

HAVERING SIXTH FORM COLLEGE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE held on Wednesday 21st June 2017 at 6.00 p.m.

Present: Richard Bint, Atul Vadher

Apologies: Joy Johnston, Nicola Lawrence

Attendance and quoracy: Meeting quorate. 2 out of 4 Members present (50%)

In attendance:

Paul Nutter	Deputy Principal
Andrew Frater	Assistant Principal
Simon Tolaini	College Accountant
Leisyen Keane	Scrutton Bland
David Webster	Buzzacott
Cathy Horne	Clerk

In the Chair: Richard Bint

<p>The Committee noted that Paul Wakeling and Sue Bannocks had sent apologies for the meeting as they were involved in the College open event 'Your Future Starts Here'. Paul Goddard from Scrutton Bland had also sent apologies. The Chair informed Members that Tracy Edmonds, who had been a Co-opted Member of the Audit Committee, had left her job as a manager at Kingston Smith and moved to Buzzacott, the College's Financial Statements and Regularity Auditors. As a result, she had resigned as it was no longer possible for her to remain a Member of the Committee.</p>		
A/17/15	<p>Declarations of Interest No declarations were made.</p>	
A/17/16	<p>Minutes of the meeting held on 6th March 2017 The minutes were approved and signed by the Chair as a true record.</p>	
A/17/17	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p><u>A/17/06 – Risk Management Report</u> – the Deputy Principal confirmed that pre-exam breakfasts had been extended across College and brunch before afternoon exams had been trialled for some courses. There had been a noticeable increase in attendance for exams as well as a reduction in the number of students arriving late or uncomposed. He referred to Maths GCSE where only 8 students had not attended the exam out of over 300 entries. He confirmed that exam breakfasts would continue next year. The Chair welcomed the initiative which had proven to be successful.</p> <p><u>A/16/06 – Risk Management Report</u> – the Committee was assured by the Deputy Principal that Risk 4.14 had been reworded so that cyber security was specifically mentioned. He confirmed that a separate report was provided at each meeting of the Risk Management Group who were monitoring the position closely.</p> <p><u>A/16/12 – Interim Report on Gifts and Hospitality</u> – the Clerk confirmed that the Business Plan had been amended as agreed so that the Audit Committee only received one report each year in the autumn term.</p> <p>All other actions would either be referred to during the meeting or brought to the Committee at the appropriate time.</p>	
A/17/18	<p>Update on the Ransomware Attack <i>Paper: Update Report following Ransomware attack</i></p>	

	<p>Introducing the report, the Assistant Principal reminded the Committee that a particularly vicious ransomware attack had hit the College in December 2016. The protection systems in place at the time had been ineffective but the processes for recovery had been good and a return to full service had been achieved. He stated that lessons had been learnt from the Ransomware attack and others since then which, although they had not affected the College, had been extremely serious and damaging. Executive had agreed that all action available to mitigate against such attacks must be taken.</p> <p>The Internal Audit of Information Management had included a look at the controls in place and had resulted in a medium recommendation that 'steps should be taken to determine whether ports 80 and 443 on the College's firewall can be stealthed'. Since the attack and the Audit, the ports had been masked. An exfiltration software license had been purchased and further protection measures implemented including removing physical disc arrays and replacing them with solid state drives. The Assistant Principal confirmed that the Hard Disk Firewall software had been fully tested and was used by the National Centre for Cyber Security and Sellafield Nuclear Facility. It would be fully operational in College on 1st July 2017. In response to questioning from the Chair, the Assistant Principal confirmed that whitelisting had been considered but it did not offer protection from infected sites accessed through a search engine.</p> <p>Responding to questioning, the Assistant Principal confirmed that the College had good systems in place which immediately identified any students sending emails or looking up online content containing particular words. The student would then be supported through the most appropriate method which could be the Care Team, the Mental Health Officer or the Safeguarding Team. Counsellors were also available in College. There was also good and effective liaison with the Local Authority Designated Officer who took the lead on some cases.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the Assistant Principal for the report, commenting that the actions which had been put in place were good.</p> <p>The Committee RECEIVED the report.</p>	
<p>A/17/19</p>	<p>Risk Management Report <i>Papers: Strategic Risk Report; Board Assurance Framework; Risk Register</i></p> <p>The Deputy Principal introduced the report, explaining that the Board Assurance Framework gave the Corporation confidence and evidence that Managers, and the Corporation itself, had identified and were managing risks. All risks were linked to the College Strategic Objectives. He explained that there were currently 3 red risks: Students fail to make good progress; Quality of Teaching and Learning; and Adverse Inspection Report. There were also 6 amber risks. Actions and controls were in place to reduce these and were included in the College Improvement Plan. He informed Members that the Risk Management Group would be considering risk 1.6 to provide more focus on the key issues around teacher's expectation of students. The Chair commented that this was important and would ensure focus on stretching students which had been of concern to the Ofsted Inspectors. Responding to the Chairs comment that the Committee would return to this point at its meeting in November, following the summer results, the Deputy Principal commented that there would also be additional lesson observation data and possibly the result of the second Ofsted Support and Challenge visit by that time.</p> <p>A Member, commenting on Risk 1.1 – students fail to make adequate progress, asked how much was the impact of teaching compared to the student themselves not actively engaging. The Deputy Principal explained that there were a range of methods used to identify and compare progress including six key assessments throughout the year. The challenge was to find evidence of progress in lessons. Coaches discussed progress with students regularly and, where an issue was identified, there were the Success Panels as well as, ultimately, the Student Disciplinary and Appeals Procedure if</p>	

