

MINUTES OF MEETING

Meeting title: Nottinghamshire Early Years and Schools Forum
Date and time: 28th February, 2pm to 4pm
Location: Virtual Microsoft Teams

Membership

'A' denotes absence

	Andrew Rossington	Maintained Primary Head Teacher
	Steve Border	Maintained Primary Head Teacher
	Helen Roberts	Maintained Primary Head Teacher – (Vice Chair)
	Nadeem Shah	Maintained Primary Head
	David Phillips	Maintained Secondary Head Teacher
	Anne Hall	Academy Representative
	Neil Holmes	Academy Representative
	James Macdonald	Academy Representative - (Chair)
A	Neil Robinson	Academy Representative
A	Daniel Moore	Academy Representative
	Ella Tuxford	Academy Representative
	Matt Rooney	Maintained Special School Head Teacher
	Jamie Hutchinson	Academy Special School Head Teacher
	Colin Barnard	Governor Maintained School Representative
	Andy Palmer	Governor Maintained School Representative
	Laura Gapski	PVI - Early Years Group Member
	Karen Richards	PVI - Early Years Group Member
A	Nigel Frith	Church of England Diocese Representative
A	Louise Knott	14-19 Partnership Representative
	Joe Jefferies	Trade Union Representative - NASUWT
A	Jo Myers	Trade Union Representative - UNISON

In attendance:

Councillor Sam Smith	Cabinet Member for Education and SEND
Councillor Nigel Moxon	Deputy Cabinet Member for Education and SEND
Peter McConnochie	Service Director, Education, Learning and Skills
Karen Hughman	Group Manager, Education Access, Standards and Safeguarding
Lynda Poole	Group Manager, Education, Learning and Inclusion
Orlaith Green	Group Manager Psychology and Inclusion Services
Irene Kakoullis	Group Manager, Early Childhood Services
Mandy Stratford	Early Years Strategic Manager, Early Childhood Services
Naomi Clark	Senior Finance Business Partner, Children and Families Finance
Sarju Sheta	Finance Business Partner, Children and Families Finance
Jason Gooch	Finance Business Partner, Children and Families Finance
Toni Gardner	Assistant Accountant, Children and Families Finance (Clerk)

3. Remove the criteria in 2.05 subsection 3 that MAT's should only hold one position within any one category within the Forum.
4. Replace with the criteria that MAT's should only hold 2 positions within any one category within the Forum.
5. Review the constitution annually in the September Forum meeting.

Agree	Disagree	Abstain
15	0	0

3b 2024-25 Schools Funding Formula – verbal update – Naomi Clark

Authority Proforma Tool (APT) for 2024-25 deadline was met and has been approved by the Department of Education (DfE) and all schools and academies should have received their budget statements.

Any concerns or questions about budget statements please contact school finance e-mail

No other update.

3c Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) Funding 24-25

Naomi Clark presented the paper; purpose of this report is to run through the Central School Services block for 24-25 and seek forum approval.

Historic commitment funding has continued to reduce by 20%. Appendix A compares 24-25 funding against the previous two years. Appendix A was detailed.

Copyright licences, not yet received Department of Education (DfE) invoice for 24-25 therefore allocation is currently an estimate, have been advise by the DfE that invoices should be sent to Local Authorities (LAs) around May, therefore this figure is subject to change.

Budget for SACRE (Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education) an allocation of £12,000.

Peter McConnohie – Following previous conversations at Forum, a request to clearly define what funding is available and the work undertaken. Finance colleagues carried out work that has identified this small budget allocation from the CSSB. Historically, this has not been identified clearly, which has led to some confusion. It's covered by elements of the School Improvement Grant which is no longer available.

Amount is significantly below what is recommended in some of the guidance that exists nationally around percentage funding from the CSSB.

Karen Richards - Appendix A just above the SACRE budget allocation, pensions for centrally employed teachers. Are they teachers that are employees within the local authorities, support staff, earlier specialist teachers, etc?

Karen Hughman – NCC have teaching staff employed centrally by the local authority in a range of services, many of them in our SEND support services, but there are some early years teachers as well.

Karen Richards - a year or so ago, I brought this topic up regarding the Teacher Pay Grant (TPG) specifically for early years, which has been ring fenced by central government for local authorities to be able to apportion it as they saw fit.

We've been collating some information within the NDNA on how authorities countrywide have allocated this.

