SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN LONDON:

ADMISSIONS CRITERIA AND CREAM SKIMMING

Anne West, Audrey Hind and Hazel Pennell

Centre for Educational Research

Department of Social Policy

London School of Economics and Political Science

September 2003

Note: This report focuses on secondary school admissions in London. In addition to substantial new material, is also includes text and examples relating to London schools from the full RISE/LSE report on secondary school admissions: 'Secondary school admissions in England: Exploring the extent of overt and covert selection'. Available at:
http://www.risetrust.org.uk/admissions.html

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

♦ This report focuses on admissions criteria used by London secondary schools and the extent to which the criteria allow the opportunity for cream skimming. It also provides some examples of ways in which individual admission authorities 'select in' or 'select out' particular types of pupils via these criteria and other admissions policies and practices.

♦ A high proportion of schools reported giving priority to siblings and to distance.

♦ Only a minority of schools (5%) selected a proportion of pupils on the basis of ability/aptitude in a particular subject(s). More foundation and voluntary-aided schools than community or voluntary-controlled schools selected pupils on this basis.

♦ Secondary schools are permitted to select pupils in order to gain a balanced intake of pupils based on their ability; this is commonly termed 'banding'. Overall, 20% of London secondary schools used some form of banding. This policy is a legacy of the former Inner London Education Authority. However, the extent to which banding is used to obtain an academically balanced intake in schools that are their own admission authority is questioned.

♦ The Code of Practice on School Admissions makes specific reference to admission authorities using criteria giving priority to certain categories of pupils, such as the children of former pupils/employees, stating that these should not be used as they may contravene legislation.

♦ We found that 13% of secondary schools were giving priority to the children of employees/governors; more voluntary-aided and foundation schools than community or voluntary-controlled schools used such criteria.

♦ One in ten secondary schools gave preference to the children of former pupils. More voluntary-aided and foundation than community or voluntary-controlled schools gave priority to the children of former pupils.

♦ Over seven out of ten secondary schools had an admissions criterion relating to the child's medical or social needs. However, community and voluntary-controlled schools were more likely to use this as a criterion than were voluntary-aided or foundation schools.

♦ A significant minority (44%) of secondary schools' admissions criteria made reference to pupils with special educational needs. Again, these were predominantly community/voluntary-controlled schools.

♦ Overall, 27% of schools had admissions criteria related to religion; the vast majority of voluntary-aided schools had such criteria. A minority of voluntary-aided schools made explicit reference in their admissions criteria to pupils from other faiths or another 'World Faith'.

♦ The most common admissions practice that could be considered potentially unfair is the use of interviews; this was used by almost half (49%) of the voluntary-aided secondary schools in London. Over a quarter (27%) of voluntary-aided schools interviewed parents as part of the admissions process.

♦ Comparisons with admissions criteria used in secondary schools in the rest of England revealed that the opportunities for overt and covert selection are greater in London than in the rest of England. More secondary schools in London than in the rest of England:

- Select pupils on the basis of religion (27% versus 11%); this is due to the fact that there are relatively more voluntary-aided schools in London than in England as a whole;

- Interview pupils as part of the admissions process (14% versus less than 1%);

- Interview parents as part of the admissions process (8% versus less than 1%);

- Give priority to children of former pupils (10% versus 4%);

- Give priority to the children of employees (13% versus 8%);

- Select a proportion of pupils on the basis of ability/aptitude in a subject area (5% versus 2%).

The evidence suggests that clearer legislation and regulation is needed, to prevent the continuation of policies and practices that are inequitable. The fact that interviews will not be permitted for intakes from September 2005 onwards can be seen to be a positive move in this direction. However, the evidence reported here indicates that special attention needs to be directed towards making secondary school admissions in London more equitable, so that schools that are their own admission authorities have fewer opportunities to choose certain pupils at the expense of others.

1   Introduction

The Conservative education reforms introduced in the 1980s resulted in the introduction of a 'quasi-market' in school-based education. More state schools became responsible for determining who was admitted to the school (see West & Pennell, 2003). Schools that are responsible for their own admissions and oversubscribed are in a position to 'cream skim' – select pupils to maximise their examination 'league table' results or, conversely, not select those who are likely to have a negative impact on school examination results. Only schools that are both responsible for their admissions and that are oversubscribed are in this position,[1] namely foundation[2] and voluntary-aided schools.

