



Office of  
the Schools  
Adjudicator

## Determination

<b>Case reference:</b>	<b>ADA4137</b>
<b>Objector:</b>	<b>Warwickshire County Council</b>
<b>Admission authority:</b>	<b>The Midland Academies Trust for George Eliot Academy, Nuneaton, Warwickshire</b>
<b>Date of decision:</b>	<b>8 September 2023</b>

## Determination

In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2024 determined by the Midland Academies Trust for George Eliot Academy, Nuneaton, Warwickshire.

I have also considered the arrangements in accordance with section 88I(5) and find there are other matters which do not conform with the requirements relating to admission arrangements in the ways set out in this determination.

By virtue of section 88K(2) the adjudicator's decision is binding on the admission authority. The School Admissions Code requires the admission authority to revise its admission arrangements within two months of the date of the determination unless an alternative timescale is specified by the adjudicator. In this case I determine that the arrangements must be determined by Friday 13 October 2023.

## 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 Warwickshire County Council, (the objector, the LA), about the admission arrangements (the arrangements) for George Eliot Academy, Nuneaton (the school), a mixed non-selective secondary school for students aged 11-16 for September 2024. The objection is to the published admission number for Year 7 (the PAN). The admission authority for the school is the Midland Academies Trust (the trust).

2. The parties to the objection are the LA, the school and the trust.

## Jurisdiction

3. The terms of the academy agreement between the 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 trust on that basis. The objector submitted their objection to these determined arrangements on 4 May 2023. I am satisfied the objection has been properly referred to me in accordance with section 88H of the Act and it is within my jurisdiction. I have also used my power under section 88I of the Act to consider the arrangements as a whole.

## Procedure

4. In considering this matter I have had regard to all relevant legislation and the School Admissions Code (the Code).

5. The documents I have considered in reaching my decision include:

- a. a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the trust board at which the arrangements were determined;
- b. a copy of the determined arrangements;
- c. the objector's form of objection dated 4 May 2023, supporting documents and subsequent correspondence;
- d. the trust's response to the objection and subsequent correspondence;
- e. recent admissions data and the LA's most recent forecast of the demand for Year 7 places locally, and
- f. a map of the area identifying relevant schools.

## The Objection

6. The LA set out its objection in the following terms:

“Warwickshire County Council are objecting to the recently determined September 2024 Admission Arrangements for The [sic] George Eliot Academy which reduces the school's Published Admission Number from 190 to 150. The reason for objecting to the 2024 admission arrangements relates to an LA's duty under the Education Act 1996 to ensure there is sufficient education provision to meet the needs of school age children. WCC continue to forecast a shortfall in secondary school places in the Nuneaton Planning Area and therefore existing PANs need to be maintained whilst at the same time continuing

discussions with existing secondary schools to increase pupil numbers to meet the additional demand for September 2024.”

7. I have informed the parties that my understanding is that the objection is that the determined PAN is unreasonably low, which results in the arrangements being unfair in contravention of paragraph 14 of the Code, which says:

“..... admission authorities **must** ensure that the practices and the criteria used to decide the allocation of school places are fair, clear, and objective.”

8. The LA told me at the time that it submitted its objection that it was forecasting “an estimated two to three form of entry shortfall (60 to 90 places) for Year 7 entry in September 2024 and beyond in the Nuneaton area. A decrease in the PAN at George Eliot Academy would increase this shortfall by another 40 places”. It also informed me that:

“Two of the existing schools in the Nuneaton and neighbouring Hartshill area which may have potential capacity to take additional pupils, if they were in a position to do so, are rated Ofsted ‘inadequate’ and ‘requires improvement’ respectively. It would be WCC’s preference not to have places removed from an Ofsted rated ‘Good’ school and subsequently replaced in a school that is rated below this.”

9. Further background which was provided by the LA is that a new secondary school is due to be provided in the north of Nuneaton to meet demand from housing development there (as a free school) but that the estimated completion date is September 2025. It acknowledged that once this school is in place, the pressure for places locally and therefore the need for places at George Eliot Academy is likely to be reduced. I shall return to a consideration of these pupil place planning matters below.

