

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM HELD ON WEDNESDAY 19 OCTOBER 2016 AT CITY HALL, BRADFORD

Commenced **0805**, Adjourned **1000**  
Reconvened **1020**, Concluded **1055**

### PRESENT

#### SCHOOL MEMBERS

Brent Fitzpatrick, Dianne Rowbotham, Dominic Wall, Dwayne Saxton, Ian Morrel Kevin Holland, Maureen Cairns, Nicky Kilvington, Nigel Cooper, Ray Tate, Sami Harzallah, Sue Haithwaite, Trevor Loft.

#### NON SCHOOLS MEMBERS & NOMINATED SUB SCHOOL MEMBERS

Ian Murch, Irene Docherty and Alison Kaye

#### LOCAL AUTHORITY (LA) OFFICERS

Allan Stobbs	- Payroll Service Manager
Andrew Redding	- Business Advisor (Schools)
Angela Spencer-Brooke	- Strategic Manager, SEND and Behaviour
Dawn Haigh	- Principal Finance Officer (Schools)
Jenny Cryer	- Assistant Director Performance, Commissioning and Partnerships
Raj Singh	- Financial Service, Business Advisor
Sarah North	- Principal Finance Officer (Schools)
Tom Caselton	- Finance Manager

#### OBSERVER

Councillor Ward

#### APOLOGIES

Members - Bev George, Chris Quinn, Emma Ockerby, Helen Williams and Tahir Jamil;  
Executive Portfolio Holder - Councillor Imran Khan (Education, Employment and Skills).  
Officers - Judith Kirk (Deputy Director, Education, Employment and Skills), Michael Jameson (Strategic Director, Children's Services) and Stuart Mckinnon-Evans (Director of Finance).  
Regular Observer - Lynn Murphy (Business Manager, Feversham College)

### DOMINIC WALL IN THE CHAIR

#### **194. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

A declaration was received from the Chair and Sue Haithwaite for agenda item 12 "High Needs Block – Funding Matters 2017/18", (minute 204).

During course of the meeting, a declaration was received by Ian Murch for agenda item 13 "DSG Central Items and De-Delegated Funds 2017/18", (minute 205).

#### ***ACTION: City Solicitor***

#### **194. MINUTES OF 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 AND MATTERS ARISING (Minutes)**

- a) The Business Advisor (Schools) reported on progress made on "Action"



items as follows:

- **Page 3 – Election of the Chair** – 2 nominations were received for Dominic Wall to continue as Chair. No other nominations were submitted. Therefore, Dominic is confirmed as Chair for the 2016/17 academic year.
- **Page 6 – Early Protection of the DSG 2017/18 and Cost Pressures** – there were 2 action points. The request for further information about cumulative impact of funding reductions is included in Document GO (item 10 of the agenda) presented to this meeting. Regarding the request for further information on the number of assessments / referrals for EHCPs by phase, an analysis was tabled:

Average age when EHCP/Statement issued by need as at Oct 16

Primary Need	Number	Average age when EHCP/Statement issued
Autism	690	6 yrs.
Hearing	99	5 yrs.
Moderate Learning	100	8 yrs.
Multi-Sensory Impairment	7	6 yrs.
Not yet identified	4	9 yrs.
Physical & medical	288	5 yrs.
Profound & Multiple Learning	145	4 yrs.
Social Emotional & Mental Health	482	10 yrs.
Speech, Language & Communication	196	6 yrs.
Severe Learning	548	6 yrs.
Specific Learning	8	9 yrs.
Visual Impairment	70	7 yrs.
<b>Average</b>	<b>2637</b>	<b>6 yrs.</b>

The Chair explained that this information had been presented earlier in the week to the District Achievement Partnership. The Strategic Manager, SEND and Behaviour, confirmed that this data showed the average of all statements calculated at October 2016 and included statements for secondary aged pupils.

