



DETERMINATION

Case reference: ADA/002590
Objector: A parent
Admission Authority: The Bishop's Stortford High School
Date of decision: 23 June 2014

Determination

In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I uphold the objection to the admission arrangements determined by the governing body of The Bishop's Stortford High School, the admission authority for the school, for admissions in September 2015.

I have also considered the arrangements as a whole and the arrangements for 2014 in accordance with section 88I(5) of the Act and I determine that these do not conform with the requirements relating to admission arrangements.

By virtue of section 88K(2) of the Act the adjudicator's decision is binding on the admission authority. The School Admissions Code requires the admission authority to revise its admission arrangements as quickly as possible.

The objection

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 parent (the objector) about the 2015 admission arrangements (the arrangements), for The Bishop's Stortford High School (the school), a foundation school for pupils aged 11-18 years. The objection is that the arrangements are unclear and the oversubscription criterion for feeder schools is unreasonable and not transparent. The arrangements for admission in September 2014 have also been brought to my attention.

Jurisdiction

2. The arrangements for both 2014 and 2015 were determined under section 88C of the Act by the governing body which is the admission authority for the school. The objector submitted an objection to the determined arrangements for admission

in 2015 on 6 April 2014. 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.

3. The objector also referred the arrangements for 2014 but objections to these arrangements should have been received by 30 June 2013. However, I have considered the arrangements for 2014 in relation to the matters brought to my attention and the arrangements for 2015 as a whole using my power under section 88I of the Act.

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:

- the objection contained in emails dated 30 March and 6 April 2014, and subsequent correspondence;
- the school's responses to the referral and supporting documents dated 28 April 2014, and subsequent correspondence;
- the composite prospectus for parents seeking admission to secondary schools in the area served by Hertfordshire County Council, the local authority (the LA) for September 2014;
- a response from the LA dated 30 April 2014, with supporting documents, and subsequent correspondence;
- minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2013 at which the governing body of the school determined the arrangements for 2014;
- the determined arrangements for admissions in September 2014;
- minutes of the meeting of the governing body meeting held on 11 September 2013 at which the arrangements for 2014 were reviewed;
- consultation documents relating to the proposed change to the arrangements for 2015;
- minutes of the meeting on 5 February 2014 at which the governing body of the school determined the arrangements for 2015;
- the determined arrangements for admissions in September 2015;

- the determination ADA 2307 dated 6 August 2012; and
- maps of the area showing local secondary schools and local primary schools.

6. I considered the arrangements for September 2014 and September 2015 and sought a meeting with the school, the objector and the LA to discuss the objection and my concerns about other aspects of the arrangements for both 2014 and 2015 which I considered might not be fully compliant with the Code.

7. I have taken account of all information received during the meeting I convened at the school on 16 May 2014 and further information that has been submitted by the school, the LA and the objector since the meeting.

The objection

8. The objection is to the arrangements for 2015 and the matters brought to my attention for 2014 which the objector says are not clear, reasonable or transparent. The first part of the objection is that the admission policy is unclear and contravenes paragraph 14 of the Code which says, "*In drawing up their admission arrangements, admission authorities **must** ensure that the practices and 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.*" There are three elements to the first part.

- i. The arrangements for both years are not clear and are open to misinterpretation because in the opinion of the objector, oversubscription criterion 4, which refers to the grouping of feeder primary schools A to F, represents a hierarchy of priority for the allocation of places.
- ii. The notes which form part of criterion 4 explain that when the total number of applications from any group of primary schools exceeds the number of places available, students who live furthest from nearest alternative community, foundation or academy secondary schools will be given priority. The objector asserts that the use of distance from the nearest alternative secondary school, as a method of discriminating between applicants, makes it impossible for applicants to make a judgement about the likelihood of gaining admission and prevents parents from making an informed choice.
- iii. The objector says it is reasonable to assume that the text of oversubscription criterion 5 refers to the school's waiting list and it is misleading to suggest that the intention is to refer to remaining places at the point of allocation of places for offers. Oversubscription criterion 5 of the 2014 arrangements states, "*Any places that remain will be allocated according to the proximity of the address point of the child's normal Monday to Friday residence, those nearest....being given priority.*"