Over the years a variety of concerns have been expressed about the administration of school admissions in various parts of the country (see Audit Commission, 1996; Gewirtz et al., 1995; West & Pennell, 1997; West et al., 1997, 1998). With the advent of the Labour government in 1997, a number of legislative changes were introduced in an attempt to improve the administration of school admissions (see West & Hind, 2003).

This report focuses specifically on admissions criteria currently in place in London secondary schools and the extent to which the criteria allow the opportunity for cream skimming. It also provides some examples of ways in which individual admission authorities 'select in' or 'select out' particular types of pupils via these criteria and other admissions policies and practices. The penultimate section compares admissions criteria used in London with those used in England as a whole. The final section presents the conclusions.

2   Admissions criteria in London secondary schools

In order to examine admissions criteria, a database of the criteria used by individual state-maintained secondary schools in England for pupils entering schools in September 2001[3] was set up (see West & Hind, 2003 for details). Our focus in this paper is on London schools, in particular the vast majority of schools that are not designated 'grammar' schools and are, therefore, nominally 'comprehensive' schools. (Tables A2 and A6 in Annex A give criteria, in addition to academic ability, used by grammar schools.[4])

A wide variety of criteria were used by admission authorities. In the sections that follow, we outline those that are most frequently used and then focus more specifically on those criteria that may be considered to be 'unfair' because, for example, they give preference to pupils with certain abilities or aptitudes or because they could contravene current anti-discriminatory legislation. In addition, we also examine criteria the absence of which might be construed as being unfair (e.g. medical/social needs, special educational needs). (Detailed information on the proportion of schools using different criteria are given in Annex A and examples of specific criteria used for individual schools are given in Annex B.)

---

[1] Admissions authorities are legally required to admit children, on demand, up to the physical capacity of the school (except in the case of selective or religious schools). Admissions to voluntary-controlled schools are the responsibility of the local education authority. City technology colleges and city academies are responsible for their own admissions, but are officially classified as 'independent' schools, not state schools.
[2] As a result of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, grant-maintained schools became either foundation schools or, if they had previously been voluntary schools, reverted to voluntary status.
[3] In a minority of cases criteria for September 2002 were used.
[4] The grammar schools in London are in outer London LEAs.

Frequently used criteria

Some admissions criteria were used by a high proportion of schools. Table 1 gives the criteria used by at least 15% of schools.

Table 1: Most frequently used admissions criteria

Criteria	Percentage of schools (N=382)
Siblings	94
Distance	86
Medical/social need	72
Pupils with special educational needs	44
Religious criteria	27
Banding	20
First preference	16
Feeder school	15

A high proportion of schools reported giving priority to siblings and to distance. Medical or social need was a criterion in over seven out of ten schools. Special educational needs were mentioned by under half of the schools. Smaller percentages of schools were reported to use other criteria (see also Table A3).

Criteria relating to ability/aptitude

The 1998 School Standards and Framework Act defines 'ability' as 'either general ability or ability in any particular subject or subjects'. It does not define aptitude, but the Code of Practice notes that a pupil with aptitude is one who 'is identified as being able to benefit from teaching in a specific subject, or who has demonstrated a particular capacity to succeed in that subject'. It is not clear how demonstrating a 'capacity to succeed' differs from 'ability' and given this we have focused on partial selection by either ability or aptitude in a particular subject area (e.g. ability or aptitude in technology, music, dance, art, languages). Our analysis revealed that only a minority of schools (5%) were selecting a proportion of pupils on the basis of ability/aptitude in a particular subject(s).

Schools that are their own admission authorities might be hypothesised to be more likely to cream skim and we therefore examined whether these schools (voluntary-aided and foundation schools) were more likely to select pupils on the basis of ability or aptitude. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Percentage of non-grammar secondary schools selecting by ability/aptitude in subject area

Type of school	Percentage selecting by ability/aptitude	N
Voluntary-aided	9	107
Foundation	8	61
Community	2	208
Voluntary-controlled	0	6
All schools	**5**	**382**

It is clear from this table that the schools selecting by aptitude/ability are predominantly those that are their own admission authority.

Banding

Under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, secondary schools are permitted to select pupils in order to gain a balanced intake of pupils based on their ability; this is commonly termed 'banding'. Overall, 20% of London secondary schools used some form of banding (29% were voluntary-aided schools, 10% were foundation and 17% were community schools). Most of these schools were in inner London (see Tables A4 and A5).

