



Office of
the Schools
Adjudicator

Determination

Case reference: ADA4479

Objector: A Parent

Admission authority: Lawrence Sheriff School Academy Trust for Lawrence Sheriff School, Warwickshire

Date of decision: 31 October 2025

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 2026 determined by Lawrence Sheriff School Academy Trust for Lawrence Sheriff School, Warwickshire.

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 an individual member of the public (the objector), about the admission arrangements (the arrangements) for Lawrence Sheriff School (the School, LSS), a selective school for boys aged 11 to 18 for September 2026. The objection is wide ranging with a central focus on whether the arrangements are fair and reasonable for pupils living in the “priority circle catchment area” and whether they are sufficiently clear to enable parents to “understand easily how places for that school will be allocated”.
2. The local authority (LA) for the area in which the School is located is Warwickshire County Council. The LA is a party to this objection. Other parties to the objection are the objector and the Lawrence Sheriff School Academy Trust (the Trust).

Jurisdiction

3. The terms of the Academy agreement between the Trust and the Secretary of State for Education require that the admissions policy and arrangements for the School are in accordance with admissions law as it applies to foundation and voluntary aided schools,

and with equalities law. These arrangements were determined by the governing board on behalf of the Trust, which is the admission authority for the School, on that basis. They were determined on 5 February 2025.

4. The objector submitted their objection to these determined arrangements on 18 May 2025. Although the objection was dated after the 15 May 2025 deadline for objections, I have decided to exercise my discretion to consider it as a late objection. The objector has asked to have their identity kept from the other parties and has met the requirement of regulation 24 of the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012 by providing details of their name and address to me. 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.

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 board at which the arrangements were determined;
- b. a copy of the determined arrangements for 2026;
- c. the objector's form of objection dated 18 May 2025;
- d. the School's response to the objection and to my requests for additional information;
- e. the LA's response to the objection and to my requests for additional information; and
- f. relevant previous determinations, namely ADA2608, ADA3127, ADA3395, ADA3524 and ADA3871.

The Objection

7. The objector asserts that arrangements have a "lack of compliance with Paragraph 14 of the School Admissions Code". Their objection focuses on the following issues:

- a) That the allocation of places is unfair within the two different identified catchment areas for the school "the Eastern Area of Warwickshire" (EA) and the "Priority Circle" (PC) in that those applicants living within the PC (but not within the EA) now have a much lower prospect of being offered a place. The objector acknowledges that this is due to a change in circumstances with all applicants from the Rugby area who live within the EA now being offered a place. The number of PC only applicants being offered places has varied from 38 in 2023 to 45 in 2024 to 13 in 2025.

- b) That the arrangements are unfair to applicants in the PC. This is specifically said to be because PC applicants who score higher than those living in the EA are not being offered places.

“Under the 2025 arrangements it is entirely feasible that every one of the 150 places could be awarded to applicants from the Eastern Area, leaving none at all for the Priority Circle – even where Priority Circle pupils achieve appreciably higher test scores.”

- c) That the arrangements are not transparent about how the Automatic Qualifying Score (AQS) is set.

The objector asserts that “parents... cannot make informed decisions about the probable allocation of seats by reading the published admission policy. Parents from the Priority Circle area will not be able to anticipate how many seats or what percentage of seats will be allocated to Priority Circle Area. Without this capability, informed decision making is impossible for parents.”

The objection is about the way the AQS is set. The objector suggests that the AQS is set behind closed doors, and this enables ‘engineering’ of the AQS resulting in preferred outcomes.”

- d) The objector believes that without “a firm cap” on the number of seats that can go to the Eastern Area to achieve transparency “the 2026 policy could in theory award every place to that catchment, at the cost of excluding higher-scoring Priority Circle Pupils and thus breaching the public-law principles of fairness and proportionality”.
- e) That the arrangements may disadvantage some members of the local community because public information is not clear about how the AQS is set or how the scores relate to the allocation of places in each oversubscription criteria.

The objector claims that some families, particularly “recent immigrants whose own schooling took place outside the UK” who have “little or no familiarity” will struggle to understand much of the admission arrangements. They argue that the arrangements must “set out in clear, straightforward language how the AQS is fixed and how it feeds through to the number of places offered in each category.”