	<p>the student failed to show improvements. He added that underperforming students were identified more quickly now and support put in place at an early stage. Responding to further questioning, the Deputy Principal explained that good information, advice and guidance (IAG) meant that students were placed on the most appropriate course, however in some cases course changes did take place during the first three weeks. The Member commented that poor attendance would impact significantly and asked whether the College divided absence by explained and unexplained. The Deputy Principal explained that is was and that occasionally students who were unable to fulfil the needs of the programme were removed from the College. However, a range of support was offered to students before any such decision was made.</p> <p>The Deputy Principal informed Members that the focus for the College was on teaching and learning, with the outcome that both results and the student experience would improve. He reminded the Committee that the process of moving from AS and A2 to linear A levels would mean less opportunity for a change mid programme. Students currently in year 10 were studying linear GCSE so would not expect to be able to change.</p> <p>Referring to Risk 1.2 – Student success does not improve, a Member asked whether there were particular schools where students were not achieving good grades at GCSE, impacting on average GCSE points score and the number of students at the College who were taking English or Maths GCSE. The Deputy Principal explained that the College could identify particular schools and that, currently, schools seemed to be predicting lower results. However, he added that the aim of the College, with the help of the support in place, was for all students to achieve to the best of their ability. The decline in GCSE results was important to be aware of, particularly regarding the impact on delivery and the curriculum offer. The Chair commented that Student Progress would be reviewed by Internal Audit.</p> <p>A Member questioned whether there were any issues regarding a lack of resources impacting on student outcomes. The Deputy Principal explained that academic requirements, including text books, were included in the budget and that the Quality and Innovation Fund could be used to purchase additional items identified by teachers in year.</p> <p>The Chair, referring to Risk 1.9 – Curriculum reform, commented that the documentation did not highlight many controls even though there were mitigating actions currently in place. He asked the Deputy Principal to populate the risk register with the additional actions including the use of external examiners and more realistic mock exams.</p> <p>Referring to Risks 4.4 to 4.11, the Chair commented that these appeared to fall within a category of Safeguarding risks but that the Safeguarding Policy and processes were not mentioned. He added that Safeguarding was strong in the College and questioned whether Safeguarding risks outside of the College should be included as a risk. The Deputy Principal agreed to raise this with the Risk Management Group and bring back a report to the next meeting of the Committee.</p> <p>The Committee RECEIVED the report.</p>	<p>PAN</p> <p>PAN</p>
A/17/20	<p>Review of the Risk Management Policy <i>Paper: Risk Management Policy</i></p> <p>Introducing the report, the Deputy Principal, explained that the previous Internal Auditors had assisted in writing the Policy and considered risk management within the College to be very good. Scrutton Bland would be conducting a Risk Management Audit during 2017-18 and any recommendations would be taken into account when the Policy was reviewed in 2018.</p> <p>Responding to questioning, the Deputy Principal explained the role of the Risk</p>	<p>PGW</p>

