



Office of
the Schools
Adjudicator

Determination

Case reference: ADA4297

Objector: A member of the public

Admission authority: The Governing Body of Christopher Whitehead Language College

Date of decision: 16 July 2024

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 2025 determined by the Governing Body of Christopher Whitehead Language College for Christopher Whitehead Language College, Worcester.

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 revised by 9 September 2024.

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 Christopher Whitehead Language College (the school), a coeducational academy secondary school for pupils aged 11 – 18.

2. The objection was that, at the time of making the objection, the school's admission arrangements for 2025/2026 were not yet published on its website. As the objector was unable to locate those arrangements, she examined the 2024/25 arrangements and made an objection based upon the fact that there was no reference to admission for summer born children outside of their normal age group. Although the objection was submitted after the deadline of 15 March 2023 for objecting to admission arrangements for September 2024, it was clear that the objector's intention was to object to the 2025 arrangements. I determined to treat it as such and notified the parties accordingly.

3. The local authority (LA) for the area in which the school is located is Worcestershire County Council. The LA is a party to this objection but has declined to respond. Other parties to the objection are the objector and the school.

Jurisdiction

4. The terms of the academy agreement between the academy 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 governing body, which is the admission authority for the school, on that basis. The objector submitted her objection to these determined arrangements on 10 April 2024. I have also used my power under section 88I of the Act to consider the arrangements as a whole.

Procedure

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

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

- a. a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the governing body at which the arrangements were determined;
- b. a copy of the determined arrangements;
- c. the objector's form of objection dated 10 April 2024;
- d. information publicly available on the websites of the school and Get Information about Schools; and
- e. the school's response to the objection and to the points raised by me under section 88I of the Act and supporting documents.

The Objection

7. The objector claimed that the school's 2025/26 admission arrangements were not available on its website. Paragraph 1.49 of the Code provides that: "All admission authorities **must** determine their admission arrangements, including their Published

Admission Number (PAN), every year, even if they have not changed from previous years and a consultation has not been required by **28 February** in the determination year”, and paragraph 1.50 of the Code says “Once admission authorities have determined their admission arrangements, they **must** notify the appropriate bodies and **must** publish a copy of the determined arrangements on the school’s website by **15 March** in the determination year and continue displaying them for the whole offer year (the school year in which offers for places are made”.

8. Although the objector was unable to locate a copy of the school’s arrangements for September 2025 admissions, she objected to the fact that the 2024 arrangements made no reference to any process for making an application for a summer born child to be admitted outside his/her normal age group. The Code defines “summer born” children as follows: “The term summer born children relates to all children born from 1 April to 31 August. These children reach compulsory school age on 31 August following their fifth birthday (or on their fifth birthday if it falls on 31 August).” It also says that it is likely that most requests for summer born children to be admitted out of their normal age group will come from parents of children born in the later summer months or those born prematurely.

9. Paragraph 2.18 of the Code says that “Parents may seek a place for their child outside of their normal age group, for example, if the child is gifted and talented or has experienced problems such as ill health. In addition, the parents of a summer born child may choose not to send that child to school until the September following their fifth birthday and may request that they are admitted out of their normal age group – to reception rather than year 1. Admission authorities **must** make clear in their admission arrangements the process for requesting admission out of the normal age group”.

Other Matters

10. There were a number of other matters which appeared not to comply with the requirements of the Code. The school has agreed to revise the arrangements to address these matters, and indeed is required to do so following my determination. I am grateful to the school for its cooperation. I have set out my observations in detail under the section headed ‘Consideration of Case’.

Background

11. The school is a coeducational secondary academy for pupils aged 11 - 18. It operates partial selection for children who present themselves as skilled linguists. I have not set out the oversubscription criteria here for reasons which will become apparent in the section titled “Other Matters”.

Consideration of Case

The Objection

12. Following receipt of the objection, the admission authority revised its admission arrangements for 2025/26, 2024/25 and 2023/24, which made the case more complex. There is a question about whether the admission authority was properly able to revise these arrangements under paragraph 3.6 of the Code, however I propose to put that question to one side and consider the admission arrangements for 2025/26 which have been sent to me and the situation as it stands.