- **Page 8 – Early Years Block Funding Matters** – It was reported that our response to the DfE’s consultation had been submitted. This response had also been shared with the Children’s Services Scrutiny Committee. No further announcements have been made by Government on the subject of Early Years Funding reform.
- **Page 12 – Consultation on the Primary & Secondary School Formulae**



**2017/18** – It was reported that our consultation document was published immediately after the Schools Forum meeting and that feedback is presented back at this meeting under agenda item 10.

b) Other matters arising

- **1 October academy conversions:** The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that 4 maintained schools converted to academy status on 1 October (1 secondary and 3 primary). None of these schools are expected to close with a deficit budget. This means that 9 schools have converted so far this academic year.
- **Oastler Letter Panel Update:** The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that the Panel met with representatives of Oastler School on 4 October and that this was a challenging and productive meeting. The Panel has asked for further information, from the school and from Local Authority, on the school's future business plans and pupil referrals processes. It is anticipated that a recommendation on this matter will be presented to the Forum at the December meeting. The Chair stated that he has received feedback about the rigorous nature of the scrutiny from the Panel and also the productive way in which dialogue is continuing. The Chair expressed his appreciation for the work of the Panel.
- **Admissions at the October 2016 Census:** The Business Advisor (Schools) reminded Members that, in previous years, we have reported to the Forum the number of children that were 'in the admissions system' but had not been allocated a place in a primary or secondary school before the October Census was taken. On a simple basis, we do not receive DSG funding in the following financial year for the children that are not placed by this time. It was explained that this affects the individual delegated budgets of schools and academies, where children are placed following the Census. It was reported that, at the October 2016 Census, 141 out of 1,594 (8.8%) applications received had not been placed. This represents roughly a £675,000 cost in DSG. In context, the figure for October 2015 was 143 out of 1,499 (10%). Most of the 141 not on roll at October 2016 were in the secondary phase and largely due to the time needed for background pupil data checking and processing. It was clarified that these figures just related to admissions into mainstream primary and secondary schools and did not include admissions to special schools. A Member asked for further information on whether the unplaced admissions in the secondary phase related to admissions into year 7 or other year groups. The Business Advisor stated that this information would be provided (subsequently provided – the majority were for year groups other than year 7).

A Non-Schools Member referred to the recent announcement on the opening of 3 new free school provisions in Bradford, 2 of which being post 16 provisions. He expressed concern about the impact that these post 16 provisions will have on the financial viability of existing 6<sup>th</sup> forms in schools. A request was made for



further information on how the Local Authority is managing, and modelling the implications of, the development of new Post 16 free school provision in the Bradford District.

- **Schools Unbilled Payroll:** The Authority's Payroll Service Manager attended in response to the request made by a Schools Member at the last meeting for further information on the position of unbilled school payroll charges. He explained that late in 2015 reconciliation issues relating to payroll charges were identified, where costs back to 2012 had not been charged to 76 schools. He expressed his apologies on behalf of the payroll service for this issue. He explained that these charges are deemed to be payable and that the Council has contacted all affected schools. He reported that some of the amounts have been paid (3 schools have paid in full) and some schools have disputed the charges (4 schools). Conversations were continuing with these schools. He stressed that flexible options were being offered for re-payment, including re-payment plans. The Council is not expecting schools to repay all sums immediately.

The Chair thanked the Payroll Services Manager for the clarity and frankness of his presentation and the information provided. Members asked the following questions:

- What are the sizes of sums outstanding? It was reported that the smallest was in the hundreds and the largest over £100,000.
- Did the 4 schools that are challenging the sums demonstrate an awareness of the problem when they were contacted? It was reported that these schools did not demonstrate awareness.
- How far back do these outstanding charges go? It was clarified that these go back to 2012.
- Doesn't financial close at year end mean that charges can't be recovered for previous years? The Business Advisor (Schools) explained that the financial year end close does not provide such finality and that often transactions span different financial years.
- If a school has not received an invoice or contact yet, does this mean that they are not affected? It was confirmed that this is correct.
- Has this issue caused any school to go into financial deficit? The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that he has not had any approach from schools, which would suggest this.
- Can School Funding Team support schools in managing this issue? The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that we can support schools and this includes discussing re-payment plans, budget implications and cash flow.
- What is the position of the schools that the Council has not yet heard from? The Payroll Services Manager explained that schools have been given some time to check and to respond but that the Council will be in further contact if nothing is heard.
- What is the total amount outstanding? The Payroll Services Manager explained that this figure is not yet available.