	<p>Management Group, adding that Keith Darvill was a member. He added that the Group invited relevant College staff to attend as required, commenting that it was an active Group which drove change. Following discussion, the Committee requested that, when considering the Policy in summer 2018, page 6 of the Policy should include more detail regarding the role of the Committee.</p> <p>The Chair asked whether the Committee did carry out an annual review as stated in section 10 on page 13 of the Policy and was advised by the Clerk that the Risk Management Policy was reviewed by the Committee, on behalf of the Corporation, every year. The Principal brought a report on Risk Management to every meeting of the Audit Committee and also included a section on risk management in his regular Principal's Report to the Corporation. The College Accountant added that the Corporation's opinion on risk management formed part of the annual report and accounts.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee, on behalf of the Corporation, APPROVED the Risk Management Policy for a period of one year until the end of the summer term 2018.</p>	<p>PGW</p>
<p>A/17/21</p>	<p>Report on Student Applications 2017/18 <i>Paper: Report on Student Numbers – Projected for 2017/18</i></p> <p>Introducing the report, the Deputy Principal explained that applications throughout period 1 and period 2 to date had been higher than in the previous three years against a declining demographic. Period 2 would end on 17th August, but if no more applications were received by that date and conversion rates remained as predicted the result would be 2621 students on the 42nd day. The Deputy Principal issued a health warning to Members reminding them that the critical point was the conversion rate at enrolment.</p> <p>Responding to questioning from the Chair regarding expected average GCSE points score, the Deputy Principal explained that schools seemed to be being conservative with their predictions but that some of the interviewed students were very motivated with good predicted grades. The Aim Higher Programme was helping to attract students with good average points scores.</p> <p>Referring to the merger between two local FE colleges, a Member asked whether there were opportunities for the College. The Deputy Principal explained that there were some BTEC courses which the College ran, including Sport, Travel & Tourism and Business but that generally the FE college attracted slightly older students. He added that the relationship between the colleges worked well and that the Sixth Form College curriculum offer was distinct and unique for 16-19 years olds. He added that the FE College would be focussing on technical courses and apprenticeships. In response to the Members suggestion that there may be the opportunity to consider new courses which were no longer being offered by the FE college, the Deputy Principal explained that this was unlikely.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the Deputy Principal for the report, commenting that applications looked positive.</p> <p>The Committee RECEIVED the report.</p>	
<p>A/17/22</p>	<p>Internal Audit Assignment Reports <i>Paper: Scrutton Bland Assignment Reports for 2016/17</i></p> <p>Introducing the report, Leisyen Keane of Scrutton Bland confirmed that all the Internal Audits were now complete, responses by management included and reports finalised. Five areas had been considered during 2016/17:</p> <p><u>Student Retention and Recruitment</u> The objectives of the audit were to 'review the efficiency and effectiveness of the</p>	

admissions process, including completion of a mystery shopper exercise to review the quality of the information, advice and guidance provided to potential learners'; and to 'ensure the strategies in place to optimise the level of retention achieved during the year and when progressing from the first to second year of a programme are effective, are working in practice and best practice is shared'.

Members were informed that the College's retention from enrolment through to the 42nd day funding qualifying period was very good at 94%. The overall opinion for Student Recruitment was Strong with no recommendations made. For Student Retention the opinion was Significant with one medium and two low recommendations made. Management responses to the recommendations were positive, including agreement to consider a KPI for unmarked registers. Leisyen commented favourably on the management response to the third recommendation around the learner attendance risk register, commenting that the new system was very positive and would better meet the needs of the College. There were two added value points for the College to consider.

The Chair stated that he was pleased to hear that recruitment processes in the College were good, adding that the recommendations were sensible although he was cautious about making it a KPI as the College already had too many. The Deputy Principal informed Members that the College had identified students who were at risk and the Progress and Inclusion Faculty Leaders were each working with approximately 40 - 50 students each. Responding to the Chair's question regarding the added value point around interview letters, the Deputy Principal informed Members that interviews would be held one week earlier in 2018, reminding Members that interview week was held at the same time as Mock Week when all Teaching and Learning was suspended. He added that there had been very high attendance at all interviews to date.

Learner funding compliance

The objective of the audit was to 'provide assurance to the College that the systems upon which they rely to make an accurate ILR return are adequately managed and controlled and fully comply with the latest funding requirements'.