13. In relation to the first part of the objection, the arrangements for 2025/26 are now published on the school's website, so I do not propose to consider this point any further.

14. In relation to the second point, the school has sent me copies of the admission arrangements for 2025/26 with track changes showing that some provisions have been added about summer born children. The objector has indicated that she is content with these changes, and I am grateful to the admission authority for its cooperation with our process. However, in my view, the changes made are not sufficient to make the arrangements compliant with the Code.

15. The arrangements now say:

"If a child is admitted to primary school out of their normal age group, (i.e. summer born children, born between 1st April and 31st August, who start school in the September following their fifth birthday), the parent will need to ask the admission authority of their preferred schools to agree for their child to continue being educated outside of their normal age group, for example, when they transfer from primary to secondary school.

This should be done before the normal admissions round closes for their child's normal age group. This will be on 31 October of the year their child starts year 5, rather than year 6. This is so they know the outcome of the decision in time to submit an application for their child's normal age group, should their request be turned down.

Worcestershire School Admissions have a useful document on their website: Policy on Delayed and Accelerated Transfer - [Placement of pupils out of their chronological age group including Summer Born children starting school](#), which you may find helpful.

For those who are seeking a place outside of the admission time or in a different year group, the Headteacher is always happy to discuss place availability and to offer prospective parents, carers and students a tour of the school. Please contact our Registrar on (01905) 423906 or by email to registrar@cwlc.email with any queries or to arrange a tour".

16. I have set out below in full the paragraphs in the Code which apply to the admission of children outside of their normal age group (partially emboldened for emphasis).

“2.18 Parents may seek a place for their child outside of their normal age group, for example, if the child is gifted and talented or has experienced problems such as ill health. In addition, the parents of a summer born child may choose not to send that child to school until the September following their fifth birthday and may request that they are admitted out of their normal age group – to reception rather than year 1. **Admission authorities must make clear in their admission arrangements the process for requesting admission out of the normal age group.**

2.19 Admission authorities **must** make decisions on the basis of the circumstances of each case and in the best interests of the child concerned. This will include taking account of the parent’s views; information about the child’s academic, social, and emotional development; where relevant, their medical history and the views of a medical professional; whether they have previously been educated out of their normal age group; and whether they may naturally have fallen into a lower age group if it were not for being born prematurely. They **must** also take into account the views of the head teacher of the school concerned. When informing a parent of their decision on the year group the child should be admitted to, the admission authority **must** set out clearly the reasons for their decision.

2.20 Where an admission authority agrees to a parent’s request for their child to be admitted out of their normal age group and, as a consequence of that decision, the child will be admitted to a relevant age group (i.e. the age group to which pupils are normally admitted to the school) the local authority and admission authority **must** process the application as part of the main admissions round, unless the parental request is made too late for this to be possible, and on the basis of their determined admission arrangements only, including the application of oversubscription criteria where applicable. They **must not** give the application lower priority on the basis that the child is being admitted out of their normal age group. Parents have a statutory right to appeal against the refusal of a place at a school for which they have applied. This right does not apply if they are offered a place at the school, but it is not in their preferred age group.”

17. Firstly, the provisions in paragraphs 2.18 – 2.20 do not apply exclusively to summer born children. They apply to any child who is to be admitted outside their normal age group, for example children who are gifted and talented or have experienced problems such as ill health. Secondly, the substantive requirement in paragraph 2.18 is that admission authorities must make clear in their admission arrangements **the process** for requesting admission outside the normal year group. Whilst the new wording in the arrangements goes some way towards meeting this requirement insofar as it tells parents that they will need to seek the permission of the admission authority for their child to continue to be educated outside their normal age group when the child transfers to a different school, it does not explain to parents what they need to do; Who do they apply to? Is there a special form? Do they write a letter? When would be the latest date for making an application? Who is the decision-maker? What evidence might support their application? Also, whilst not specifically a requirement that parents must be told how decisions are made, it would certainly be helpful for both the parent and the decision-maker to explain what factors are taken into account and what evidence might have a bearing on the outcome.