- Has disciplinary action been taken? The Chair responded to advise that this was not a matter for the Schools Forum. The Payroll Services Manager did confirm that systems have been significantly tightened.
- How many schools will have converted to academy before this issue is resolved? A request was made for this information to be provided for the Forum at the next meeting.

**Resolved –**

**(1) That progress made on “Action” and “Matters Arising” be noted.**

**(2) That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2016 be signed as a correct record.**

***ACTION: City Solicitor***

**195. MATTERS RAISED BY SCHOOLS**

**No resolution was passed on this item (please see AOB).**

**196. STANDING ITEM - DSG GROWTH FUND ALLOCATIONS (a)**

The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that there are no growth fund allocations to be considered at this meeting.

**No resolution was passed on this item.**

**197. STANDING ITEM - BRADFORD EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT COMMISSIONING BOARD (BEICB) (i)**

The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that the minutes of the Bradford Education Improvement Commissioning Board meeting, held on 22 September, will be approved by the BEICB on 24 November and will be presented for information and consideration at the December meeting.

**No resolution was passed on this item.**

**198. EDUCATION PERFORMANCE 2016 (i)**

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented Document GM, which provides a simple overview of the summer 2016 attainment results for the Bradford District. He explained that the intention behind providing this information, as in previous years, is to ensure that Members have an awareness of what the data says about our areas of improvement and underperformance, so that this can be thought about in taking financial decisions. A good example of this is in our thinking about the impact of the reduction in Early Years Block funding from April 2017 and whether we use a proportion of one off monies to help ameliorate against this next year, recognising how our additional spend over time has delivery improvement in the



Early Years Foundation Stage Profile results. Another aspect is the primary to secondary funding ratio. In particular, for 2017/18, where the Forum is currently considering a reduction in the funding rates across the Schools Block in order to manage the DSG's affordability position, the Forum needs to be mindful of the impact that reductions may have in areas where the most improvement is required. It was explained that this summary document is based on a more detailed results analysis that was presented to the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee on 12 October.

In response, a Schools Member stressed that the improvement position is a much more complicated picture than presented in the simple document, for example, in looking about like for like comparisons of achievement of pupils with SEND where the distribution of these pupils (between mainstream and specialist provisions) is different in Bradford than in other authorities. Another Member also stressed that the data presented must be accurate and that the very recent Key Stage 4 performance information has confirmed figures that are different from what is presented in Document GM.

**Resolved –**

**That the information in Document GM be noted.**

#### **199. THE LOCAL AUTHORITY'S FINANCIAL POSITION AND BUDGET PROPOSALS (i)**

The Authority's Head of Budgeting, Management Accounting and Projects attended the meeting to give Forum Members an update verbally on the position of the Council's wider budget planning. It was explained that this is provided in advance of the Council's 2017-2019 budget proposals being presented in more detail on 7 December. He reported:

- The Council's forecast budget position is set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy that was published in July 2016. The Strategy sets out detailed assumptions underpinning the forecast but as with any assumptions there will be some deviation in reality. However, overlaying this there are some major issues on the horizon which will affect the Council's position:
  - Business Rate Retention – three strands:
    - Fair funding review
    - Business Rates Baseline re-setting
    - 100% transfer of business rates
  - Brexit
  - New Homes Bonus Consultation
  - Devolution
  - National Schools Funding Formula consultation
- As a reminder, since the austerity measures commenced, the Council has had to make reduction of over £218m up to 2016/17. The 2016/17 budgetary gap is over £48m when you include reductions to Public Health grant. The budget gap to be closed is £11.6m in 2017/18 in addition to the £24m of savings agreed by Full Council in February 2016. The gap for 2018/19 is currently



forecast to be a further £20.5m. We may need to find additional savings to pay for any transitional costs so the targets could increase.

- We are adopting this year an Outcome Based Budgeting Approach by arranging the Council's Budget into the recognised priority Outcomes. i.e. the key things that are important to the Council and Districts. With this exercise we are trying to design what the Council will look like in 2020/21.
- Key risks in managing this approach are:
  - Managing demand in Adult Social Care
  - Managing the rising number of Looked After Children
  - Discussions with West Yorkshire Partners on sub regional initiatives
  - Home to School Transport
  - Inflationary pressures and whether these can be contained within Council Tax rises
  - Business Rate Tax base – still experiencing appeals
  - Responses of Partners to the measures the Council might take that lead to additional budgetary pressures on the Council
  - Ultimately there are risks associated with delivery and the change effort required.
- The Council has applied for a four year settlement from Government. If this application is successful it will provide some certainty on the rate of descent of our Revenue Support Grant allowing the Council to make some plans around those planned reductions.
- The Council will be publishing the detailed budget proposals on the 28 November for consultation ahead of the Executive meeting on 6 December.
- There will be an Autumn Statement from Government on 23 November but we are under no illusion that austerity measures are and will continue to impact on local government.

In response, Members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- What exercise is KPMG doing with the Council? The Assistant Director, Performance, Commissioning and Partners responded to explain that KPMG is looking at the Council's early help offer and the options for delivery.
- Does the Council do any 'doomsday' budget planning? Yes it does.
- In recent SEN Reference Group meetings Forum Members has talked about other funding streams that might be available to Bradford, including from the Northern Powerhouse strategy. The Head of Budgeting stated that these streams are on the Council's radar, but offered a view that discussions around the Northern Powerhouse (and announcements related to this) appear to be stalled perhaps due to Brexit considerations.

The Chair thanked the Head of Budgeting, Management Accounting and Projects for his presentation.

**Resolved –**

**That the information presented verbally (and recorded in the minutes) be noted.**



**200. NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CONSULTATION (i)**

The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that there have been no further announcements from Government about proposals for a National Funding Formula. It is perhaps now reasonable to assume that further information will be announced in and around the Chancellor's Autumn Statement, which is scheduled for 23 November. If this is the case, we would expect to present further information to the Schools Forum at its meeting on 7 December.

The Chair asked Members whether they would support the arrangement of an additional single item agenda Schools Forum meeting in November if a substantial announcement on National Funding Formula (the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage of consultation) is made well in advance of the 7 December meeting. This was agreed by Members. The Business Advisor (Schools) stated that the Formula Funding Working Group would also be convened to look at detailed modelling.

**Resolved –**

**Where the Government's 2<sup>nd</sup> stage of consultation on the National Funding Formula is announced other than in close proximity to the next scheduled meeting on 7 December, that an additional single item agenda Schools Forum meeting be called.**

**Action: Business Advisor (Schools)**

**201. CONSULTATION OUTCOMES - PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FORMULAE (a)**

The Principal Finance Officer (Schools) presented Document GO. It was explained that Forum Members are asked to consider the outcomes of the consultation, which was agreed at the last meeting, and then to make final recommendations on the structure of the Primary and Secondary funding formulae, and the criteria for the allocation of Schools Block funds, for the 2017/18 financial year. It was also explained that the report provides an update on further modelling related to the values of formula factors and the contribution from the Schools Block to High Needs Block pressures in 2017/18 (the 'worst case scenario' modelling requested at the last meeting).

The Principal Officer took members through the report and the feedback that has been received. The level of engagement that we have had with schools was emphasised, on the issues outlined in the consultation paper, including the illustrative 1.5% reduction in pupil-led formula values and the 'worst case scenario' Minimum Funding Guarantee modelling. The Chair stated that it is helpful for Forum Members to hear about the significant level of communication that has been had with schools as the complexity of some of these issues is testing. The Chair also clarified that the Forum, at this meeting, is not being asked for a decision on a 1.5% reduction. Decisions relate purely to the structure, not the values, of the primary and secondary funding formulae for 2017/18.





The Chair asked officers to clarify for the Forum what the rationale is for showing worst case scenario modelling. It was explained that showing schools at this stage what the greatest extent of a reduction in their main formula funding would be in 2017/18 aids their early budget planning. The Principal Officer stated that the Council has had positive engagement with schools on the information (and the ready reckoner) that has been provided. The Schools Forum at the last meeting asked to see the worst case cumulative position for schools and the modelling attached to Document GO responds to this. It was clarified that this modelling was still based on an estimate of October 2016 pupil numbers and does not include a view of Post 16 funding. The modelling does include the impact of reductions in early years funding based on the DfE's consultation proposals. It was explained that the Forum is being asked to consider a further contribution from the Schools Block to High Needs Block pressures in 2017/18, illustratively from a 1.5% reduction in pupil-led formula values, but that there was also a line of inquiry about whether a greater sum could be transferred from the Schools to the High Needs Block e.g. by reducing funding to the point that all primary and secondary schools and academies are on their MFG level. This was identify a further approximate sum of £2m. The Business Advisor (Schools) reminded Members that Document GG presented to the Forum on 21 September estimated that there is still a £1.2m funding gap in the 2017/18 DSG after the application of a 1.5% reduction in the Schools Block. The Business Advisor (Schools) added that, where the national funding formula is not favourable to Bradford, something akin to a 1.5% reduction year on year in funding could be the reality for Bradford schools over the next 5 years (depending on the timescale and level of protection decided by Government in its transition to the NFF). Alongside a very rough average of an annual 2.5% increase in costs, this could mean schools in Bradford facing something in the region of an average minimum 4% annual budgetary pressure. We are seeking to make sure that schools are aware of this as early as possible in their budget planning.

In response, Members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- At the last meeting a question was asked about whether funding changes would place schools cumulatively into deficit. Can this information be provided? The Business Advisor (Schools) explained that this request has not been forgotten but that it is difficult to give a useful view for a number of reasons, including because looking at current surplus balances positions and a value of possible funding reduction does not give insight into the action that the school can and will take to balance its budget. A better picture will emerge from our discussions with individual schools on their budgets. The Authority also does not have sight of academy balances.
- A 1.5% reduction does not represent a significant cash loss for some school but for others the value is much more significant. This needs to be watched.
- The information around the 1.5% and the Schools Block consultation has been presented to BPIP. One of the areas of feedback is how complicated these considerations are. The Chair stated that the Forum must tread



carefully and must recognise that there is likely to be some difference in the level of understanding that the Schools Forum Members have about these issues and the understanding of the wider schools community. Decisions about a Schools Block contribution in 2017/18 may be one of the most difficult decisions the Forum has yet taken.

- Members asked for clarification of who sits on the Formula Funding Working Group. This was provided. It was also clarified that the role of the FFWG will be to do the more detailed analysis of formula funding impact but that this isn't a decision-making group.
- That, until the Government publishes its 2<sup>nd</sup> stage of national funding formula proposals we can only speculate on the longer term impact for Bradford and we have no sight of the future position of our High Needs Block. We will need to develop our High Needs Block strategy in the context of the Government's reform.
- The Authority is requested to provide further information on the strategic case for the movement of Schools Block monies to the High Needs Block and to set out how the cost effectiveness of the allocation of the current High Needs Block is being secured.

#### **Resolved –**

- (1) That the additional modelling presented in Document GO be noted.**
- (2) That the structure of the formulae for the calculation of individual primary and secondary school and academy budget shares for the 2017/18 financial year, as set out in Document GO Appendix 1, be agreed. Agreed by consensus (without requiring a vote).**
- (3) That the criteria for the allocation of the DSG's Schools Block Growth Fund, and other Schools Block centrally managed funds, as proposed in the consultation document, be agreed.**

**Action:** *Business Advisor (Schools)*

#### **202. CONSULTATION ON EARLY YEARS BLOCK FUNDING MATTERS 2017/18 (a)**

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented Document GP, which provides a further update on Early Years DSG funding matters asks the Forum to agree to the publication of the consultation document setting out our proposals for Bradford. Early Years Single Funding Formula for the 2017/18 financial year. A summary of the report, the principles behind our proposals, the consultation document and the feedback from the Early Years Working Group was provided. Our estimates of the trajectory of rates to April 2019 under the Government's national funding reform were explained.

Forum Members agreed to the publication of the consultation without making any comments or asking any questions.



**Resolved –**

**That the consultation paper set out in Document GP Appendix 1 be published.**

**Action: Business Advisor (Schools)**

**203. CONSULTATION ON HIGH NEEDS BLOCK FUNDING MATTERS 2017/18 (a)**

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, Document GQ, which asked Members to agree the publication of the proposed consultation document on the High Needs Block funding model for 2017/18. This included first sight of the estimated minimum number of places the Authority expects to commission and the arrangements for paying top up (Plus Element) funding.

The key proposals were outlined, including the proposed lifting of the cash budget protection factor from 1.5% to 3.0% and the introduction of a temporary small setting factor for resourced provisions. A Member asked for clarification on whether the small setting factor applied to all resourced provisions. It was confirmed that this did on a sliding scale. So, for example, a setting with 12 places would receive half the £48,000 deminimis figure.

The Chair added that the review of SEND teaching support services needs to be brought into the Forum's considerations and that the Forum has not received a recent update on the position of this review. He requested that an update be provided to the next meeting.

**Resolved –**

**(1) That the consultation paper set out in Document GQ Appendix 1 be published.**

**(2) That the planned report to the Schools Forum to be presented on 7 December includes further information on the work taking place to ensure the efficient allocation of the High Needs Block and provides an update on the review of High Needs Block funded services and the development of sector-led delivery.**

**Action: Business Advisor (Schools)  
SEN and Behaviour Strategic Manager**

**204. DSG CENTRAL ITEMS AND DE-DELEGATED FUNDS 2017/18 (i)**

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, **Document GR**, which asked the Forum to consider the position of the funding of Schools and Early Years Block central items and de-delegated items from the DSG in 2017/18. Members were reminded that decisions on the retention of funds, including de-delegated funds, will need to be taken by the Forum on 11 January. Members were asked to consider what additional information would help in these decisions.



In presenting the report, the Business Advisor (Schools) focused on the implications of academy conversions, in particular in the secondary sector, on the position of some of the de-delegated funds, especially the maternity and paternity insurance scheme. He also set out the Authority's expectations with regard to central funds in 2017/18.

In response Forum members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- The Vice Chair stated that she will collect further feedback from BPIP on the views of primary headteachers on de-delegation.
- A Member asked for further information on the position of funds with respect to the Authority's delivery position in the future. The Chair added that it would be useful for Members to understand where there are / aren't commercial alternatives for schools for the purchasing of services.
- A Member representing the Teaching Trade Unions (having declared an interest), in line with the Authority's expectation, stated that the Unions would wish for the current collective arrangement for the delivery of Trade Union facilities Time to continue for 2017/18. The Chair stated that there appears to be consensus from Forum members for this to continue in 2017/18.

**Resolved –**

- (1) **That the planned report to the Schools Forum to be presented on 7 December includes further information on the future availability of buy back into de-delegated funds, to inform the Forum's decisions making for 2017/18.**
- (2) **That feedback on de-delegated funds is collected from the Bradford Primary Improvement Partnership, to inform the Forum's decision making for 2017/18.**

**Action:** *Business Advisor (Schools)*

**205. SCHOOLS FORUM STANDING ITEMS (i)**

No further updates were presented on the Forum's standing items.

**No resolution was passed on this item.**

**206. ANY OTHER BUSINESS / FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**Resolved –**

- (1) **That further information on the charging of payroll costs, as requested as recorded in the minutes, is provided.**
- (2) **That further information is provided in response to a Member's**



**request for consideration of how the Local Authority is managing, and modelling the implications of, the development of new Post 16 free school provision in the Bradford District.**

**207. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**The next meeting of the Schools Forum is Wednesday 7 December 2016.**

*Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Schools Forum.*

*committeeseecretariat\minutes\SF\19Oct*

**THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER**

**208. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (a)**

The Schools Forum was asked to consider if the item relating to “Not For Publication Minutes of 18 May 2016 (Contract Settlement, Agenda Item \*18)” should be considered in the absence of the public with the approval of the following recommendation:

**Resolved –**

**That the public be excluded from the meeting during the discussion of the following item (item \*18) on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if they were present exempt information within Paragraph 3 (Financial or Business Affairs) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) would be disclosed and it is considered that, in all the circumstances, the public interest in allowing the public to remain is outweighed by the public interest in excluding public access to the relevant part of the proceedings for the following reason: “commercial confidentiality”.**

**209. NOT FOR PUBLICATION MINUTES OF 18 MAY 2016 "CONTRACT SETTLEMENT" (NFP minutes)**

**Resolved –**

**That the NOT FOR PUBLICATION minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2016 be signed as a correct record.**



**Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Schools Forum.**

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER

