, considering the different pupil use cases ("personas"). This should include promoting Oak's use for homework help and revision.**

Oak materials should also be leveraged to support wider government objectives. For example, we have found that Oak has supported the Sustainability and Climate Change Strategy, 2022, by releasing primary science materials which have an emphasis on nature.

However, in our stakeholder engagement, Relationships, Sex and Health Education (RSHE) was particularly and frequently mentioned as an area where teachers would welcome additional support. Young people, aged 15-24 years, experience the highest diagnosis rates of the most common sexually-transmitted infections[7].   The House of Commons Women and Equalities Committee recommended in March 2024 that the Government should work with Oak to improve the teaching of sex education, and the materials available to support it, in order to ensure it delivers the information and guidance children need. Oak has confirmed it stands ready to offer a full RSHE curriculum once new statutory guidance is available.

> **Recommendation 14: We recommend that Oak release materials on Relationships, Sex and Health Education as soon as new statutory guidance is available.**

There is also great potential for access to Oak materials to form part of international development programmes, especially in a climate of a reduction of aid. There has been some interest in and exploration of this by organisations other than Oak. For example, the Gates foundation co-funded a Tanzanian NGO to carry out a project to adapt Oak resources to a Tanzanian context and provide AI-generated lesson planning support. This found that adaptation was feasible and that there was potential for further cross-curriculum collaboration. In our engagement we found that significant appetite remains for Oak materials to be readily available to support international development.

Currently, Oak materials are not geo-restricted, but there has been a commitment that Oak will not operate or market its resources internationally, except in tightly limited circumstances.   For example, Oak were able to use their materials to support Ukrainian refugees as this was an acute humanitarian crisis. The commitment not to promote materials internationally was intended to mitigate any potential impacts on the international interests of commercial education suppliers. However, the new MIA,

---

[7] [Sexually transmitted infections and screening for chlamydia in England: 2023 report - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk)

completed alongside this review, has concluded Oak has, to date, likely had a limited impact on the international market for commercial curriculum resources.

It is the Review Team's firm view that consideration should be given to the merits of embedding Oak materials in international development interventions in areas where local systems would not be able to purchase resources of similar quality on the open market. The Review Team believe this should form part of any limited circumstances where Oak can operate internationally.

> **Recommendation 15: We recommend that the DfE consults with the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office on the possibility of embedding Oak resources in International Development interventions.**

User Experience

While users are generally positive about the quality of Oak materials, and Oak makes regular changes in response to user feedback, our stakeholder engagement did identify some areas where the user experience could be improved.

Lesson structure and guidance

Oak lessons under the new curricula all have the same components, with each linked to part of Oak's evidence-based learning framework. This has been an important part of ensuring consistency and providing quality assurance across curricula for different subjects and key stages, developed with different curriculum partners. However, some stakeholders found the resulting structure to be too rigid, and in some cases off putting. We heard particular concerns about the appropriateness of the lesson structure for younger learners in KS1. Experts in early education highlighted that this age group benefit from hands-on learning and highlighted that children in KS1 may not have the required reading age or attention span to engage in a lesson structured around a long slidepack. Other stakeholders reported that this would increase workload for the teacher, who then has to shorten and adapt the pack for classroom use.

> **Recommendation 16: We recommend that Oak should evaluate whether the lesson format and style should sometimes be varied, especially for younger pupils.**

As set out earlier in this report, the need not to stray into providing Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for teachers, alongside the emphasis on consistency, has also imposed constraints on how guidance is offered to teachers on the effective use of Oak resources. Guidance accompanying each set of lesson materials is constrained to the 'lesson details' section, which sets out the lesson objectives, key words and common misconceptions. Guidance beyond those points is limited to a single 'teacher tip'. Other helpful guidance, for example on how to adapt materials for use with pupils with Special

Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND[8]) is provided through a blog on the website. While this blog contains a lot of helpful information, the information is not directly accessible from individual lessons and older posts disappear from view on the home page meaning helpful information may be missed.

> **Recommendation 17: We recommend that guidance for teachers on effective use of the Oak curriculum should be clearly accessible both from within individual resources and on the home page, perhaps in a guidance hub.**

Pupil interface

Since being established as an ALB, Oak's main focus has been on reworking its materials to support their use in the classroom and their primary audience has therefore been teachers. All new content has been designed to work with the pupil interface but more recently Oak has not had sufficient resource to prioritise further improvements to the pupil area of the website. As a result, the pupil area is less engaging than comparable pupil-focussed Edtech, something that we heard reflected in our stakeholder engagement.

Enhancing the features available in the pupil product may lead to increased overlap with existing market provision. This means any new developments would need careful consideration, but at the very least there is a strong case to review the look and feel of the pupil website to address the corporate feel.

> **Recommendation 18: We recommend that the pupil area of the Oak website is significantly refreshed to make the interface more engaging.**

Delivery model

As mentioned earlier the Review Team found Oak still has a legitimate mandate to operate as an ALB as there are still very clear benefits to an ALB model, which has independence but also is strategically aligned to government's priorities.

Partnership model

In establishing Oak as an ALB the original business case identified the benefit of retaining Oak's 'by teachers for teachers' approach. A key part of this was committing to a model whereby Oak would contract with curriculum partners to deliver new curricula, rather than developing the curricula and supporting materials in house. Oak's curriculum partners have included a range of high performing school trusts, subject associations,

---

[8] [Supporting pupils with SEND? How Oak can help | Oak National Academy](#)

education charities, publishers and universities. These were supported by subject expert groups, recruited via an open process, and a Subject Lead in the Oak team.

As well as allowing Oak to operate in a very lean way and providing a means to harness sector expertise, the outsourcing model lent important credibility to the new ALB. However, we do not think Oak has done all that it can to maximise this benefit. All materials are presented consistently under Oak branding, with the curriculum partner only credited at the very end of the lesson slidepack, and in the licencing information.

> **Recommendation 19: Oak should seek agreement from its curriculum partners to display their branding more prominently on lesson resources they have developed.**

The outsourcing model has also come with some challenges. Oak needed to deliver a consistent quality of product across multiple contracts, with a range of different organisations of different types and sizes. Feedback from Oak has indicated that the model was most effective where curriculum partners were already well established with existing access to teachers and resources. Another learning was that the need for in house quality assurance was initially underestimated, leading to the need to hire contingent labour (discussed later in this report). Once the publication of cycle two materials concludes in Autumn, Oak will enter a different phase of delivery, which offers the opportunity to review the effectiveness of the outsourcing model and potentially take a different approach for future projects.

Open Licencing

Oak's delivery model included the decision to make the curriculum resources freely available to all, to maximise public benefit. This has meant using an Open Government Licence (OGL) for all new curriculum resources, which once available will make Oak the first open-sourced full national curriculum offer. This delivers positive benefits as Oak's resources can be freely downloaded and adapted by any organisation, which means there is potential for greater benefit and use for every resource.

However, this has also meant that Oak has needed to think hard about how to use third party resources, which require compliance to third party copyright. Third party content is essential for a broad and rich curriculum and some subjects rely on it heavily, e.g. Music and English. Oak has procured some licences and ensured users are aware of the terms and conditions of third-party copyright. However, in some instances it is not possible to obtain the licence, e.g. a publisher has refused the use of their material on Oak. In these instances, Oak has developed work arounds, such as signposting teachers to use a text in English without using published content or creating content in-house for subjects. Oak acknowledges that this has taken more time and cost to develop, however the long-term benefit of having the curriculum delivered on an OGL will be hugely valuable.

Relationship with commercial market

As set out earlier in this report, since being established as an ALB, Oak has had a difficult relationship with the commercial providers of curriculum resources, who consider that the provision of free resources by Oak has a negative impact on their business. The intention was quite different – that Oak would provide a helpful starting point where teachers were not already accessing high quality resources and that, by securing teacher buy-in to the use of high quality resources and supporting the development of the evidence base on curriculum best practice, Oak would support the future development of the market. The OGL approach outlined in the previous section is also intended to support innovation in the wider sector, allowing other organisations to build on Oak's products.

Oak has done some work to test the feasibility of signposting to alternative curriculum sequences, as was set out in the 2024-25 Chair's letter. We understand that this is something that the market would welcome in principle, though publishers have raised concerns about how this would work in practice. Significant further work would be needed to ensure that any approach is fair and robust. There is also the potential for Oak resources to be used to support the development of the Edtech sector. Drawing only on Oak materials has been a key part of ensuring that the outputs of Aila are of sufficient quality and there are now plans to add Oak materials to the DfE Content Store. This will allow AI companies to train other tools on Oak content in the same way, ensuring accurate, high-quality outputs. This is in line with our recommendation that DfE should seek to maximise the value of Oak's assets. We are also aware that questions have been raised about whether Aila might draw on a broader range of materials going forward. As for signposting, work would be needed to ensure that high-quality outputs were maintained.

The MIA completed alongside this review has concluded that Oak has had a modest impact on the domestic commercial curriculum market (and an even smaller impact on the international market) through introducing a greater degree of risk and uncertainty into commercial decision making, but that there is little evidence that Oak has been used as a substitute for commercial resources. It is too early to accurately assess the impact of Aila.

Governance

This section considers whether Oak National Academy are meeting expectations of governance arrangements for an ALB.

Board and committees

The Review Team found Oak has an experienced and skilled board of non-executive directors, who have supported and challenged Oak during the first two years.   The non-executive directors have a mix of skills, although many have educational backgrounds.   The Review Team found the board has driven efficiency and effectiveness and has a positive and transparent relationship with Oak.   At board meetings, discussion is open and unhindered and there is an appropriate mix of documentation shared, including detailed and practical CEO reports, performance against Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Objectives and Key Results (OKRs) and the presentation of subcommittee meeting reports.   There is evidence of non-executive-directors providing the right level of challenge, and with good contextual knowledge, and they have also proactively taken part in lessons learned exercises with directors.

There has been a known risk of some committees having fewer members, however Oak has recently taken steps to address this by recruiting one new non-executive director to the board and two new non- directors to the sub-committees. The current chair of the board is due to step down in 2025 and a new recruitment process will be led by the DfE to fill this post. Both directors and non-executive directors report a positive and effective relationship between the board and Oak, and the board members speak highly of the achievements of Oak over the last two years.

> **Recommendation 20: We recommend that Oak's board accelerates its Board Effectiveness Review to ensure completion as soon as possible in 2025.**

Risk Management and assurance

Oak has an effective risk management strategy, where risks are tracked, measured and reported at every Senior Leadership Team meeting. This is followed up by the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee which tracks risks and conducts deep dives into particular risks. The overall approach to risk is sensible and Oak is a self-aware organisation, which knows and manages its risks effectively.

Accountability

This section reviews the relationship between the department and Oak, and the support and challenge offered to Oak via the critical 'sponsoring' relationship of the department.

Role of the sponsor team

Both Oak and the DfE report a positive working relationship, which has effectively supported Oak's work and development over the last 2 years. The DfE has provided additional support in Oak's infancy to help Oak establish all the processes required for an ALB. With these processes now established, the DfE has taken a more business as usual role. However, with the departure of the Chair and the CEO the team will be leading recruitment processes in 2025.

The role of the DfE's relationship with Oak is set out in the framework agreement[9] and reinforced in the annual chair's letter. This sets out the strategic aims and the KPIs for the year ahead. This process is a key requirement for how the Department holds Oak to account, however the Review Team found a tension between the timing of the chair's letter and the way Oak sets its own internal targets, which are termly rather than annually. As covered later in this review, the Review Team also found that some of the processes involved in setting KPIs need to be reviewed to ensure the DfE have time to discuss implications, risks and options before they are signed off by the Oak Board.

The Review Team has found that the Sponsorship Team has the right positive attitude and approach but has not always been able to act as a fully intelligent client. With the development of Aila and Oak moving more into the Edtech space, there may be a need for the team to have access to additional expertise including on Edtech and AI to ensure good quality future commissioning and subject knowledge in this area.

Similarly to Oak, the DfE has been focussing on product development and establishing Oak as an ALB. The Review Team found that because of this they hadn't yet taken the opportunity to join up on wider DfE strategies. The Review Team found there were many opportunities to establish links with other policies and stakeholders welcomed the opportunity to make the links with areas such as curriculum hubs, SEND and hospital schools.

> **Recommendation 21: The Sponsorship Team would benefit from more breadth of skills, and additional access to specialists, Edtech and AI. We also suggest that the Sponsorship Team should join up more widely with other DfE policy areas to maximise opportunities for Oak to support DfE objectives.**

---

[9] Oak's Framework Agreement (2).pdf

Oversight

The Review Team found the current KPI system to hold Oak to account to be broadly effective and did work for the DfE and for Oak. Oak has achieved all KPIs set over the first two years and are on track to complete the 24/25 KPIs.

Although effective, it should be noted that the KPIs are used as a high-level measure, with Oak's own OKRs being used as more detailed internal targets, which drive priorities in the organisation. Oak states that the OKRs are consciously chosen to be challenging and report on these at every board meeting. However, the Review Team found there was some ambiguity as to how these, more detailed, performance measures are set and in particular DfE's role in setting the broader KPIs.

The KPIs are also single targets and therefore also, single points of failure. The OKRs are much more detailed and may provide a better (and alternative) means of measuring the elements of Oak's performance that really matter. There seems to be no reason why the OKRs couldn't replace the KPIs (and two sets of targets are not necessary in the Review Team's opinion) but they would need to more robustly debated, set and agreed by the DfE and the Board (where the Senior Sponsor is present).

With the change of leadership and chair in 2025, we recommend that DfE looks to develop a more robust performance measure setting process, so that there is a clear process where DfE and the board set and debate targets, whether that be KPIs or OKRs.

> **Recommendation 22: We recommend the DfE reviews the process for setting performance measures, including who is responsible for setting KPIs, the timing of these in relation to OKRs and where these two systems could work more effectively together.**

Efficiency

This section considers the efficiency of Oak as an organisation. It looks to ensure that Oak is meeting the expectations for financial management processes in line with current guidance, and the expectations for the identification of cashable efficiency gains made through change in practices, for example, digitisation and the workforce.

Staffing

The Review Team found Oak to be a lean organisation with an agile operating model, which looks to pivot resource to focus areas driven by the organisation's OKRs. The central corporate team is small and use their roles to flex to ensure they are getting the most value from their staff and for business continuity.

To support the delivery of products, Oak has regularly used contingent labour in instances such as having the capacity to quality assure all curriculum resources and to build an Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) tracking system to support open licencing of the curriculum resources. After the delivery of cycle two of the curriculum resources in Autumn 2025, contingent labour use is predicted to fall to normal levels. However, the Remuneration and HR Committee has been looking at the use and management of contingent labour to try and improve this process.

Oak operates as a fully remote organisation, with a clear, intentional set of culture and values. Remote working helps Oak to reduce costs, but they do rent some spaces around the country for workers to attend in person. Oak has worked hard to role model and describe what good culture means, including producing some excellent scenarios of how it works to set really clear boundaries and expectations of the whole team in a well-constructed and novel culture document. Oak tracks employee satisfaction through surveys and the Review Team found these receive positive results.   Oak has also sought feedback from Investors in People, which has shown the organisation to be above industry benchmarks and Oak has recently worked on embedding the proactive giving and receiving of feedback more robustly. Overall, the Review Team found Oak has worked intentionally hard to create an excellent staff culture and sees this as an area of continuous development.

As a lean organisation, Oak does face particular challenges around succession planning. With the departure of the CEO, this has highlighted the need to have succession planning in place for key roles.   To partially mitigate this risk, Oak has already been using progression pay to recognise where someone has taken on additional responsibility or undertaken development that is beneficial to the organisation. However, this still remains a risk due to the lean nature of the organisation.

Recommendation 23: We recommend the board puts a formal succession plan in place for key roles in the organisation.

Digital

Oak operates a fully digital platform, which was reviewed by the Government Digital Standards Agency, which provides feedback and recommendations on their digital services. The Review Team found Oak improves its digital service by producing work to understand their different users and then using this to feed into planning and the design of digital services. User feedback is collected frequently and they respond to this quickly, demonstrating their keen focus on user need. The Review Team found Oak are ambitious at setting high standards for AI in education and are assessing AILA against 24 quality and accuracy benchmarks. Stakeholders with digital expertise spoke highly of the product and its compliance to high digital standards. As noted earlier in this report, Oak has also agreed for the EEF to evaluate AILA and this again highlights the team's openness to work with others and to provide assurance on the products. To measure the quality of its digital services, Oak collects and uses a wide range of data including net promoter score, number of daily lessons taken, number of resources downloaded and teachers' awareness. Oak also carries out more detailed annual evaluations, these have been carried out by ImpactEd to date. The Review Team found the use of data to improve quality of services to be extensive and were assured that Oak is a continuously improving organisation.

Oak has published an up to date accessibility statement on their website. This shows they are committed to making the website accessible, but there are some outstanding areas to continue to work on. These include labelling some buttons and fields, some content not being announced to screen readers and only having a small amount of content which is signed. Oak has plans to continue to improve the accessibility, where there isn't a disproportionate burden and regularly seek feedback on accessibility from users.

Finance

Generally, the Review Team found excellent adherence to financial guidance, for example in preparation of the annual report, mitigation of fraud and effective performance tracking. Board members were given assurance on the financial accounts when Oak was first set up, by attending a series of challenge sessions. Furthermore, Oak has used the Government Internal Audit Agency to provide assurance of its processes but has recently externally tendered for this work and has appointed a new provider.

Oak's internal audit reports have demonstrated excellent accountability and attention to detail in all audited areas with an impressive record of 'substantial' classifications.

Oak has been a lean organisation from its infancy and this has allowed it to operate in a nimble and responsive way. However, this model has also carried risk, as the organisation does not have the capacity to absorb budget cuts. The lean model has led Oak to rely on contingent labour when delivery challenges have arisen, which has provided a short-term solution but does not necessarily provide long term value for

money. The Review Team found that underfunding in other areas like marketing and communications also has the potential to be short-sighted, as it does not maximise the return on the investment already spent (in terms of production of materials etc).

To action the recommendations in this review and ensure that Oak delivers best value for money, some further financial investment will be essential. A significant investment has already been made in the provision of high-quality curriculum resources, that are readily available for all. However, to deliver on the ambitions to reduce teacher workload and improve the quality of curriculum across the school system, Oak and the DfE now need to ensure the resources are being used widely. It is for this reason that many of our recommendations focus on marketing and comms and identifying other uses for Oak curriculum resources to support wider DfE and Government objectives. Overall, we think Oak's suite of curriculum resources is an asset with potential to provide great value, so now the focus needs to be on using this asset to its full potential.

About this publication:

    enquiries https://www.gov.uk/contact-dfe

    download www.gov.uk/government/publications