Background

8. The School is a boys’ grammar school in Rugby with a co-educational sixth form. It has a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 150 places in Year 7 and a PAN of 75 places in Year 12 for 2026/27. Admissions are based on selection, dependent upon children’s academic ability. Applicants eligible for admission are then prioritised in accordance with a set of oversubscription criteria. The school opened on its present site in 1878 and became an academy in September 2014. It was judged to be outstanding in all areas by Ofsted in March 2022.

9. There is a girls' grammar school (Rugby High School) and a co-educational school (Ashlawn) that also offer a proportion of places selected by ability. These three selective (or partially selective) schools all fall within the EA. There are five other non-selective secondary schools within three miles of the School.

10. In total, there are six selective grammar schools in Warwickshire, all of which allocate their places based on results achieved in an 11+ test. Each school has its own admission arrangements. All three of the East Warwickshire selective schools use the EA and PC catchment areas.

11. The School is part of a consortium of schools (The West Midlands Grammar Schools) that use a common entrance test. Children sit the test in the September before they are due to start Year 7, so children sat the common entrance test in September 2025 for entrance into Year 7 in September 2026.

12. As I have said, the School's admission arrangements include two catchment areas:

- i) The Eastern Area of Warwickshire (EA) – this is described as the aggregated catchment areas of Bilton, Ashlawn and Avon Valley Schools and includes Rugby.
- ii) The Priority Circle (PC) – the Centre of which is Rugby Water Tower and has a radius of 10.004 miles (this includes the Eastern Area)

The EA is entirely within the PC.

13. After the allocation of places to children with an Education, Health and Care Plan naming the School, the oversubscription criteria can be summarised as:

- a) Looked after children (LAC) and previously looked after children (PLAC) who achieve the Automatic Qualifying Score (AQS) or above.
- b) 30 places allocated to children who were eligible for the Pupil Premium (PP) at point of registration, who live in the catchment areas. The AQS for PP students is lower than the AQS for other applicants by between one and twenty points and is determined annually.
- c) Up to 5 places allocated to children eligible for Service Premium (SP) at point of registration, living in the catchment areas who achieve the AQS. The AQS for SP pupils is lower than the AQS for other applicants by between one and twenty points and is determined annually.
- d) Children of staff who achieve the AQS.
- e) Children living in the EA who achieve the AQS.
- f) Children living in the PC who achieve the AQS.

- g) Any remaining places allocated to children eligible for Pupil Premium who achieve the AQS for PP children.
- h) Any remaining places allocated to places eligible for Service Premium who achieve the AQS for SP children.
- i) Any children living outside the catchment areas who achieve the AQS.
- j) Any children who achieved the minimum qualifying score.

Within each criterion, priority is given to those achieving the highest score in the entrance test.

14. The School states that “the intention is to prioritise able local children living at a reasonable distance from the school so that they can fully engage with the school’s curriculum and wider curricular activities. This is based upon a circle with a radius of 10.004 miles.” The circle is the PC.

Consideration of Case

15. The main theme of the objection is that children from the PC catchment area are disadvantaged by the order of priority in the oversubscription criteria and by the process which is in place for deciding how the AQS is set, each of which determine an applicant’s prospects of being admitted.

16. The objector believes that the admissions policy for the school, for 2026 entrance, is “unfair, unreasonable and will have disproportionate impact on seat allocation for students from the Priority Circle catchment area”.

The objector refers to “seat allocation” as meaning the allocation of places into year 7 in the School.

17. They argue that based on their research, a consistent pattern of admissions has been observed relative to different oversubscription criteria with approximately “38-45” places being allocated to children from the PC Area up until 2024. However, this changed in 2025 when “just 13 seats only of the PAN of 150” were allocated based on residence in the PC. They continue to say that “in 2026, with existing admissions policy Eastern area can fill all published PAN till 150 [sic] leaving no seats available for Priority Circle area. Parents are not aware of this reality.”

18. The objector believes that the arrangements for 2026/27 do not comply with Paragraph 14 of the Code which states that:

“In drawing up their admission arrangements, admission authorities must ensure that the 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.”

19. First, dealing with the question of fairness. This term is not defined in the Code. However, in the Supreme Court, fairness had been described as a “protean concept”, meaning that fairness is “not susceptible of much generalised enlargement”. In other words, fairness cannot be defined in universal terms. Its requirements will depend on the circumstances.