9. The second part of the objection is that the arrangements in relation to feeder schools are neither transparent nor made on reasonable grounds, in that local children living within close proximity to the school have not been offered places while applicants living in other towns and counties have made successful applications. The large number of feeder schools, 38 in total, has led to increasing levels of oversubscription; and feeder schools in the neighbouring LA which are closer to undersubscribed secondary schools in that county, should not be named. Paragraph 1.15 is cited and says, “*Admission authorities may wish to name a primary or middle school as a feeder school. The selection of a feeder school or schools as an oversubscription criterion **must** be transparent and made on reasonable grounds.*’

Other Matters

10. Having reviewed the arrangements as a whole for admissions in September 2015, I considered issues which may contravene the Code. I discussed with the school the requirement to publish the 2015 arrangements on the school’s website; the need for greater clarity about the treatment of applications for the extra 25 places that will be available to be allocated in 2015; the actual number of places to be allocated on the basis of aptitude; the content of the sixth form supplementary information form (SIF) and finally the need to improve information about the operation of the waiting list.

Background

11. The school is situated in Bishop’s Stortford, Hertfordshire close to the Essex border. It is an all-ability foundation school for boys aged 11 to 18 years of age, with a co-educational sixth form. Although the school describes itself as a “mathematics and computing specialist school”, it has pre-existing partially selective admissions for students demonstrating sporting or musical aptitude, as permitted by section 100 of the Act.

12. The school has a published admission number (PAN) of 155 for admissions in September 2014. The governing body has also determined a PAN of 155 for 2015, but has come to an agreement with the LA to admit an additional 25 boys, that is, a total of 180 places for one year only. There are approximately 1099 pupils on roll which includes 335 in the sixth form. The number of first preferences for the school has risen slightly from 145 in 2011 to 163 in 2014, with the overall number of preferences rising from 402 in 2011 to 517 in 2014. This latter trend reflects the change in 2013 which permits parents in the LA area to express four rather than three preferences. Parents in Essex are permitted to make six preferences, with a maximum of four for schools in Hertfordshire.

13. The school is a member of a consortium with other local secondary schools. The head teacher confirmed that the consortium acts as a rather loose federation and that there are no formal links with regard to admissions, other than the agreement to organise a common date for aptitude assessments, which can be taken at any one of three schools.

14. There is increasing demand for secondary school places in the town and forecasts of pupil numbers indicate that demand for secondary places will peak in 2021 when there is a projected shortfall of 189 places. The LA advised me that officers have been leading discussions with all local secondary schools seeking to ensure sufficient provision for all local children.

15. The objection has been made following the objector's son not being allocated a place at the school for 2014. I have no jurisdiction to consider the circumstances of an individual child and will limit my consideration to the compliance or otherwise of the school's admission arrangements with the Code.

Consideration of Factors

16. The matters that I shall consider fall into two parts. Where an issue relates to only one set of arrangements I will refer specifically to the year in question.

17. Part one has three aspects and the first of these relates to oversubscription criterion 4 of the arrangements for admission in September 2014 which says, *"Places will be allocated to the following groups of schools. The percentages allocated to each group of schools will reflect the proportion of remaining applications received from those schools."* The objector interpreted this as meaning that the proportion of remaining places decreases as each group is considered in turn and contends that the use of the word "remaining" implies that after allocations have been made within the first group of feeder schools, applicants from the next group of schools will be considered for the places that remain. This may or may not be what actually happens and there could be other interpretations.

18. The school says it accepts that the process of admissions can appear to be very complex to some parents, but although an assumption may be made that the 38 feeder schools placed in six groups, A to F represents a hierarchy, this is not stated in the arrangements and there has been no feedback from parents to suggest that the wording is of doubtful meaning or is difficult to understand. The school reasons, *"As it is percentages that are being allocated, it follows that the order of the groups is immaterial and that each group will receive exactly the same percentage in any given year in whatever order a reader may choose to place the groups."*

19. When applicants read the explanatory note to criterion 4 there is in my opinion, the possibility that the reader might conclude that places are allocated to

applicants in hierarchical order, in groups from A to F. The note starts with the sentence, *“Recent experience is that applications from any group of primary schools will exceed the number of places available.”* This could suggest the possibility that as each group is considered a point might be reached where no further places remain. In my view an explanation of how the process works in practice is required and would help parents to understand how the arrangements are applied. The Code places a mandatory requirement on the admission authority to ensure that arrangements are clear and also says that they should be easily understood by parents but at present in my view they are insufficiently clear. The school has confirmed that the wording has been adjusted to provide greater clarity for parents about how the percentages are calculated and applied.