10. I also note in passing, but with some concern, that in its form setting its objection the LA informed me that:

“The academy has capped year groups 8 to 10 at 150 but in year groups 8 and 9 have 20 and 28 pupils respectively on their waiting list. The school would be at the original PAN on entry in these year groups if the previous capacity was made available.”

11. Although I have no jurisdiction to consider this matter here (since it relates to practice rather than something set out in the admission arrangements for the school) and so have not referred this matter to the trust or sought its comments regarding it, I am nevertheless concerned that this would appear at face value to constitute a breach of the requirements concerning the availability of school places in years other than the normal year of admission, which are clearly set out in paragraph 2.28 of the Code. This says:

“With the exception of designated grammar schools, all maintained schools, and academies, including schools designated with a religious character, that have places available **must** offer a place to every child who has applied for one, without condition or the use of any oversubscription criteria, unless admitting the child would prejudice the efficient provision of education or use of resources.”

That is to say, the Code does not permit a school to arbitrarily “cap” the number of places which it makes available in the way the trust appears to have done for the school, and the trust may wish to give this matter its consideration.

12. I have asked the school (in relation to the objection) to provide me with its net capacity calculation, but in spite of the trust having had adequate time to respond and in spite of being reminded of this request, it has not done so. I will refer to this matter again below.

## Other Matters

13. When I looked at the arrangements as a whole, it seemed to me that the following matters may fail to conform with the requirements concerning admission arrangements:

- (i) the arrangements say that:

“The published admission number for Year 7 at George Eliot Academy is 150. When the number of applicants for this age group is below this number, then all applicants will be admitted in accordance with the School Admissions Code 2021.”

Paragraphs 1.6 and 2.8 of the Code make it clear that a school is only oversubscribed when the number of applicants is greater than the PAN, not equal to it.

- (ii) the definition of looked after and previously looked after children appears not to conform with the requirements of the Code;
- (iii) the arrangements do not provide information on the operation of random allocation as a tie-breaker, and
- (iv) the arrangements do not provide a description of the process for parents to request admission for their child out of its normal age group.

## Background

14. The school is one of five secondary schools that currently serve the town of Nuneaton and its associated rural area, which is situated to the north of Coventry in the East Midlands abutting the county of Leicestershire. This area is one of 17 secondary planning areas in the county of Warwickshire which are used by the LA to assess current and future demand for school places.
15. The school’s website says that it was first opened in 1961, becoming first a foundation school in 2009 and then converting to academy status in 2011. It is part of the Midland Academies Trust, which includes three other secondary schools, one of which is in the county of Leicestershire and one of which is also in the Nuneaton planning area in Warwickshire. Its most recent Ofsted inspection took place in September 2021 and the report published in November 2021 rated it as “Good”. Its previous inspection grade had been “Requires improvement”.

16. The arrangements were determined on 13 December 2022 by the trust board. They include the statement which I have set out above concerning the PAN, and go on to provide the oversubscription criteria which are used if there are more applicants than the determined PAN. The first priority is given as:

“A ‘looked after child’ or a child who was previously looked after but immediately after being looked after became subject to an adoption, residence, or special guardianship order.” A footnote directs the reader to an appendix where adoption orders, residence orders and special guardianship orders are explained, but nothing further is stated.

17. The arrangements also say:

“In the event of a tie between two or more applicants who cannot be separated when applying the oversubscription criteria, a process of independently verified random allocation will be used to allocate spaces.” No further detail is given.

18. When it made its objection, the LA said that the trust had carried out a consultation on its proposal to reduce the PAN from 190 for 2023 admissions to 150 for 2024, and it provided me with a copy of what it referred to as the consultation document issued by the trust (which appears to me to be no more than a letter setting out the proposal). It referred me to a statement made in that document that:

“For several years, the published admission number (PAN) at George Eliot Academy has remained at 190. However, the actual number of pupils joining in Year 7 has been around 150 on average each year.”

The LA told me that “Current year 7 (September 22) had 190 offers made. For September 2023 187 offers have been accepted with a waiting list of 7 which will be reoffered as part of the allocation round.”

19. The LA had responded to the trust’s consultation saying that it did not agree to the proposed reduction in PAN because a shortfall of Year 7 places was being forecast for the Nuneaton Secondary Planning Area, which at that time, was showing 53 too few places for 2023 and 83 too few for 2024, even if the school’s PAN remained at 190.

