

Minutes of the Meeting of the Solihull Schools Forum held 11th July 2011

<p>Members Present Derek Smart (Chair) Louise Minter Jane Hutchinson Jenny Godsall Roberta Narroway Alexis Elliott Diane Newton Mike Goodwin Lynda Mackay Janet Marsh Bill Sedgwick Charlotte Shadbolt Steve Howells Tony Morrison Vivienne Stone-Fewings Amanda Mordey Doug Gibson Cllr Nick Stephens Cllr Norman Davies David Lewis Ian Backhouse Gina Godwin Observers: Julie Cobley Andrew Wilkins Others Present: Cllr Joe Tildesley Chris Palmer Steve Fenton Deb Wilson</p>	<p>Arden Streetsbrook I & N Monkspath J & I Knowle CE Primary Valley Infants Blossomfield Infant & Nursery School Yew Tree I & J Langley Primary School Knowle CE Primary Sharmans Cross Junior Alderbrook School Heart of England Alderbrook School Park Hall Tudor Grange Academy Forest Oak/Merstone Reynalds Cross SMBC SMBC ATL NAHT Whitesmore Neighbourhood Nursery Yorkswood School Hazel Oak School Cabinet Member for Education & Children's Services Service Director, Learning & Achievement Business & Performance Manager Yorkswood School</p>
---	---

Minutes taken by Sarah Arthur, Senior Forum Administrator

Item	Discussion	Action
1	<p>Apologies for absence Apologies were received from Karen O'Keefe (Oak Cottage School), Paul Williams (Archdiocese of Birmingham Diocesan Schools Commission), Professor Derek Sheldon (Lyndon School) Lesley Heale, Director for People, Stewart Crowe, Forum Co-ordinator, Mark Pratt (Sharmans Cross), Antoinette Fisher (Dorridge J & I), Cllr Alan Rebeiro, Paul Ashdown, Solihull Sixth Form, Tracey Henshaw (Lighthall Under 5's) and Jane Davenport (Reynalds Cross) – substituted by Amanda Mordey.</p> <p>DS welcomed Cllr Tildesley in his newly elected role as Cabinet Member for Education & Children's Services and warmly thanked Cllr Davies for his contribution to Forum in this role and welcomed his continuing input as one of the three elected Councillor members on Forum.</p> <p>As this is the last Forum meeting of the academic year, DS sincerely thanked outgoing members, Lorna Bosley, Doug Gibson, Alexis Elliott and Ann Jones for their membership and contribution to the work of Forum and its groups and to Alexis for her joint Chairmanship of the School Improvement Work Group. Re-elected members from September; Diane Newton and Tony Morrison were welcomed, as were Mark Pratt, Head Teacher at Sharmans Cross and Cllr Alan Rebeiro who were both appointed to Forum in May. As they were unable to attend tonight they will be formally welcomed in October. Roy Baylis from Grace Academy will also be welcomed to Forum in October as a new Academy representative. Lastly DS welcomed Julie Cobley from Yorkswood and Andrew Wilkins from Hazel Oak whose terms of office start from September but are attending tonight as observers.</p>	DS
2	<p>Minutes of previous meeting (28th March 2011) – Agreed as an accurate record</p>	