Section 101 of the School Standards and Framework Act states that:

> the admission arrangements for a maintained school may make provision for selection by ability to the extent that the arrangements are designed to secure (a) that in any year the pupils admitted to the school in any relevant age group are representative of all levels of ability among applicants for admission to the school in that age group, and (b) that no level of ability is substantially over-represented or substantially under-represented.

Clearly there is a debate about what 'substantially' means, but we found examples of schools banding in a way that gives rise to an intake 'skewed' towards higher ability pupils. Below are two examples of approaches to banding used by two schools responsible for their own admissions:

> Places are offered in the following ratios: Band 1 [the highest]: 40%, Band 2: 40%, Band 3: 20% (foundation school).

> The girls chosen for admission will be drawn from across the ability range, i.e. above average, average and below average…The Governors' expectation is that the …entrants to the school will be approximately made up of [27% of] girls of above average ability, [56%] of average and [18%] of below average. These proportions are in no way rigid…(voluntary-aided school).

By way of contrast, where community schools used banding a different approach was adopted. In these cases banding was organised centrally by the LEA rather than by individual schools and all pupils who were in the final year of primary school in the LEA[5] were subject to the banding system. Two examples of such banding systems are given below:

> A quarter of the total places available at each of these schools are allocated to each of the four reading bandings [25% in each].[6]

> The main purpose of the tests[7] is to make sure that each secondary school has, as far as is possible, an even balance of pupils of different abilities and is therefore a comprehensive school. There are five bands of ability [20% in each band], ranging from 1a (for pupils who show aptitude in the subject areas tested) through 1b, 2a and 2b to band 3 (for pupils who have difficulty in the subject areas tested).

Banding systems used by LEAs can be construed as being fairer than those conducted by individual schools for several reasons. First, the LEA-wide system as used by the inner London LEAs applies to all pupils attending primary schools within the LEA, whereas a school-based system involves only those primary pupils who *apply* to the secondary school in question. This is important as in practice there may be particular reasons why some parents may be deterred from applying to a particular school – for example, there may be a perception that there is little chance of success. Second, if the admission authority is the LEA the system is more likely to be clear and transparent

---

[5] Separate arrangements are usually made for applicants attending primary schools elsewhere.
[6] A reading comprehension test, taken in Year 6 of primary school, is used to allocate pupils to bands.
[7] The Qualification and Curriculum Authority's optional year 5 tests for maths and reading are used.

©Anne West, Audrey Hind & Hazel Pennell   7

as the LEA has less of a vested interest in the process than an individual school. If the admission authority is a school on the other hand, it would be possible for the highest scoring pupils in any particular band to be admitted at the expense of others while still adhering to the banding system.

Finally, our evidence indicates that where banding takes place on an LEA-wide basis, it is designed to obtain a comprehensive intake to schools in the area, whereas in the case of *some* school-based systems, the banding system could be skewed in favour of those of higher ability. Indeed, as can be seen from the examples cited above, the banding systems used by some schools that are their own admission authority suggest that this is the case.

Criteria giving priority to children of employees or former pupils

The Code of Practice on School Admissions makes specific reference to admission authorities giving priority to certain categories of pupils such as the children of former pupils, stating that these should not be used as they may contravene the Race Relations Act 1976. However, we found that 13% of schools were giving priority to the children of employees/governors:

> Children of present school staff who are normally employed for a minimum of 10 hours per week. Headteachers will have the discretion to include children of other staff employed at the school (community school).

> A parent working at the school (foundation school).

One in ten schools gave preference to the children of former pupils and a small percentage of schools (3%) gave preference to pupils with a 'strong family connection' or equivalent.

More voluntary-aided and foundation than community or voluntary-controlled schools gave priority to the children of former pupils (14% and 28% versus 3% and 0%).

Criteria relating to medical/social need

Over seven out of ten schools had an admissions criterion relating to medical or social needs of the child. However, as can be seen from Table 3, the schools that are more likely to have this criterion were community/voluntary controlled schools as opposed to voluntary-aided/foundation schools.

Table 3: Percentage of schools with admissions criteria referring to medical/social needs

Type of school	% schools with medical/social need criterion	N
Voluntary-controlled	100	6
Community	89	208
Foundation	64	61
Voluntary-aided	41	107
Total	**72**	**382**

Interestingly, medical/social need did not necessarily need to be supported by a professional, so leaving the possibility of administrative discretion being used by an admission authority to 'select' certain categories of pupils. This point can be illustrated by the following examples showing the criteria used by, respectively, a foundation and a community school in the same LEA. In the case of the foundation school no mention is made of the need to provide professionally supported evidence of medical or social need while for the community school the requirement to provide such evidence is made quite clear.

> Where there are special medical/social grounds for admitting the girl (foundation school).

In exceptional circumstances, the Director of Education has discretion to give a higher priority where a parent provides professionally supported evidence, at the time of application, that their child has an acute personal or medical need for a place at the college (community school).

Special educational needs

A significant minority (44%) of schools' admissions criteria made reference to pupils with special educational needs. However, as shown in Table 4, these were predominantly community/ voluntary-controlled schools.

Table 4: Percentage of schools with special educational needs admissions criterion

Type of school	% schools with SEN as criterion	N
Community	65	208
Voluntary-controlled	50	6
Voluntary-aided	18	107
Foundation	16	61
Total	**44**	**382**

It thus appears that children with special educational needs may be less likely to be admitted to schools that are their own admission authority. However, in some LEA brochures the issue of admissions for such children is not explicitly given as an admissions criterion so this information needs to be treated with caution.

Nevertheless, when we examined admissions brochures from LEAs where special educational needs was included as an admissions criterion for community schools it was generally not included as an admissions criterion for voluntary-aided or foundation schools.

For example, for community schools in one LEA, the first admissions criterion was: '[Children] for whom a statement of special educational needs has been made under the Education Act 1996 and for whom the school has been named in that statement'. None of the foundation or voluntary-aided schools in the LEA concerned had such a criterion and only 16% of the schools in this category (in the same LEA) mentioned 'special needs' in their admissions criteria or admissions information to parents.

Religious schools and other faiths

Overall, 27% of schools had admissions criteria related to religion; 94% of voluntary-aided schools had such criteria, 17% of voluntary-controlled schools and 2% of foundation schools.

If we focus specifically on voluntary-aided schools, we find that a minority (35%) made explicit reference in their admissions criteria to pupils from other faiths or another 'World Faith'. Some examples are given below:

A few places may be available for non-catholic children provided their parents are ready to support the Christian beliefs and values of the school, but in order to preserve the particular Roman Catholic character of the school not more than 10% of each year's intake shall consist of boys who are not of the Roman Catholic faith (… however, our recent heavy over-subscription does mean that if we are able to accept non-Catholics then the number would be considerably less than 10%) .

Open places: the Governors have designated 30 places as open places to be offered to students who with their parent(s)/carer(s) are practising members of non-Christian major world faiths (defined as Muslim, Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, Jewish) and where the application is accompanied by a supportive religious reference from their place of worship.

Criterion 4 out of 5: Other applicants, including children of families practising other world faiths, providing the parents accept the aims and Christian ethos of the school.

It is noteworthy that some voluntary-aided schools do not even mention pupils from other Christian denominations. However, we found one example of a school that not only had a criterion relating to those who were not Christians, but also provided details of the proportion of 'Non-Christians' admitted the previous year (8% of the intake) and another where religious criteria were not taken directly into account for a substantial proportion of the intake:

The Governors have designated 35 places [out of the 90 total intake] each year as Open Places. Priority will be given to:
(a) (i) Children who have a brother or sister attending [the school] at the time of application.
(ii) Applicants who live nearest to the school, measured along the shortest, safe travelling route in order of proximity.
(b) Families living beyond a 4 mile radius…

An unusual example was a voluntary-aided school that used the same admissions criterion as the LEA (which was very rare) but also noted:

However, in addition, as we are a Church and a multi-faith school, we request that students are sensitive to, and respectful of, religious worship and prayer (voluntary-aided school).

Idiosyncratic practices enabling schools to 'select in' and 'select out' pupils

There are a wide range of other idiosyncratic criteria and other practices that are potentially unfair. These include interviews, imprecise, unclear criteria, reference to the pupil's academic record or the record of siblings.

Interviews

The most common admissions practice that could be considered potentially unfair is the use of interviews. Fourteen per cent of schools in London interviewed pupils as part of the admissions process, a practice that was used by almost half (49%) of the voluntary-aided schools in London. Eight per cent of schools interviewed parents as part of the admissions process (such interviews were used by 27% of voluntary-aided schools).

At present, the Code of Practice allows church schools to carry out interviews in order to assess 'religious or denomination commitment'.[8] In some cases, this is the stated aim, for example: 'An interview to confirm Catholicity'. In one notable case, although the focus is on religious commitment, the criteria appear to be unachievable:

Baptised fully practising children of families where at least one Catholic parent/guardian is a Baptised fully practising member of the Catholic Church, *whose first priority is a Catholic education for the child where both child and parent/guardian have attended Saturday evening/Sunday Mass every week since the child started Primary School.* This must be supported by:

---

[8] Interviews will not be permitted for admissions to state secondary (day) schools from September 2005 or thereafter.

- An interview at the school to confirm Catholicity
- A signed statement by the parent/guardian stating that they have not applied nor taken steps to apply (including the sitting of a selective test) to a non-Catholic school.

In this case, the requirement to have attended Mass every week is unlikely to be achievable (given childhood illnesses and holidays); in addition, the requirement for parents to confirm that they have not applied to a non-Catholic school would appear to be on *a priori* grounds unreasonable as there is no guarantee that the application to the Catholic school in question – or indeed any Catholic school – would be successful.

Whilst for some schools it is stated that interviews are to determine religious commitment, in other (voluntary-aided) schools this is not their sole aim:

Applicants and their families making a Foundation application will be invited to come for interview. The function of the interview is to assess whether the aims, attitudes, values and expectations of the applicant and her family are in harmony with those of this Anglican school as detailed in the school prospectus …and to explore further the family's commitment to their faith.

Catholicity of home and pastoral benefit to be derived by child.

Moreover, in some schools, no reference is given to 'religion':

Admission criterion 1: The outcome of an interview with the pupil to ascertain their potential to contribute to or benefit from a small school with a caring family atmosphere.

Criteria that are not clear

Some criteria are not clear or fair in that they are vague and allow administrative discretion as indicated by the following examples from voluntary-aided schools:

Any pastoral, social or educational benefit to be gained from the pupil's education at the particular school.

Compassionate factors.

Other criteria relate to the behaviour of siblings, which again would appear to be unfair and enable schools to 'select out' some pupils on account of the behaviour of others:

Whether the candidate has a brother or sister with a satisfactory record at the school and whose parents have supported the school (for this purpose, a pupil's record will be regarded as satisfactory if she or he has: (i) consistently achieved A or B grades for effort in all subjects, general attitude to work and school, and conduct (as shown in interim and annual reports); (ii) good records of punctuality and attendance; and (iii) taken part in extra-curricular activities or made a contribution to the school in another way).

Whilst not necessarily an 'admissions criterion' some (voluntary-aided) schools take up references from pupils' primary schools:

The school will also require each application to be supported by a reference from the applicant's primary headteacher…The purpose of taking [this] up is to give the primary heads the opportunity to show that the applicant and her family's attitudes, values and expectations are in sympathy with this…school.

3   Admissions criteria used in London and the rest of England

Our analysis has revealed that some secondary schools' admissions criteria appear to be designed to 'select in' certain groups of pupils and 'select out' others. Whilst many community schools do not fall into this category, a minority of schools that are their own admission authorities use a variety of criteria which appear to be designed to select certain groups of pupils but not others. Given the links between social background, prior attainment and later examination performance (see West and Pennell, 2003), these practices enable some such schools to obtain higher league table positions than others.

Comparisons with admissions criteria used in secondary schools in the rest of England (see Annex A) reveal that the opportunities for overt and covert selection are greater in London than in the rest of England. More secondary schools in London than in the rest of England:

♦ select pupils on the basis of religion (27% versus 11%); this is due to the fact that there are relatively more voluntary-aided schools in London than in England as a whole;

♦ interview pupils as part of the admissions process (14% versus less than 1%);

♦ interview parents as part of the admissions process (8% versus less than 1%);

♦ give priority to children of former pupils (10% versus 4%);

♦ give priority to the children of employees (13% versus 8%);

♦ select a proportion of pupils on the basis of ability/aptitude in a subject area (5% versus 2%).

In addition, more secondary schools in London than in the rest of England:

♦ mention special educational needs as a criterion (44% versus 38%);

♦ use 'banding' (20% versus less than 1%); this is almost certainly a legacy of the former Inner London Education Authority which had a policy of banding to try and ensure an academically 'balanced' intake.

More schools outside than inside London mention siblings, catchment area, feeder schools and 'first preference' as criteria for admissions.

4   Conclusions

In conclusion, the evidence reported here reveals that despite attempts by the Government to reform school admissions, there is considerable room for improvement. Admissions criteria that are not objective or clear, or allow for administrative discretion continue to be used and some may also contravene current legislation. The process of secondary transfer needs to be further reformed if some groups of parents and pupils - and schools - do not continue to benefit at the expense of others. By encouraging academically and socially-mixed schools that do not give unfair advantages to some categories of pupils, policy makers have an opportunity to improve educational outcomes for the majority at the same time as promoting social justice. This will require both clearer legislation and more regulation, to prevent a continuation of policies and practices that are

inequitable. The fact that interviews will not be permitted for intakes from September 2005 onwards can be considered to be a positive move in this direction.

References

Audit Commission (1996) Trading Places: The supply and allocation of school places. London: The Audit Commission.

DfES (2001) Statistics of Education: Schools in England 2001, London: DfES.

Gewirtz, S., Ball, S. J. & Bowe, R. (1995) Markets, Choice and Equity in Education, Buckingham: Open University Press.

West, A. & Hind, A. (2003) Secondary school admissions in England: Exploring the extent of overt and covert selection, London, Research and Information on State Education Trust. Available at: http://www.risetrust.org.uk/admissions.html

West, A. & Pennell, H. (1997) Educational reform and school choice in England and Wales, Education Economics, 5, 285-306.

West, A., Pennell, H. & Noden, P. (1997) Secondary School Admissions: Towards a national policy? London: Research and Information on State Education Trust.

West, A., Pennell, H. & Noden, P. (1998) School admissions: increasing equity, accountability and transparency, British Journal of Educational Studies, 46, 2, 188-200.

West, A. & Pennell, H. (2003) Underachievement in Schools, London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Acknowledgements

Address for correspondence: Professor Anne West, Director, Centre for Educational Research, Department of Social Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE. Telephone: 020 7955 7269. E-mail: a.west@lse.ac.uk

Annex A   Secondary schools' admissions criteria

Introduction

Data in the following tables relate in the vast majority of cases to admissions (to year 7) in September 2001. Information was obtained from LEA composite prospectuses and from individual schools for those voluntary-aided and foundation schools not included in prospectuses (in some cases information relating to admission in September 2002 was provided); not all such schools provided data.

For tables relating to England: Data were available for 3013 state-maintained secondary schools out of 3165 secondary schools in England (excluding middle schools and CTCs) (DfES, 2001). Of these, 151 were designated grammar schools (out of 164 in England) and 2862 were not.

For tables relating to London: Data were available for 401 secondary schools out of 406 in London (excluding middle schools and CTCs). Of the schools in London, 382 were non-grammar schools and 19 were grammar schools (all in outer London).

The definitions of Inner and Outer London differ from those used in DfES (2001). Inner London, for the purposes of this analysis, comprises the former Inner London Education Authority LEAs and includes Greenwich but excludes Haringey and Newham. Outer London excludes Greenwich and includes Haringey and Newham.

Table A1   London and England: secondary schools (excluding grammar schools)

Criterion	London secondary schools N=382 %(n)	England excluding London N=2480 %(n)	England secondary schools N=2862 %(n)
Siblings	**94% (358)**	**96% (2391)**	96% (2749)
Distance	86% (330)	86% (2124)	86% (2454)
Medical/social need	72% (274)	73% (1803)	73% (2077)
Special educational needs	**44% (168)**	**38% (949)**	39% (1117)
Religion	**27% (102)**	**11% (282)**	13% (384)
Banding	**20% (76)**	**<1% (2)**	3% (78)
First preference	**16% (62)**	**45% (1117)**	41% (1179)
Feeder school	**15% (59)**	**30% (732)**	28% (791)
Pupil interviews	**14% (53)**	**<1% (16)**	2% (69)
Children of employees	**13% (50)**	**8% (195)**	9% (245)
Children of former pupils	**10% (39)**	**4% (97)**	5% (136)
'Other faiths'	**10% (37)**	**2% (57)**	3% (94)
Parent interviews	**8% (29)**	**<1% (13)**	2% (42)
Difficult journey	7% (26)	6% (157)	6% (183)
Catchment area	**6% (23)**	**69% (1717)**	61% (1740)
Ability/aptitude in subject area	**5% (19)**	**2% (55)**	3% (74)
Strong family connection	3% (11)	1% (35)	2% (46)

Note: Statistically significant differences (0.05 level or beyond) between London and the rest of England are emboldened.

Table A2　London and England: grammar schools

Criterion	London grammar schools N=19 % (n)	England excluding London N=132 %(n)	England grammar schools N=151 %(n)
Distance	74% (14)	70% (92)	70% (106)
Siblings	63% (12)	73% (96)	72% (108)
Medical/social need	42% (8)	45% (59)	44% (67)
Children of former pupils	**32% (6)**	**6% (8)**	9% (14)
Special educational needs	21% (4)	14%(19)	15% (23)
Religion	16% (3)	5% (7)	7% (10)
Catchment area	**16% (3)**	**55% (73)**	50% (76)
Ability/aptitude in subject area	11% (2)	2% (2)	3% (4)
Strong family connection	5% (1)	2% (2)	2% (3)
Children of employees	5% (1)	7% (9)	7% (10)
Parent interviews	5% (1)	2% (3)	3% (4)
Pupil interviews	5% (1)	3% (4)	3% (5)
Difficult journey	5% (1)	20% (26)	18% (27)
First preference	**0% (0)**	**44% (58)**	38% (58)
Feeder school	0% (0)	4% (5)	3% (5)

Note: Statistically significant differences (0.05 level or beyond) between London and the rest of England are emboldened.

Table A3　Inner and outer London secondary schools (excluding grammar schools)

Criterion	London secondary N=382	Community N=208	Voluntary-aided N=107	Foundation N=61	Voluntary-controlled N=6 (n)
Siblings	94%	100%	79%	98%	100% (6)
Distance	86%	94%	63%	100%	100% (6)
Medical/social need	72%	89%	41%	64%	100% (6)
Special educational needs	44%	65%	18%	16%	50% (3)
Religion	27%	0%	94%	2%	17% (1)
Banding	20%	17%	29%	10%	50% (3)
'First preference'	16%	14%	26%	3%	33% (2)
Feeder school	15%	16%	16%	13%	0% (0)
Pupil interviews	14%	0%	49%	0%	17% (1)
Children of employees	13%	13%	7%	26%	0% (0)
Children of former pupils	10%	3%	14%	28%	0% (0)
'Other faiths'	10%	0%	35%	0%	0% (0)
Parent interviews	8%	0%	27%	0%	0% (0)
Difficult journey	7%	11%	1%	2%	17% (1)
Catchment area	6%	7%	6%	5%	0% (0)
Ability/aptitude in subject area	5%	2%	9%	8%	0% (0)
Strong family connection	3%	0%	9%	2%	0% (0)

Table A4   Inner London secondary schools

Criterion	Inner London secondary N=120	Community N=63	Voluntary-aided N=48	Foundation N=5	Voluntary-controlled N=4 (n)
Siblings	91%	98%	79%	100%	100% (4)
Distance	85%	97%	67%	100%	100% (4)
Medical/social need	79%	98%	50%	100%	100% (4)
Banding	61%	57%	65%	60%	75% (3)
Special educational needs	53%	71%	31%	0%	75% (3)
Religion	37%	0%	90%	0%	25% (1)
Pupil interviews	27%	0%	65%	0%	25% (1)
Difficult journey	22%	37%	2%	20%	25% (1)
Parent interviews	16%	0%	40%	0%	0% (0)
'Other faiths'	13%	0%	33%	0%	0% (0)
Feeder school	12%	2%	27%	0%	0% (0)
First preference	11%	2%	25%	0%	0% (0)
Ability/aptitude in subject area	9%	5%	15%	20%	0% (0)
Children of former pupils	7%	0%	17%	0%	0% (0)
Strong family connection	4%	0%	10%	0%	0% (0)
Catchment area	3%	3%	4%	0%	0% (0)
Children of employees	3%	0%	6%	0%	0% (0)

Table A5   Outer London secondary schools (excluding grammar schools)

Criterion	Outer London secondary N=262	Community N=145	Voluntary-aided N=59	Foundation N=56	Voluntary-controlled N=2 (n)
Siblings	95%	100%	80%	98%	100% (2)
Distance	87%	93%	59%	100%	100% (2)
Medical/social need	68%	85%	34%	61%	100% (2)
Special educational needs	40%	63%	7%	18%	0%
Religion	22%	0%	97%	2%	0%
First preference	19%	20%	27%	4%	100% (2)
Children of employees	18%	19%	7%	29%	0%
Feeder school	17%	23%	7%	14%	0%
Children of former pupils	12%	5%	12%	30%	0%
Pupil interviews	8%	0%	36%	0%	0%
'Other faiths'	8%	0%	36%	0%	0%
Catchment area	7%	8%	7%	5%	0%
Parent interviews	4%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Ability/aptitude in subject area	3%	1%	5%	7%	0%
Strong family connection	2%	0%	9%	2%	0%
Banding	1%	0%	0%	5%	0%