20. The letter sent by the trust to consultees at the end of the consultation referred to this response of the LA to its proposal, saying:

“Directors considered the sole response received – from Warwickshire County Council – which opposed the proposal on the grounds of shortage in local places until such time as the new secondary school planned for the north of Nuneaton is opened. Whilst the Trust appreciates this context and will continue to support local pupil place planning where possible, it is necessary to reduce PAN to match long-term average pupil entry numbers for educational and financial planning purposes.”

## Consideration of Case

### The PAN

21. The trust has told me that it does not consider the PAN which has been determined for the school for 2024 to be unreasonably low. It says that its own and the LA's forecasts for the longer-term show that there is "insufficient" need to retain the previous PAN of 190. I have noted the reference by it to "the longer-term", rather than to 2024. However, I am concerned here only with the school's admission arrangements for 2024. The trust acknowledges that "there is only temporary pressure for 2024/5, due to delay in the new school" and says that once this latter is in place "a PAN of 150 for George Eliot Academy is an appropriate level to maintain."
22. The trust has referred me to "the recent government publication of local authority place planning scorecards", saying that this shows that "Warwickshire is one of the least accurate local authorities in terms of accurately predicting pupil numbers, with a strong tendency towards over-estimation". It did not provide me with a copy of the document to which it was referring, or a precise reference to it, but I believe this to be "Local Authority School Places Scorecards" which is an annual publication, the most recent having been published on 29 June 2023. The data which this provides is a comparison between the total number of pupils in Years 7 to 11 for the local authority as a whole with the numbers which it had been projecting one and two years previously. This does show that the most recent information is that the Warwickshire forecast has been 2.2 percent above actual numbers one year ahead of time and just over 5 percent above actual numbers two years ahead of time. The national averages were 0.36 percent too high and 0.73 percent too high, respectively.
23. Since, however, this is not an analysis of Year 7 forecasting as such, and since it encompasses the local authority as a whole, it has very limited value in drawing conclusions about the likely accuracy of the Year 7 forecasts for one of the 17 secondary planning areas in the county. The fact that the data shows that Warwickshire forecasts of total Year 7 to Year 11 numbers in schools are at the high end the range nationally does not mean that its forecasting methodology is necessarily poor, as the trust has said it believes it to be. The Year 7 forecasts form only a small part of the total secondary population in any given year, and other factors such as changing migration trends and economic conditions will always affect these differently in different local authority areas. Nevertheless, I have asked the LA to describe its forecasting methodology, and I will refer to this again below.
24. In further support of its own position, the trust has told me that it admitted only 182 pupils to Year 7 in September 2023 in spite of having agreed to take a "bulge" additional form of entry in that year, making its effective PAN 220. It complains that it had to absorb the difference between its expenditure on additional staffing and the growth funding provided by the LA, asking me to "bear this context in mind when reviewing any figures presented".
25. Figures given to me by the LA show that the school census in May 2023 recorded the following year group sizes at the school:

Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11
183	145	142	157	173

26. In its submission concerning the objection to the PAN to me, the trust also:

- (i) said that the LA had erroneously invested its available resources in the new school at Higham Lane North, rather than support additional provision across the area, such as in one of the other schools in the trust (Hartshill Academy);
- (ii) complained that Etone College, which as it says is the nearest secondary school to George Eliot Academy, had been “allowed” to increase its PAN by 30 in 2021, which it says has resulted in a long-term reduction of 30 pupils entering George Eliot Academy (and which as a result has “three year groups with entries around or below 150 at this time”);
- (iii) told me about the problems of the school being funded on pupil numbers from the previous year, which it says “is unsustainable” because the school “experiences periodic over and under-staffing compared to funding”;
- (iv) said that because of the current surplus places “in each year group” it is “already taking a disproportionately high number of in-year admissions” and that because there is a need “to keep staffing at a level which can be funded in the long-term, this means increased class sizes and pressure on the quality of education which can be provided”. It told me that some pupils come to the school from as far afield as Coventry and then return “when places at local schools become available”, increasing the “churn” which is experienced, which “is another pressure in terms of school budgets”;
- (v) told me that the school is “critically short of practical classroom provision”, and that to “bring facilities up to the level required to provide a broad and balanced curriculum for 190 pupils in a year group would need a major financial investment” which the LA has been “unwilling” to assist with to date, and
- (vi) said that it does not believe the involvement of the adjudicator to be necessary, since it is willing to accommodate “bulge” years where needed and that it prefers to have dialogue with LA officers concerning how the school can assist in managing a “temporary place pressure”, asking that this is something which it would like the adjudicator to encourage.

