

Message

---

**From:** Michelle Meadows [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=31A9C158AEFF44C28A7C30E6E82F7F08-MICHELLE ME]  
**Sent:** 20/07/2020 12:37:46  
**To:** SPATCHER, Jacquie [Jacquie.SPATCHER@education.gov.uk]  
**CC:** Sally Collier [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=eb20201e9e4d48498fbf3f2e8a48ed14-Sally Colli]; Kate Keating [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=0b14b7b3d93645899f9a063c64e4a0c1-Kate Keatin]; **NR**  
**Subject:** **NR** education.gov.uk  
RE: URGENT - Jon Coles model etc

The evidence I would use to rebut JC's model –

Jon's model assumes that the CAGs are giving signal about the level of improvement (or deterioration) a centre would have seen in their results this year if exams had gone ahead.

We do not believe that the CAGs give this signal, rather we believe they reflect different approaches to producing the CAGs taken within centres. This is because:

1. Not only are the levels of inflation seen in the CAGs extreme (e.g. +13% at grade B at A level, 10% at grade 4 at GCSE), they are peaked at grade 4 at GCSE and grade B at A level. If JC is right then why are centres expecting improvement so targeted at particular grades? At GCSE one could argue it is because centres target their teaching at pupils on the 4/3 borderline but it is implausible that they do the same at A level for the grade B/C borderline.
2. There is a pattern in the level of improvement suggested by the CAGs such that some centre types (e.g. FE colleges) are expecting higher levels of improvement than other centre types. The pattern of improvement is not plausible and not seen in normal years (see earlier in the chain). The pupils within centre types with the highest CAGs would be advantaged by JC's model.
3. Some centres have put in implausible CAGs e.g. all A\*s and As where in previous years they have had a full and normal distribution of grades from grade A\* down to ungraded. These centres would be advantaged if the CAGs were used. It is not simple to remove these centres and fully standardise their grades because the level of inflation is on a continuum – it is impossible to judge where the cut off should be between centres who have sought to advantage their candidates versus centres who have just been overly optimistic.
4. We know that some centres have used statistics on previous year's outcomes to internally moderate their CAGs. The pupils from these centres which have acted with integrity will be disadvantaged by JC's model.
5. We also know from conversations with teachers that some centres have taken the approach of adding a blanket +1 to all CAGs prior to submission. It is implausible that these +1s reflect true expected improvement.
6. The calculated grades from the model correlate more strongly with NRT outcomes for centres than the CAGs. However, JC would argue that a combination of CAG and statistics would correlate even higher. Since JC's model is not built it is at this point impossible to know. But we do know all the points above.
7. Finally, since awarding is underway, to create and then implement JC's model would delay results.
8. In sum we do not believe that we can use a model such as the one suggested by JC because to do so would disadvantage pupils from centres which acted with integrity.

Michelle.

---

**From:** SPATCHER, Jacquie <Jacquie.SPATCHER@education.gov.uk>

**Sent:** 20 July 2020 11:53

**To:** Michelle Meadows <Michelle.Meadows@ofqual.gov.uk>

**Cc:** Sally Collier <sally.collier@ofqual.gov.uk>; Kate Keating <Kate.Keating@ofqual.gov.uk>

NR

NR

@education.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: URGENT - Jon Coles model etc

Thanks for this Michelle – v helpful to see the stats. We'll get back to on the slides as soon as we can.

Can I just press you again on the question of a rebuttal of the JC model, please? I'm being pressed quite hard at this end to see something on that (in part to support Andrew's planned calls to ASCL and CST today), and to understand what your plans are for getting something out publicly.

Jacquie

---

**From:** Michelle Meadows <Michelle.Meadows@ofqual.gov.uk>

**Sent:** 20 July 2020 09:21

**To:** SPATCHER, Jacquie <Jacquie.SPATCHER@education.gov.uk>

**Cc:** sally collier <sally.collier@ofqual.gov.uk>; Kate Keating <Kate.Keating@ofqual.gov.uk>

NR

NR

@education.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: URGENT - Jon Coles model etc

Hi Jacquie

I updated my slides this weekend. They are attached – Sally hasn't seen yet so they are still draft. There is a slide with CAG inflation on and a note about how it varies by centre type (in suprising ways). I have copied the centre type background data below (inflation is expressed in terms of mean grade). Jon knows that FE comes out high but he hasn't seen the ranking of generosity – the effect being that his model would disadvantage certain centre types (unless we believe the ranking tells us about improvement – no such pattern normally exists in the data). He might be moved by the rank order information?