<p>3</p>	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>Post 16 analysis – information from CP has been circulated to Forum and considered by the School Improvement WG. However as this is very complex data and difficult to use as a basis for comparison and conclusions in a complex inter-authority setting it has been agreed not to pursue this in further detail.</p> <p>Reduction in Standard Fund grants – At the March Forum meeting SF had tabled a letter from the DfE received just before the end of the financial year, outlining a reduction in standard fund grants. DS had responded to the DfE on behalf of Forum and received a reply which did not reverse this decision. The DfE have now issued a second letter to local authorities in which they reaffirmed that in their opinion this was not an issue and as a technical solution were going to provide LAs with a form of words to satisfy the audit authorities and allow LAs to roll this shortfall forward for each year it was felt necessary. It remains in essence therefore a cut in funding and for Solihull LA the budget strategy is to minimise any overspend at year end to reduce the possibility of an overspend being taken forward into the next financial year. SF confirmed that due to a number of factors at year end, it has been possible to generate sufficient one off windfalls to fully fund this potential future shortfall of £600,000 which would have been liable for payment at some point. Whilst it is disappointing that this funding cannot be allocated in other ways members thanked SF for addressing this funding requirement and removing a future shortfall.</p> <p>Local Safeguarding Children’s Board – Cllr Davies confirmed that he has spoken to Mark Rogers to express concern that Forum is not represented on the Safeguarding Board and will be following that up. As a statutory body with membership from key external stakeholders, the meetings are required to take place and bear the associated costs, although ND emphasised the benefits from co-operation across safeguarding boards to pre-empt and avoid safeguarding issues arising in Solihull.</p> <p>Sports Development Programme – IB asked if there was any update on the programme running from Smiths Wood Campus as he is aware that this programme has been retained at Lode Heath school. D Wilson confirmed that through development of partnership with Smiths Wood, a funding stream for 3 days per week for this post has been arranged and an application was also made through the Social Economic work stream as a community initiative to support this partnership work. As a result we have been successful in obtaining a further 2 days per week to make this a full time position. Discussions will be taking place with Smiths Wood to negotiate a job description for this post which will be ring fenced to current persons in post.</p> <p>AST Group meeting on 7th April – SF confirmed that this group will roll forward the current mode of operation so that no individual school or centrally held element is unfunded in the current year and, as for other ex grants, review this over 2011/12 to reach a view on how to allocate this in future years.</p>	<p>ND</p> <p>SF</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Cabinet Member Items</p> <p>Cllr Joe Tildesley thanked Cllr Davies as outgoing Cabinet Member and stressed his own enthusiasm and commitment to the children and young people of this Borough, outlining his experience of Chairing the Education Scrutiny Board and involvement in the Fostering Panel and Looked After Children in a corporate parent role.</p> <p>JT congratulated colleagues on the work that is carried out at schools which exceeds expectations and is a key reason why people aspire to live and be educated in Solihull. JT acknowledged the challenges that are coming from government with an expectation that by 2015, schools will be achieving 50% A-C including Maths and English, but voiced his confidence in our schools being able to achieve this. Issues such as the continuation of an education gap between the North and South of the Borough continue to cause frustration and JT affirmed that support and assistance in meeting this type of local challenge is very much part of his role. JT stressed that locally, he and other elected members have a key role in supporting and helping schools in whatever way possible in achieving their goals and facing challenges and reiterated to colleagues tonight that he would welcome any contact or question they may wish to discuss with him. JT also intends to visit all schools by Christmas to engage in individual dialogue with head teacher colleagues and identify issues they would like him to focus on to assist them on continuing to achieve the results they do for children and young people in this Borough.</p> <p>JT then requested three things from Forum colleagues. Firstly he outlined that a meeting has</p>	

	<p>recently taken place of the Children & Young People’s Trust Board during which frank and open discussions took place. As a result it has been acknowledged that the current structure cannot continue in its present form and the Board is now on probation for 12 months after which time if it is felt that impacts and outcomes are not identified and being delivered, the Board will be disbanded. JT made a personal request that Schools Forum representatives attend these Trust Board meetings over this interim 12 month review period.</p> <p>Secondly JT referred to the discussions at the last Forum meeting regarding the DSG contribution to the work of the Local Safeguarding Children’s Board which was agreed. JT urged Forum members to play an active part in the work of the LSCB which he considers is a key element of the education responsibilities of schools. Lastly, JT commended the work of the 14-19 Strategic Partnership Working Group and as an essential element of Forum’s work, again urged any members of this group to make this workstream a priority. JT reiterated his invitation for any colleagues to make contact with him to discuss any issues they may have and invited questions.</p> <p>LM and JG are the governor and primary/special head teacher representatives on the CYPTB and pointed out that whilst they have regularly attended these meetings, they were unable to attend the recent meeting to respond on what they feel these meetings are providing for their constituent groups. Both JG and LM expressed a strong opinion that through discussions held at Primary Partnership and Solihull Governor Association meetings, the wider group of colleagues are unable to see tangible outcomes or impacts through membership of this Trust Board. This is despite active participation in the group structure of the Trust, provision of information and so on. JG felt that it would be difficult to commit more of her own valuable time to attending these meetings on behalf of colleagues, if there were no relevant and helpful outcomes to feed back to the wider group. JG will be attending the meeting of the CYPTB this week and will be expressing these views. JT reiterated his assurance that if following the next 12 months of meetings achievements and outcomes cannot be identified, the Trust Board will not be continued but stressed that ongoing support of members is needed for this interim period.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Work Group reports School Improvement WG – Alexis Elliott/Roberta Narroway AE highlighted that a T & F Group has been established to consider the Performance and Development review for support staff and is continuing to meet. AE drew members’ attention to the DfE consultation on Performance Management and Capability for teaching staff, which potentially represents a huge shift on areas of confidentiality and reporting. Cath Haslam has contacted schools with this information and AE urged all schools to respond to this consultation. This information did not appear to have reached all colleagues and SA will re-issue the link. CP highlighted that the draft guidance for Behaviour in Schools has been published on the DfE website today and advised colleagues to look at this.</p> <p>Finance Work Group – Mike Goodwin MG was happy to take any questions on the report and as an update confirmed that the contract for cashless catering has not yet been signed as hoped, which will incur a delay on implementation and roll out across schools which is now likely to be September/October. Whilst the Non delegated DSG T & F Group had understood the Shaping Solihull Group were reviewing funding levels for SIAS, this is not the case and the T & F Group will therefore review the progress of this area of work in the Autumn term. The Funding Consultation T & F Group have two meetings in place for next week but as yet details of the second stage funding consultation have not been received from the DfE.</p> <p>SEN Work Group – Jenny Godsall JG highlighted that whilst some information had not been available, verbal reports had been given by J Essex on initial modelling for delegation of funding for elements of the SISS service. There remains a sense of frustration within the group that for a variety of reasons the relevant information to support these discussions is not always available and the group have now agreed an action that all information asked for at previous meetings will be available for the next meeting and in advance, to allow appropriate reading time. Professor Derek Sheldon has agreed to Chair the SEN group from September and members of the</p>	<p>SA</p> <p>MG</p>

	group feel hopeful that progress will continue to be made on the key issues under discussion.	
6	Children & Young People’s Trust Board update – covered by Cllr Tildesley’s report.	
7	Feedback from Education & Early Years Safeguarding Group – Diane Newton DN confirmed that an action identified at Forum in May for local authority representation at this group has been successfully progressed. DN highlighted the Munroe Report and stated that this demonstrated once again, the importance of inter agency communication and sharing of information. Whilst it is hoped this report will produce positive outcomes, there is a sense of frustration that this issue remains to be addressed despite many previous recommendations.	
8/ 9	Learning & Achievement and the new autonomous school system/Shaping Solihull – C Palmer and D Wilson CP’s report outlines the national context in which we are working and summarises where we are as a local authority in this emerging new landscape of the relationship between local authorities and schools and in the case of Solihull, connecting with the whole of the Shaping Solihull schools agenda. CP outlined the government perception of local authority roles in the future, with focus on supporting vulnerable children; Looked after children, children outside mainstream education and also special educational needs, with the role of the LA using its wider responsibilities to ensure the needs of these vulnerable children are met. The LA will also be expected to act as champions for parents and families around school admissions, fair access and available school places and as a champion for education excellence across the family of schools as well as individual schools to ensure continuing improving performance. Government has a particular view on how schools can improve; one aspect being more autonomy for schools, combined with greater trust for front line professionals. The extent of the latter will depend on the detail of the national curriculum and the extent of central direction by regulation and inspection, although the commitment to autonomy is there. CP suggested that the next feature of school improvement would be strengthening the accountability framework which links into greater trust for front line professionals, high expectations and proportional support and accountability for those schools performing well/less well and critically, school to school collaboration. Collaboration between schools as part of school improvement underpins the work of the Shaping Solihull Group and CP referred to a recent publication which highlights the importance of a mediating layer as a buffer between the Centre and schools. This method of operation is quoted as sustaining improvement by providing three areas of importance; targeted and hands on support to schools, buffer between schools and the Centre and a channel to share and integrate improvements across schools. The description of delegating responsibility away from the Centre and creating this mediating layer between the LA and schools is an accurate reflection of the work of the Shaping Solihull Group and CP then asked DW to comment further on their work. The detailed briefing paper has been shared with several audiences and DW invited questions on the journey so far. DW was asked to comment on representation at the collaboratives across sectors and confirmed that the majority of primary schools are represented and there is growing interest and participation by secondary colleagues. From a Northern group perspective, TM commented that there is a desire to improve on and increase partnership working, but in terms of proposals on implementing and funding collaborative working, there is an element of readjustment and looking at this new way of operating on the part of secondary schools. BS confirmed that St Peters, Tudor Grange and Alderbrook are all participating in the work of their collaborative. DW referred to the envisaged Strategic Accountability Board, with a proposal to establish a Task & Finish Group to firm up the way forward and its function, ie this mediating layer between the LA and schools, roles of this Board and Forum linkage to this type of body. DW stressed it is not intended to replicate or lose any good work and practices that are in existence within the Council and other bodies, but rather find a way of bringing these strands of work together and work smarter with them. DW quoted an example of bringing in other directorates and agencies as part of evolving the work of Shaping Solihull and suggested the	

Board could hold council services, schools and external providers to account for delivery of agreed priorities and this could in fact be a two way process with schools and the Board being accountable to each other. Each collaborative would be represented at the T & F Group with membership from other bodies to be identified to include other directorates, governors and Northern network and also to include Solihull Schools Forum.

CP commented on the importance of putting schools in the driving seat in relation to services they get from the LA and academisation has brought to the fore the process of negotiating price and identifying clearly what is included within a particular service or package. CP felt this type of scrutiny, review and negotiation of services should be available to all schools regardless of status and how they are funded. CP suggested that in terms of school improvement, the Strategic Accountability Board could virtually be viewed as a governing body for SIAS in Solihull and could carry out these types of functions in terms of strategic direction, budget setting, staffing structure and so on, holding CP to account to make sure SIAS delivers against that. The Board would be responsible for the financial effectiveness of SIAS with different funding streams, commissioning work and interface with Schools Forum on identified funding priorities and in effect take on the buffer role between schools and the LA.

There remains a good deal of work to develop around the Strategic Accountability Board and its future role but CP emphasised the need to include School Forum representation at least in the short term to be part of these discussions and ensure there is no overlap on functions of the two bodies.

CP referred to discussions for a business plan for some of the services under discussion such as the Extended Schools service, which could be managed at collaborative level but tailored to the particular needs of each collaborative. The structure of Shaping Solihull could be used to best effect to bring together all available data through all the various council services to co-ordinate, inform and make best use of available resources, to the benefit of not only schools, but the community as a whole and to shape, as well as underpin, strategic planning. DW quoted the example of the Sports Development Programme which did in fact bring together different strands of resource to create an extended provision to the benefit of schools and community. Collaborative working will also allow a wider and perhaps more representative voice of schools to discussions which is difficult to provide through individual representation on other bodies.

DS thanked DW and CP for their papers and presentations and echoed colleagues' sentiments that the work of Shaping Solihull has clearly progressed since the last presentation to Forum and felt with these developments there is more clarity and a focus on joined up thinking. DS invited questions to DW and CP:

- LM commented that as a governor representative involved in Shaping Solihull this had proved to be an exciting project which is developing well and congratulated those involved. Comment was made that the success of Shaping Solihull will depend in some part on maintaining participation and enthusiasm from the schools involved and embracing the work as it moves forward, particularly from the secondary sector. CP pointed out that whilst it hoped to meet the full potential of this group with all sectors involved, this type of working could be used by primary schools as a stand alone group; this is a virtue of this model.
- JG pointed out that the model of working has been identified and progressed by schools as the most effective way of working in partnership rather than as a directive imposed on them and this style of organisational development is the strength of Shaping Solihull as it moves forward. It is however understood that the structure will need to adapt and grow to take its work forward and consideration will have to be given to how this might look in terms of leadership, personnel and where additional resources would be identified from to support this. This may be joint funding for seconded positions by the LA and schools for example and will demand a close relationship between the two.
- Comment was made on funding available to schools and this model of working could in fact allow larger scale decision making, commissioning and purchasing of services,

	<p>with school expenditure managed more effectively and by those who use the services at ground level, with schools better informed on how school money is spent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS pointed out that a principle of the collaboratives is to meet schools' needs and therefore there should not be a template for all six collaboratives who will at any one time be looking at different projects with different local agendas. BS also warned against creating a series of mini local authorities and retaining focus on meeting the needs of those schools in that local area. • CS whilst acknowledging the progress made and input from colleagues, questioned if we were in danger of creating another level of bureaucracy, citing Primary Partnership, Bursar Groups, Schools Forum, all as existing bodies representing schools and asked if the creation of Shaping Solihull would in fact just be duplicating work. CS felt it was important to have a clear vision for what this group intends to achieve and in 12 months time for example, look critically at what has been achieved and what its future structure is likely to be in terms of replacing or liaising with other bodies already in existence. Colleagues were in agreement that evaluation at each stage is important. CP felt that this mediating layer was not creating something separate but rather bringing together and formalising partnership work that has already been in place at schools. It was pointed out that as the collaboratives have received Special Projects funding to pump prime this work there will be evaluation of impact in any case for feedback to Schools Forum. • NS referred to grant funding for the appointment of a Business Manager which was secured by a North collaborative and asked if there was scope for this funding amongst other collaboratives. DW confirmed that this information was shared, but the funding has now gone and is for one year only. It was also felt that not all collaboratives were at the same stage and it may not have been appropriate timing for them to put this bid forward to secure that type of role. This emphasises once more that each of the collaboratives are progressing and evolving at different stages and possibly in different directions. <p>DS asked DW if high level broad objectives for the Strategic Accountability Board had been identified to include a formal linkage with Schools Forum and whilst not available for discussion today, DW agreed to put some thoughts together for discussion at Forum Executive in September. Forum supported DS's suggestion that on their behalf, Forum Executive consider the issue of Forum representation on the Strategic Accountability Board/Task & Finish Group and seek to support the development of Shaping Solihull, in the context of close involvement and clarity of what Forum's role will be. It was suggested Forum representation could be one governor and one schools member.</p> <p>Thanks were given to school colleagues and CP for the many hours of work and effort put into progressing the Shaping Solihull project to date.</p>	<p>DW</p> <p>DW</p> <p>Exec</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Funding breakdown and breach of Central Expenditure Limit – Steve Fenton DSG and school budget 2011/12 report.</p> <p>SF referred to the table which, as requested by Forum, provides detail of all child and pupil funding not delegated to schools with an accompanying appendix which provides narrative for each individual budget line. The table is from the S251 Extract which is a common financial return completed by local authorities and submitted to the DfE to provide benchmarking information. SF referred to highlighted elements of the non delegated spending which are relevant for academy top slicing, the nature and detail of which has caused confusion.</p> <p>SF reviewed the table with the first page detailing the DSG funding of £136 million. The actual DSG is £160 million with the difference of £25 million allocated to academies through a complicated system of calculating their budget share.</p> <p>In terms of the Central Expenditure Limit SF confirmed that Forum are yet to receive the detail of this calculation but explained that with the on-going expansion of the academisation programme we will in fact now continue to breach the CEL. SF reminded members that the proportion of non delegated DSG funding must increase no more than the increase in delegated schools funding but this breach will always now occur with the balance of funding from these two areas for academies. SF felt the government reasoning for not abolishing</p>	

	<p>reporting of the breach is to ensure that local authorities and Forums still have these discussions on what is delegated and what is not. In the case of Solihull these discussions are already taking place through the work of the Non delegated DSG T & F Group and the annual report to Forum on Combined Services and non delegated grants. DS thanked SF for this update and acknowledged the points made with regard to the effect of academies funding on breaching the CEL.</p> <p>The remaining pages on the table show other areas of spend on schools or school related other education budgets ie psychology service, cost of issuing statements, home to school transport. The latter for example represents £2 million, but as it is outside the DSG Forum have had limited conversations on the subject. SF invited questions:</p> <p>DS firstly thanked SF for this information which has shown Forum for the first time where funding for children and young people is spent and whilst not intended for debate as such tonight, is a very helpful piece of information in understanding the total components which make up this area of funding and expenditure.</p> <p>DN asked SF to clarify 1.6.9 Termination of employment costs which is shown as zero. SF confirmed this does not come from delegated DSG but from Council funding and is in respect of redundancies and exit costs from schools. If through a schools re-organisation ongoing cash saving to the DSG could be demonstrated, Schools Forum could agree to charge restructuring costs to the DSG under this line, but this situation has not been identified.</p> <p>Cllr Stephens asked that in future reports there is a little more information on where income is coming from, ie government grants, purchasing of services. SF agreed to address this.</p> <p>CS welcomed the information provided but questioned to what purpose it was going to be used. To be used in analysis this information will need to be provided each year to allow comparison of data and CS questioned if it was the role of Forum to examine budget lines outside the DSG and analyse them.</p> <p>SF responded that this information was requested by Forum whose role and responsibilities are focussed on monitoring expenditure. SF agreed that Forum’s focus is traditionally DSG items but have become increasingly aware of the areas outside the DSG some of which are now academy relevant and therefore would be helpful to be known for the context of Forum discussions. Furthermore there are a lot of areas outside the DSG which can still impact on schools, such as policy deployment and objectives to achieve 20% budget reduction, the impact of which on certain services may indirectly be felt by schools. DS supported these comments and welcomed the opportunity for Forum to consider the total picture of finances for young people in the Borough and suggested the role of Forum could be to consider areas of funding, their context against schools funding, areas we can influence and set this against the work of Shaping Solihull Group to give a wider context.</p> <p>This report was received with thanks and SF was asked to bring this on an annual basis for comparison and to provide a wider context to Forum discussions.</p>	<p>SF</p> <p>SF</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Final report from Lanchester Task & Finish Group and Terms of Reference for Lanchester Monitoring & Progress Group – Diane Newton/Chris Palmer</p> <p>DN referred to point 3 of the report “Conclusions and Lessons for the Future”, commenting that the T & F Group have worked hard to support Lanchester, establish what went wrong and draw out lessons to be learned and as a group decided to encompass these in point 3 of the report. DN discussed each of these points 3.1 – 3.7. individually highlighting the relevance and importance of each point.</p> <p>The group had then considered its future direction and proposed that it be reformed as a Monitoring and Progress Group which will continue to meet and hold the local authority to account for sustained and continued progress at Lanchester as much work remains to be carried out and that they would continue to report back to Forum. DN referred Forum to the draft Terms of Reference for this Monitoring & Progress Group which will include a rider agreed at Forum Executive of</p> <p>“Whilst the Monitoring & Progress group will support the transition from IEB to full governing body, Schools Forum will review the status of the Monitoring & Progress group once a full</p>	