18. It may be the case that the process is set out in full in documentation on the Worcestershire School Admissions website, in which case the arrangements can simply say that details of who to apply to; the date by which applications should be made; and the factors taken into account are set out on a particular webpage and provide a direct link to the webpage in question. However, the arrangements as revised do not explain the process clearly and the link included in the arrangements doesn't work. When I clicked on it, I got an error message saying 'cannot open this file'.

19. I have upheld this objection because the 2025 arrangements were not published on the school's website by the required date and did not comply with the requirements in paragraph 2.18 of the Code. Neither for that matter did the 2024 arrangements. Although I only have jurisdiction to consider an objection to the 2025 arrangements, I anticipate that the school will also revise its 2024 arrangements as these will continue to apply to in-year applicants for the duration of the 2024 Year 7 intake (also see below in relation to my jurisdiction under section 88I of the Act).

Other Matters

20. Upon receipt of the school's revised sets of admission arrangements for 2025/26, 2024/25 and 2023/24, the case manager emailed the admission authority on my behalf (copied to the objector and the local authority) explaining that the adjudicator has the power under section 88I of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, (where a set of admission arrangement have been brought to her attention), to consider the arrangements as a whole and determine whether they comply with the Code and other education legislation. The email said that, having now read the school's admission arrangements for 2025/26, it was my view that there are aspects of them which do not comply with the Code. These are in addition to the points raised in the objection.

21. The email also explained that, although the objection which has been made is for the admission arrangements for 2025/26 and therefore my jurisdiction in respect of the objection is only in respect of those arrangements, I intended to also consider the 2024/2025 arrangements under my section 88I jurisdiction since they: are still relevant; appear to be essentially the same as the 2025 arrangements; and have been brought to my attention. This will allow the admission authority to make the required changes to those arrangements as well as the 2025/26 arrangements. There is no necessity to make changes to the 2023/24 arrangements (even though they are the same as the other sets of arrangements and have been brought to my attention) because they are no longer in operation.

22. I have set out below the provisions in the 2025/26 and 2024/25 arrangements which appeared to me not to comply with the Code. As a general point, the arrangements need additional clear section headings. In particular, the oversubscription criteria should be clearly labelled as such. Paragraph 1.6 of the Code states that the admission authority for the school must set out in their arrangements the criteria against which places will be allocated at the school when there are more applications than places and the order in which

the criteria will be applied. These oversubscription criteria must be applied strictly. If the school is not oversubscribed, all applicants must be offered a place.

- a. The arrangements say: “The following guidelines are established to provide Governors with parameters for accepting students to Christopher Whitehead Language College and establishing a waiting list in the event one becomes necessary”. Admission arrangements are not “parameters” or “guidelines”, and it is unclear and misleading to suggest that they are. As above, schools’ admission arrangements are required to include oversubscription criteria which set out how places will be allocated in the event that there are more applications than places available and to allocate places in accordance with these published criteria. Paragraph 14 of the Code 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.
- b. The arrangements say: “Our philosophy regarding admissions is as follows:
 - Every effort will be made to attract and accept students with diverse ethnic, religious, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.
 - We are an inclusive community, accepting students with a diverse range of additional needs.
 - A balanced student body of females and males is considered ideal.
 - Priority will be given to students from our "feeder" schools, which include Honeywell, Oldbury Park, Pitmaston, St Clement's CE, Our Lady Queen of Peace, Hallow and Rushwick primary schools.
 - Priority acceptance will be given to siblings of current students.
 - We reserve the right to place the child in what we deem to be the most suitable learning environment. Siblings will be placed in the same House but not the same Learning Mentor group.
 - We reserve the right to admit children of all our staff who are out of area to improve staff work life balance.”

