



Office of
the Schools
Adjudicator

Determination

Case reference: ADA3497

Objector: A member of the public

Admission authority: The Priory Federation of Academies Trust for The Priory Academy LSST, Lincoln, Lincolnshire

Date of decision: 12 August 2019

Determination

In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I do not uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2020 determined by the trust board for Priory Academy LSST, Lincoln, Lincolnshire.

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 member of the public, (the objector), about the admission arrangements (the arrangements) for The Priory Academy LSST (the school), an academy with a specialism for technology for students aged 11-18 for September 2020. The objection covers several aspects of the arrangements but principally concerns the complexity of the arrangements; the selection of feeder schools; the selection of students by aptitude; the administration of a waiting list and the lack of clarity concerning admission to the sixth form.
2. The local authority (LA) for the area in which the school is located is Lincolnshire County Council. The LA is a party to this objection. The other parties to the objection are the academy trust (the trust) and the objector.

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, which is the admission authority for the school, on that basis. The objector submitted his objection to these determined arrangements on 7 March 2019.

4. The objector reports that the school offers “masterclasses” (not mentioned in the admission arrangements but well known in the local area) aimed at Key Stage 2 children approaching secondary transfer. The objector is unclear whether participation in the masterclasses might confer any advantage in the admissions process, but if it did then he suggests that this would be procedurally unfair as places are limited and there appears to be a competition for them. He thinks that such masterclasses could only be procedurally fair if they were equally available to all children. I shall not be considering this point as part of the objection since, as the objector himself points out, these classes are not part of the admission arrangements and thus are not within my jurisdiction.

5. I am satisfied the objection has been properly referred to me in accordance with section 88H of the Act and with the exception referred to above, it is within my jurisdiction.

Procedure

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

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

- a) the objector’s form of objection dated 7 March 2019;
- b) the trust’s response to the objection and supporting documents;
- c) the comments of the LA on the objection and supporting documents;
- d) the LA’s composite prospectus for parents seeking admission to schools in the area in September 2019;
- e) maps of the area identifying relevant schools and the geographical spread of pupils attending the school;
- f) confirmation of when consultation on the arrangements last took place;
- g) copies of the minutes of the meeting at which the Priory Federation of Academies Trust Board determined the arrangements for the school; and
- h) a copy of the determined arrangements.

The Objection

8. The objector makes the following points in his objection:

- 8.1. The arrangements are so complex that parents are unlikely to be able to assess the likelihood of a successful application, this is unclear. The objector asserts that this contravenes paragraph 14 of the Code which says that *“admission authorities **must** ensure that 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”*
- 8.2. The objector thinks it is not possible to assess from the arrangements whether the selection of feeder schools is made on reasonable grounds as no reasons for the selection are given. Paragraph 1.15 of the Code says *“the selection of a feeder school or schools as an oversubscription criterion **must** be transparent and made on reasonable grounds.”*
- 8.3. The objector is concerned that there is so little detail given about the operation of the ten per cent selection by aptitude that this may breach paragraphs 14 and 1.17 of the Code by being unclear. Paragraph 14 is quoted above and paragraph 1.17 says *“all selective schools **must** publish the entry requirements for a selective place and the process for such selection.”* The objector asserts that it is also impossible to assess from the arrangements whether this aptitude selection complies with the requirements of the Code in paragraphs 1.31 and 1.32 by being a genuine test of aptitude rather than a general test of academic ability. Paragraph 1.31 says *“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.”* Paragraph 1.32 says that *“admission authorities **must**: a) ensure that tests for aptitude in a particular subject are designed to test only for aptitude in the subject concerned and not for ability; b) ensure that tests are accessible to children with special educational needs.....; and c) take all reasonable steps to inform parents of the outcome of selection tests before the closing date for secondary applications on 31 October.....”*
- 8.4. The objector is not confident that the aptitude testing is procedurally fair as required by paragraph 14 of the Code set out above because the school does not explicitly state in its admission arrangements that catch up testing dates are available to those children who are unwell on the day of the test, or who move to the area after the test, but before the national deadline of 31 October each year. He argues that service children or traveller children may move late to the area and miss the opportunity to take the aptitude tests.
- 8.5. The objector asserts that in the operation of ranking and waiting lists there are, in effect, multiple rankings (for example for aptitude places and for each feeder school) and that this breaches the requirement that the admission authority provides the LA with a single list of applicants ranked in accordance

with the school’s oversubscription criteria to facilitate the operation of coordination. The objector refers to paragraph 15d of the Code that says “*when oversubscribed, a school’s admission authority **must** rank applications in order against its published oversubscription criteria and send that list back to the local authority*”.

8.6. The objector states that the academic criteria for the Sixth Form are not given in the arrangements. He considers that this is unclear and that the arrangements may not comply with paragraph 14 of the Code referred to above and that applicants and their parents should be able to find all the information they need in a single document.

8.7. The Sixth Form arrangements give priority to applicants attending other Priory Federation academies, but the objector says it is not clear whether these are named feeder schools nor what the grounds for the selection might be if this is the case. He argues that this may breach paragraph 14 of the Code referred to above and paragraph 1.17 referred to above.

Background

9. This school became an academy in 2008. It is one of the schools within the Priory Federation of Academies Trust. It was previously a Foundation School known as the Lincoln School of Science and Technology, which provides the derivation for the current school name. It says in its prospectus that it sets out to be non-selective but high attaining. When it was inspected in 2010 it was judged by Ofsted to be outstanding and the inspection confirmed the high levels of attainment in the school. Ten per cent of its places are allocated on the basis of aptitude for technology. The published admission number (PAN) at Year 7 is 240 with 24 of these places allocated on the basis of aptitude for technology. The school offers boarding in its school form. It has a PAN of 30 for day places for the sixth form and an additional PAN of 30 for sixth form boarding places. The school is very oversubscribed for Year 7 as can be seen from the information on the preferences for admission in 2019 provided by the LA:

| School | Pref 1 | Pref 2 | Pref 3 | Pref 4 | Total |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Lincoln The Priory Academy LSST | 462 | 236 | 96 | 0 | 794 |

10. The trust has told me that it has devised a set of arrangements that attempt to give children in all the primary schools in and around Lincoln a fair chance of obtaining a place at the school. It does this by distributing the places remaining after the first two oversubscription criteria have been applied to those applying from each of the named schools in proportion to the number of children in the relevant year group of those schools

rounded up to the nearest whole number. Relevant year group in this context means the year group for the cohort that will be transferring to secondary school in the September with which the arrangements are concerned. There are 51 named schools and then the trust also allocate places to the group of applicants not attending any of the 51 primary schools and treats this group as though it were a school with an average size roll, making a total of 52 groups of applicants. It explains that it created this additional “virtual school” or group as a means of assisting families who will be moving into the area and whose children do not attend a Lincoln primary school. The LA had requested the school to consider doing this.

11. The admission arrangements are available on the school’s website and I have summarised them in the following paragraphs.

12. Year 7:

- a. Looked after children or previously looked after children.
- b. Applicants who achieve the minimum standards needed for admission on the basis of aptitude for technology

In the event that more than 24 applicants achieve the minimum standard, the 24 places will be offered to the applicants with the highest scores in the assessment. Any remaining applicants will then be considered along with other applicants using the criteria in paragraphs below. In the event that fewer than 24 applicants achieve the minimum standard, they will all be admitted and those places will be added to those available using criteria c to f below.

- c. For each of the 51 primary schools listed in the arrangements (I have not listed them here) and the group of applicants from ‘other primary school’, that school’s allocation from the applications from that school as described above.

In the event of more applications than the number of places allocated to any primary school under criterion c, the criteria from d onwards below are applied in order. In the event that all places allocated to a primary school are not taken up, those places, and any other places available, will be allocated to other applicants through a lottery supervised by an independent person (changed every year) not connected to the trust or the local authority.

- d. Siblings of pupils who are on the roll of the academy at the time of the application.
- e. Children of a member of staff of the academy.

In the event of more applicants than places under criteria d or e above, children living nearest to the school have priority, using criterion f.

- f. Children who live nearest to the academy measured by the straight-line distance from the Post Office address point of the academy’s main entrance to the Post Office address point of the child’s home.