20. Fairness is focused on the effect of the arrangements on any relevant group. The purpose of eligibility criteria and oversubscription criteria is to create advantage for some applicants and disadvantage to others. A factor which is relevant in the consideration of substantive unfairness is the reason (or justification) for adopting a particular oversubscription criterion. This must be considered in context. The LA provided information which demonstrates that the number of applications for LSS increased considerably over the last three years from 407 in 2023 to 563 in 2025. The school has a PAN of 150 and so, in 2025, there were more than three applications for every place in the school. The PAN has not changed in the last three years.

21. Table 1 shows information provided by the LA about how places were allocated in the last three years against each of the oversubscription criteria 1-6.

Table 1: Allocation of places at LSS by oversubscription criteria

		2023	2024	2025
	Total Offers	150	150	150
a.	Looked after or previously looked after children.	1	0	1
b.	Pupil premium	7	10	12
c.	Service premium	0	2	0
d.	Staff children	0	0	0
e.	EA	86	100	123
f.	PC	45	38	13
	Lower oversubscription criteria.	11	0	0

22. I note that oversubscription criteria a to d apply equally to children from both catchment areas. Therefore, there is no disadvantage caused to children who are LAC / PLAC, PP or SP or who are children of staff based on whether they live in either catchment area.

23. As noted earlier, the EA falls entirely within the PC. Therefore, every child offered a place who lives within the EA, also lives within the PC.

24. The objector's concern is for those children who live outside the EA, but within the PC. The number of children offered places within this group over the last three years has fallen. However, this does not in itself imply that the oversubscription criteria disadvantage that group because the patterns and the number of applications to the school may change annually. It is important to note that because LSS has become more heavily oversubscribed, inevitably more children who apply to the school will not get places. If the school were not oversubscribed, every child who achieved the AQS or the minimum qualifying score would be offered a place.

25. The School has provided information about the number of applications received and the AQS. This is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: The number of applications to LSS and the AQS in recent years

Year	Number of applications received	Automatic Qualifying Score (AQS)	Minimum Schore Admitted (if different to AQS)
2025 (provisional)	563	212	212 (195 for PP/SP)
2024	472	212	212 (192 for PP/SP)
2023	407	211	211 (193 for PP/SP)
2022	429	212	212 (194 for PP/SP)

26. The consistency of the level at which the AQS is set provides evidence that the number of places allocated against each of the oversubscription criteria is not influenced by the School manipulating the AQS to advantage one catchment area over another. Indeed, the admissions arrangements state that students will be admitted "where the ability of those to be allocated places is deemed to be commensurate with cohorts previously admitted to the school". It is clear from this information that the AQS is likely to be set close to or at the same level as for previous cohorts and not varied significantly to engineer a different outcome by admitting more children from the EA catchment. Making this information available in the arrangements would make them clearer to parents.

27. It is not possible for the school to predict how many applications they will receive, from where and how many will achieve the AQS. The reason a smaller number of children are admitted from the PC (who do not live in the EA) is because there has been a higher number of applicants living in the EA who have met the AQS. The objector argues that this is unfair.

28. On the question of fairness, I reiterate that oversubscription criteria give priority to one group of pupils over another. That is, indeed, their purpose. It is for admission authorities to determine the priority they give to different groups provided their oversubscription criteria meet the requirements of the Code.

29. By way of example, although extremely unlikely, it is theoretically possible that all 150 places could be filled in a year group by children with an EHCP and/or those who fall within oversubscription criteria a to d. In this extreme example, it would make the catchment areas irrelevant. That does not mean the identification of oversubscription a-d is unfair. Conversely, and as has been the case in recent years, there have been very few pupils admitted as a result of acquiring priority under oversubscription criteria a to d, so there are more places available for pupils from both catchment areas. The point is that the consistency of the AQS illustrates that the school has sought to maintain a particular academic standard consistently over time in terms of the ability of those who are admitted. The School has not changed the AQS or taken any actions to disadvantage applicants who live in the PC. The School has simply continued to admit local children with a level of ability which it considers is appropriate and which has remained consistent over several years.

30. The objector argues that when the number of applicants from the EA increases beyond a certain number, the AQS should be raised to ensure more able pupils with higher test scores from the PC gain places. This would not be in-line with the school's objectives as stated in paragraph 26, namely, to ensure a consistent level of ability within the school.

31. The School, in response to the objection, provided information about the range of enquiries they receive regularly about fairness including:

“Eastern area parents welcoming their own child's priority but objecting to students travelling to school from outside the Eastern Area.

Circle parents object to Eastern Areas being prioritised ahead of their own child.

Out of catchment parents objecting to the Priority Circle.

Parents in Nuneaton (within Warwickshire) but outside the Priority Circle objecting to the part of Coventry (not in Warwickshire) within catchment being given priority.

Non-pupil premium parents objecting to pupil premium children being given priority”.

The School presents a compelling view that all these parents would “view a different system aligned with their own preferences as “fair” as it would increase the chance of their own child obtaining a place at LSS, but the admission authority has to consider the overall fairness of the arrangements given the exceptionally high levels of demand”.

32. I accept that the School has set its oversubscription criteria having taken fairness into account and in the context of the exceptional level of demand for places. I, therefore, do not uphold the objection that the arrangements operate to cause an unfairness to applicants living in the PC who do not also reside in the EA.

33. The Code also requires that oversubscription criteria are “reasonable”. The common law test in this context, is that for a decision to be considered unreasonable it would have to be a decision that no rational admission authority would have made having considered all relevant factors, placing sufficient weight upon each of those factors and disregarding any irrelevant factors.

34. Based on the detailed responses to my request for additional information from both the School and LA, for which I am grateful, I am satisfied that the admission authority has demonstrated that decisions on how to organise the oversubscription criteria for the School have been made having considered the relevant factors. I have concluded that there is a rational basis for adopting the oversubscription criteria which have been adopted (including the adoption of both catchment areas) and the order in which priority is afforded. The rationale for the introduction of the PC catchment area was to ensure that children living outside Warwickshire, the same distance from the school as children within Warwickshire, would be afforded equivalent priority within oversubscription criteria. This is in line with the Code and demonstrates the consideration given to the requirement of reasonableness in determining the arrangements.

In my opinion, the School’s admission arrangements are reasonable.

35. For these reasons I do not uphold this aspect of the objection. My judgment is that the inclusion of both catchment areas and the order of priority afforded to applicants living within each of those areas is both fair and reasonable.

36. I will now turn to the issues raised by the objector in relation to the way the AQS is set. The objector states that:

“Parents, especially parents from the Priority Circle Catchment area, cannot make informed decisions about the probable allocation of seats by reading the published admission policy. Parents from the Priority Circle area will not be able to anticipate how many seats or what percentage of seats will be allocated to Priority Circle Area. Without this capability, informed decision making is impossible for parents. The school can, if it desires, provide adequate information that empowers parents to make informed decisions”.

37. As illustrated in paragraph 29 and in Table 1, the number of pupils allocated places under each of the oversubscription criteria changes yearly depending on the applications received, applicants’ performance in the entrance test and where they live. This is not something that the admission authority can predict or control. It is, therefore, not possible for the admission authority to provide accurate and reliable information to parents about how many places “will be” allocated under each of the oversubscription criteria in any one year.

38. Paragraph 2.1 of the Code states that:

“While parents may express a preference for any state funded school admission authorities must not give any guarantee that a preference will be met”.

This means that when a parent applies for a place at the school for their child, their application will be considered by the admission authority alongside all other applications equally and regardless of preference.

The LA then coordinate the admissions process meeting the highest preferences possible for all applicants.

39. The LA website provides information to parents about how the coordinated admission process is conducted and how they should complete the application for a secondary place. This includes the following advice on school preferences:

“– You can apply for up to six schools.

- Name the schools in your order of preference but be aware you could be offered a place at any of the schools you apply for.
- Think about how your child would get to those schools and get home, as well as the costs involved in travelling.
- We strongly advise you to name at least three schools on your application. Naming only one school does not guarantee your child a place at that school or give your child priority for a place over another child.
- We recommend that one of the six schools you name in your preferences is your priority area school.”

40. The admission arrangements as determined have been considered carefully and revised following previous adjudicator determinations. They provide substantial information about the “practices and the criteria” used to decide the allocation of school places that, in my opinion, are clear and objective. There is no obligation upon admission authorities to set out in their arrangements how likely it is that any applicant will be offered a place. The obligation is to explain clearly to parents the steps that they need to take to make an application and how the outcome of that application will be determined. The arrangements set out both things clearly.

41. I will next consider the element of the objection that is concerned with whether the the “Automatic Qualifying Score” (AQS) is determined in line with the published policy. This I have taken to mean that the objector alleges that the AQS is not being set as the arrangements describe and, therefore, parents do not know what the AQS will be at the time of making an application.

42. The arrangements explain the process by which the AQS is determined. They provide significant detail about the entrance tests. This includes details of how the test scores are determined; how parents register for the test; and arrangements for taking the test, including how the School will make special arrangements in a wide range of circumstances that may impact on a pupil’s ability to attend or access the main assessment sessions.

43. The “results” section of the arrangements describes how data from the tests will be used to consider verbal reasoning, non-verbal reasoning, and mathematics scores. Parents have access to

“1) [Their] child’s score for each of the three components and a total score.

2) The Automatic Qualifying Scores and the required minimum academic standard for admission (minimum score for a place on the waiting list).”

The arrangements also make it clear that this information can be used for comparison purposes but there is “no guarantee that any child, including those who score above the required score for previous years, will be offered a grammar school place.”

44. The objection focuses upon the process employed in setting the AQS once the test has been completed and the results known. The LA provided a helpful and comprehensive outline of the terms of reference of the Committee of Reference. The purpose of the Committee is:

- “- To determine an automatic qualifying score for entry to each grammar school in the area along with a waiting list score range of each school.
- To review any significant matters arising from the tests.
- To review the arrangements which have been made for students whose parents applied for access arrangements due to special educational needs or medical issues”

45. The School asserts that the AQS is fixed objectively in line with the published policy. This is confirmed by the LA and evidenced by the consistency of the AQS over the last three years.

46. The School states that:

“The information provided is adequate for parents to take informed decisions and they show this by filling their Common Application Form with their preferred choice of schools. However, this expression of preference does not equate to ensuring that their son will gain a place at the school.”

47. The arrangements state that:

“The headteacher has overriding discretion to set the Automatic Qualifying Score and the required minimum standard for admission (minimum score for a place on the waiting list) on behalf of the admissions authority as considered appropriate to ensure that those offered places, and those on the waiting list, have reached an academic standard which will enable them to benefit from a grammar school environment”.

48. The objector is concerned that the headteacher is not objective and, therefore, the procedure of setting the AQS is not an objective one, as required by paragraph 14 of the Code.

49. However, the arrangements go on to explain the role of the Committee of Reference. They state:

“When determining the Automatic Qualifying Score (AQS) for the school, the Headteacher will consult with the Committee of Reference and will consider the over-subscription criteria, the ability of the overall cohort and the number of places available for the relevant year of entry. As many places as possible will be allocated, in line with the school’s published admission number, and only where the ability of those to be allocated places is deemed to be commensurate with cohorts previously admitted to the school.

The Headteacher, after consulting with the Committee of Reference, will also consider the scores of children just below the Automatic Qualifying Score and determine the required minimum academic standard for admission (minimum score for a place on the waiting list) for that year. All applications are considered against the oversubscription criteria; no special consideration will be given in the case of siblings”.

50. This explanation places the setting of the AQS in context. The headteacher is not setting the AQS for the school in isolation. The AQS is set following discussions with the Committee, which is an objective body. There is an established procedure, which is explained in the arrangements, that sets out the benchmark and the factors which are considered by the headteacher in discussion with the Committee members when determining how the AQS is set.

51. The wording in the arrangements about the headteacher having overriding discretion, if taken in isolation, may give the misleading impression that the headteacher sets the AQS as he or she sees fit. However, the school and the local authority have provided assurances that the AQS is set objectively. The existence of, and the role of the Committee of Reference, if considered alongside the consistency at which the level of the AQS is set supports these assurances. I have concluded, therefore, that the intention behind the wording in the arrangements about the headteacher’s discretion is to emphasise and make clear to applicants that the AQS will be set at a level which ensures that those admitted are able to benefit from the grammar school education which the school delivers. The setting of the AQS in the manner described in the arrangements is endorsed by the local. For these reasons, I do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

52. The School correctly explains that it is not possible to identify how many places will be allocated against each of the oversubscription criteria prior to National Offer Day. This is because of unknown variables each year, including “on-time test registrations, 11+ results and the home addresses of applicants”.

53. The School highlights that the level of oversubscription (over three applications for every place) means that, inevitably, applicants will be disappointed.

54. In relation to the question of whether the admission authority is in fact carrying out the process described in the arrangements, this is something I have no jurisdiction to determine.

55. Paragraph 3.1 of the Code states that:

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

Footnote 4 of the Code defines admission arrangements as follows:

“Admission arrangements mean the overall procedure, practices, criteria and supplementary information to be used in deciding on the allocation of school places and refers to any device or means used to determine whether a school place is to be offered.”

The extent of my jurisdiction is to consider the arrangements themselves, and not how they are administered or whether the admission authority is applying the arrangements as they have determined them.

56. The objector believes that without “a firm cap” on the number of seats that can go to the EA “the 2026 policy could in theory award every place to that catchment, at the cost of excluding higher-scoring Priority Circle Pupils and thus breaching the public-law principles of fairness and proportionality”.

57. The objector is right that theoretically all places could be allocated to applicants before reaching the oversubscription criterion which gives priority to PC applicants. However, as set out earlier, this is also true for pupils with EHCPs and for pupils who are LAC/PLAC, entitled to pupil premium or service premium or children of members of staff.

58. The Admission Authority has chosen to set a “firm cap” on the number of pupils who will be prioritised because of eligibility for pupil premium and service premium. However, there is no requirement to do so, it is a decision for the Admission Authority.

59. Conversely, the Admission Authority has chosen not to have a “firm cap” on the number of applicants allocated places from the EA catchment area. This again, is a decision for the Admission Authority.

60. As explained earlier, the purpose of oversubscription criteria is to prioritise some applicants over others. I have already set out the reasons why I do not consider the arrangements to be unfair or unreasonable. The decision of the admission authority not to impose a “firm cap” on the number of applicants in the EA who are given priority based on living in the catchment area is neither unfair nor unreasonable. Therefore, I do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

61. Finally, I will consider the objector's concern that:

"The arrangements may disadvantage some members of the local community because public information is not clear about how the automatic qualifying score is set or how the scores relate to the allocation of places in each oversubscription criteria."

62. The relevant requirement is set out in the Code paragraph 1.17 which states that:

"The admission authorities for all selective schools **must** publish the entry requirements for a selective place and the process for such selection in their admission arrangements."

63. As mentioned above, paragraph 14 of the Code also requires that the practices and criteria used to decide the allocation of school places are "clear". However, the meaning of the word "clear" is expanded upon in this context. It states that "Parents should be able to look at a set of arrangements and understand easily how places for that school will be allocated".

64. I have already said that I find the arrangements to be sufficiently clear as to how places are allocated, and I do not agree with the objector's assertion that the requirements for clarity in Paragraph 14 of the Code mean that every detail of every aspect of the arrangements must be set out in full. It is logical to interpret paragraph 14 to mean that arrangements must not be vague, ambiguous or confusing so that they are easily understood. The determined arrangements include a significant amount of information intended to provide clarity to parents. For example, the arrangements explain that

- applicants must sit various selection tests.
- the tests are then marked independently.
- the AQS and minimum entry score are determined at a meeting of a Committee of Reference.
- those who achieve the AQS and those who achieve the minimum entry score (as relevant) are then prioritised under the oversubscription criteria in the order described.
- the level of priority within each oversubscription criterion is determined by the AQS, with those who have higher scores being given higher priority.

65. In my opinion, the inclusion of further detail risks rendering the arrangements less clear. There is a need to strike a balance between clarity and detail related to the ease of comprehension.

66. I, therefore, do not uphold this aspect of the objection because, in my view, the level of detail provided in the arrangements provides adequate information for parents to understand how places will be allocated.

Determination

67. In accordance with section 88H (4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I do not uphold the objection to the admission arrangements determined by Lawrence Sheriff School Academy Trust for Lawrence Sheriff School, Warwickshire.

Dated: 31 October 2025

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Mr Philip Lloyd