Some have chosen to put it on the early years base rate to top it up, therefore it's shared out amongst all settings regardless, some have allowed it to be apportioned to

those teachers working in early years, FS1 or FS2 provisions, and some have allocated it also to qualified teachers working in the FS1 units.

We had a meeting or two about this, we talked about how we might allocate it, feel we never really got to an answer, but said we might revisit it.

I personally struggle to justify the inequity in both pay and recognition for the same job in the same sector, if we are saying that teachers within centrally retained teachers who go to both PVI and schools are able to access the teacher pay and pension scheme. We can't then say that teachers that work in the PVI, in the sector can't access the same pot, feels disjoint and we're giving out a mixed message, that's my personal opinion and want to make the above clear for minutes.

Example – teacher works in a school or maintained early years provision for three days and two days with me at one of my early years' units in a preschool. She cannot access pension for the two days she worked for me, and yet she can when she's in the maintained provision in the school.

Struggle with the inequity, the mental health and mental well-being across the sector, particularly in PVI's who are really struggling far more than the maintained sector to recruit because of inequalities such as pay and pension, holiday allowance, etc. I'm not expecting an answer here today but would like it noted, and that I'm working both with the Westminster Schools Forum and with the NDNA to get an answer to this.

I know lots of LA's as are making other decisions where they are sharing it across the sector to allow for that equity.

Mandy Stratford –there's probably two different things here.

Naomi and Karen have just alluded to teachers who are employed by the local authority which are advisory roles. Teachers for our schools, specialist family support teams, our education improvement advisors and our early years specialist, these teachers work for the local authority, they're not working in settings of any kind, this report relates to these teachers and not teachers who are employed in the sector. This is not anything to do with the TPG included in the early years block.

The teachers paying/pension grant, rules around a teacher being able to access their pension for the day they work in a PVI is not something the LA are in control of. This is a ruling under the teachers' pay and pension scheme.

Meetings regard this have happened, and we consulted with the sector about how the TPG would be allocated which led to the decision made two years ago when grant was first ring fenced. If we want to take it further, then will leave it with the chair James on how to move forward.

James Macdonald – require another discussion to work out what our strategy is going to be in terms of central government more than Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC). Do not think this is something that that we can just drive ourselves, James to look at getting something together with Mandy Stratford.

JMc

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the Forum:

1. Approve the Authority's application to centrally retain funding within the Central School Services Block for the services set out at Appendix A.

Agree	Disagree	Abstain
15	0	0

3d Early Years DSG Funding Central Expenditure 2024-25

Mandy Stratford presented the paper to seek approval by the forum to centrally retain up to 1.8% of the indicative early years block to provide the functions that support the statutory duties as specified by the regulations of 2020 and seek approval to publish the hourly rates payable to the earlier sector for the delivery of early education entitlements.

Paper gives a breakdown of how the DSG early years block has been allocated for this year, and the proposed allocations.

Funding pays the early years sector for children who are eligible for their funded childcare, includes three- and four-year-olds and disadvantaged 2-year-olds, that is for 15 hours a week and the additional 15 hours, making it up to 30 hours for working parents of three- and four-year-olds.

From April 2024 children aged 2 and over of working parents will be entitled to 15 hours a week, this extends to 30 hours by September 25.

From September 2024, children aged nine months and over will be entitled to 15 hours a week of funding, again extending to 30 hours by September 2025.

Supplementary funding is also payable for children who meet certain criteria, such as free school meals, early years pupil premium and disability access fund.

Page two of the report shows the 2024-25 funding rates.

The EY block provides funding for several early years' posts across the teams in the Council, breakdown included in Appendix one. Funding posts within the early childhood services team, the early years portal children's centre services, workforce development, governance, consultation, and engagement as well as a contribution to the early years' inclusion fund and the Families Information Service.

LAs are currently permitted to retain up to 5% of centralised, early years funding for central expenditure. Last year, Nottinghamshire retained 2.8% of the overall budget. As the budget for 24-25 is higher and can now retain from all age groups following consultation, the proposal is to retain up to 1.8%. This percentage will be confirmed when budget allocations are finalised, July 2025.

Laura Gapski - how do you quantify what that percentage will represent without having the final budget allocation?

Mandy Stratford - we know how much the costs are, it will be up to a maximum of 1.8% dependent on the amount that we received from central government, which is subject to final confirmation. Based on our indicative allocations and on our estimates, it won't be any more than 1.8%.

Jason Gooch - in the June Schools Forum meeting, the final accounts of the DSG paper will be presented, it's in this report we can comment on what the actual retained percentage is.

Karen Richards - feedback from the sector has been very positive they are grateful for the pass on rate and the retention being as low as possible.

The sector and LA work well, there are plenty of local authorities and providers that don't have that same understanding. Every penny counts and the more we can pass on directly to impact the maximum number of children, the better.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the Forum:

1. Approves the Authority's proposal to retain £1,320,362 of early years funding to be used for sufficiency and assessment functions within the Early Childhood Services and Schools and Families Specialist Service.

Agree	Disagree	Abstain
15	0	0

2. Approves the publication of the hourly rates to be payable to Early Years Providers as detailed above.

Agree	Disagree	Abstain
15	0	0

3e Early Years and Childcare Inclusion Fund Proposal

Mandy Stratford presented the paper.

The LA currently retain a certain element of the early years block to fund SEND support for children who are accessing early years settings. Discussions have taken place around how that might look going forward with the numbers of children that we're expecting to access their entitlements, and to consider those children who will be accessing childcare outside of the school day through the government's new Wrap around programme.

Funding overview was explained.

Purpose of this paper is to seek approval for us to consider the development of a special education / inclusion fund for nought to eleven-year-olds which will start in financial year 2025, funded from the High Needs Block in the DSG. To carry out a robust data collection exercise to estimate the needs, demand, and costs of that inclusion fund more accurately.

A conversation was had about possible negative impact on the early years sector, willingness to support with a reassurance that this does not happen, and a note that numbers could be a lot different to the estimates.

Special schools and a note that the LA wants to work closely with special school colleagues to investigate the impact of this. When the initial wrap around Pathfinder programme was launched by the government, it was anticipated that it wouldn't cover children in special schools, that has now been lifted.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the Forum:

1. Consider the development of an Early Years and Childcare (0-11 years) Special

Educational Needs Inclusion Fund (SENIF) from 2025 – 2026 onwards., to be funded by High Needs Block of DSG.

2. Approve members of SFSS and Early Childhood Services to carry out a robust data collection exercise to estimate need and costs of such an Inclusion Fund more accurately.

Agree	Disagree	Abstain
15	0	0

3f DSG Budget Monitoring & Additional Staffing for 2024-25

Sarju Sheta presented the DSG Budget Monitoring period 10.

DSG looks to end with an underspend of £400K, £300K in the High Needs Block, £100K in the Early Years Block, overspend and underspend detailed, summary as table on page 2.

Jason Gooch presented the Early Years DSG Budget Monitoring period 10.

Forecast on the early years block as been updated with January 2024 census but this number is not yet confirmed, to reiterate the early years block is funded based on five months using January 23 census data which are confirmed and seven months using January 24 census data unconfirmed.

January 24 count is lower than previously forecast, expectation the PT count from January 23 to January 24 for three- and four-year-olds universal hours would decrease by 2% based on trend, but figures suggest this more like a decrease of 3.3%. Two-year-olds expectation was a decrease of 4.4% but figures suggesting more like a 10.3% decrease.

With less numbers means less funding but in turn less uptake therefore payments out to the sector subsequently will reduce as well.

Forecast £113K underspend is net of an overspend on the early years supplementary.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the Forum:

1. That the Early Years & Schools Forum notes the content of the report – report noted.

Karen Hughman presented the Additional Staffing paper.

Report is around the need for some new staff within the local authority establishment seeking support from the Forum. It will then have to go through due process to increase the establishment of the local authority, posts are based on pressures that have been identified by working with schools.

Number of posts and teams where these are needed were detailed.

Andrew Rossington - questioned whether the increase in numbers could be related to the effects of Covid, therefore numbers may not be a true reflection of the growth, in turn the accuracy of the comparison.

Is there any thought / funding into retention of staff, in our schools the turnover of caseworkers is quite high adding some delay with the whole process.

Peter McConnochie in terms of education, health, and care case workers within ICDS it's a real challenge in terms of staff recruitment and retention understandably as they're the frontline, both with schools and with parents and carers.

The LA have asked the workforce development team to review in terms of retention, particularly around levels of pay, how that relates to other authorities for similar roles, discrepancies here make it hard to hold on to the quality of staff that we'd want.

This causes reliance on agency staff, and one of the challenges with agency staff is a very quick turnover which leads to increased dissatisfaction per service for schools and for parents and carers.

This is not sustainable, and it doesn't deliver the best outcomes, something which needs to be addressed.

Karen Hughman in terms of numbers agree this could be related to covid and something the LA can bring back in terms of future information and monitor going forward.

Jamie Hutchinson - recruitment is essential, with the right experience of staff that can make an impact above the impact already made by SENCOs in schools.

How to access this resource? Would it be different for an academy, maintained compared to a special school.

Karen Hughman – All three of these services are open to any school or academy and will be free of charge.

A conversation was had regards financial underspends due to vacant roles within the support services this being due to recruitment yet looking to create new roles. The requirement still to have these posts, the difficulties faced to recruit these roles, a requirement in terms of future ways of working, school ownership and the importance of working together.

Matt Rooney – Primary team is established; at the time this team was established from a pot relate to exclusion and to improve inclusivity the secondary sector was not interested and chose to take the money does this mean the secondary sector will have both pieces of the cake? Forum should be interested in patterns of exclusions and the geography of these, should we be waiting for this provision to provide support and challenge for these schools.

Nadeem Shah – echo's and agreed with Matt's points it's a balance between philosophy and practicality as secondaries did relinquish all that support to take the money, secondaries should be dealing with the issue, but the LA would be letting these pupils down which is not acceptable, there needs to be some recognition from those particular places where there is higher demographic of exclusion.

Karen Hughman – reason that things have evolved as they have is that primary sector have a much larger complement of staffing and a much smaller proportion of devolved funding than the secondary sector. However, the LA has a duty towards children who have been excluded, and ultimately, it's the LA that must Commission the provision for those excluded children. There is a balance to be had, having three staff is still nowhere near the complement of staff that is available to the primary sector, but it's more realistic in terms of managing those responsibilities of the local authority, providing the advice that secondary schools are asking for and seeking to reduce

exclusions before the model that we operate in Nottinghamshire becomes unmanageable because of the numbers that are being excluded.
Peter McConnochie – the opportunity for a subgroup of this forum to consider the challenges that Nottinghamshire is experiencing, to understand the data and therefore understand where there might be opportunities to use reserve funding for specific pieces of work and projects to try and address those very issues. Make sure the mechanisms are right for the challenge, invest time, energy, and resources into seeing what will make a difference.

The opportunity for a subgroup as mentioned above welcomed by members,

Comments from Team's chat: -

Karen Richards - very worthwhile proposals, interesting to hear about the potential pathways for support. Early Intervention is vitally important - as is support for parents in raising young children to be emotionally resilient. This has been an issue we have observed in recent years in the early years sector which might hopefully be addressed through the Best Start initiative.

Orlaith Green - Following on from Karen and Peter's updates, just providing assurance to colleagues that we are not currently carrying lots of vacancies in the specific teams we are looking to recruit these new posts to. We also have retention and recruitment inbuilt into the service development plans.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the Forum:

1. Notes and supports the proposal to use High Needs Block Funding to enable the establishment of an additional 2 FTE Health Related Education Team Teachers (Mainscale - UPS3) posts ,1 FTE Secondary Lead Partnership Officer (Grade D) and 4 FTE additional Communication and Interaction Teachers from April 2024 subject to the approval of the consequent structure changes by the Cabinet Member for Education and SEND.

Forum members noted report and support the proposal.

3g High Needs Presentation

Officers recognise a presentation is helpful however, going forward as well as a presentation with the highlights around the High Needs Block a forum report outlining the High Needs Block Funding in more detail and intention on spend, an option to proceed with this maybe something the subgroup could consider.

At this point budget setting is indicative, though some consultation has taken place finance are still working through some of the details around what needs to sit where to make sure that the budget balances ensuring budgets are the right size in the right place.

There are significant financial deficits in many local authorities, safety valve and other measures in place in Nottinghamshire puts the LA in a strong position and to date do not have a deficit. Even though Nottinghamshire's funding levels are comparatively lower than other authorities which links back to the historical factor.

Long held approach in Nottinghamshire, a lower level of specialist provision, which is impacting Nottinghamshire now in terms of funding availability.

Significant underspend where the LA upsized a budget considerably to cover demand this demand has been seen this year in terms of an overspend in that area.

Funding allocations into LA expecting to be less generous in future where we have seen increases of 10% are likely to reduce to around 4% in future years.

Import and export adjustment LA continues to be a net exporter a trend likely to continue, funding is set aside for increase in terms of the reclaimed funding through recoupment.

SEN home to school transport continues to be biggest financial challenge for the LA and for many other LAs. An area of real need for transformation. An ongoing challenge for the LA, but no change in terms of the budget allocation. High Needs Block contributes £1.764M to school transport expenditure, amount that hasn't changed for around 12 years, set at this amount with no change because of constraints in place by the ESFA. If High Needs Block was to pick up the whole cost of the SEN transport it would significantly compromise the budget position.

Within the LA it's regularly the most overspent budget, an area where the LA are seeing growth. The continued growth in EHC assessment requests and EHC plans, which is currently over 4,200 has an impact on requests for specialist provision, which often then has an impact in terms of SEND transport.

A rise in suspension and exclusions seeing young people being educated outside of mainstream schools also has a significant impact of this budget.

Overall allocation this year for Nottinghamshire is just over £120 million.

MFG set at 0.5% in terms of top up funding this must apply to all specials schools including Fountaindale, this is following ESFA /DfE guidance and that MFG applies to all schools at the same rate, for 23-24 the LA tried to submit a disapplication to not do this which was refused.

Special schools' bandings have been increased for 2024-25, inherited system where banding for a pupil is different between schools, working together to make this more equitable. Fountaindale is still 15.5% more than other schools regard top up therefore continuing with a gradual programme of achieving equality.

2024-25 additional increase to the 10 special schools currently paid on the standard rate is an extra 3.88%.

Jamie Hutchinson - the plan and time to bring all bands to the same level has been talked about for seven years, would like to see a costed plan over the next four years to see how and where that money is going to come from.

Place funding remains at £10,000 per pupil as per DfE guidance. LA continuing the work to increase places available in Nottinghamshire special schools.

James Hutchinson – split site and to fully go through this.

Matt Rooney help with explanation as at the time he was working at county hall and with special schools - allocation either £10K or £50K, criteria you must meet depends on how far in miles, and how many roads between the two sites and the extent to which having more than one site impacts on your school budget.

LA currently have four secondary units and three primary enhanced provision units based on the increases from last year.

David Phillips from Teams chat - Mainstream enhanced provision units - in this meeting last year (23/02/23) I asked that the full review report of Autumn 2022 was shared with forum to evaluate the success of these units. SEND Locality groups had been informed that there was to be an Annual Enhanced Provision Unit Report to inform decisions on expansion in Autumn 2023.

I am not aware that this autumn review has taken place, nor has the original full report from Autumn 2022 been shared.

1. Has a review informed the further roll out, and if so why has it not been shared as requested in Feb 2023?
2. If there has not been a detailed review, on what basis has the decision been made to roll out the EPU's further?

Karen Hughman - reviews have been undertaken by Peter Higgins, they haven't yet been shared. one of the things talked about was having these working party groups where information on the enhanced provision units can be considered in more detail.

We had agreed that there would be up to 9 units therefore funding has been set aside for a maximum of 9 units.

A further discussion was had about distribution and evaluation of these reviews been shared for good practise, Karen Hughman to address and report back, with a view that this is shared in the proposed new working groups. Questions were asked regards how many enhanced provision units Peter had visited this year, that he was part of the school improvement team.

Partnership funding devolved to schools to support children with social and emotional mental health needs and those at risk of exclusion, there is a projected 10% increase to the funding for this year.

An error on presentation found and to be amended before posting on public website.

Peter McConnochie - independent specialist provision, budget where there was an underspend last year, but forecasting a budget overspend this year which will either be subsumed with changes in the underspends within the high needs block or may need to use reserve funding from the savings from last year.

Budget impacted around availability of provision, long term increase in number of children, young people with EHCP outlined on presentation graphs, putting additional pressure on placement availability, there's plans to increase specialist school capacity within the county, however the lack of available space brings that reliance on the independent market, reforecasting an overspend of £1.3M approximately.

Orlaith Green presented slides regard inclusion services, Additional Family Needs (AFN), Family Network Funding (FNF) and High-Level Needs (HLN).

There are four additional teachers in the communication and interaction team, they are split funded between the high needs block and the early years block as they also cover early years.

AFN was increased last year by 30%, will remain the same for the coming year.

However, doing some work through the SEND improvement programme to work on the equity of the distribution of the AFN to each family, based on work that two families of schools are piloting, with the intention it will go live for all schools September 2024, reflected in 2025-26 budgets. For the LA to better track the allocation of AFN funding for children attending a family of schools outside of their nearest school and some

other indicators of what we're describing as magnet schools, where they have an increased number of children with SEND with this the hope is to reflect that in the allocation of AFN.

Both AFN and FNF are based on APT data which take into account measures of deprivation like free school meals, IDACI, prior attainment and pupil numbers, a clear formula but LA wants to reflect the funding based more on local knowledge around schools and who are supporting children with SEND.

HLN budget proposing to increase this by £1.4M for 2024-25, and this will be used to increase the bandings amounts.

Peter McConnochie - SEND policy is coming to an end with a new outcome strategy being developed across the local area, one of the LAs focus going forward. To continue the work around the SEND improvement programme, particularly the work referred to earlier and on presentation.

A focus around increasing early intervention.

Matt Rooney – The increase received for High Needs as a local authority is less than half what was received the previous year. A concern and we need to somehow empower our politicians to represent us and to continue to lobby central government.

Historically underfunded compared to other LAs.

The home to school transport is a concern. Need to see some strategic thinking around. Who are we putting where? Why are the transport costs spiralling? Are we just placing children in the nearest and quickest available place as opposed to the right place? Big questions and challenges for the local authority on commissioning decisions.

A requirement to talk about number of places attached to other types of provision, how many children are in certain types of provision and the need to do this consistently to know where those places are and where they are not.

Clarity around enhanced provision £1.2M. Is this Stubbing Wood or something different? Where does that sit? Are there more of those in the pipeline.

SEND improvement investment. It's increased by £300,000 to nearly £0.5M. Why? Does that include the health checks? How much were the health checks? Have we had value for money on them? What's the impact of them? What was the commissioning decision that sat behind that arrangement?

Post 16 High Needs Block increase of nearly £800,000, Why? Where is it going? How are we investing? Where are these children coming from? Are they coming out of special schools?

Independent specialist provision - a slight increase in that budget. Need cannot be met in a mainstream setting. Mainstream or maintained? Correlation with information given. Message from LA is there's going to be an increase in the number of plans.

Keen to scrutinise the number of children that are costing £26.6M, what does the LA anticipate this being alongside the trends. Same question for pupils without an EHCP.

For all budget allocations is the LA getting value for money? Where are the controls, the checks, the balances?

	<p>That HLN funding, an absolute lifeline to so many schools and practitioners working in mainstream settings. Orlaith mentioned an increase of £1.4M, fantastic news, how many new children do we anticipate that will support? Will this providing more funding to more children, if an amount of the increase is to increase the banding rates how much is this?</p> <p>If HLN bands are being increased there is a need to look across the board.</p> <p>For 23-24 allocated a contingency budget of £0.6M no contingency built in for 24-25.</p> <p>Peter McConnochie – all these queries and questions the reason there is a need for some alternative arrangements around monitoring, scrutinising, working together, planning together in the future.</p> <p>Forming two sub groups was discussed one for High Level Needs Block and one for Early Years Block – email requesting member interest to be sent out. Questions raised by Matt Rooney a basis for an agenda for the High Needs sub group.</p> <p>A High Needs meeting this side of Easter and probably one next half term with an update to members at the June meeting.</p> <p>The need to continue and re-pick up lobbying MP’s as actioned by Nottinghamshire 5 years ago.</p>	TG			
4.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>James Macdonald advised members that Nadeem Shah would be resigning from the Forum as he would be taking up a headship role outside of Nottinghamshire, thanks was given for all the work so far and best wishes for the future.</p>				
5.	<p>Confidentiality</p> <p>There were no confidential items.</p>				
6.	<p>Date and time of next meeting</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="146 1417 1335 1458"> <tr> <td data-bbox="146 1417 683 1458">Thursday 13 June 2024</td> <td data-bbox="683 1417 842 1458">2-4pm</td> <td data-bbox="842 1417 1335 1458">St Giles (in person only)</td> </tr> </table>	Thursday 13 June 2024	2-4pm	St Giles (in person only)	
Thursday 13 June 2024	2-4pm	St Giles (in person only)			