In the event that two or more applicants under criterion f live the same straight-line distance from the school, the place or places will be allocated at random by an independent person.

13. Year 12 (Sixth Form):

The trust sets out the specific requirements for each subject in the school's sixth form prospectus. Academic entry requirements and subject-specific requirements are the same for internal and external applicants. Where the number of applications for admission to day places is greater than the published admission number, the trust uses the following oversubscription criteria.

- a. Looked after children or previously looked after children.
- b. Students wishing to study the academy's specialist subjects (science and technology subjects);

Where the application of criterion b leaves more students than places, then the 'total' of students' grades in GCSE examinations will be taken into account, in order, starting with the highest score. In the case of tied 'totals', then the distance from home to the academy will be used as in paragraph c below;

- c. A student who lives nearest to the academy measured by the straight-line distance from the academy's main entrance to the post office address point of the child's home.
- d. In the event that two or more applicants under criterion c live the same straight-line distance from the academy, the place or places will be allocated at random by an independent person.

The trust offers boarding places for the sixth form. Applicants must first meet the entry requirements for the sixth form. If there are more applicants than places then the following oversubscription criteria are applied:

- a. Looked after children and previously looked after children.
- b. Children of members of the UK Armed Forces who, because of high family mobility, qualify for Ministry of Defence financial assistance with the cost of boarding fees.
- c. Children with a boarding need, allocated to the following sub-categories in order: i) children at risk or with an unstable home environment and children of service personnel who have died while serving or who have been discharged as a result of attributable injury; ii) children of key workers and Crown Servants working abroad (for example the children of charity workers, people working for voluntary service organisations, the diplomatic service or the European Union, teachers, law enforcement officers and medical staff working abroad) whose work dictates that they spend much of the year overseas. Applicants who fall within this criterion need

to submit a letter of support from an appropriate authority/employer demonstrating that the parent fulfils one of these criteria.

- d. Students on roll at the Trust's other academies offering secondary education: the Priory Belvoir Academy; the Priory City of Lincoln Academy; the Priory Pembroke Academy; the Priory Ruskin Academy; the Priory Witham Academy.
- e. Students wishing to study the academy's specialist subjects (science and technology subjects).
- f. other applicants.

Consideration of Case

14. I now consider each of the points made by the objector in turn alongside the comments made on these points by the school and the LA.

15. The first point is that the arrangements are so complex that parents are unlikely to be able to assess the likelihood of a successful application. The objector asserts that the arrangements contravene the requirement for clarity in paragraph 14 of the Code which I have quoted above.

16. The trust responded by saying that when the LA opened the Lincoln School of Science and Technology in 1992, the intention was to provide a school for the Lincoln area that offered pathways for pupils interested in following a science and technology based curriculum. Although the school is now an academy with a specialism in technology, it retains much of this original objective and the admission arrangements were designed, therefore, to provide access to all pupils in the Lincoln area (as defined by the Lincoln telephone area code) to focus on technology and to progress on to technology based undergraduate, training and apprenticeship places. The trust has continued to work closely with the LA. Parents in each primary school know that they are applying for one of a stated number of places allocated to children from their child's primary school. The trust considers from its extensive contact with parents, that they are supportive of the transparency of the arrangements and have found the information on the number of places particularly clear and helpful in making decisions. The trust, as the admissions authority, does not advise parents on the likelihood of the success of an application.

17. The LA commented that it does not know of any instances where a parent has complained that the arrangements are not clear and for its part it did not have a difficulty with the clarity of the arrangements.

18. I have read the arrangements carefully and do find them to be relatively complex; however, this is not in itself in contravention of the Code. The Code in paragraph 14 which is quoted above requires arrangements to be "*clear*". Relatively complex arrangements need to be very carefully set out and explained so that they can be understood. In the words of paragraph 14: "*Parents should be able to look at a set of arrangements and understand easily how places for that school will be allocated*". I have read the

arrangements and consider that the arrangements are written in a way that is clearly laid out and the reasoning for how they operate is set out for the reader and I do not think that they fail the test of clarity. The language used and the way they are laid out helps to ensure that the reader can follow them clearly. The objector asserts that a parent should be able to assess the likelihood of their child obtaining a place but this is not in fact a requirement of paragraph 14 of the Code. The requirement in paragraph 14 which I have set out above is rather different. At Year 7 a parent will understand that there are specialist places available on the basis of an aptitude test, and that for children attending each primary school there are a small number of places available together with the criteria which are used to allocate these. In my view this is sufficiently clear to meet the requirements of the Code in this respect and so I do not uphold this part of the objection.

19. The next part of the objection is that it is not possible to assess whether the selection of feeder schools is made on reasonable grounds as no reasons for the selection are given. Paragraph 1.15 of the Code says “*the selection of a feeder school or schools as an oversubscription criterion must be transparent and made on reasonable grounds.*”

20. The trust responded that the policy is inclusive of all primary schools in the Lincoln area (as explained above) and does not, therefore, favour a subset of selected Lincoln primary schools. Furthermore, when new primary schools open in the area, they are added to the list as was the case for admissions in 2020/21. Indeed, in order that all reasonable efforts are made to include pupils who are not registered at any of the Lincoln area primary schools, a “virtual school” was added to the list which is used to allocate some places to such children. This was developed in discussion with, and the full support of, the LA admissions manager.

21. The LA commented that the school has responded to feedback in the past. For example, it was observed that it would be difficult for anyone not attending one of the named primary schools to obtain a place at the school and as a result the school added the additional “virtual school” described above to account for this. As the school observes this also provides the opportunity for those not currently living in the Lincoln area to have an opportunity to gain a place. It also provides an access route for children who have been home educated. The LA goes on to say that although no reasons for the selection of schools is made within the policy, the school does review the selection each year, as can be seen with the addition of a new school which will only have a Y6 class for the first time in September 2020. The LA confirms that the school has maintained the LA’s longstanding strategy for it in terms of its delivery of technology for the Lincoln area.

22. The Code in paragraph 1.15 permits a school to have feeder schools. The Code does not define what is meant by a feeder school but does require the selection of such schools to be both “*transparent and made on reasonable grounds.*” In my view the arrangements meet the requirement for transparency by clearly listing all of the schools concerned and by explaining the rationale for the additional “*other primary school*”.

23. The trust gives as its reason for the selection of schools that it wishes to enable children in every primary school in the Lincoln area (as defined by the Lincoln telephone

area code) to have a fair chance of gaining a place at this specialist academy. My view is that it is reasonable for the school to have selected the schools it has named based on this objective. I asked the trust if it had evidence of the success of this strategy and was sent a map showing the wide distribution of children on the school's roll which is consistent with the objective of the arrangements. I am satisfied that the trust has been transparent in its selection of schools and the selection of the schools has been made on reasonable grounds. The school offers a distinctive type of educational provision. It was established to make this provision for children in the Lincoln area so it seems sensible and proper for it to seek to achieve this through its chosen approach. The objector rightly points out that paragraph 1.9b) of the Code does not permit an admission authority to *"take account of any previous school attended, unless it is a named feeder school"*. The school has named its feeder schools so I do not think that this paragraph applies in this case. The term "feeder" is not defined in the Code. When there is no defined meaning, we can use the dictionary meaning of the word where the smaller primary schools each feed some pupils into the larger secondary school. I do not uphold this part of the objection.

24. The next part of the objection is that there is little detail given about the operation of the ten percent selection by aptitude and that this may breach paragraphs 14 and 1.17 of the Code by being unclear. The objector considers that it is not possible to assess whether this aptitude selection complies with the requirements of the Code in paragraphs 1.31 and 1.32 by being a genuine test of aptitude rather than a general test of academic ability. In addition, the objector asserts that it is not possible to be confident that the aptitude testing is procedurally fair as required by paragraph 14 of the Code because the school does not explicitly offer catch up testing dates to those children who are unwell on the day of the test, or who move to the area after the test, but before the national deadline of 31 October each year. He is concerned that service children or traveller children may move late to the area and miss the opportunity to take the aptitude tests.

25. The trust in its response says that it believes that the arrangements for aptitude testing are clear and provide sufficient information for parents within the arrangements. Supplementary information is readily available for parents who wish to find out more than is published in the arrangements. The trust takes responsibility for deciding the content of the test and it scrutinises the paper to ensure that it is a true test of aptitude and not ability. The LA said that it had not received any comments from parents about the aptitude testing arrangements.

26. I have considered the testing arrangements and am satisfied that the school has been clear about how the arrangements work. The objector has not argued that the test is flawed as an aptitude test but has asserted that he cannot judge whether the test is an aptitude test because there is insufficient detail about it in the arrangements and that this means that the arrangements do not comply with the Code. The school asserts that it takes care to ensure that the test is a genuine test of aptitude and not of ability. The Code in paragraphs 1.31 and 1.32 requires the "form of selection to be clear and objective" and for the admissions authority to ensure the test is a test for aptitude in this case. Paragraph 1.17 of the Code says *"all selective schools must publish the entry requirements for a selective place and the process for such selection."* I am satisfied that the form of selection

in this case is clear in that it is made plain in the arrangements that applicants will need to take an aptitude test. All applicants for these selective places take the same tests so there is no reason to think that the test is not objective. The Code requires the trust to ensure that the test is a true test of aptitude and the trust has provided the evidence that this has been reviewed by the trust to ensure that this is the case. The objector wishes sufficient information to be available so that he can judge for himself that the test is a true test of aptitude; however, the Code does not require an admissions authority to publish such detailed information in its arrangements and I do not uphold this element of the objection.

27. The trust, in its response to me, says that it understands its responsibility to ensure that all pupils have an opportunity, should they choose, to take the aptitude test. In addition to the two publicised dates, pupils are able to sit the paper by request and no pupil has been refused the opportunity to sit an aptitude test. The trust also explained in correspondence to me how it will work with parents to ensure that those applicants who wish to apply for a specialist place will be able to take the test and receive the result before making an application for a place at the school. I am satisfied by the evidence that the trust supplied to me and consider that this is neither unclear nor unfair on any particular group of applicants and in consequence I do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

28. The next part of the objection is that it is possible that in the operation of ranking and waiting lists there are, in effect, multiple rankings (for example for aptitude places, for each feeder school) and that this breaches the requirement that the admission authority provides the LA with a single ranked list to facilitate the operation of coordination.

29. The trust responded that after 1 September each year, it employs a waiting list based on its over-subscription criteria. Before that date, the LA administers the admissions arrangements using the list of pupils provided by the academy. It is the LA which determines the allocation of pupils across the county once the academy has provided the list. The trust says that the LA is supportive of the methodology used by the Trust. The LA responded to confirm this point by saying it does not consider that the arrangements are unlawful in this respect as this would also be the case in bilateral schools or other schools with aptitude ranking. The LA accepts that the methodology gives an additional administrative burden for the LA to address but it deals with this.

30. I have considered the comments made and assessed them alongside paragraph 15d of the Code that says “*when oversubscribed, a school’s admission authority **must** rank applicants in order against its published oversubscription criteria and send that list back to the local authority*” and paragraph 2.14 of the Code that says “*each admission authority must maintain a clear, fair and objective waiting list until at least 31 December...*”. My jurisdiction concerns the provision of the ranked information to the LA and I am satisfied that it can receive a list from the school that contains a ranked order of applicants for places. In the same way, I am satisfied that the school itself can maintain a waiting list with a ranked order of applicants. Whilst the many feeder schools and the selection by aptitude add complexity to the list, I am of the opinion that the arrangements meet the requirements of the Code in these respects and so I do not uphold this part of the objection.

31. The next part of the objection refers to the admission arrangements for the sixth form. The objector asserts that although the more general details are published, the academic criteria for the Sixth Form are not given in the arrangements but instead are given in some detail in the school's prospectus. The objector considers that this is unclear and may not comply with paragraph 14 of the Code and that applicants and their parents should be able to find all the information they need in a single document.

32. The trust responded that it considered that the information required to consider an application to the school's Sixth Form is clearly stated in the arrangements and the prospectus gives more detailed subject specific information. The LA wondered whether the school could add more information into the arrangements if it wished so that it is not necessary for an applicant to refer to a further document.