Leisyen confirmed that the overall opinion was Significant and that there was one medium recommendation relating to learner transfers. Responding to the Chair's question as to whether the problem related to A Level Russian only, the Deputy Principal confirmed that the Russian position had been resolved and it was hoped that other learner transfers, including on GCSE programmes, would be resolved by September.

Key Financial Controls

The report on Key Financial Controls had been brought to the previous meeting of the Committee. Significant assurance had been given and the three low recommendations had all been addressed.

Information Management

The objectives of the audit were to 'provide assurance that the College is complying with the Data Protection Act 1998, that controls in place represent best practice, that the College's network is adequately protected against unauthorised access and that the College's paper-based data is adequately secured and archived in line with statutory legislation'; and to 'confirm that the College is appropriately prepared to comply with the potential changes in legislation (GDPR)'

Members were assured that Data Protection processes were in place and that appropriate steps were being taken in preparation for the introduction of GDPR. Scrutton Bland had given a reasonable opinion with 4 medium and 4 low recommendations. These included mandatory staff training as part of induction.

Responding to questioning from a Member, Leisyen explained that secure data was not kept in a fire safe but it was considered to be secure. She added that exam papers met with the examining boards requirements. Referring to the third recommendation, the

	<p>Chair asked what happened to confidential waste and was informed by the Assistant Principal that there was currently a range of practice across the College. He added that it was an important issue and that he had asked for it to be included on the Audit schedule. The Chair commented that portable storage devices, referred to in the fourth recommendation, could introduce viruses and asked whether adequate controls were in place. The Assistant Principal confirmed that this was included in the new software referred to previously.</p> <p>Careers Advice and Guidance The objective of the audit was to 'help ensure that the College offers high quality, impartial careers advice and guidance that meets the needs and best interests of young people and complies with statutory legislation'.</p> <p>Leisyen confirmed that the audit opinion was strong and that no recommendations had been made. There was one added value point relating to feedback from parents which had already begun to be implemented.</p> <p>The Committee RECEIVED the reports.</p>	
7.25 pm Leisyen Keane and David Webster left the meeting		
A/17/23	<p>Internal Auditor's Performance Review <i>Paper: Performance Review for the Internal Auditors for 2016/17</i></p> <p>The Deputy Principal informed the Committee that the management responses to the performance indicators were very positive. He added that Leisyen was particularly knowledgeable about further education and the sixth form sector which had been extremely helpful. Responding to a question from a Member about the position should Leisyen leave, the Deputy Principal stated that the College would expect a replacement of equal ability and the Assistant Principal added that the tender process had been very clear about what was required. The College Accountant commented that Paul Goddard who normally attended Audit Committee meetings was also very effective. Although most of the work had been carried out by Leisyen, the Assistant Principal explained that part of the IT fieldwork had been carried out by an IT specialist who was also very effective.</p> <p>The College Accountant informed Members that the lowest rating referred to co-operation and co-ordination between the internal and external auditors as there was currently no evidence that this had taken place. The Chair agreed that this was not a significant factor but added that it should be retained as a PI.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee APPROVED the Internal Auditors Performance Review for 2016/17.</p>	
A/17/24	<p>Appointment and Remuneration of Internal Auditors for 2017-18 <i>Paper: Cover Page</i></p> <p>The proposed fee for 2017/18 was £11,392 plus VAT in line with the original tender for a three-year appointment made in 2016.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee APPROVED the reappointment of Scrutton Bland as the Internal Auditors for the financial year 2017/18 at a fee of £11,392 plus VAT.</p>	
7.35 pm Leisyen Keane and David Webster returned to the meeting		
A/17/25	<p>Internal Audit Plan for 2017-18 <i>Paper: Scrutton Bland Internal Audit Assurance Strategy and Annual Plan 2017/18</i></p> <p>The College Accountant, introducing the paper, explained that the Plan had been discussed by the Principal and himself and agreed with Scrutton Bland. The contract was for 24 days' work and the breakdown of who completed this was included on the</p>	

	<p>cover page. He informed Members that the proposed plan included four main fieldwork audits: Risk Management and Governance (2.5 days); Student Attendance and Progress Monitoring (4 days); Human Resources and Performance Management (4 days); and Prevent and Safeguarding (4 days). The remaining 2 days would be reserved for any issues arising in-year.</p> <p>Student Attendance and Progress Monitoring and Human Resources and Performance Management were key areas for the College and could impact on the Ofsted judgement. The Deputy Principal commented that the London Borough of Havering had looked at Safeguarding in the previous year adding that it would be helpful to compare progress.</p> <p>Referring to the detail of the Human Resources and Performance Management Audit on page 9 of the Plan, the Chair asked Leisyeen to add the words 'and appraisals are appropriately followed up' after 'the quality and consistency in which the review documents are completed'.</p> <p>Commenting on the inclusion of Student Attendance in the Plan, the Chair questioned why it was being considered again and was informed that this related to support and follow-up of poor attenders rather than completion of registers. The Deputy Principal commented that it was helpful for the College to have this information and the Chair asked Leisyeen to ensure that previous comments from Members regarding progress were considered. The Chair expressed the view that Progress Monitoring and Performance Management were particularly key.</p> <p>The Chair stated that it was important that the fieldwork was better spaced out in the future so that there was no requirement for the Committee to receive so many reports at one time. He requested that a timetable showing which reports would go to which Committee meetings next year, once agreed with management, be emailed to all Members of the Committee.</p> <p>Referring to page 8, a Member asked why the College did not think it appropriate for an audit of Maths and English GCSE. The Deputy Principal confirmed that the College was fully compliant, with all students who had not achieved a Grade C continuing with their studies. He reminded Members that the revised 1-9 GCSE grading would have an impact in 2017/18 with a debate over whether grade 4 or grade 5 was considered a pass. He added that there had been significant improvements in both English and Maths GCSE last year and that current data looked strong.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee, on behalf of the Corporation, APPROVED the Internal Audit Plan for 2017-18.</p>	<p>Scrutton Bland</p> <p>Scrutton Bland</p>
<p>A/17/26</p>	<p>Internal Auditors Performance Indicators for 2017-18 <i>Paper: Internal Audit Performance Indicators 2017-18</i></p> <p>The College Accountant confirmed that the proposed Performance Indicators were the same as for the previous year which had been referred to under item 10, Internal Auditors Performance Review for 2016-17.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee, on behalf of the Corporation, APPROVED the Performance Indicators for the Internal Audit Service for 2017-18.</p>	
<p>A/17/27</p>	<p>Financial Statements and Regularity Auditors Performance Indicators for 2016-17 <i>Paper: Financial Statements and Regularity Auditors Performance Indicators</i></p> <p>The Committee was informed by the College Accountant that no changes were proposed to the Performance Indicators used for the previous year.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee, on behalf of the Corporation, APPROVED the Performance Indicators for the Financial Statements and Regularity Auditors for the financial year</p>	

	2016/17.	
A/17/28	<p>Financial Statements and Regularity Audit Plan for 2016-17 <i>Paper: Buzzacott Planning Document – ‘External Audit Strategy’</i></p> <p>David Webster of Buzzacott reported to the Committee that the planning document confirmed the audit arrangements for the year ending 31st July 2017. The timetable set out on page 8 was similar to the previous year and would be completed with the relevant Committee and Corporation dates shown. He confirmed that the fee was £14,075 as previously agreed.</p> <p>He drew Members attention to the key issues identified on pages 5 and 6, explaining that three (management of override controls; accounting estimates; and related party transactions) were included every year. The two additional identified key issues for the current year were income recognition and capital works. Referring to income recognition, the Chair questioned whether the grant from the Wolfson Foundation for £100,000 should be counted as income and was advised that it was an unusual income stream as it was a non-government grant and therefore the income would be recognised on receipt.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee, on behalf of the Corporation, APPROVED the Financial Statements and Regularity Audit Plan for 2016-17</p>	
A/17/29	<p>Implementation of Audit Recommendations – progress report <i>Paper: Cover Page</i></p> <p>The Assistant Principal, Performance, Services and Resources, explained that the recommendations from the recent audits had all been accepted and were currently with the relevant College manager for review. A Progress Report would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee. He confirmed that all previous actions had been completed and reminded Members that they had been reported to the Audit Committee on 6th March 2017.</p> <p>The Committee RECEIVED the report.</p>	
A/17/30	<p>Value for Money Report <i>Paper: Value for Money Report</i></p> <p>The College Accountant explained that this was the third year that the Committee had received a Value for Money report. He explained that, previously, the focus had largely been on non-pay costs but that a continued effort was being made to build on increases in efficiency, both in the rationalisation of teaching and support staff and in better allocation of staff. A new aspect considering the contribution analysis for each Faculty had been added.</p> <p>Referring to section 2 - Salary Costs, the College Accountant explained that the new database Budget Tool had been fully embedded and that he and the Assistant Principal, Quality and Innovation, were planning to implement the linked Curriculum Planning Tool ready for 2018/19. Responding to questioning, he explained that planning for 2017/18 was nearing completion with a detailed database used by the Assistant Principal and the new tool had only been purchased in June 2017. One of the advantages of linking the two would be the ability to use the staff details and costs from the budget tool which would inform the 5 year forecast. It would also provide reports showing staff costs by subject.</p> <p>Members were reminded that in-year savings from non-pay costs had contributed to the Quality and Improvement Fund. Through good procurement, and with no noticeable change in service level, there was a strong trend of non-pay costs reducing: with £2.54m in 2014/15, £2.20m in 2015/16 and a forecast spend of £2.10m in 2016/17.</p>	

	<p>The College Accountant explained that the approach outlined in section 4 of the report was key and had moved from obtaining value for money for standalone projects to focussing on a value for money mind-set forming part of routine management practice.</p> <p>Referring to the contribution analysis in section 1, a Member queried what the second, third and fourth columns related to. The College Accountant explained that they showed the number of students enrolled on courses and allowed the spend by Faculty to be analysed.</p> <p>The Chair stated that the contribution analysis highlighted some particularly important issues which needed to be explored in more detail. He commented that the SSB Faculty had one third of the risky courses and had self-assessed as a Grade 3, however the analysis showed it to be the highest contributor (contributing £1.7m or 59%, against an average of 45%). He questioned whether enough money was being spent on the Faculty and whether there was an issue, for example, with class size. The Assistant Principal, Performance, Resources and Services explained that there was a higher percentage of both newer and younger teachers in SSB compared to other Faculties which had a large impact on staff costs. The Deputy Principal added that staff turnover in SSB was positive with teachers moving on to better jobs, adding that the contribution analysis was helpful and enabled reflection. He informed Members that SSB tended to have fewer courses but that they were generally larger than other Faculties. He explained that there were improvement actions in place, including raising the entry criteria for Sociology AS and upper sixth students would no longer be allowed to start it. The Chair welcomed the initiatives but emphasised his concern that the Faculty was the highest contributor alongside low achievement compared to most other faculties and requested reassurance that sufficient resources were being directed into the Faculty. The Chair stated that the Audit Committee would monitor the position and asked for a follow up report at the next meeting including information on average class size and the number of students on each course. The Deputy Principal commented that the Faculty had a very low level of 'education support' (£2,747) compared to MST (£166,771) and AMC (£118,799) which affected the contribution rate. He explained that the high level of education support in MST and AMC related to Science and Art technicians which were not a requirement in SSB.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the integrated approach to value for money, commenting that the non-pay savings were particularly good.</p> <p>The Committee RECEIVED the report.</p>	<p>PGW / PAN / ANF / SJT</p>
<p>A/17/31</p>	<p>Review of Committee Terms of Reference <i>Paper: Current Terms of Reference of the Audit Committee</i></p> <p>The Clerk reminded Members that all Committees were tasked with reviewing their terms of reference in the summer term prior to approval by the Corporation. No changes to the current terms were suggested. The Chair, referring to paragraph 12 of the Functions and Responsibilities of the Committee, asked whether the Committee did review its own effectiveness. The Clerk reminded the Committee that they prepared an annual report each year which was presented to the Corporation and included all the business which the Committee had undertaken. Members of the Committee also completed evaluation forms at the end of each meeting which reviewed the effectiveness of the meeting itself as well as one particular paper.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Corporation, should APPROVE the Terms of Reference of the Audit Committee for one year until the end of the summer term 2018.</p>	
<p>A/17/32</p>	<p>Evaluation of Meeting <i>Paper: Evaluation of Audit Committee Meeting and Paper</i></p>	

	Members were asked to complete the evaluation forms individually and return them to the Clerk at the end of the meeting.	
A/17/33	Date of Next Meeting Tuesday 21 st November 2017 at 6.00 pm.	

The meeting ended at 8.05 p.m.

Chair _____

Date _____

CLH 22nd June 2017