20. In a subsequent letter to me, the school clarified that the term ‘remaining’ is a reference to places that are available after criteria one to three have been applied. It would have been helpful to have included a note to this effect in the arrangements for admission in 2014 and I note that the school has amended the wording and removed the word ‘remaining’ from the arrangements for admissions in 2015.

21. The second element refers to the same explanatory note at the end of criterion 4, which says that when applications from any group of primary schools exceeds the number of places available, students who live furthest from nearest alternative community, foundation or academy secondary schools will be given priority. The objector asserts that using the distance from the nearest alternative secondary school as a method of deciding between applicants if there are more applicants than places, makes it impossible for parents to make a judgement about the likelihood of gaining admission. In his view It would be clearer to parents if the school adopted a ‘closest first’ policy which would reflect both the arrangements used by the girls secondary school (The Hertfordshire and Essex High School) and by the LA. It would then enable parents to make an informed choice. The LA explained at the meeting that it had removed a similar criterion from its arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools precisely because it was difficult for parents to assess their chances of gaining admission.

22. In my opinion, applying the principle of allocating places to pupils who live some distance from the nearest alternative school might be reasonable in some circumstances, such as when priority is afforded to applicants on the basis of distance from home to school, within a set of arrangements that are not complex. However, a number of applicants who live within a mile of the school, who expressed a first preference for the school were unsuccessful in gaining admission in 2014 and in each case, as the next nearest secondary school was full, applicants were allocated to alternative schools some distance from where they live. Of the 19 boys in this position in 2014, the distances they will travel range from six times to 14 times the distance that they live from the school. With one exception all children will be travelling between two and four times further than the home school distance. While I

accept that it is never possible to guarantee a place at a particular school, I question whether it is reasonable that the impact of the school's arrangements is to limit access to local children, while providing access for students from a wide geographical area. I agree with the view of the LA that the inclusion of this factor adds to the difficulty parents may have in assessing the likelihood of gaining admission and have concluded that it is not reasonable to use distance from the nearest alternative school in this way within the complexity of the school's current arrangements.

23. The final element of the first part of the objection refers to criterion 5 of the 2014 arrangements, "*Any places that remain will be allocated according to the address point for the school, to the address point to the child's normal place of Monday to Friday residence, those nearest....being given priority.*" The objector maintains that this criterion causes confusion by implying that the school uses a 'closest first policy' to allocate places and that it relates to remaining places, which is completely misleading. It is reasonable to assume this note refers instead to the school's waiting list.

24. The school said that there are two quite separate oversubscription criteria, 4 and 5. At the meeting the objector explained that the arrangements for 2014 were accessed from the school's website. When printed, as I also discovered, all headings on the printed version had slipped, causing confusion to the objector about which text related to each of the criteria and which to waiting lists. The format of the arrangements provided by the school and circulated to all parties was markedly different. Having seen the version printed from the website, the school acknowledged that there must be a technical problem, caused when the website was updated recently. The school agreed to investigate the problem with the website. This aspect of the concern was withdrawn.

25. To conclude my consideration of the first part of the objection, in my view the arrangements for both 2014 and 2015 are open to alternative interpretations from those intended by the governing body and are insufficiently clear. The arrangements do not conform to the mandatory requirements of the Code concerning clarity and for this reason I uphold this aspect of the objection.

26. The second part of the objection is that the arrangements in relation to feeder schools are neither transparent nor made on reasonable grounds, in that local children living in close proximity to the school have not been offered a place, while applicants living in other towns and counties have made successful applications. The large number of feeder schools, 38 in total, has led to increasing levels of oversubscription; and feeder schools in the neighbouring LA which are closer to undersubscribed secondary schools in that county, should not be named.

27. The LA confirmed that the increasing level of oversubscription referred to, is due to the fact that parents are now able to express four rather than three preferences in Hertfordshire. Parents residing in Essex can express up to six preferences but only four of these are permitted to be for schools in Hertfordshire.