27. As these are points which the trust has specifically put to me in support of the PAN of 150 which it has determined, I need to address them in turn. I must firstly point out that, in spite of what the trust might wish to be the case, the adjudicator has no discretion but to consider the objection which has been made about the arrangements which the trust has determined for the school. Paragraph 3.1 of the Code says that:

“The Schools Adjudicator **must** consider whether admission arrangements referred to the Schools Adjudicator comply with the Code and the law relating to admissions.”

28. I have set out above and explained to the parties (including the trust before it wrote to me) what my understanding is concerning the nature of the objection which the LA has made and how this relates to the relevant matters in the Code. That is, my only concern as far as the objection is concerned is whether or not the PAN which the trust has set for the school for 2024 is unreasonably low, making the arrangements unfair. I have therefore given my consideration to the points made by the trust against that background. The LA has not commented on what the trust has said.
29. The trust says it informed me of its views about capital funding decisions made previously by the LA in order to show that it had made “proactive attempts to encourage a more strategic approach to place planning”. I am not sure that what the trust has told me does amount to this, and in any case pupil place planning is not the trust’s responsibility, but that of the LA, so I am not clear why the trust wishes to impress me on this point. The reasonableness of the PAN it has determined must be judged in the context of the reality for children in the area in 2024, not a position that might have been had other decisions been made by the relevant bodies, and the trust was very clearly aware of that reality when it set its PAN. The key issue here is the forecast of the local need for Year 7 places in 2024, a subject to which I will return below.
30. Similarly, the trust’s unhappiness with the PAN increase at another school in the area is not material to my consideration. The trust must be aware that, as a school which is its own admission authority, Eton College has been able to increase its PAN as a matter of its own decision-making, and it does not have to be “allowed” to do so as the trust complains. An increase in PAN is a change which does not require the admission authority to carry out a consultation, and an objection may not be brought concerning an increased PAN once it has been determined, as made plain in paragraph 3.3b) of the Code. By contrast, precisely because (in particular) the relevant body charged with ensuring that there are enough school places locally for local children (the LA) must be able to seek recourse if other bodies which have power to alter the number of such places do so by reducing them, the Code does not prevent objections to reduced PANs, as in this case.
31. The trust complains that the pupil funding regime and in-year admissions (with the resultant “churn” in pupil numbers) cause it financial and managerial problems. These are not different problems from those faced by many other schools and they would not be ameliorated by the school having a reduced PAN, as the trust appears to believe. PANs do not govern the availability of places in connection with in-year admissions, and a reduced PAN does not “cap” the number of places available for in-year admissions as a year group passes through a school. Rather, in fact, the reverse is likely to be true, since (as I explained above) the places available in later year groups are determined by whether admissions would cause “prejudice the efficient provision of education or use of resources”, as stated in paragraph 2.28 of the Code. One consideration concerning “prejudice” is clearly the physical capacity of the school, which does not change because a PAN is reduced, unless there have also been physical alterations which affect this.



32. In spite of it telling me that having surplus places causes the school to suffer unwanted in-year admissions, the trust has also told me that its current accommodation is inadequate, presumably in order to support its desire to have fewer pupils. The determinant of a school's physical capacity is its net capacity calculation, which I have asked the trust to provide me with in order that I may have some hard information on this point. The LA has been unable to locate the net capacity calculation for the school when it was a maintained school, and the trust has not responded to my request for this information. However, the GOV.UK website "Get Information about School" which was last updated for the school in June 2023 states that its capacity is 950, which equates to a PAN of 190.
33. I shall now return to the question of the local need for places in September 2024. I have said what the trust's view is of the likely accuracy of the LA's forecasting of the need for pupil places, and what my assessment of this is. I have also already stated the reason which the LA gave for making its objection to the PAN determined by the trust for the school for 2024. Since the trust has expressed a lack of confidence in the LA's forecasting procedure, I have asked the LA to explain its methodology to me. I have also asked it to provide me with the most recent output from that process for the secondary schools in the Nuneaton Secondary Planning Area for September 2024, as well as the actual number of Year 7 admissions for each of them for 2021, 2022 and 2023.
34. The LA told me that it "uses the DfE's guidance on forecasting pupil numbers, as outlined in DfE School Capacity (SCAP) Survey 2022 Guide for local authorities, May 2022." It has set out for me the factors which are used in the annual forecasting of Year 7 numbers, which begins with resident population numbers using NHS GP registration data, adjusted by an "uptake factor" based on recent trends. Parental preference is taken into account for each of its Planning Areas separately, and new housing developments are taken into account using completion information from planning authorities to which "pupil yield rates" for each year group are applied. In other words, it has confirmed that its own methodology is very much in line with that of other local authorities. The trust has been provided with a copy of this correspondence from the LA, but has made no comment concerning it.
35. In the Nuneaton Secondary Planning Area, for admissions in each of the years 2021, 2022 and 2023, the sum of the Year 7 PANs for the five secondary schools was 956. The total number of Year 7 admission (or offers, in the case of admissions for September 2023) was 946, 1011 and 1025 respectively. Where necessary, additional pupils were accommodated by agreed "bulge" (above PAN) admissions at different schools and the trust was unhappy that its own agreed "bulge" to allow 220 admissions in 2022 resulted in only 185 admissions. It says that it will be receiving only 182 Year 7 pupils in September 2023 against its current PAN of 190. Notwithstanding those facts about the school, it is clear from these figures that there is a growing Year 7 cohort in the area, and that the total number of Year 7 places as shown by the PANs of the five schools does not meet this demand.
36. The LA has given me the following most recent (2023) forecast of the need for Year 7 places across the five schools for 2024 and beyond.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total PAN for the five schools (with George Eliot PAN at 190)</b>	<b>Forecast need for Year 7 places</b>
2024	986*	1066
2025	1106**	1061
2026	1106	1027

\* Capital build at another school allowing 30 additional Year 7 places from 2024

\*\* Assumed PAN of 120 of new secondary school from 2025

37. These figures give the detail of the “two to three form of entry shortfall” for 2024 which the LA referred to in its objection, there being 80 fewer places than the forecast need. If the PAN for the school remains at 150, that shortfall will be 120 places in 2024 and there will be barely sufficient places in 2025 even with the new school in place, according to these forecasts. The school has acknowledged that there is “temporary pressure for 2024”, as I have said.
38. Since I am not persuaded by the trust’s views concerning the forecast methodology employed by the LA and since it seems to me that this ought to be capable of producing at least reasonably accurate results, I am of the view that the shortfall in Year 7 places for 2024 which the LA is forecasting must be taken seriously. This shortfall is of course, with certainty, made even larger by the Year 7 PAN which the trust has determined for the school.
39. Neither am I persuaded by the trust’s arguments that support its statement that a reduced PAN is “necessary to match long-term average pupil entry numbers for educational and financial planning purposes”. It must always be the paramount consideration for schools to ensure that they contribute to a sufficient educational provision for the young people in the area in which they are situated. I fail to see how, for example, an admission authority’s view about the ease with which it can maximise the quality of education which it provides can ever be used in such an argument, if the consequence is that there are too few places for children in the first place. That would clearly be the case here, and while it may be possible for the LA to secure adequate provision for the number of Year 7 pupils which there are likely to be in the Nuneaton area in 2024 by temporary means such as further “bulge” admissions at schools where this is possible, the reduction in the PAN at the school makes this more difficult, and makes more likely the possibility that some children will not be found places there and have to travel out of the area to secure a school place.
40. The PANs which the admission authorities for schools are required to determine provide absolute certainty to the LA concerning the number of places which are available for local children, and this is not the case for “bulge” admissions. In these circumstances, the PAN which the trust has determined for the school is unreasonably low, and the arrangements

as determined by the trust for the school are unfair, in contravention of paragraph 4 of the Code. For the avoidance of doubt, I am of the view that any reduction in the school's PAN from that which applied for 2023 would have made the arrangements unfair. I uphold the objection.

### Other matters

41. The trust has not contested my view that the wording of its arrangements concerning the point at which oversubscription criteria are applied does not conform with paragraphs 1.6 and 2.8 of the Code, making them unclear for parents and in breach of paragraph 14 of the Code.
42. It also agreed that the definition of previously looked after children which the arrangements contain failed to include the required reference to children who appear to it (as the admission authority) to have been in state care outside England and ceased to be in state care as a result of being adopted, and that the reference to child residence orders in the arrangements is no longer appropriate as these have been replaced by child arrangement orders. The determined arrangements do not conform with what paragraph 1.7 of the Code stipulates.
43. Paragraph 1.34 of the Code says:

“Admission authorities that decide to use random allocation when schools are oversubscribed **must** set out clearly how this will operate, ensuring that arrangements are transparent, and that looked after children and previously looked after children are prioritised.”

The arrangements say only:

“In the event of a tie between two or more applicants who cannot be separated when applying the oversubscription criteria, a process of independently verified random allocation will be used to allocate spaces.”

44. I was concerned that this did not meet what paragraph 1.34 requires and asked the trust for its comments. Its reply was that this was not the case. It told me that looked after and previously looked after children are prioritised when random allocation is used (something which the arrangements do not say), and that the policy is explicit as to “the circumstances in which random allocation will be used and how it will operate.” Further, it told me that since paragraph 1.35 requires that a fresh round of random allocation is used each time a child is allocated a place, it would be happy to include wording to this effect, in line with its current practice.
45. What paragraph 1.34 requires is that admission authorities should describe, transparently, the process of random allocation that is employed, since there are in theory many approaches to this matter, of which the most common are electronic random number generation and the drawing of lots, but there could be many others. As paragraph 12 of the Code spells out, the Code itself has the force of law, and where “**must**” appears it

represents a mandatory requirement. Paragraph 1.34 has the effect that the means used for randomising applications must be stated, giving parents the right to know exactly how places will be allocated. My view is that the requirement of transparency also means that the supervision of the random process, which paragraph 1.35 requires to be carried out by someone independent of the school, should also be laid out, for example by saying who such a person would be in order that their independence is evident. The arrangements do neither of these things, and do not meet the requirements of paragraph 1.34 of the Code.

46. In response to my concern that the arrangements do not describe the process for parents to request admission for their child out of the normal age group, the trust told me that the arrangements say that the school participates in the LA's scheme of co-ordination (as it must do), which does describe this process. However, the trust accepted that the arrangements do not "make explicit reference to this", and proposed adding wording which would refer the reader specifically to Warwickshire's scheme. It is not for the adjudicator to comment on putative wording for inclusion in admission arrangements, but my view is that paragraph 2.18 of the Code is abundantly clear when it says:

"Admission authorities **must** make clear in their admission arrangements the process for requesting admission out of the normal age group." [my emphasis].

As determined, the arrangements fail to comply with paragraph 2.18 of the Code.

## Summary of Findings

47. I have explained in the foregoing paragraphs why I:

- (i) uphold the objection which has been made to the PAN of 150 for the school for admissions in September 2024; and
- (ii) find that the admission arrangements:
  - a. are unclear because of the wording which describes the point at which oversubscription criteria are used;
  - b. fail to provide the definition of looked after and previously looked after children which is required by paragraph 1.7 of the Code;
  - c. do not set out clearly how random allocation operates when used under the arrangements, and
  - d. do not contain a statement of how parents can make a request for their child to be admitted out of its normal age group.

48. The deadline for preferences to be expressed by parents in relation to admissions to secondary schools in 2024 is 31 October 2023. In order that a revised PAN shall be determined by the trust for the school in time to inform parents of the number of available places at the school before stating their preferences, I will require the trust to revise these arrangements no later than 13 October 2023.

## Determination

49. In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2024 determined by the Midland Academies Trust for George Eliot Academy, Nuneaton, Warwickshire.
50. I have also considered the arrangements in accordance with section 88I(5) and find there are other matters which do not conform with the requirements relating to admission arrangements in the ways set out in this determination.
51. By virtue of section 88K(2) the adjudicator's decision is binding on the admission authority. The School Admissions Code requires the admission authority to revise its admission arrangements within two months of the date of the determination unless an alternative timescale is specified by the adjudicator. In this case I determine that the arrangements must be determined by Friday 13 October 2023.

Dated: 8 September 2023

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: