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Kieran Holliday (KH) Head of Pupil Based Commissioning (LBS)
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4 members of the public
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
   a) Everyone was welcomed to the meeting.
   b) Apologies for absence were received from Mr P Hedger, Ms D Scrase and Ms J Smith.

   RESOLUTION: a and b were noted

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS
   The Chair reminded those present to declare any business interests, pecuniary or otherwise, as and when they occurred.

   RESOLUTION: agreed

3. MINUTES
   The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2016 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:
   a) In the list of attendees Jenny Sims (JS) to read *Jenny Sims (JS).
   b) Minute 1 (e):

      Mr Theobald was thanked for his service as Vice Chair of the Schools Forum...

      to read

      Mr Theobald, who had not wanted to stand for re-election, was thanked for his service as Vice Chair of the Schools Forum...

   c) Minute 7 a (vii):

      ...new Sherwood Park Hill School had opened...

      to read

      ...new Sherwood Park Hill Campus had opened...

   RESOLUTION: agreed

4. MATTERS ARISING
   a) The paper, Briefing Note on Matters Arising, was noted. KH updated Forum Members further:

      i) Minute 5f: the SLA had yet to be distributed, but this was in hand.
      ii) Minute 7 (a) (v): Zurich had underwritten the costs associated with the fire at Barrow Hedges Primary School, but there would be costs to the local authority because of the delays to the project. It was expected that all works would be completed by April 2017.
iii) Minute 11 (d): It was confirmed that Headteachers had been contacted through the Primary and Secondary Schools VPP about the operation of the Wandle Valley Assessment Unit.

iv) Minute 8 (d): Members welcomed the information that there would be a report to the next meeting from the Strategic Director (People) and the Executive Head of Children’s Social Care and Safeguarding on the concern expressed about social workers not turning up to meetings and a report to show what was provided by social care to education for the £272k that the DSG contributed to the social care budget.

RESOLUTION: noted

b) It was agreed that all other matters arising were covered on the agenda.

RESOLUTION: agreed

5. LA SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM IN FUTURE

a) The paper, *Future Resourcing of Schools Forum: the appointment of an Interim Head of Education/Education Advisor role to support the management of the Local Authority Education Services and Schools Forum*, which was circulated with the agenda in advance of the meeting, was taken as read.

b) KH commented that at the previous meeting the Schools Forum had expressed concern about senior officer support following the 1 November 2016 spin out and the departure of the Executive Head of Education and Early Intervention (EHEEI) on 11 November 2016. He reported that the responsibilities of the post had been split three ways and residual responsibilities that SES cannot take had been picked up by the Head of Pupil Based Commissioning (HPBC) as interim Senior Education Officer (SEO). KH reported that he would need additional resources as some of the remaining responsibilities that must remain with the Council would be difficult for him to cover. These responsibilities included: being the lead education officer for the Schools Forum; strategic management of the DSG; decisions relating to ASIP, Schools Causing Concern, governance and intervention on behalf of the local authority; and, development of a borough wide SEN commissioning strategy.

c) KH outlined how the job description/person specification for an additional senior interim support had been developed and the approval process it had been through. It was being proposed that this would be a part time post for a year (possibly 3.5 days a week for 39 weeks), which would then be reviewed. A recruitment company had selected candidates and the Chair, RA, KH and the Interim Head of SEN had sifted through these and selected four people to interview on 13 December 2016. This person would be a LA appointment reporting to KH. The estimated cost of the appointment was £100k and would be recharged to the DSG and SES Ltd as appropriate.

d) During discussion the following points were made:

i) Headteachers from all phases of education would like to be able to work with the person being appointed and it was proposed that the DSG should fund some release time to support this;

ii) An organogram was needed;
iii) Why hadn’t primary Headteachers been involved in sifting the CVs? Would there be a primary Headteacher on the interview panel?

iv) £100k had been charged to the DSG for the EHEEI post – but that was full time; the proposal was that this position was part time and so should the charge to the DSG be less?

v) The EHEEI had said at the previous meeting that savings from his salary would be used to contribute towards the Targeted Youth Service (TYS) as at that point the post was not going to be filled. What would happen to funding for the TYS?

vi) Who was on the interview panel?

vii) What happened to the charge made to the DSG when the post of Executive Head of Planning and Commissioning (EHPC) was made redundant?

e) KH explained that when looking for a team to sift through the candidates CVs a primary Headteacher had been approached but when it came to finding diary time it had not been possible to arrange a meeting where everyone could attend. The same team who had shortlisted the candidates would be interviewing them. KH was asked to consider adding a primary Headteacher to the interview panel.

f) It was noted that the recharge to the DSG could be reviewed; this amount replicated the arrangements for the previous EHEEI. It was noted that as the proposed appointment was for a consultant, the cost of this was higher than the cost of making a permanent appointment (given on cost and associated overheads). One of the advantages of this was that should the appointment not work out as intended it could be easily ended.

g) KH reported that SES Ltd would, if required, contribute up to £10k to support this post until its managing director commenced employment, which was expected to be in April 2017.

h) It was suggested that SH should review the budget for the TYS; she believed that the comment made by the outgoing EHEEI about the savings being made from his salary being used to support the TYS had been a throwaway line. She did not believe that savings would accrue as other staff were stepping up to cover his responsibilities. It was accepted that at the time he had made the comment there was no intention to appoint an interim and that the Schools Forum had made its decision about the TYS in part based on the comment.

i) KH reported that he had spoken to Laura Noulton about the TYS and that she was not expecting a contribution from the DSG in this financial year. If savings could be evidenced at the end of the financial year and there might be a call on the DSG in 2017/18.

j) Concern was expressed about money being moved around the budget without the Schools Forum being party to it. Members wanted to know what had happened to the money that used to be allocated to fund the EHPC role which had been made redundant. It was suggested that it was likely to have been moved to support the SEN budget. Members reiterated that they wanted clarity and control over the DSG; should funds be released back to the DSG they should be notified. It was suggested that in the order of £200K would have been released back to the DSG from the EHPBC and EHEEI roles and
that they should be accountable for its reallocation. SH explained that there was a balance between the amount of detail that could be provided and managing the budget in a timely and efficient way.

**RESOLUTION:** a to j were noted

k) It was agreed that:

i) There needed to be clarity about all costs relating to covering the work of the previous EHEEI and a cap on the cost to the DSG of the proposed interim appointment.  

ii) The proposal to fund release time for Headteachers in each phase to be able to work with the appointee should be costed and discussed further at the FRG.  

iii) An organogram would be provided.  

iv) There would be no cost to the DSG in 2016/17 relating to the TYS.  

v) The FRG would discuss with the new appointee the financial information that Schools Forum required.  

vi) The Schools Forum agreed to the appointment as described in the paper noting that the actual costs needed to be confirmed and that there would need to be discussion about how the post would work.

**RESOLUTION:** agreed

6. **UPDATE ON LBS EDUCATION SERVICE CHANGES**

a) The paper, *Update on Sutton Education Services Ltd*, which was circulated with the agenda in advance of the meeting, was taken as read.

b) WC reported that 25 governing bodies had now joined the company and that a focus for the company was the SEN budget as the more spent on SEN meant that there was less available to be spent elsewhere. SES Ltd had a real interest in trying to bring down SEN expenditure. He also outlined the need to establish a mechanism to capture feedback on SES Ltd as a supplier.

c) WC was asked to clarify which services had moved to SES Ltd. It was reported that KH, the Head of SEN, the Headteacher of the Virtual School and the Courts Prosecution Officer remained as LA posts although the latter 3 posts had been seconded to SES Ltd.

d) WC was asked to clarify management of the SEN team as the interim Head of SEN was leaving in December 2016 and the Head of SEN was unlikely to return to work until Easter 2017. He reported that two team leaders would be acting up during the period where there was no Head of SEN and that the arrangements would be kept under close review as they could only be short term.

e) It was suggested that at its next meeting the FRG could consider how to regulate the relationship between the Council as customer and SES Ltd as supplier - including how to report back to the council. A member expressed concern at this being delegated to the FRG as it was believed that the FRG only considered financial matters. Schools Forum members were assured that if this was referred to the FRG it would only be so that the proposal could be
formulated and that would then be referred to the Schools Forum for its decision.

**RESOLUTION:** a to e were noted

f) The Schools Forum:
   
   i) agreed to receive a report in the first half of the summer term 2017, and approximately every six months thereafter, to enable the Forum to provide feedback to the Council;  
   
   ii) agreed that the FRG should provide input on mechanisms for capturing feedback from stakeholders and bring back proposals to the Schools Forum. 

**RESOLUTION:** agreed

7. REVENUE REPORT

a) The Chair began by referring members to KH’s email, sent on 7 December 2016, which had explained the background to why there was a difference in the current predicted overspend in the SEN budget compared to that previously noted:

   “An internal briefing paper was produced which went to Formula Review Group in September which was based on month 4 figures for 2016/17. For that briefing officers were asked to estimate the likely overspend for 2017/18 but at that time information detailed SEN information wasn't available. The high needs pressure estimated at that time was predicated on the fact that the SEN budget for 2016/17 was underfunded by £1m based on expected pupil numbers. For the purposes of the briefing it was stated that this would be at least the same again in 2017/18. This wasn't based on detailed SEN data (and didn't include any allowance for increases in demand) and therefore should always have been treated with some degree of caution.

   Since this briefing, the SEN team have produced a forecast for 2017/18 based on actual EHCPs as well as predicted EHCPs which are showing a significant increase from the previous year. This has resulted in a large increase in the estimate on SEN spend and explains in part the difference between the way in which the initial figure was estimated and the figure provided in enclosure 7 of the forum papers (a £3.2m pressure in the High Needs Block).

b) The Chair requested that the Revenue Report was considered, recognising that the change in the predicted overspend had come out of the blue and was most unwelcome.

c) The Revenue Report, which had been circulated with the agenda in advance of the meeting, was taken as read. During discussion the following arose:

   i) The DSG would further reduce as Stanley Park High School had converted to academy status on 1 December 2016.
   
   ii) SH would check how much the conversion of Brookfield Primary School to academy status had reduced the DSG allocation to.
   
   iii) The budget for alternative provision (£313k) allocated £248k to Limes
College and £82k to STARS.

iv) STARS had reported that it had not yet received any funding to support SEN; CH would pick up this negotiation with STARS which had not been concluded by the EHEEI before he had left the local authority.

v) What would happen to the £700k that had been committed to the Green Wrythe Primary School project which now was not being pursued? Would this be ring fenced for Early Years? KH recommended that this not be ring fenced and that it be used to ease the DSG. This was agreed.

vi) Was there any support for SEN in the early years funding as there was a significant hidden subsidy coming from the voluntary sector supporting children with additional needs? SH noted that there was a £106k contribution to Thomas Wall nursery from the High Needs block.

vii) The description of the SEN budget pressure was based on firm numbers from last year, but the numbers were continuing to increase. The new figure was the best estimate available at this point in time and crucially included an estimate of likely growth in SEN numbers in 2017/18 which the previous estimate didn’t (as it had a different purpose). The DfE was not funding new places which was causing major problems across local authorities. There was nothing to suggest that the DfE was going to increase the budget for new places so the untenable pressures were expected to continue.

viii) Arguably £3.2m was not a wild overspend as the advent and nature of EHC Plans had impacted hugely on other local authorities too – and to some by a greater extent.

ix) The management of the SEN budget was completely dissimilar to the management of school budgets.

d) SS declared an interest as some of the funding was for the Secretary of the Sutton Teachers Committee and SS was the current Secretary. She recommended that discussion was needed with the primary Headteachers in order to move this forward and commented that a proposal had been with the EHEEI for some time and that effectively it was the local authority that had stalled discussions. SH reported that the decision was needed before Christmas as recommendations needed to be made to the Strategy and Resources Committee on 16 January 2017 in order to be submitted to the EFA by 20 January 2017. SS expressed concern about these time scales.

Following discussion it was agreed to recommend that trade union funding was delegated and that this would facilitate the unions talking directly to the primary Headteachers. The primary school representatives accepted this proposal and it was agreed.

e) CH was invited to explain the current SEN predicted overspend. He described the methodology used which had led to the current predicted overspend of £3.2m. He had included:

i) actual end-October 2016 numbers of students with Statements /EHC Plans with all plans costed at full year cost for 2017/18.

ii) an estimate of the number of EHC Plans finalised (and therefore funded) during November 2016 - March 2017 (using November 2015 – March 2016 as a proxy). These plans were costed at full year cost for 2017/18.

iii) an estimate of the number of EHC Plans finalised (and therefore
funded) during April 2017 - March 2018 (using November 2015 – October 2016 as a proxy for the equivalent month). These plans were costed at part year cost for 2017/18, based on the month they were finalised.

iv) transfer destinations for student in Y6, Y11 and above, proportionally based on actual destinations in Summer 2016.

f) He had assumed that a new plan cost £5,600 based on an average of 20 hours support; this was after the schools had funded the first £6,000. CH concluded that there were more EHC plans being agreed and that the number of hours per plan was also increasing. The change of legislation had meant that whereas in the past young people with Statements left the system at 16 they could now remain within it until they were 25 and there were also more young people returning to the system. In 2011/12/13/14 there had been around 1100 Statements with about 140 new each year and about 120 left the system. In 2015/16 there were 173 new EHC Plans and almost none left the system. In the first 6 months of 2016 131 new EHC Plans had been agreed.

g) There was concern expressed about how this position had not been anticipated and whether the new figures should be trusted; from the point of view of the Forum the predicted SEN overspend had trebled between meetings.

h) KH referred to his email where he had recognised that this was a significant cause for concern for schools but assured the Schools Forum that these figures had been scrutinised by senior officers and were believed to be realistic. He recommended that the issue was put on the next FRG agenda for a more detailed analysis and explanation and proposed that the meeting now made decisions based on the £3.2m predicted overspend. These decisions were needed in order that the information could be considered by Strategy and Resources Committee on 16 January 2017 in order to be submitted to the EFA by 20 January 2017.

i) The Schools Forum noted the following:

   i) the latest position on the DSG for 2016/17, as at month 7;
   ii) the EHC in funding position for 2016/17, as at month 7;
   iii) the latest position on Early Years;
   iv) the budget pressures for 2017/18.

RESOLUTION: a to i were noted

j) The Schools Forum agreed:

   i) to de-delegate Schools in Financial Difficulty and Behaviour Support Services (Primary); SH
   ii) to delegate staff costs – trade union supply cover; SH
   iii) to ask the FRG to review the position relating to the SEN budget. KH/BM

RESOLUTION: agreed
8. DSG SAVINGS PROPOSALS

a) The paper, *Dedicated Schools Grant Savings Options – Cover Report* which had been part of the second despatch of papers, was taken as read.

RESOLUTION: noted

b) It was reported that the decision was needed on recommendation A and B tonight to go through the approvals procedure outlined above in order to make the return to the DfE by 20 January 2017.

Concern was expressed by AT that the Children, Family and Education (CFE) Committee was not part of this process and that it was being bypassed preventing the Diocesan representatives from the opportunity to express a view. It was suggested that this was because of unfortunate timings of meetings rather than by design and whilst preferable it was not a requirement for funding matters of this nature to be considered by CFE committee. AT suggested that the local authority ought to schedule its meetings appropriately and he asked KH to raise this within the Council.

KH

c) SH drew attention to paragraph 4 and highlighted that the figures in 4 (i) were based on census data from October 2015 and so the amount would change as the calculation would ultimately be based on the most recent census data from October 2016. The impact on individual schools would vary depending on pupil numbers.

d) It was noted that in paragraph 6 the last sentence should refer to option (iii), not option (iv).

e) Attention was drawn to paragraph 19; the local authority expected that growth funding for new school provision would come from the DSG in future which would be a significant extra call on DSG funding in the future.

f) RA tabled a document that she had circulated immediately prior to the meeting to KH and the Chair. The Chair asked RA to take School Forum members through the document which summarised the options available alongside RA’s response.

Option 1

g) RA commented that she considered that option 1, cutting school budgets by 0.5%, was a last resort. RA considered that schools would already be facing a reduction in real terms of between 1% and 3% in 2017/18 and that a further 0.5% reduction was untenable at this time.

h) The representatives of the following groups agreed that the base budget should not be reduced as school budgets were already under significant pressure:
   i) maintained secondary schools;
   ii) secondary academies;
   iii) maintained primaries.
   iv) primary academies
   v) The academy primary representative asked that a mechanism was added to allow some flexibility if there was an expansion of more than

KH
vi) The Chair also expressed discomfort about cutting the base school budget.

**RESOLUTION:** c to h were noted

i) It was agreed that the Schools Forum did not support the local authority’s proposal to reduce base budgets for schools by 0.5% from 2017/18. **KH/SH**

**RESOLUTION:** agreed

Option 2 - Before discussing Option 2, CC declared an interest as Chair of Governors of Hackbridge Primary School.

j) With regard to option 2 RA commented that schools viewed this as the favoured option to take, i.e. cutting growth funding from £80k to £51k in the first year. It was considered that funding should be given that was sufficient to cover immediate costs.

k) The tapering of the growth funding over 2 years was discussed. It had been suggested that there was reduced growth funding (£51k) in year one, with half funding in years 2 and 3 and zero in year 4. However, RA’s paper proposed that either in year 2 funding was £27k and £0 in year 3 – or there was no growth funding for years 2 and 3.

l) Clarification was sought about what would happen if all the new school places were not taken up; KH noted at this point that schools cannot expect to be full, the Audit Commission recommend a surplus of 5% of places and although Sutton’s place planning is tighter than this it was unrealistic to assume that schools would be full. SH reported that if there was a shortfall of more than 5 students there was already a mechanism to give £1k per place for maintained schools – academies were fully funded for their places.

m) Concern was expressed about the impact of reducing the place funding on schools expecting it, like Bandon Hill with 4FE. However the counter argument was that growth funding had been overly generous and could not now be justified. If over generous funding was not cut then all schools budgets would be cut; the Schools Forum needed to make decisions that were fair to all schools.

n) It was noted that Schools on a split site receive an additional £50k a year.

**RESOLUTION:** j to n were noted

o) The Schools Forum agreed to reduce growth funding from £80k to £51k for the first year of expansion and to zero for subsequent years unless there were more than 15 vacancies in a year group. If there was, there would be funding of £27k in the second year and then zero in the third year. It was agreed that this would not affect bulge classes; it would affect permanent expansions. **KH/SH**

**RESOLUTION:** agreed
Option 3

p) It was agreed that funding for Speech and Language, ASD and EAL services would be reduced collectively from £798k a year to zero over 3 years starting from September 2017 to allow lead in time for restructure/redundancy based on £200k in the first year, £300k in the second year and the remainder in the third year. This would be reviewed after the first year with a break clause built in.

q) WC was asked to ensure that SES Ltd was clear about what was provided by the services and what was being charged for; this would be co-designed with partner schools.

r) The Schools Causing Concern budget was discussed. It was agreed that this budget should vary from year to year depending on risk assessments. It was agreed that in 2017/18 this should be reduced to £100k.

s) The Education Other Than at School (EOTAS) budget was discussed. It was agreed that this budget should vary from year to year depending on risk assessments. It was agreed that in 2017/18 this should be reduced to £150k.

RESOLUTION: p to s were agreed

t) Option 4

It was agreed to defer discussion on this until the next item on the agenda.

RESOLUTION: agreed

Option 5 Before discussing Option 5, GI, RA, EB and JP declared interests due to their connections to the PRUs.

u) RA commented that PRUs should be funded on a formulaic approach taking into account needs; there was concern that reducing funding to the PRUs could ultimately be a false economy.

v) During discussion it was suggested that there was a need to look in detail at funding for the different groups, the different top up levels and recognise that the costs for KS3 were different to that for KS4. It was generally agreed that alternative provision needed to make savings and that a funding formula should be developed.

RESOLUTION: u and v were noted

w) The Schools Forum agreed to:

i) reduce the top up payments to both Limes College and STARS by £2k for 2017/18 onwards assuming that the SEN payment that STARS was awaiting referred to in Minute 7 (c) (iv) above was made;

ii) recoup funds for permanently excluded pupils to the DSG rather than the PRU;

iii) develop a PRU funding formula.

RESOLUTION: agreed
9. **SEN FUNDING AND TOP UP RATES**

a) The papers, *Consultation on changes to SEN Funding and Top Up Rates* and *DSG Top-Up Special Needs Consultation Report – December 2016* which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, were taken as read.

b) MP declared an interest as Chair of Governors of Sherwood Park/Hill Special School.

c) MP referred to the response from Sherwood Park/Hill Special School which was included in the papers and commented that the classification of students was not adequate for the complexity of needs. To illustrate how the needs of children had changed over time she said that about 10 years ago there were 10 children in wheelchairs and in 2016 15 out of 78 pupils were in wheelchairs. Not only was there a growth in the number of children and young people with EHC Plans; there was a growth in the complexity of the plans. MP supported the addition of a fourth banding for the school and recognised that the SEN Panel provided a failsafe in terms of the funding to meet an individual students’ needs.

**RESOLUTION:** a to c were noted

d) The Schools Forum agreed to:

i) Implement the top up rates as set out in the consultation document with the addition of a fourth band at Sherwood Park/ Sherwood Hill from September 2017;  

ii) have a ratio of 1:6 at specialist bases for students with hearing impairments in line with BATOD recommendations for a year which would then be reviewed.

**RESOLUTION:** agreed

e) KH expressed concern that the decisions made in Minutes 8 and 9 might not be sufficient to make the savings required. He explained that the decision about changes to the basic formula lay with the local authority - although the Schools Forum made recommendations about what it considered the formula should be. KH was concerned about the harshness of the decisions relating to growth funding in the context of base budgets that would be ‘lesser’ and more evenly spread across a greater number of schools. KH reported that the recommendation that he would make to the Strategy and Resources Committee was that the 0.5% cut to the schools’ base budget should remain; this was on the grounds that the saving was likely required to balance the DSG even with the cuts already identified, given difficulties on balancing DSG, we should avoid accruing a deficit that will be very difficult to recover and given that additional pressures in SEN and Growth will continue into the future.

**RESOLUTION:** noted
10. EARLY HELP AND CHILDREN’S CENTRES/FREE ENTITLEMENT FUNDING LEVELS FOR 2/3/4 YEAR OLDS

a) The paper, *Progress update from the Early Years Task and Finish Group*, which was circulated with the agenda in advance of the meeting, was taken as read.

b) AM explained that the project was not as well developed as had been hoped in part because of capacity issues and partly because the DfE had been slow to respond with details needed. A project team was now in place and the intention was that a draft consultation would be considered by the Task and Finish Group during the week commencing 12 December and sent out to all providers for Christmas. It was hoped that the responses could be analysed and brought back to the Schools Forum’s next meeting.

**RESOLUTION:** a and b were noted

c) MM and JA agreed to remain on the Task and Finish Group and it was agreed that this should be expanded to include childminders. Concern was expressed about the timetable and the fact that neither MM nor JA were aware of the proposed meeting of the Group on 16 January 2017.

d) It was agreed that work should progress as outlined by AM with the draft recommendations considered by the FRG on 25 January 2017 and then considered at the Schools Forum meeting on 9 February 2017.

**RESOLUTION:** c and d were agreed

11. CAPITAL REPORT

a) The paper, *Capital Funding Arrangements for Schools*, which was circulated with the agenda in advance of the meeting, was taken as read.

b) Members were referred back to the, *Briefing Note on Matters Arising*, for a response to the question asked about Greenshaw’s funding at the previous meeting (Minute 7 (a) (iv).

> Phase 2 secondary expansion. Greenshaw does not have an overspend of £1.6m. The total project funding provided by the LA is £6.16m. This is £1.16m over the original budget approved by CFE (however since March 2015 CFE approved +15% to the secondary expansion programme to reflect truer costs of delivery). This funding was met within this programme and were included in the figures reported to Forum in October.

**RESOLUTION:** a and b were noted

c) The Capital Maintenance Programme for 2017-18 was approved.

**RESOLUTION:** agreed
12. CONFIDENTIALITY

It was agreed that none of the Minutes should be deemed as confidential.

RESOLUTION: agreed

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There were no items raised as any other business.

RESOLUTION: agreed

14. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

a) School Forum: Thursday 9 February 2017 at 6.30 pm at Cheam High School

b) Formula Review Group:
   (i) Wednesday 25th January at 6:00pm at Cheam High School
   (ii) Tuesday 28th March at 4.30 pm at Cheam High School

All

c) It was noted that the next meetings of the Children, Family and Education Committee were on 15th December 2016 and 23 March 2017.

RESOLUTION: a to c were noted

KH

d) KH was asked to bring dates for the May 2017 and July 2017 meeting to the next meeting of the Schools Forum.

RESOLUTION: agreed

The meeting ended at 10.30 pm