Michelle

Inflation in CAGs	GCSE
FE	0.48
Sixth Form College	0.42
Independent	0.39
Secondary comprehensive	0.38
Secondary Modern	0.36
City Academy	0.35
Free schools	0.34
Secondary selective	0.27



Inflation in CAGs	A level
Secondary Modern	0.64
FE	0.51
Secondary comprehensive	0.49
Independent	0.45
City Academy	0.45
Free schools	0.44
Secondary selective	0.38
Sixth Form College	0.37

---

**From:** SPATCHER, Jacquie <[Jacquie.SPATCHER@education.gov.uk](mailto:Jacquie.SPATCHER@education.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 20 July 2020 08:42

**To:** Michelle Meadows <[Michelle.Meadows@ofqual.gov.uk](mailto:Michelle.Meadows@ofqual.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Sally Collier <[sally.collier@ofqual.gov.uk](mailto:sally.collier@ofqual.gov.uk)>; Kate Keating <[Kate.Keating@ofqual.gov.uk](mailto:Kate.Keating@ofqual.gov.uk)>

NR

NR @education.gov.uk

**Subject:** URGENT - Jon Coles model etc

**Importance:** High

Hi Michelle – hope you’re still standing. I gather last week was pretty difficult...

In the interests of speed I’m forwarding Andrew McCully’s email below ahead of letting you have further comments on the symposium materials that were sent through on Friday, as you will see that Andrew is after additional information to enable him to have conversations with ASCL and CST today. Can you help, please?

Can you (or Kate) also clarify what your plans are re putting something out publicly that rebuts JC’s position? I understand that it was agreed last week that Ofqual would do that but it’s not in the materials that were sent through to us on Friday – do you plan something separate – eg a blog?

And NR may already have asked this but we’re also being pressed for the materials that you’re planning to use at the symposium itself (I assume there will be slides?) as well as those that will be circulated afterwards. It would be good to see those asap.

Many thanks, and I’m v happy to have a word on the phone if that would be helpful.

Jacquie

---

**From:** MCCULLY, Andrew <[Andrew.McCully@education.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.McCully@education.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 20 July 2020 08:16

**To:** SAXTON, Jo <[Jo.SAXTON@education.gov.uk](mailto:Jo.SAXTON@education.gov.uk)>; NR @education.gov.uk; TAYLOR, Innes <[Innes.TAYLOR@education.gov.uk](mailto:Innes.TAYLOR@education.gov.uk)>; PATERSON, Chris <[Chris.PATERSON@education.gov.uk](mailto:Chris.PATERSON@education.gov.uk)>; GRIBBELL, Rory <[Rory.GRIBBELL@education.gov.uk](mailto:Rory.GRIBBELL@education.gov.uk)>; MANSFIELD, Iain <[Iain.MANSFIELD@education.gov.uk](mailto:Iain.MANSFIELD@education.gov.uk)>; SPATCHER, Jacquie

<Jacquie.SPATCHER@education.gov.uk>

Cc: NR Jobshare <NR@education.gov.uk> NR

NR @education.gov.uk>; PS, Gibb <Gibb.PS@education.gov.uk> NR

NR @education.gov.uk>; DYSON, Michelle <Michelle.DYSON@education.gov.uk> NR

NR @education.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: official sensitive - comms for Tuesday

Jacquie/Jo

I was hoping for two things from Ofqual that I have not yet seen.

One was an explicit analysis and challenge to the JC model which demonstrated both a) why it could not be accepted (which so far has leaned on the legal arguments that it was not the model consulted upon and that it would not be compatible with the duty on standards over time); and b) why the model is not actually fairer.

On b) I understood from conversations on Friday that Ofqual had done an analysis of the which type of schools had followed the expected model more closely and conversely which schools would be affected most by the following the JC model. I think I heard that at one end of the spectrum sponsored academies would be most disadvantaged by standardisation following the JC model and that FE colleges and independent schools would be most advantaged. If that is true could we see the analysis?

My proposition on Friday was that some of us should engage with ASCL and CST today at the level of NR and NR to make two important points. First that it wasn't that JC's interventions had been ignored but that they had explicitly been rejected because they would be no fairer. And secondly that JC's model would also be damaging for the future in terms of grade inflation. We need the analysis and challenge to the JC model for me or others to do that (Jo I am sure is better equipped, but I am not).

But I also want to do two other in the conversations with NR and NR if they were true and justified. I wanted to be able to say that since JC's model flew in the face of what ASCL had advised, its members those who would most lose out would be members who had followed ASCL's advice. If true it would be helpful to have material to back that up.

Secondly I want to be able to inject into the discussions that FE colleges and Independent Schools stand to gain more because they have assessed grades most in excess of the model. That's why I need the analysis at b)

Clearly NR and other system leaders will need to reflect on two things if I were able to indicate that this is the findings of Ofqual's analysis: first should they really support an argument which disadvantages sponsored academies most of all? And is there at least some degree of discomfort in supporting an argument which benefits independent schools, advocated by a trust which includes many independent schools?

Andrew