	<p>governing body is in place at Lanchester”.</p> <p>The report then moves to recommendations which DN stressed are not arbitrary but have been considered in a wider context of the phasing in of regeneration programmes in the North and of any new building programme, where it is recognised that a new building is not sufficient basis to solve any difficulties and the function, change process and supporting infrastructure must also all be in place.</p> <p>DS congratulated the group on steps taken to date which show the potential for a promising and satisfactory outcome whilst recognising the ongoing potential for instability and welcomed the points contained in section 3, which he felt were valid concepts to be enshrined elsewhere in council policy. CP confirmed that as part of the policy deployment for the North Solihull Regeneration Programme, the issues about project management and change management in the context of a new build are most pertinent.</p> <p>CP confirmed that at the IEB meeting last week it has been decided to rename the Lanchester Campus as Oaklands. There are 23 pupils now back on site on an integrated timetable with those at the PRU and a further intake of six KS2 pupils in September. CP pointed out that the six pupils each had a previous out of local authority placement and would have contributed to part of the high level of external expenditure quoted in SF’s financial breakdown. Oaklands is now beginning to fulfil its important role of ensuring that wherever possible young people are placed within Solihull. CP commented that whilst many steps have now been put in place with regard to infrastructure and staffing, there remains work to be carried out and therefore a role for a monitoring and progress group.</p> <p>DN asked that the minutes record the T & F Group’s thanks to D Bailey, Executive Principal and C Palmer for their unstinting efforts in taking the situation at Lanchester forward and towards a satisfactory outcome.</p> <p>Forum received DN’s report and noted the recommendations contained within the report. The Terms of Reference for the Monitoring and Progress Group with the inclusion of the rider were agreed in principle at Forum and will be taken to Executive in September for final agreement. TM requested that under item 2 “Tasks” of the Terms of Reference, that it includes reference to reduction of out of authority placements as a measure to reduce the deficit within the licensed period. Forum were happy for Executive to review these as a final document in September and thanked DN and CP for tonight’s report. Finally, Forum endorsed, with acclaim, DN’s proposals for a sincere vote of thanks to all concerned, (but particularly to DB and CP), for all that had been achieved so far.</p>	<p>Exec DN</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>Election of Forum Chair – Chris Palmer</p> <p>CP took the Chair to request nominations for the post of Chair of Forum from September 2011. J Marsh nominated D Smart, seconded by L Mackay. No other nominations were received and D Smart was duly elected with thanks. The appointment of DS will be ratified at the October Forum meeting and the Vice Chair elected.</p> <p>DS stated clearly that he will be stepping down as Chair of Forum after this year of office in July 2012 and reiterated his strong wish that another candidate could be identified to shadow him during this year to be in a position to be available to take over the role of Chair in a year’s time. LM is taking these discussions through the Forum Governor Group, but has been unable to identify any candidates to date.</p> <p>Colleagues thanked DS most sincerely for his Chairmanship of Forum over this last year.</p>	
<p>13</p>	<p>Ratification of appointment of Andrew Wilkins - Special Schools Forum member from September 2011</p> <p>As one nomination was received for one vacancy no election was required and this is a procedural matter. Forum duly endorsed the appointment of Andrew Wilkins.</p>	
<p>14</p>	<p>Date of next Forum meeting – Monday 17th October 2011, 6.00 pm, Room 1 Civic Suite</p>	