



Office of
the Schools
Adjudicator

Determination

Case reference: ADA3672

Objector: An individual

Admission authority: The Governing Board of Bishop Wordsworth's Church of England Grammar School

Date of decision: 13 October 2020

Determination

In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, Dr Vallely and I do not uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2021 determined by the governing board of Bishop Wordsworth's Church of England Grammar School, Salisbury, Wiltshire

The referral

1. Under section 88H(2) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, (the Act), an objection has been referred to the adjudicator by a person, (the objector), about the admission arrangements (the arrangements) for Bishop Wordsworth's Church of England Grammar School (the school), a selective academy school for boys aged 11 – 16 with a co-educational sixth form for September 2021. The objection is to the following aspects of the arrangements for admission to Year 7:

- a) the methodology for setting the qualifying standard for admission and lack of clarity as to how the standard is set;
- b) sharing the same tests with other schools;
- c) priority being afforded to applicants eligible for the Pupil Premium;
- d) re-use of the same selection tests for late sitters and late applicants; and
- e) the use of age standardisation in the selection tests.

2. The local authority for the area in which the school is located is Wiltshire County Council. The local authority is a party to this objection but has made no representations other than to provide information we have requested. The governing board of the school is a party to the objection, as is the objector.
3. This is one of twelve objections to the admission arrangements for September 2021 for twelve different schools referred to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator by the same objector. Dr Marisa Vallely and I have been appointed as joint adjudicators for these twelve objections as permitted by the Education (References to Adjudicator) Regulations 1999. I have acted as the lead adjudicator for this case and have drafted this determination.
4. There are a number of aspects which are common to all twelve objections. We are aware that the objector has made objections to other schools in previous years about these same aspects. Those objections have been determined by different adjudicators. We have read the relevant previous determinations and taken them into account. Those determinations do not form binding precedents upon us, and we have considered each of these aspects afresh. The approach we have taken is to discuss each of the common aspects in the objections which have been made this year and agree the wording of our determinations in relation to those aspects. Some identical wording will appear in each of the twelve determinations in relation to these common aspects.
5. Where an objection also contains aspects, which are unique to that objection, the lead adjudicator has made a determination on each of those aspects which has then been read and agreed by the other adjudicator prior to completion of the determination.

Jurisdiction

6. The terms of the Academy Agreement between the academy trust and the Secretary of State for Education require that the admissions policy and arrangements for the academy school are in accordance with admissions law as it applies to maintained schools. These arrangements were determined by the governing board, which is the admission authority for the school, on that basis. The objector submitted his objection to these determined arrangements on 25 April 2020. We are satisfied the objection has been properly referred to us in accordance with section 88H of the Act and it is within our jurisdiction.

Procedure

7. In considering this matter we have had regard to all relevant legislation and the School Admissions Code (the Code).
8. The documents we have considered in reaching our decision include:
 - a. a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the governing board at which the arrangements were determined;
 - b. a copy of the determined arrangements, which include the Supplementary Information Forms;

- c. the objector's form of objection dated 25 April 2020, supporting documents and subsequent correspondence;
- d. the school's response to the objection and subsequent correspondence;
- e. information provided by the local authority; and
- f. relevant previous determinations, research papers and court judgments referred to in the text.

Objection

9. There are five aspects to this objection. We have identified the relevant paragraphs of the Code here, but not set them out. The relevant paragraphs are set out in full when we come to our detailed consideration.

10. First, the objector considers that the arrangements are unclear as to who sets the qualifying standard; how it is set; and when it is set. He argues that, where the qualifying standard is set after the results of the tests are known, this is merely a method of filling available places, whereas the qualifying standard should be an objective measure of a grammar school standard of ability. This he suggests is unreasonable. Relevant paragraphs of the Code are paragraphs 1.17. and 14.

11. Second, the objector has said that the school has failed to list all the schools that share the same test and that this may allow a child to sit the same test with the advantages that would provide. He suggests that this contravenes paragraphs 1.17 and 14.

12. Third, the objector considers that affording priority in the oversubscription to applicants eligible for the pupil premium creates an unfairness to applicants who are not eligible, and that it was never the intention of the Government to have a two-tiered system which permits pupil premium applicants to be deemed selective on a qualifying score which is lower than the qualifying score for other applicants. In the case of this school, the qualifying standard is the same for all applicants. Relevant paragraphs of the Code are paragraphs 1.39A. and 14.

13. Fourth, the objector considers that re-using the same selection tests for late sitters and late applicants renders the testing process subject to abuse, as those who sit the tests in the main round may pass on the questions to those sitting the tests at a later date. The objector argues that this abuse of process, which he suggests is widespread, renders the tests unfit for purpose. Relevant paragraphs of the Code are 1.31. and 14.

14. Fifth, the objector considers that the use of age standardisation in the selection tests is unnecessary, rendered obsolete by the widespread practice of tutoring and gives an unfair advantage to younger children, particularly those who have been tutored. Relevant paragraphs of the Code are 1.31. and 14.

Background

15. Bishop Wordsworth's Church of England Grammar School is an 11 to 16 single sex boys' grammar school with a co-educational sixth form from September 2020. The school has academy status and is located in Salisbury, Wiltshire. It was rated by Ofsted as Outstanding in December 2006. The school has a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 160 for admissions to Year 7, and a PAN of 70 sixth form places available to external applicants, both male and female. It is oversubscribed. Data provided by the local authority shows that in 2020, 210 first preference applications were received for admission to Year 7; in 2019 the figure was 192; and in 2018 the figure was 181.

16. As we have said, the objection relates to the admission arrangements for Year 7. The arrangements provide that all candidates are required to sit an Entrance Test. Parents are told their child's score and whether he has met the qualifying standard for entry to the school. The arrangements say that the parent of a boy who has met the qualifying standard may express a preference for the school through the common applications process. Only candidates who meet the qualifying standard in the Entrance Test will be eligible to be considered for admission to the school. The arrangements suggest that the standard pass mark is normally between 70 per cent and 74 per cent.

17. Where applications from candidates who have met the qualifying standard exceed the number of places available, the following oversubscription criteria will be applied with distance from school being the order within the criteria, the boy living nearest to the school being first in the criterion:

- a. Any looked after or previously looked after boys who have met the qualifying standard.
- b. Any candidate attracting pupil premium funding (those who have been registered for free school meals at any point in the six years prior to the test day) who have met the qualifying standard.
- c. Boys meeting the qualifying standard who live within the catchment area of the school
- d. Boys meeting the qualifying standard who have a sibling in the school
- e. Boys meeting the qualifying standard who are children of members of staff at the school
- f. Other boys who meet the qualifying by distance from the school to home.

Consideration of Case

18. We have divided our consideration of the case into five headings, each of which comprises one aspect of the objection. As we have said, the objector has made objections on the same points for twelve schools. He has helpfully provided us with generic representations on the subjects of the setting of the qualifying score; priority for applicants eligible for the Pupil Premium; re-use of the same tests for late sitters and late applicants; and age standardisation. Because the representations are generic, our consideration of the

points is also generic, and so the text will be largely the same in all twelve determinations. It may not be identical as all of the schools have different arrangements.

The methodology for setting the qualifying standard is unclear and does not operate to establish a reasonable qualifying standard

19. The objector considers that the methodology for setting the qualifying standard (pass mark) for the tests is unclear. He also considers that, where the pass mark is set after the selection tests have been taken, this is simply a method of ensuring that available places are filled and does not establish a grammar school standard of ability. Accordingly, his view is that this is not a reasonable method of selection. The relevant requirements in the Code are in paragraphs 14 and 1.17. We have set these paragraphs out below. For the avoidance of doubt, we have not considered paragraph 1.31 in this section because our view, as we will explain in more detail later, is that paragraph 1.31 relates to whether the type of testing in operation, (in this case Verbal and Non Verbal Reasoning, Maths and Comprehension tests designed by the Centre for Evaluation and Monitoring (CEM)) provides an accurate reflection of a child's ability.

20. Paragraph 14 states that: "In drawing up their admission arrangements, admission authorities **must** ensure that the practices and the criteria used to decide the allocation of school places are fair, clear and objective. Parents should be able to look at a set of arrangements and understand easily how places for that school will be allocated." Paragraph 1.17 states that: "All selective schools **must** publish the entry requirements for a selective place and the process for such selection."

21. The first question for us to consider is how much information the school's admission arrangements must contain in order to be sufficiently clear. Parents need to know which steps they must take and by when, and what their child needs to do in order to be eligible for a place at the school. This information needs to be set out so that parents can look at the arrangements and understand easily how places will be allocated. Our view is that the information can either be in the arrangements themselves or signposted clearly in the arrangements with further detail accessible via a one-click link.

22. Our view is that in order for the arrangements to be sufficiently clear, where there is a pre-established pass mark, the arrangements must state what that pass mark is. Where the pass mark is not a pre-established one, the arrangements must say this. They must also say when the pass mark will be set, and when parents will be told whether their child has reached the pass mark. There is no requirement that the pass mark must be set using a particular methodology or that it be set by a specified body. However, the arrangements must be reasonable and operate fairly; therefore, we consider that the pass mark must be set by a competent person or body. There is no requirement that admission arrangements must set out how the pass mark is set, but if they do this the methodology must be described clearly.

23. The school's arrangements say that the qualifying standard is calculated after the boys have taken the test. Our conclusion on the question of clarity is that, since the entry requirements are set out clearly in the arrangements, this is sufficient to conform to the requirements in paragraphs 1.17 and 14 of the Code.

24. In terms of whether the school's qualifying standard is a reasonable one, the school has helpfully explained that the pass mark is normally between 70 per cent and 74 per cent. The school says that when the tests have been taken the pass mark is set so that sufficient applicants pass to fill the PAN plus about 18 for the waiting list. Too high a pass mark would mean that the year group would not be full with wasted spaces, while too low a pass mark would mean there would be a large number on the waiting list with false hope of entry and this would not be in their interests.

25. The objector asks the question 'who is to say and why what the required standard should be' and he suggests that as the ability range of candidates sitting the test each year will vary how does the school know that the boys being admitted are at the required standard. The school makes it clear that it is satisfied that each year sufficient boys who take the test and achieve high marks will be suitable to be admitted up to PAN. The level of ability of the candidates will vary from year to year but experience at the school indicates that there are always enough boys at or above the required standard to fill the PAN for year 7. This is borne out by the progress and performance of the boys as they go through the school and sit other national tests.

26. The school considers that the setting of its pass mark is a rational and fair process. We agree. From the CEM familiarisation papers and other evidence we have seen, it is apparent that the same areas are tested each year with similar types of questions; the school has made clear that the appropriate academic standard is set with reference to the cohort of boys taking the tests each year, which is reasonable; the school is not seeking to establish that the boys who are admitted are of exactly the same academic ability as those admitted in the previous year (in order to do this the school would need to use identical tests each year and have an identical pre-set pass mark); it is seeking to ensure that places at the school are filled by applicants who will be capable of coping in the academic environment of this particular school.

27. The objector's view is that setting the pass mark after the tests have been taken does not establish grammar school ability. It is merely a method of ensuring that the school fills to PAN. If the academic standard of a particular cohort of applicants is low, those admitted will simply be highest of the low, so to speak. It is entirely possible, he argues, that the applicants in the previous year were all of particularly high ability, and so those admitted were the highest of the high. There would be an inconsistency of academic standard as between the two year groups. We acknowledge that this is a possibility, albeit unlikely given that the same areas are tested each year.

28. The objector considers that an appropriate grammar school standard should be set, and those applicants who do not meet the standard should not be admitted. No special arrangements should be made for particular applicants, such as those who are younger or

eligible for the pupil premium. All should be judged exclusively on the score they achieve on the day. He considers that the purpose of grammar schools is to serve the most academically able applicants. If they do not fulfil this purpose, there is no point in having them. If a grammar school cannot attract applicants of high calibre it should move to an area where such applicants exist (he suggests Coventry). He points out that paragraph 1.18 of the Code allows designated grammar schools to select their entire intake on the basis of high academic ability. They do not have to fill all of their places if applicants have not reached the required standard.

29. However, many grammar schools choose not to have admission arrangements which are based solely on achieving the highest scores in a selection test, and this is provided for in the primary legislation governing admissions and explicitly permissible under the Code. Indeed, grammar schools which are academies are required to provide education for pupils who are drawn wholly or mainly from the area in which the school is situated, and for this and other reasons these schools frequently employ oversubscription criteria based upon catchment areas and proximity to the school. Where a grammar school does not admit wholly on the basis of ability, it must, again by virtue of the Code, give priority to applicants who are looked after or previously looked after who reach the required academic standard. Grammar schools are being also actively encouraged by the Government to offer priority in their arrangements to disadvantaged pupils.

30. The effect of this is that applicants who are not looked after or disadvantaged, or who do not live reasonably close to the school, may not be offered places even though their scores are higher than those who are offered places. It is not for us to tell grammar school admission authorities that they should admit wholly on the basis of rank order performance in selection tests; whether or not they should have other oversubscription criteria; whether they must set the pass mark before or after the tests; who must set it; or what must be taken into account in setting it. It is for us to reach a conclusion about whether the arrangements which are in place operate fairly and reasonably.

31. From our experience in previous cases, we know that various factors are taken into account in setting the qualifying standard where it is set after the test scores are known. Each year the number of applicants sitting the tests and the ability of those applicants will be slightly different, not least as the number of children of the relevant age group in any part of the country will be different from year to year. It is also possible that, notwithstanding the extensive work undertaken to benchmark the tests against those used previously, the level of difficulty of the tests will be different, and these factors will affect the level at which the qualifying standard is set. The aim, as the objector says, is to fill the school to PAN, which is a legitimate aim. Grammar schools are able to have vacant places where there are insufficient applicants who meet the required standard, but most choose not to do so. Each pupil brings an allocated amount of funding, which schools need. We also know from our experience that schools regularly fall into budget deficit where they are unable to fill to PAN.

32. The factors taken into account in setting the qualifying standard are the number of applicants, the range of test scores, the oversubscription criteria and the standard of education at the school. The objective is to ensure that enough offers will be accepted; that

those who accept an offer for a place at the school will be able to thrive in the particular academic environment at that school; and that the school will maintain, or improve, its level of achievement in public examinations. The process is complicated by the fact that parental preference is unpredictable, and so the qualifying standard will need to be set at a level where more applicants achieve the qualifying standard than there are places available. However, where it is set too low, there will be a large number of dissatisfied parents whose child has achieved the qualifying standard but not been offered a place. In our view, setting the qualifying standard is a challenging task, and is one that must be undertaken by persons who have detailed knowledge of the school, the patterns of offers and acceptance in previous years and most importantly the day-to-day operation of the school itself.

33. A pre-set pass mark may not have the effect of establishing year-on-year consistency of ability where it operates alongside oversubscription criteria because the offer of a place will not be wholly dependent upon the test score. A pass mark which is set annually after the results of the tests are known will inevitably be set only with reference to the candidates who have taken the tests. In our view both are reasonable, and neither result in an unfair outcome. The objective of the arrangements for this school is NOT, as the objector suggests it should be, to admit applicants of the highest level of ability, it is to admit looked after children, previously looked after children, applicants eligible for the pupil premium, siblings, children living the catchment area, children of staff and other children who meet, or exceed, a minimum required standard of academic ability. This is a permissible and lawful objective.

34. For some schools, the pass mark is set by the governing board on recommendation of the head teacher. For other schools, the pass mark is set by a committee comprised of persons with knowledge of the operation of the schools in question and their academic standards. In this school the pass mark is set by senior staff. Our view is that both practices are reasonable. Many of the schools which are the subjects of these twelve objections have proven track records of academic excellence and have been rated as Outstanding by Ofsted. The schools themselves and persons with knowledge of the schools are best qualified to determine who should set their pass marks and how they should be set. For these reasons, we do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

Failure to disclose schools which share the same test

33. The objector makes the point that the school has failed to list all the schools which share the same test. He suggests that a child may sit the same test more than once and that this would be fraud.

34. The school says that it utilises test papers produced by CEM and they require that all completed papers are returned to them and that any that are unused due to 'no shows' are destroyed. The school goes on to say that 11+ tests are coordinated by the consortium of schools that use CEM to take place on the same day. This consortium is made up of the school and the other grammar school in the area which is a girls' school. Only girls sit the test at the girls' school and only boys sit the test at the boys' school. Therefore, they

suggest, the system is designed so that it is impossible for test papers to be 'leaked' and they see no issue with the same papers being used by different schools.

35. It is clear from the school's response that they are satisfied that all reasonable steps are taken to prevent tests papers from being used fraudulently and to prevent children taking the same test more than once.

36. We are of the view that the arrangements are fair, clear and objective and that they can be clearly understood by parents. They therefore conform with paragraph 14 of the Code. We are also satisfied that the arrangements cover the entry requirements for a selective place and the process for such selection in line with paragraph 1.17 of the Code. We do not therefore uphold this aspect of the objection.

Unfairness to applicants not eligible for the Pupil Premium

37. The objector considers any priority provided for pupils eligible for the pupil premium to be unfair to those children who are not eligible for the pupil premium. He says that all children should be ranked upon score. He argues that all the children will have been educated for six years in schools and if, after this six years, they have not reached the same standard as others, there is either a major failing in their school education or the child is not ready to enter a grammar school due to current ability. He believes that any claim of disadvantage should have been rectified by the test date

37. The objector goes on to accept that the Code provides the right for admission authorities to give priority within their oversubscription criteria to pupil premium children but considers that this was not designed to have a two-tier pass mark because this would be unfair to non-pupil premium children. He argues that the priority was introduced only to provide a 'tie breaker' for those pupils whose marks are equal in the tests. He suggests that this should be the only opportunity for pupil premium children to be prioritised over other pupils.

38. He suggests that pass marks be set at a level above which pupils are of 'grammar school ability' and therefore any pupil below that level, either pupil premium or non-pupil premium, would not be deemed suitable to attend the school. He concludes that any priority provided for pupil premium pupils discriminates against, and is unfair to, a child who is not eligible for the pupil premium. The school's arrangements do not provide priority for pupil premium pupils by setting a lower pass mark for these boys. All applicants must achieve the same qualifying score in order to be eligible for a place.

39. The pupil premium is additional funding given to state funded schools in England to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils and close the gap between them and their peers. Pupil premium funding is available to both mainstream and non-mainstream schools, such as special schools and pupil referral units. It is paid to schools according to the number of pupils who have:

- been registered for free school meals (FSM) at any point in the last 6 years;
- been looked after by the local authority (in care or accommodated) for one day or more; or
- ceased to be looked after through adoption, or via a Special Guardianship, Residence or Child Arrangements Order.

40. “Many children and young people living in our most deprived communities do significantly worse at all levels of the education system than those from our least deprived communities. This is often referred to as the 'attainment gap'.” This is a quotation from a Department for Education (DfE) paper which led to the introduction of the concept of Pupil Premium funding. The funding was introduced in 2014. The DfE’s paper introducing pupil premium funding states that evidence shows that children from disadvantaged backgrounds generally face extra challenges in reaching their potential at school, and often do not perform as well as their peers. The pupil premium grant is designed to allow schools to help disadvantaged pupils by improving their progress and the exam results they achieve.

41. When pupil premium funding was introduced, schools were given the opportunity to give priority in their admission arrangements to children who are eligible. Schools are able to:

- choose from which group or groups (Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP), pupil premium or Service Premium (SP) recipients) to give priority:
- specify a number or percentage of their published admission number of pupil premium pupils who will be given priority. For example, this can be representative of the number of disadvantaged children resident in the school’s local area; or they can prioritise a certain percentage of local eligible children;
- limit priority to specific eligible sub-groups. For example, restrict the admissions priority to children currently in receipt of Free School Meals or children eligible for pupil premium in the school’s catchment area;
- decide the ranking given to the priority (after looked after and previously looked after children); or
- choose to give higher priority to eligible children of the relevant faith than those not of that faith, if they have a faith designation.

42. In May 2018 the DfE published a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the DfE and the Grammar School Heads Association. (GSHA) This was updated in March 2020. In this MoU both parties have a shared ambition to see more pupils from lower income backgrounds applying to, passing the test for, and being admitted to selective schools. It was agreed specifically that admission authorities can consider lowering the selection test pass mark for children eligible for the pupil premium. The MoU stated that “this is a decision for the individual school’s admission authority. A number of grammar schools already set a lower pass mark for disadvantaged children. Any authorities who take

this approach should ensure this still provides sufficient rigour to ensure those children can thrive within the highly academic environment of a grammar school.”

43. The DfE and GSHA agreed to report on progress in admitting more disadvantaged children to grammar schools against the following success measures:

- increased number of selective schools effectively prioritising disadvantaged children in their admissions arrangements, with a view to all GSHA member schools doing so by the scheduled end of the Parliament;
- an upwards trend of numbers of disadvantaged children applying to selective schools;
- an upwards trend of numbers of disadvantaged children being admitted to selective schools.

44. In May 2018 the DfE launched the Selective Schools Expansion Fund (SSEF). The stated purposes of this scheme are to support the expansion of selective schools where there is a need for additional places, both in terms of a shortfall of secondary places in the local area and a demand from parents for more selective places; and for selective schools to have ambitious but deliverable plans for increasing access for disadvantaged pupils (namely pupils eligible for the pupil premium). In this scheme selective schools are encouraged to take steps which lead to an increase in the proportion of disadvantaged children being admitted to the school. Successful schools in this scheme have used the oversubscription criteria within their admission arrangements to support this aim. Some schools have set new, greater proportions or numbers of pupil premium children to be admitted and many have lowered the standard mark or pass mark for pupil premium pupils so that more may be offered places.

45. There is a significant body of research which demonstrates the existence and extent of the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and others up to and including the age of sixteen. A great deal of work on the factors which affect the gap and how it can be reduced has been undertaken, much of this research is from the Education Policy Institute.

46. It is clear that Government policy is to encourage improved access to grammar schools for disadvantaged pupils, and that schools are encouraged to give priority to disadvantaged pupils in their admission arrangements’ oversubscription criteria. Any priority given to pupil premium pupils in oversubscription criteria means that others, lower down the criteria, have a lower priority. The purpose of introducing oversubscription criteria is to ensure that some groups of children are given higher priority than others where a school has more applications than there are places available. The Code makes clear in paragraph 1.8 that schools are able to adopt reasonable oversubscription criteria, and that this of itself is not unreasonable. Neither does it constitute unfairness.

47. In the case of pupil premium pupils’ inclusion in the oversubscription criteria we are of the view that prioritising pupil premium pupils who achieve the pass mark over those who are not pupil premium pupils is reasonable. Indeed, it is a practice which is encouraged by Government policy and Guidance and is compliant with the Code. Paragraph 1.39A of the

Code expressly permits schools to give priority to pupil premium pupils. It states “Admission authorities may give priority in their oversubscription criteria to children eligible for the.... pupil premium.....”. As the school says, “it has been the clearly expressed intention of successive governments for school in general and selective schools in particular to address the issue of social mobility where they can”. The arrangements fall fairly and squarely within the permissions given in paragraph 1.39A. We do not therefore uphold this aspect of the objection.

Re-use of the same tests for late sitters and late applicants

48. The school uses the same tests for late sitters and late applicants. In all twelve of the objections he has made this year, the objector has claimed that late sitters are advantaged unfairly and has suggested that the adjudicator determining these objections is obliged to answer a set of questions. The joint adjudicators have considered these questions carefully; we have considered the additional submissions made and information provided by the objector in relation to the objections he has made this year; we have read previous determinations on this issue; and we have looked at relevant court papers provided.

52. All twelve of the schools objected to this year use verbal and non-verbal reasoning 11+ tests (VR and NVR tests) designed by CEM. Some use exactly the same set of tests for the first round of testing as they do for all subsequent testing rounds for entry to Year 7, and some use a different set of tests of the same type for the purposes of late testing. By this we mean a different set of 11+ VR and NVR tests designed by CEM. Schools using the former practice, as this school does, argue that it is unfair to use a different test, albeit a test of the same type because it is necessary to compare like with like in order to ensure parity of results and therefore fairness. CEM does not publish its test papers, and those administering the tests are required to hold them confidentially and only to disclose the papers to candidates at the time the tests are taken.

49. The objector’s view is that re-use of the same tests for applicants seeking admission to selective schools is not compliant with the Code because children recall the content of the tests and may pass it on to late sitters. He has tested this proposition using his nephew whom he says was able to describe questions to him after sitting CEM 11+ tests. The nephew took tests for entry to selective schools in Shropshire, Walsall and Wolverhampton, which he sat as ‘mock exams’ before being offered a place at a selective school in Berkhamsted. The objector then published the information provided by his nephew on a public website and was forced by a court injunction to take it down. The objector suggests that other children sit tests for a number of grammar schools as practice.

50. The judge considering the injunction proceedings made the following findings, which were upheld by the Court of Appeal, and which we accept:

- “It is doubtless the case that some children who have sat a selection test will tell their parents, and possibly some others, something about it, but there is no good reason to think that any, let alone, much information has become generally known or available...;

- Any reasonable person knows that unauthorised disclosure of the content of an examination or test yet to be taken in a way that may come to the attention of candidates about to sit that examination risks undermining the purpose and integrity of the examination or test, and that such information is therefore confidential...;
- There is a difference between a child telling a parent and a parent telling another parent about test content, and the posting of such material on a public website;
- If all, or part of test content is disclosed, there is at least a risk that the integrity of the tests and public confidence in them would be compromised...;
- Candidates sitting the tests and their parents are under a duty of confidentiality, so that if the parent of a child who had recently taken the selection tests was to publish the questions on a website knowing that other children are about to take the same test, the parent could be enjoined to take down the content of the website...”

51. CEM, said, in the course of these court proceedings, that if a comprehension title, words from the synonyms questions, the subject matter of Maths questions, or the type of NVR questions were disclosed to a candidate about to take the same selection tests, this would be unlikely to make a difference to the marks achieved, however CEM also said that a difference of one raw score mark can equate to up to six standardised marks, which could alter a candidate’s ranking significantly.

52. The objector has provided evidence in the form of a Twitter feed about the CEM 11+ tests for the King Edward Consortium Schools. This appears to be an exchange of information between members of the 11+ Exams Forum. The Forum is an organisation which provides advice to parents whose children are intending to take the CEM 11+ tests. The information in the Twitter feed relates to tests taken from 2011 – 2016. There is no evidence that this exchange of information is continuing. The information in question appears to have been passed on by candidates who had taken the tests. However, it also appears that the King Edward Consortium of Schools were in discussion with the Forum about these postings, and were not concerned that they would prejudice the integrity of the selection tests because comments about a particular set of tests were not being posted whilst those tests were still being used for late applicants.

53. The courts accepted that it was reasonable for schools to use the same tests for late applicants in order to ensure consistency of standards and to avoid the additional cost of commissioning separate tests for each occasion. Candidates are tested late because there is a genuine reason why they are unable to sit the tests on the original test date or because they move into the area after the deadline for registering to take the tests has passed. Admission authorities generally require substantiating evidence before they will agree to a particular candidate being late tested. Where there is a gap of many months between the original test and the late test (as may be the case where a child has moved into the area), the use of age standardisation ensures that age provides no advantage. CEM has said: “The choice of how candidates are tested is the schools, which is guided by their admissions policy. CEM would only be able to compare candidate’s performance to provide an ordered age standardised score if the same test is taken”. We return later to the wider question of age standardisation for those tested at the same time.

54. The objector also alleges that there is a practice of candidates being paid £1000 to take the 11+ tests and feed-back the content. He says: “E.g. some parents have decided on a private school and would like £1000 to help with fees. They engage in a deal with tutors - c£1000 for providing feedback. Any intelligent child can recall a lot. They select the brightest. Some children wear badges with a pin-camera recording every page of questions on a micro-SD card automatically. More advanced ones have a sim card and mobile data is used to transmit pages in real time outside the hall. But, these 4G badges cost a substantial amount. The child is simply told to wear the badge and sometimes does not know what it does! It is not so difficult to gain the content for late sitters...”.

55. The allegation that children (or their parents) are paid to pass on test questions or to take the tests wearing hidden cameras is a serious one, and we are sure that admission authorities and those administering the tests will be vigilant to this practice. The schools which are the subject of these twelve objections have now been made aware of the objector’s allegations, and they will appear in our published determinations. If grammar schools have any reason to believe that candidates are wearing hidden cameras, they may decide to adopt a more rigorous form of searching candidates or indeed use different tests for late sitters.

56. The ability of a 10-year-old child to remember test questions in a set of tests comprising some 250 questions might be improved if the child took several selection tests for different schools or areas, as in the case of the objector’s nephew. There is also reference in the correspondence to ‘dodgy tutors who get tutees together who have sat the tests and pump them for information to aid late sitters’. We have not been provided with any evidence that such a practice is operating in relation to this school.

57. We have agreed to adopt a rather simpler approach to this particular alleged breach of the Code than has been adopted in previous cases. Relevant paragraphs of the Code are 1.31 and 14. Turning first to paragraph 1.31, this says that: “Tests for all forms of selection **must** be clear, objective, and give an accurate reflection of the child's ability or aptitude, irrespective of sex, race, or disability. It is for the admission authority to decide the content of the test, providing that the test is a true test of aptitude or ability.”

58. Our view is that what paragraph 1.31 requires is that **the test itself** must be clear, objective and give an accurate reflection of the child’s ability (in the case of selective schools). So, in order to comply with paragraph 1.31, the particular test used by the school must fulfil these requirements. There is no reference here to **the procedures for taking the tests**, (requirements in relation to procedures fall under paragraph 14, as we will explain later). Paragraph 1.31 is a requirement that the selection test must be fit for purpose. The objector suggests several reasons why CEM 11+ tests are not fit for purpose. This is because in his view the test scores should not be standardised for age, and because he considers that the tests do not establish whether candidates are of grammar school ability. We have dealt with these points elsewhere.

59. Looking at the second sentence of paragraph 1.31., references to ‘the test’ are, in our view, highly suggestive that what is envisaged is one set of tests to be used for all

applicants in a particular year group. Although this wording is not conclusive, it is more difficult to argue that the form of selection used produces an objective reflection of ability where different tests are taken by different applicants. CEM's response supports this.

60. What the objector is referring to (namely a child who has taken the tests passing on test questions which are made available to others taking the same test at a later date) is what we would call cheating. In any examination or test where a child passes on a test question, and another child uses that knowledge to his/her advantage, that would be cheating. This is very different to preparation or coaching. Coaching, in the context of VR and NVR tests, is providing help with the skills and techniques needed to do well in those particular types of tests. Giving people the questions before they take the test in the context of these particular tests is neither preparation nor coaching.

61. The objector argues that the results of the tests taken by late sitters are not an accurate reflection of their ability because late sitters can cheat, and therefore the test is not fit for purpose. There is the possibility of cheating in any examination – GCSEs, A Levels etc (pupils smuggling in notes etc). The possibility of cheating does not apply exclusively to late testing of 11+ candidates. Forms of cheating other than candidates passing on questions to other candidates who take the test at a later date are possible. For example, a rogue employee at CEM or an A Level examining board could give away the questions before the test or examination is taken. The person at the school/local authority who is responsible for keeping the CEM 11+ tests confidential could give the questions to candidates in the first round of testing before they sit the tests. The fact that candidates may cheat does not render the test itself unclear, not objective, or not a true reflection of ability. Cheating is always a possibility.

62. We emphasise that what we are considering here is whether the selection test being used for **this school** in 2021 gives an accurate reflection of a candidate's ability. In order that we can ensure that we have explained our role with absolute clarity, we considered the hypothetical possibility that we had evidence which we considered to be proof that there is a systemic practice of cheating in place which is subverting the test scores for late applications to this school. Our view is that, even if we had such proof, which we do not, this would not mean that **the test itself** does not conform to paragraph 1.31.

63. What the objector is referring to is that the **practice** of using exactly the same set of tests more than once may lend itself to an abuse. Put simply, if the school used a different test of the same type for late sitters, people could not abuse the process in the way he suggests is a possibility. Certainly, if a different 11+ test was used for late sitters, what we have described as cheating would not be possible in the way the objector describes. However, we need to make clear here that it is not our function to suggest that one method or process might be 'better' than another, and we cannot require an admission authority to adopt a particular form of test or procedure for conducting a test. Our role is confined to determining whether the admission arrangements comply with the Code.

64. As the objector has rightly said, paragraph 14 of the Code is relevant. What this says is that admission authorities must ensure that the practices used to decide the allocation of

school places are fair and objective. Our view is that there is a strong argument that in order for the testing **practice** to be considered objective, all applicants must take the same set of tests where this is possible. It is not for us to say whether a practice that is different to the one used by the school would be more or less objective. We are not able to comment upon whether or not it can be guaranteed that an applicant who scores 121 in one set of CEM VR and NVR 11+ tests is of exactly the same ability as an applicant who scores 121 in a different set of CEM VR and NVR 11+ tests. Our view is that a practice of having all applicants take the same test, albeit a few months apart, is an objective practice for deciding the allocation of places.

65. Finally, we come to the crux of the objection, which is the assertion that the practice of using the same set of tests more than once creates an unfairness. The unfairness is said to arise because this practice allows for the possibility of cheating. As we have said, cheating is always a possibility in any set of tests or examinations. The objector has produced no evidence that there is a practice of cheating in place in relation to the selection tests for this school. Our view is that the risk of cheating in the way the objector has described producing an advantage to the late sitter is lower in VR and NVR tests than in other examinations. An applicant taking A Level History will be asked four questions and is likely to remember all of them. A late sitter with advance notice of the questions could be helped considerably by knowing the questions before taking the examination.

66. Applicants taking CEM VR and NVR tests answer some 250 questions in total. If a person passed on one correct question and answer, this could mean that a late sitter might achieve the pass mark when he/she would not otherwise have achieved it, or that the late sitter might achieve a standardised mark which is up to six marks higher than the mark which he/she would have achieved. But even if this were the case, (and the chances are remote), this would still not guarantee the offer of a place because the oversubscription criteria would then need to be applied. In order to pass on any advantage to the late sitter, a child of 10 would need to remember questions exactly and know which one of four multiple choice options is the correct answer. The child would also need to be willing to do something which he/she would surely know is wrong; and to pass on an advantage to another child possibly to his/her own detriment since the tests are a competition and all the tests are taken before any child knows whether he or she has obtained a place at the school. The person receiving the answer would need to use that information knowing this to be cheating.

67. The evidence produced by the objector indicates that there is a Forum which passed on information provided by candidates who had taken the Birmingham Consortium 11+ tests. There is evidence that some test questions were passed on, but no evidence that these were the correct questions. No answers to questions were conveyed to the parents of any candidates who sat the same tests at a later date. The postings took place after the relevant tests had ceased to be used; and the latest post was in 2016. We have not seen any evidence that the Forum is continuing to pass on information obtained from candidates who have sat the Birmingham Consortium Schools tests, or evidence that any similar exchanges of information are in operation for this school. We have not been provided with

any evidence that candidates sit the tests for this school wearing hidden cameras or are likely to do so for the school's 2021 admissions tests.

68. We do not consider that general allegations of cheating and evidence of exchanges of information about the content of tests after they have ceased to be used provide any basis upon which we can conclude that the practice of re-using the same tests for late sitters for admission to this school in September 2021 is compromised. In the absence of any such evidence, our conclusion is that re-use of the same tests for late sitters does not operate to confer an unfair advantage upon them. Our view is that it is reasonable to operate this practice in order to save cost and create parity of results, as recognised by the courts. For these reasons we do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

Age standardisation

69. The objector says in the form of objection: "It appears age standardisation is used, yet this is not clear in the admissions policy. Age standardisation is flawed. No age standardisation occurs for A levels, GCSEs or year **6 SATs** (tests where an expected standard of **100** is expected), the later which is sat just 8 months after the main 11+ date. It was not even used in the old year 2 SATs tests. It is not used for phonics tests or multiplication tests. Age standardisation is never used in any public examination". He asks whether all of these other forms of testing are wrong not to use age standardisation, and why age standardisation is required for the school's selective tests but not required for SATs.

70. The objector's view is that age standardisation is used in 11+ tests based upon the claim that different age groups score different marks as they are younger. However, he considers that the research which has led to this claim is flawed and rarely challenged. What does make a difference to an applicant's score (he says) is preparation. Preparation and tutoring for the tests effectively mean that the applicant's age becomes irrelevant, and most applicants prepare or are tutored. Therefore, age standardisation provides an unfair advantage to younger applicants. The objector suggests that there is no evidence that age standardisation will lead to fair outcomes in a situation where the majority of applicants have prepared or are tutored.

71. In the objector's words: "It is obvious that age standardisation is not required when tests are prepared for. A 16-year-old is no better at recalling multiplication tables than a 10-year old who has been practising. A 10-year old who has been practising NVR questions can beat a number of MBA graduates taking the same test (this I have demonstrated further, with my own sons). Age is irrelevant to the score if one prepares. Preparation is king". The objector later produced more detailed information in support of his arguments. He suggests that, although some children taking the school's selection tests are inevitably younger than others, they will have had the same number of years of schooling. By Year 6, after nearly seven years of being taught the same things, any disadvantage caused by being younger will (he says) have narrowed considerably. The objector claims that the only content of the 11+ tests which is not taught in schools is Non-verbal Reasoning.

72. The objector's argument is that all children begin at the same level and have to prepare themselves and are capable of reaching their "theoretical maximum". Some children will take longer to reach their theoretical maximum than others after which extra practice has negligible benefit. "This is not simply age dependent, it is skill dependent. Age has no great advantage. 10-year olds fare no worse in NVR than MBA graduates if they prepare; in the same way 10-year olds fare no worse than an MBA graduate in a multiplication tables test. I would anticipate that the 10-year-old would be faster than the MBA graduate."

73. The objector's statements appear to be opinion possibly based upon his own experience. The question we are considering here is whether standardising 11+ test scores by age creates an unfairness. A 10-year-old may do better in a multiplication test than an MBA graduate because he/she has learned the multiplication tables more recently or has a better memory. Repeating tables is a test of memory, not a test of reasoning. The difference between Verbal and Non-verbal reasoning tests and many other types of tests is that success cannot be achieved simply by repeating specific learned information. For example, to do well in the comprehension questions, it will be necessary to have a wide vocabulary and the ability correctly to deduce answers from what is said in a piece of text. Candidates are required to have absorbed information from many sources and to apply it correctly. Whilst the ability to memorise may not be improved by maturity, the ability to reason is something entirely different.

74. If maturity is developed over time, it would seem to us that children may not all be able approach these tests from the same level, as the objector suggests. Nobody would suggest that a three-year-old would be capable of approaching these tests in the same way as a ten-year-old, for example. There is an age gap of nearly a year between the oldest child taking the 11+ test and the youngest. The questions for us are whether age makes a difference; if so, what that difference is; whether standardising the tests by age compensates for the difference; and whether it compensates effectively. The tests are a competition, and in order for any competition to operate fairly, the objective must be that all competitors come to the starting gate at the same time and that there is a level playing field insofar as the tests themselves are capable of achieving this. Familiarisation with the types of questions asked and practice may improve scores, but admission authorities and test providers have no control over whether children prepare or are coached.

75. The school has said in response to the objection: "CEM recognise that on the test day boys could be nearly a year different in age which could mean that one boy had received 20 per cent more days of education than another, They CEM standardise the score for age on the date of the exam so that all applicants have an equal chance of passing"

76. In dealing with the twelve objections which have been referred to us, we were conscious that admission authorities were in a difficult position in being asked to respond to questions about the selection tests they use, and that CEM was the appropriate body to answer detailed questions about the 11 plus tests which they sell to grammar schools. We

asked CEM a series of questions. The ones specifically relevant to this aspect of the objection were:

- Could CEM provide us with the methodology it uses for age standardisation of test results? What is the evidence base which underpins the need for this age standardisation?
- Could CEM advise us on the process it uses to ensure that the selection assessments are a true test of ability?

77. CEM's response was as follows:

"The reason that CEM uses age standardisation, is that in assessments of ability it is expected that the older learners achieve higher scores than the younger learners. In a typical classroom, some learners will be up to 12 months older than their youngest peers. When CEM interpret assessment results our interest is in comparing learner's ability against the ability of a wider group and it is important that any differences seen are down to ability and not purely down to the age of the learners. Age standardised scores correct for the effect age has on assessment scores. Age standardised scores allow meaningful comparisons to be made between learners in a class, school or larger group.

The age standardised scores are calculated from the raw scores to allow candidates to be compared when their age profiles are quite different. The age standardisation is based on the age of learners on the day they take the assessment.

CEM cannot provide full details of how the calculations are done. Under Section 43(2) of the Freedom of Information Act, information that would prejudice a commercial interest can be withheld. CEM believe that disclosing this information would be likely to prejudice our commercial interest as it would enable competitors to understand our standardisation process. This could enable our competitors to understand our general approach to the test.

In terms of assessment development – all questions are selected from a bank of items that have been specifically written and designed to be appropriate for assessing pupils at the beginning of the Autumn term in Year 6 of the English school system.

Our tests correlate highly with KS2 SATs results: separate studies have shown correlations of around 0.75 on samples of 4000-5000 pupils".

78. The objector makes two substantive claims, first that the arrangements do not indicate whether age standardisation is used in the selection tests, therefore they are unclear. Second that the tests do not give an accurate reflection of an applicant's ability because they give an unfair advantage to younger applicants. Additionally, if the school's tests operate unfairly, this may mean that the practices used to decide the allocation of places are not objective or reasonable.

79. Dealing first with the issue of clarity, the arrangements refer to “the standardised score” but the term is not explained. The arrangements have a number of appendices attached, one of which explains the test results and the arrangements for informing parents. The school explains that CEM standardise the test scores because ‘boys could be nearly a year different in age which could mean that one boy had received about 20 per cent more days of education than another’. The scores are standardised for age on the date of the test so that all applicants have an equal chance of passing’.

80. Paragraph 14 of the Code requires that the practices and the criteria used to decide the allocation of school places are clear, and that parents should be able to look at a set of arrangements and understand easily how places for that school will be allocated. The objector is correct that the admission arrangements themselves make reference to standardisation without explaining that what is referred to is age standardisation, or what age standardisation is, and so could be said to be unclear. We take the view that the arrangements are sufficiently clear to comply with paragraph 14 where any additional information about the tests which parents need to read is published alongside the main admission arrangements, clearly signalled to parents and accessible via a one-click. As this is the case, we do not find the arrangements to be unclear in the manner suggested by the objector. Therefore, we do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

81. As we have said above, the objector also suggests that the process of age standardisation provides an unfair advantage for younger children. He believes that the extensive preparation for the tests which children undertake renders the need for age weighted standardisation of test results “null and void”. The objector cites paragraphs 14 and 1.31 of the Code. We have set these paragraphs out in full above. Paragraph 14 requires that the criteria used to decide the allocation of places are fair and objective, and paragraph 1.31 requires that selection tests must be objective and give an accurate reflection of the child’s ability.

82. The objector asks why other major assessment events such as SATs or GCSEs are not age standardised and suggests that, because these other assessments are not age standardised, the selection tests for grammar schools should not be age standardised. This issue could of course be argued both ways; if age standardisation is deemed appropriate for grammar schools’ tests then why is it not introduced into the SATs and GCSE processes? A look at the online conversations about this topic shows clearly that there are strong views on both sides of this argument, both from parents and assessment providers. This determination, however, concerns the fairness of the admission arrangements for a specific school and deals only with the selective school tests for that school. We will therefore limit our conclusions in this matter to the school in question, its admission arrangements and the selective assessment tests which are part of them.

83. There is significant and compelling research evidence that children who are ‘summer born’ perform less well in tests of ability than children born at other times of the year. This gap is clear in primary aged children and remains an issue even into the later stages of secondary school. A study by the Institute of Fiscal Studies entitled ‘When You Are Born Matters; The Impact of Date of Birth on Child Cognitive Outcomes in England’ collates

many previous pieces of research and looks at the reasons why summer born children perform less well. The paper also puts forward some suggestions about mitigating this effect.

84. It is important to be clear about the purposes and rationale of age standardisation and why it might be (or not be) necessary. Age standardisation assumes that the period of birth does not affect the innate intellectual ability of the pupil at the time of taking the test but that the test performance may be affected by age. A younger child might well not perform as well in the test simply because of age and experience rather than because of lower ability. At the time pupils take the 11+, one child taking the test might be born on the first day of the school year (September 1) while another might be born on the last day (August 31). With what amounts to a whole year's difference in their ages, the older child is clearly at an advantage; for example, they will have been exposed to more language and, on average, a greater range of vocabulary. As children are exposed to a new vocabulary at the rate of more than 1000 words per year, the difference can be very significant for the 11+ tests. Age standardisation removes this potential unfairness and the marks are adjusted to make them 'standard' for all children regardless of their age.

85. We are of the view that age standardisation removes some of the potential unfairness for summer born children in the 11+ tests and therefore its inclusion in the admission arrangements for these schools is fair.

86. The objector makes the point that age standardisation is made 'null and void' by the extensive preparation which children receive before the 11+ tests. He maintains that "Most children who sit tests prepare. Many are tutored. Some are prepared in outreach programmes free of charge." The objector has not produced any evidence to substantiate this statement, so therefore we do not know how many pupils are tutored and we have no evidence of preparation through outreach programmes. We are aware that test familiarisation materials are made available to pupils who will be sitting the tests and these documents appear on the admission sections of the websites of some of the schools. These materials are familiarisation information to show how the tests are carried out, completed and marked and they provide examples of the type of question which will be asked in the tests. They are designed to prevent undue anxiety for those pupils who are sitting the tests.

87. We are also aware that many pupils receive additional preparation through tutoring for the 11+ tests. A literature review commissioned by the Office of the School Adjudicator (OSA) which looked at disadvantaged pupil performance in the 11+ test studied this element of the process and confirmed that "Pupils that have been tutored are more likely to access a grammar school, and children in households with larger incomes are more likely to have access to tutoring. Tutoring is found to be effective at supporting pupils to pass the 11-plus." However, there is nothing in the law or the Code which forbids the use of paid tutoring or additional coaching. Indeed, the law relating to admissions and the Code apply to admission authorities, local authorities, governing boards and adjudicators. But they do not and could not interfere with what parents choose to do in supporting their children's learning whether through commercial tutoring or other means. We are unaware of the scale

of additional tutoring/mentoring/support for pupils in the primary schools in this case. If, as the objector suggests it is widespread for this school then we do not believe that it makes the use of age standardisation 'null and void'. If all pupils are tutored and improve their scores because of it then the attainment gap between summer born children and others would remain the same- albeit at slightly higher score levels.

88. The objector refers to the fact that the Key Stage 2 Standard Attainment Tests (KS2 SATs) are taken within a few months of the 11+ tests and are not age standardised. This is correct, but it is also true that summer born children as a group do less well in these tests than autumn and spring born children. Of course, KS2 SATs tests serve a different purpose and the fact that there is no need for them to be age-standardised has little bearing on what is appropriate for 11 + tests.

89. In summary we are of the view that there is substantial and compelling research which shows that 'summer born' children are at a disadvantage when being tested for ability towards the end of their primary education and that the application of an age standardised weighting to the test scores reduces this disadvantage and makes the tests 'fairer'. Whilst tutoring/coaching/mentoring appears to improve the test results of many pupils, there is no evidence in the research materials we have looked at and the objector has not produced any evidence to suggest that it diminishes the achievement gap due to age. We therefore do not accept that additional preparation for the 11+ tests negates the need for the age standardisation weighting, and we do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

Summary of Findings

90. We find that the arrangements are sufficiently clear about the setting of the pass mark. We consider it reasonable to set the pass mark after the results of the tests are known and with reference to the cohort of each individual year's intake.

91. We find that affording priority to pupil premium pupils is expressly permitted by the Code and. Our view moreover is that giving priority to pupil premium pupils is in line with wider Government policy and – critically for our consideration - reasonable and does not cause unfairness.

92. We find that the school, under the instruction from CEM, takes all reasonable steps to ensure that the test papers are not 'leaked' to other schools and that the tests dates are coordinated across schools in the area so that candidates are taking the test at the same time. We do not consider it essential that other schools taking the same tests should be listed in the admission arrangements.

93. We find that it is reasonable to re-use the same tests for late sitters and late applicants because it achieves parity of results and saves costs. It is arguable that this practice could operate unfairly if late applicants were to cheat, but as the objector has not produced any evidence that there is an established process of cheating in operation at this school, we have no basis upon which to reach a conclusion that the re-use of the same tests creates an unfairness here.

94. We find that the arrangements are sufficiently clear that the tests results are standardised by age. We are of the view that age standardisation does not create an unfairness to older applicants and that its use remains necessary albeit that some applicants are coached. The objector has not produced any research to counter the substantial and compelling research which shows that 'summer born' children are at a disadvantage when being tested for ability towards the end of their primary education and that the application of an age standardised weighting to the test scores reduces this disadvantage and makes the tests fairer. Whilst tutoring/coaching/mentoring appears to improve the test results of many pupils, there is no evidence in the research materials we have looked at and the objector has not produced any evidence to support his claim that it diminishes the achievement gap due to age.

Determination

90. In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, Dr Vallely and I do not uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2021 determined by the governing board of Bishop Wordsworth's Church of England Grammar School, Salisbury, Wiltshire

Dated: 13 October 2020

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Ann Talboys

Schools Adjudicator: Marisa Vallely