Some of these “philosophies” are actually oversubscription criteria, and some are not. The Code enables priority to be given to children who attend named feeder schools, to siblings of children attending the school in question and to children of members of staff at the school. However, oversubscription criteria must be described clearly as such in the school’s admission arrangements. Paragraph 1.8 of the Code requires that oversubscription criteria must be clear and procedurally fair. The order of priority within each of the oversubscription criteria must also be clear. The other “philosophies” such as “Every effort will be made to attract and accept students with diverse ethnic, religious, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.... We are an inclusive community, accepting students with a diverse range of additional needs...A balanced student body of females and males is considered ideal” are not oversubscription criteria. It is confusing for parents to read such “philosophies” in a set of admission arrangements. Although

laudable general aims, it is unclear what bearing they have on the allocation of places. Again, this is contrary to the requirement of clarity in paragraph 14 of the Code.

- c. The arrangements say: “Children whose final statement of special educational needs or their education, health and care plan (EHCP) names our school will be automatically allocated a place, as long as the admission does not prejudice the provision of efficient education or efficient use of resources”. This statement is incorrect. Paragraph 1.6 of the Code says that; “All children whose Education, Health and Care Plan names the school **must** be admitted”. Admission authorities might argue that the admission of a child is prejudicial when consulted on their admission before the school is named, but once a school is named in a child’s EHCP the child must be admitted. The arrangements should also make clear that children with EHCPs will have priority over children admitted under the ‘normal’ admission arrangements, which will mean fewer places available. There is no longer any such thing as a “statement of special educational needs”.
- d. Oversubscription criterion 2 says it gives priority to “Children who present themselves as skilled linguists”, and that “As a specialist Language College, we are seeking to recruit up to 10% of students who have proven aptitude for foreign language learning”. Paragraph 1.8 of the Code requires that oversubscription criteria must be clear. The arrangements provide no definition of what the admission authority considers to be a child who presents themselves as a skilled linguist, or what is needed to demonstrate that an applicant has a proven aptitude for foreign language learning. It is not possible for parents to know whether their child would be afforded priority under oversubscription criterion 2 by looking at the arrangements.

Also, aptitude and ability are different concepts. Unless the school conducts its own test of aptitude, this criterion risks operating unfairly. Some children may have been given the opportunity to study languages and have therefore developed an ability which can be demonstrated by reports from teachers/tutors; others, who may have equal aptitude, may not have had the same opportunities. Partial selection by **ability** is generally not permitted under admissions legislation except in the case of schools which have had partial selection by ability continuously in place since 1998¹, which is why there must be a method of testing for **aptitude** in place at the school. (Emboldened for emphasis).

¹ See section 100 of the Standards and Framework Act 1998.

Paragraph 1.32 of the Code says:

“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 disabilities, having regard to the reasonable adjustments for disabled pupils required under equalities legislation; 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** so as to allow parents time to make an informed choice of school - while making clear that this does not equate to a guarantee of a selective place”.
- e. Oversubscription criterion 4 says: “Precise details of our school’s catchment area are available from the Local Authority and on the Worcestershire County Council website”. The school’s catchment area is an integral part of its admission arrangements, therefore a map (or other clear description) of the catchment area must either form part of the admission arrangements or be directly accessible via a one click link to a relevant webpage. This is contrary to the requirement of clarity in paragraph 1.8 of the Code.
- f. Oversubscription criterion 5 refers to “Children living outside the catchment area of our school who at the time of application have a brother or sister (including children living as siblings/stepchildren in the same family unit) on the roll of the preferred school and who will still be on roll at the time of the sibling's admission”. This should be oversubscription criterion 6 as it is itself a separate oversubscription criterion. Also, the phrase “preferred school” is unclear.