28. The objector refers to a previous objection to the school's arrangements and asserts that the school has not reviewed its arrangements as required by the determination of August 2012. The head teacher said that the school had not been instructed to reduce the number of feeder schools but rather to review arrangements and, ".....to look carefully at the number of, and reasons for including primary schools as named feeder schools". It provided evidence to me that the previous head teacher had raised these issues at a meeting of the governing body on 10 October 2012 and that the governors had reviewed arrangements.

29. Paragraph 1.15 of the Code says, "*Admission authorities may wish to name a primary or middle school as a feeder school. The selection of a feeder school or schools as an oversubscription criterion **must** be transparent and made on reasonable grounds.*"

30. The school says its arrangements are not unreasonable; they are designed to serve a wider community. As a single sex school it would naturally admit students from a wide area and the county boundary is not a relevant factor, in that it is inevitable given the school's location on the county boundary that it will admit students who reside in Essex. The number of students admitted from Essex will also be affected by factors such as the number of siblings and the home locations of students accepted under the aptitude criterion. I confirmed to the objector at the meeting that the county boundary is not an issue. The school as its own admissions authority and the LA must treat applications from within and outside the LA boundary equally, as parents have a statutory right to express preferences for any school.

31. The school stated that it is the role of the arrangements to give parents the right to make four meaningful choices and not to restrict them to one undersubscribed school. However, in my view, although the school does have a role to play, with other secondary schools in the area, to ensure that the combined effects of arrangements do not unfairly disadvantage any particular set of families, it is the role of the LA to ensure that there is sufficient overall provision in its area for all children, rather than any individual own admissions authority. The governing body must be careful to give equal consideration to the effect of the arrangements on local children, whenever it considers proposed changes to its arrangements, and before it consults and determines them. A further issue to consider is the impact on local families who apply for a place for a first born child but are unsuccessful. There will be no chance of gaining any subsequent priority by applying under the sibling criterion, for a younger son in the family.

32. Noting the school's response, the objector acknowledged that a single sex school might require a larger than average area than a co-educational school, from which to admit children, but he felt that this could only be justified if the school is undersubscribed, and this is not the case. The action of increasing the number of feeder schools to 38 in 2014 was not reasonable in his view. To prevent unnecessary journeys by car or public transport the school should consider naming feeder schools within a three mile radius. The definition of 'outlying village' is questioned by the objector, as some feeder schools are urban schools, situated within statutory walking distance of other secondary schools. Churchgate Church of England Primary School is given as an example. The objector says that this school, located in the town of Harlow, 5.9 miles from the school, has 3 secondary schools within 2.9 miles. Data provided by the LA and the school shows that only two children from this school have been admitted over the past three years. In my view this low level of applications would not warrant the naming of that school as a feeder school unless there was a compelling educational reason.

33. Accepting the point made by the school that it admits boys only, there is still in my opinion, the likelihood of a mismatch between parental expectations that they will gain priority for admission based on attendance at a named feeder school and the capacity of the school to admit them. The combined PANs of the feeder schools is 1136, compared to the PAN of the school which is 155. I enquired at the meeting about the rationale for the inclusion of particular primary schools within the different groups. The school said it was probably a reflection of the sum of the admission numbers, to make even group sizes, but on checking I see the total number of places in each group of feeder schools varies widely from 115 to 300. Parents need to understand why schools are grouped as they are and what significance this has for their application, as this is not clear at present.

34. Data provided to me shows that not all parents of boys who attend the feeder schools name the school as a preference. In six feeder schools no parents have expressed a first preference for the school during the last three years (the period for which I have data available). In another 18 feeder schools the number of first preferences is very low indeed, with fewer than 3 first preferences made in each of the last three years. This would suggest to me that the pattern of preferences may have already changed and that a further detailed review is required by the governing body. The school confirmed that there were no educational or cultural links to the 38 primary schools it has named as feeder schools and the only link, is that at some point in the past a child attending one of the 38 named schools has been admitted. This seems to me to be a very tenuous link and not one that provides a sufficiently objective, reasonable or transparent reason for naming so many schools spread over a wide area.

35. In practice there is a large number of siblings who gain priority over applicants in the feeder school groups A to F, with 39 in 2012, 46 in 2013 and 36 in 2014.

Some of these boys may have qualified as siblings of brothers admitted under criterion 5 (attending non-feeder schools) or brothers admitted on the basis of aptitude in music or sport where no account is taken of attendance at a feeder school. Therefore the potential for an increasing number of children living some distance from the school, to gain priority for admission as siblings is considerable and also needs to be reviewed by the governing body. In my view this compounds the complexity of the arrangements.

36. There is rising pressure on secondary places and the potential for a greater number of applicants to be refused admission. Local children may be unfairly disadvantaged if the school continues to give priority on the basis of 38 feeder schools, a number of which are located some distance from the school. In my view the naming of 38 feeder schools is not reasonable as it lacks the necessary transparency and objectivity required to comply with the requirement of paragraph 1.15 of the Code.

Other Matters

37. I discussed a range of issues about the arrangements for admission in September 2015, including the requirement to publish arrangements on the school's website; the need for greater clarity about the treatment of applications for the 25 additional places, the proportion of places made available on the basis of aptitude, the content of the supplementary information form that applicants to the sixth form are required to complete and finally the need to improve information about the operation of the waiting list.

Publication of 2015 arrangements on the school's website

38. When I first checked the school's website on 6 May 2014 the arrangements for 2014 were clearly signposted and can be found easily by parents. However, I could not locate the determined arrangements for admission to the school in September 2015. Using the search facility I received a message, "*No content was found matching your search for admissions 2015.*" On the LA's website under the section for Voluntary Aided and Foundation schools, I found the *proposed* arrangements for entry in September 2015. I also discovered that it was possible to find one of the school's web pages which displayed the 2015 arrangements, using a web based search engine. The difficulty in locating the 2015 arrangements clearly contravenes the requirement to display arrangements on the school's own website, as soon as they have been determined and for the whole of the offer year. As mentioned earlier, the school explained that it has been updating the website and that this is a further technical issue to resolve. The school has subsequently published the arrangements for admission in 2015 on the school's website.

The need for greater clarity about the treatment of applications for the 25 additional places

39. The arrangements for 2015 include the following statement, *“The Published Admission Number for the year commencing September 2015 will be 155. In agreement with the Local Authority, as part of a temporary strategy to meet rising forecast demand, the school will increase its intake to 180 for a single year under a Local Agreement. The temporary increase in intake is for September 2015.”* A new criterion three has been inserted which says, *“There will be 25 places allocated to applicants whose normal home address (Monday to Friday) is within the boundary of the five electoral wards of Bishop’s Stortford town. Each ward will randomly allocate five places.....”* I checked whether or not these 25 places would be included in the school’s calculation of the percentage of applications from each group of feeder schools or whether the school would only include the unsuccessful applicants. The LA said there had been no discussion with the school about how applicants would be treated in practice, but as a number of pupils will be unsuccessful in the random allocation round for a place under criterion three, it would be reasonable to have an automatic opportunity to be considered as an applicant attending one of the feeder schools. The school agreed that these applications should be included in the calculation of the total proportion of applications for each group of schools. In my view an additional sentence in the arrangements is required to provide certainty about this issue for parents. I also asked if the siblings who were given priority for places were included in the group application totals as this was also not made clear in the arrangements. I was advised that these applications were quite separate and not included in the totals. This must be made clear for parents, within the arrangements.

The proportion of places made available on the basis of aptitude

40. In September 2014 the number of places available to be allocated on the basis of aptitude was 10 per cent of the PAN of 155, that is, 15 places, eight for sport and 7 for music. For admissions in 2015 the governing body has again determined a PAN of 155. However, in the 2015 arrangements the number of pupils to be admitted under criterion 6 has increased, *“Up to 5% of places (i.e. 9) will be allocated to pupils with a proven aptitude in sport. Aptitude will be assessed using an appropriate sporting aptitude test. Up to 5% of places (i.e. 9) will be allocated to pupils with a proven aptitude in music. Aptitude will be assessed by an appropriate musical aptitude test.”*

41. Section 102 (4) of the Act says: “In this section “the proportion of selective admissions” in relation to a relevant age group, means the proportion of the total number of pupils admitted to the school in that age group (determined in the prescribed manner) which is represented by the number of pupils so admitted by reference to aptitude for the subject or subjects in question.”

42. At the meeting the school said that it had not appreciated that as the number determined in the prescribed manner was only 155, the number of places would

need to remain at 15, this being ten per cent of the total, rather than 18 which is ten per cent of the temporary intake for September 2015. The school agreed to amend its arrangements immediately.

Admission to the sixth form

43. The general requirements and prohibitions in the Code apply to the arrangements and the SIF for admission to the sixth form, in the same way that they apply to admissions to year 7. When I reviewed the arrangements for admission to the sixth form I noted that the school had included in its application form requests for information that are not permitted by the Code.

Section C asks whether or not the applicant has applied to other sixth forms or colleges. Paragraph 1.9c of the Code says, "*It is for admission authorities to formulate their admission arrangements, but they **must not**: c) give extra priority to children whose parents rank preferred schools in a particular order, including 'first preference first' arrangements ...*" The school said it needed to have this information so that it could direct applicants to other schools that might have more appropriate courses. In my view this information should be readily available within the LA's sixth form prospectus and guidance should be provided by the school the applicant is currently attending. It is not acceptable to ask about any other applications.

Section D asks for a personal statement in two parts "a) *your reasons for wanting to join the sixth form and b) extra-curricular interests*"; and section E asks applicants to, "*Indicate which extra-curricular activities you intend to undertake.*" Paragraph 1.9i of the Code says, admission authorities "**must not prioritise children on the basis of their own or their parents' past or current hobbies or activities**"

In my view it is perfectly reasonable to ask for this information if it is required for organisational purposes, but not until a place has been offered and accepted.

Section F requests permission to photograph or make any recording of the student and section I requests a passport sized photograph. Paragraph 1.9o of the Code says that admission authorities, "**must not request photographs of a child for any part of the admissions process, other than as proof of identity when sitting a selection test**"

Section I refers to a reference from the head teacher of school the student is attending currently. I accept that the school may wish to ask for confirmation from the applicant's current school, of the predicted grades for GCSE examinations and for any grades already achieved, but the school must be careful to avoid asking for a general reference as this may contravene paragraph 1.9g which says admission authorities must not, "*take account of reports from previous schools about children's past behaviour, attendance, attitude or achievement, or that of any other children in the family;*"

44. The school agreed to amend the SIF accordingly.

45. Finally, the arrangements currently state, "*The School maintains a list of continuing interest for the first term of the school year after which time all applications are treated as casual admissions.*" The Code says in paragraph 2.14, "*.....schools **must** maintain a waiting list for at least the first term of the academic year stating in their arrangements that each added child will require the list to be ranked again in line with the published admission oversubscription criteria*".

Conclusion

46. The arrangements for admission in 2014 and 2015 are open to alternative interpretations from those intended by the governing body. In my view this is due to the overall complexity of the arrangements and because they lack the necessary clarity that enables parents to understand and assess the likelihood that an application will be successful. In this respect they are insufficiently clear and do not meet the mandatory requirements of the Code.

47. The Code says that the selection of feeder schools must be transparent and made on reasonable grounds, but the only ground for the inclusion of feeder schools is the fact that at some point in the past an application has been made from a family at one of the 38 named feeder primary schools. A clear pattern of applications over the past three years indicates that in 21 of the named schools fewer than three parents have expressed a first preference for the school. The school has confirmed that there were no other educational or cultural links that might in my view, provide objective reasons for their continued inclusion in the arrangements. In my opinion there is not a sufficiently strong reason as required by the Code for maintaining 38 feeder schools and current arrangements are not transparent. For these reasons the arrangements do not conform to the requirements of the Code.

48. For the reasons detailed above I uphold the objection to the arrangements for 2015 and am of the view that the arrangements for 2014 do not conform with requirements relating to admission arrangements.

Determination

49. In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I uphold the objection to the admission arrangements determined by the governing body of The Bishop's Stortford High School, the admission authority for the school, for admissions in September 2015.

50. I have also considered the arrangements as a whole and the arrangements for 2014 in accordance with section 88I(5) of the Act and I determine that these do not conform with the requirements relating to admission arrangements.

51. By virtue of section 88K(2) of the Act the adjudicator's decision is binding on the admission authority. The School Admissions Code requires the admission authority to revise its admission arrangements as quickly as possible.

Date: 23 June 2014

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Mrs Carol Parsons