Table A6   Outer London: grammar schools

Criterion	London grammar N=19	Community N=6(n)	Voluntary-aided N=6(n)	Foundation N=7(n)
Distance	74% (14)	50% (3)	67% (4)	100% (7)
Siblings	63% (12)	50% (3)	67% (4)	71% (5)
Medical/social need	42% (8)	50% (3)	0% (0)	71% (5)
Children of former pupils	32% (6)	0% (0)	67% (4)	29% (2)
Special educational needs	21% (4)	50% (3)	0% (0)	14% (1)
Religion	16% (3)	0% (0)	50% (3)	0% (0)
Catchment area	16% (3)	33% (2)	17% (1)	0% (0)
Ability/aptitude	11% (2)	0% (0)	17% (1)	14% (1)
Strong family connection	5% (1)	0% (0)	17% (1)	0% (0)
Children of employees	5% (1)	0% (0)	17% (1)	0% (0)
Parent interviews	5% (1)	0% (0)	17% (1)	0% (0)
Pupil interviews	5% (1)	0% (0)	17% (1)	0% (0)
Difficult journey	5% (1)	0% (0)	17% (1)	0% (0)

Annex B   Examples of admissions criteria

Community secondary school

1. Applicants who have a brother or sister already at the school.
2. Applicants who live nearest to the school. Nearness to the school will be measured on a large-scale map of the area. For this purpose measurement will be over the shortest reasonable walking route and accessibility by private or public transport will be disregarded.
3. In exceptional circumstances the…Director of Education…will admit children on grounds of particular medical or social need for [named school].

Community secondary school

Places will be offered in the following priority order up to the standard admissions number to the applicants who made the school their FIRST PREFERENCE.

If more applications are received in any one criterion than there are places available the 'tie-breaker' of distance, measured by the shortest, safe walking route, will be applied.

a. Students with statements of Special Educational Needs which can be best met, in the view of the Learning Support Panel, through attendance at a particular school.
b. Applications made on medical grounds. Such applications must be accompanied by supporting evidence from a Consultant at the time of application. Requests will only be considered for the school nearest to the child's home.
c. Pupils with older brothers and sisters attending the linked high school at the closing date for receipt of application to high school.
d. Pupils who attend in the academic year 99/00 a primary school which was previously linked to the preferred high school AND an older brother or sister attended that school in September 1999.

Voluntary-aided secondary school

Where there are more applications for places than the total of 120 places available, places will be offered according to the following order of priority:

1. Roman Catholic children baptised into and practising their faith, whose parents can produce a letter of priestly support.
2. Other Roman Catholic children baptised into the faith.
3. Christian children whose parents wish their daughter to attend [named school].
4. Non-Christian children whose parents wish their daughter to attend [named school].

Foundation secondary school

Allocation of places will follow the criteria in order as published:

- Siblings of pupils at present on roll at the School
- 10% places for pupils by aptitude for Music by audition
- 5% places for pupils by aptitude for Dance by audition
- 10% places for pupils with Technological Aptitude
- Pupils whose parent works at the School
- Remaining places allocated by geographical proximity to the School

Foundation secondary school

Siblings – a child whose brother or sister attends, or who has attended, the school.

Proximity – children living nearest to the school (measured in a straight line from the front door of the home to the front door of the school).

Foundation secondary school

Where applications for admissions exceeds the number of places available the following criteria will be applied, in the order set out below, to decide which children to admit:-

1.   Where the child has a brother or sister currently attending the school.
2.   Where the child has a brother or sister who attended the school.
3.   Where there are medical grounds (supported by a Doctor's certificate) for admitting the child.
4.   Proximity of the child's home to the school with those living nearer being accorded higher priority.

The governors will seek to retain the full range of ability and the balance of social diversity which has been the tradition of the school.

Pupils will be admitted at the age of 11 without reference to ability or aptitude.

[The named] School is committed to the co-ordinated approach to admissions administered by the [named borough].