Oversubscription 6 (which should be 7) refers to “Children living outside the catchment area of our school who, at the time of application, attend one of our linked primary schools”. There is no definition of which schools are the linked primary schools. Presumably, this refers to the feeder schools mentioned earlier in the arrangements. If this is the case, the oversubscription criterion needs to say that priority is given to children attending the named feeder schools. The oversubscription criterion does not specify whether priority would be afforded to children attending one of those schools at the time of application or at the date of the applicant’s admission to the school. Neither does it explain how priority is ordered within the oversubscription criterion - whether places are offered in order of proximity of the home address to the school or some other method is in place. This is contrary to the requirement of clarity in paragraph 1.8 of the Code.

- g. Under the section headed “Please note” it is said that “Late applications will be allocated in the same order, provided places remain available”. There is no

definition of what is considered to be a late application as the arrangements contain no detail of the closing date for on-time applications; it is also unclear as to whether the words “in the same order” mean in the order of the oversubscription criteria, the order of which is also unclear. This is contrary to the requirement for clarity in paragraph 14 of the Code.

- h. The arrangements say: “When all available places have been allocated, Christopher Whitehead Language College will operate a waiting list. Parents who wish their child to be included on the waiting list must inform us in writing.” Paragraph 2.15 of the Code says that “Each admission authority **must** maintain a clear, fair, and objective waiting list until at least 31 December of each school year of admission”. It is contrary to paragraph 2.15 to request parents to make a written request for their child’s name to be included on the waiting list before 31 December in the admission year.
- i. Under the heading “In-Year Admissions” the arrangements say: “The family should in the first instance contact the school and arrange to meet with the Deputy Headteacher who has oversight of admissions”. I was unclear what the purpose of the meeting is. Paragraph 1.9 of the Code says: “Admission authorities **must not** a) place any conditions on the consideration of any application other than those in the oversubscription criteria published in their admission arrangements; b) take into account any previous schools attended, unless it is a named feeder school;... g) 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; or m) interview children or parents.” If there are vacant places in the year group for which an application has been made, those places must be allocated in accordance with the oversubscription criteria as required by the Code.
- j. Also under the heading “In-Year Admissions” the arrangements say: “When a student is transferring from another school in the UK, the Admissions Officer will normally contact the previous school to seek relevant information and to request that the student’s school records be forwarded at the appropriate time”. I was unclear as to what the phrase “at the appropriate time” means. If this is after a place has been offered and accepted, this would not be contrary to the Code. However as mentioned in the previous sub-paragraph, admission authorities are not permitted to take into account reports from previous schools about a child’s past behaviour, attendance, attitude or achievement in deciding whether or not to offer that child a place at the school.
- k. The arrangements say: “Students from countries outside the UK who have been accepted at Christopher Whitehead Language College must provide proof of date of birth and of permanent residency in the Worcester area after an offer of a place has been made”. The phrase “permanent residency” is unclear contrary to paragraph 14 of the Code. It is not reasonable to impose a requirement to provide proof upon some applicants but not others. It is also not permissible to require

applicants to live in the Worcester area. The child's home address is as defined in the admission arrangements.

- l. The sixth form admission arrangements say: "There are two different pathways available for study. The entry requirements for each of these pathways will be detailed on our website". The two pathways of study were unclear from reading the admission arrangements, and the entry requirements were not stated. I understand that the entry requirements for sixth form are sometimes complex. It is common for admission authorities to set out these requirements in separate documentation, but there must be a clear link in the admission arrangements to any additional documentation so that parents can look at the admission arrangements and be able to understand what the entry requirements are. Again, this is contrary to the requirement for clarity in paragraph 14 of the Code.

- m. The sixth form admission arrangements say: "Applications supported by a reference are always preferable". It is unclear what purpose the reference is intended to serve and who is expected to provide the reference. Furthermore, as stated previously, paragraph 1.9g) of the Code says that 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; therefore the Code does not permit references from previous schools. Also, the sixth form admission arrangements state that places are allocated to applicants who meet the entry requirements in accordance with the oversubscription criteria, which is how the Code requires that places must be allocated. References have no part in the allocations process. The PAN for Year 12 is 110. I wasn't sure, because the arrangements do not specify as they should do, that the PAN refers to the number of external applicants for whom places are available. Pupils already attending the school who meet the entry requirements will transfer from Year 11 to Year 12. They do not need to make an application for a place.

23. When I drew these matters to the attention of the school, I received the following helpful response:

"On behalf of Christopher Whitehead, I appreciate the detailed check on our Admissions Policy. Hopefully the improvements will make a perceived complicated process clearer for parents and ensure fairness. Thank you for accepting that our intention is to cooperate fully.

I accept the majority of comments and await permission to adjust the policy. The irony is that the policy is checked by Worcester Local Authority prior to publication. The only further clarification I would request under other matters are:

“Students from countries outside the UK...”. The intention with this paragraph was to:

- a. Ensure age was appropriate, i.e. not a 25 year old being placed with 15/16 year olds. Under safeguarding this is still required’?
- b. Permanency was to stop students naming addresses where they clearly had friends / relatives but did not live there. How we would prove a period living there, I am unclear.

A sixth form reference was to double check courses studied. We have had students claim to have studied Triple Science, Physics etc and have been undertaking General Science. Students have also claimed to have studied RS when they had not! Would a change in terminology to ‘confirmation of KS4 courses undertaken is required’ be acceptable?

Thank you for your detailed undertaking of this matter and I am pleased that the initial parental objection is now deemed to be concluded”.

24. I am heartened that the school perceives my observations as improvements which will make the admissions process clearer for parents and ensure fairness. They were certainly made for those purposes. In answer to the school’s questions:

- It is acceptable for the arrangements to require that a birth certificate or other available documentation be provided in the case of applicants where there are grounds to question the date of birth given on the application form.
- Establishing a child’s home address can be complex, particularly in the case of a child whose parents live separately and who spends part of the week with one parent or another. In very general terms, acceptable evidence might be copies of council tax or utility bills which will tend to indicate ordinary residence. If establishing whether a family had lived at a given address for a specific period of time, a request could be made for copies of bills covering that period. What makes this matter more complex is that many families simply do not have what would be termed a permanent address. These could be refugee families who are necessarily in temporary accommodation or living with friends or relatives, those living in the private rental sector with no security of tenure, looked after children, traveller families etc. There are many different forms of wording which can be used, depending upon how the admission authority wishes to determine a family’s home address. This must be the child’s ordinary residence. Evidence such as the address for receipt of child benefit should not be seen as absolute proof as there are circumstances in which the recipient may not live at the same address as the child.
- It is acceptable to ask for evidence of subjects studied at A level and copies of GCSE certificates.

25. Finally, the local authority has not submitted any response to this objection, which is a matter for them. I was concerned to read that the local authority are said to have 'approved' the school's arrangements. I was hoping that they might offer some help to the school in making the necessary changes. The Code sets out Sample Arrangements which could be used as a starting point, but these do not cover all parameters. Some examples of schools which use partial selection that I am aware of are Rastrick High School and The Cardinal Vaughan Memorial School. These schools do not partially select based upon aptitude for foreign language but on the basis of musical aptitude. However their admission arrangements describe how the partial selection process works and may be of some assistance. I am not endorsing these arrangements as exemplars, I am simply aware that they undergone external scrutiny as each set of arrangements has been the subject of an adjudicator determination.

26. I am conscious that it has taken me longer to complete this determination than would ordinarily have been the case, and that the school has been awaiting its completion in order to make the necessary revisions to its arrangements. Ordinarily, an admission authority would be given two months to revise its admission arrangements following an adjudicator's determination. My view is that a revised set of arrangements needs to be published on the school's website in good time for parents making applications for places in September 2025. Since the closing date for such applications is 31 October 2024, I determine that the admission arrangements must be revised by 9 September 2024, which is a slightly shorter period but is the beginning of the first full week of the next school year, according to the school's online calendar.

Determination

27. In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2025 determined by the Governing Body of Christopher Whitehead Language College for Christopher Whitehead Language College, Worcester.

28. 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.

29. 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 revised by 9 September 2024.

Dated: 16 July 2024

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Dr Marisa Vallely