33. I have considered this point and can see that the arrangements set out the minimum level of academic attainment required to gain a place in the sixth form but refer applicants to the school's prospectus for detailed information about individual subject requirements. Having looked at the prospectus which is readily available on the school's website I am satisfied that the information provided in the arrangements is clear for applicants and their parents about the procedure for application; what academic standards are required and what the oversubscription criteria are. If the trust were to add all the individual subject information into this document then the complexity of the single document could be overwhelming. It would be open to the school to separate its admission arrangements into separate age specific documents but there is no requirement within the Code for this and I can see merit in the way that the school has presented its arrangements as a single document with additional course information available in the sixth form course prospectus. I do not uphold this part of the objection.

34. The last part of the objection is that the sixth form arrangements give priority to applicants attending other Priory Federation academies, but it is not clear whether these are named feeder schools nor what the grounds for the selection might be if this is the case. Paragraph 1.14 quoted above applies.

35. The trust responded that this priority only applies to boarding places and is one of the oversubscription criteria. This priority is used to provide a way for students already at one of the federation's named academies in Year 11 to continue their education in LSST's sixth form if, for example, their parents were to move away from the area.

36. The Code requires the selection of feeder schools to be transparent and reasonable. My view in this case is that the school has transparently set out which schools are being considered to be feeder schools for the application of the boarding criteria. A clear reason is given for their selection, which is set out above and as a result I conclude that the arrangements are compliant with the requirement of the Code for feeder schools. I do not uphold this part of the objection.

Summary of Findings

37. There are several facets to this objection. The first group of issues concern the level of information that is provided about the selection of students by aptitude for technology. The Code requires an admission authority to set out its criteria and procedures for selection and that the arrangements must be clear, fair and objective. I consider that the arrangements provide sufficient information for a parent to be able to understand how places are allocated and what the criteria are for the selection of children on account of their aptitude for technology. The trust has shown me the additional information that is available for parents who wish to find out more about the process. A balance has to be found between the provision of all available information and provision of too little. The objector has argued in favour of more information being provided within the arrangements. I can see the merit of this argument but if this is going to make the arrangements long and inaccessible to parents then it becomes a counter productive approach. Having looked at the balance of information provided in these arrangements I am satisfied that the trust has met the requirements of the Code and enables interested parents to find out further information in other documents.

38. I have looked at the additional information that the trust has provided concerning the aptitude tests themselves and the procedures for administering them. I am satisfied that the trust has systems for ensuring that the tests are a genuine test of aptitude as it is required to do by the Code. I do not agree with the objector that the arrangements should contain sufficient information that he or a parent can judge for themselves that the test is a fair test of aptitude. The objector is also concerned that the school does not provide additional aptitude tests for children who were not available at the main test days. The trust confirms that it does do this and that no child is disadvantaged in this respect. I have not upheld these parts of the objection.

39. The next part of the objection concerns the operation of ranking and waiting lists. Paragraph 15d of the Code says "*when oversubscribed, a school's admission authority must rank applications in order against its published oversubscription criteria and send that list back to the local authority*". The objector does not think that the information supplied by the school to the LA complies with this requirement of the Code. Despite the relative complexity of the arrangements I am satisfied that the LA receives sufficient information as a list that allows it to carry out its allocation task properly. I do not uphold this part of the objection.

40. The last part of the objection concerns the sixth form admission arrangements and the selection of feeder schools and the provision of information about the academic requirements for different courses. I am satisfied that the selection of the feeder schools is quite transparent and the trust has given an explanation of its reasons for using this oversubscription criterion. The argument concerning the provision of information within the arrangements is similar to that rehearsed above. I agree that if the information is concise it is helpful to place it within the arrangements. However, where the information is complex for each different subject, I can see merit in keeping it within a separate document that is accessible from the same place on the school's website as the arrangements themselves. I

am satisfied that the trust's approach to this does not contravene the requirements of the Code and I do not uphold this element of the objection.

Determination

41. In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I do not uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2020 determined by the trust board for Priory Academy LSST, Lincoln, Lincolnshire.

Dated: 12 August 2019

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: David Lennard Jones