



ON APPEAL FROM:

The Information Commissioner's Decision Notice No:
FS50588285

Dated: 15th. December, 2015

Appeal No. EA/2015/0294

Appellant: Paul Boam ("PB")

First Respondent: The Information Commissioner ("the ICO")

Second Respondent The Office for Standards in Education, Children's
Services and Skills ("Ofsted")

Before

David Farrer Q.C.

Judge

and

Dave Sivers

and

Melanie Howard

Tribunal Members

Date of Decision: 3rd. October, 2016

Date of Promulgation 16th November 2016

The Appellant did not appear at the hearing
Ms. Elizabeth Kelsey appeared for the ICO.

Mr. Bernard Cornwell appeared for Ofsted

Subject matter Whether or to what extent information which the Tribunal had ordered to be disclosed was the personal data of third parties for the purposes of s.40(2) of FOIA and, if or in so far as it was, whether disclosure would breach the First Data Protection principle.

The Decision of the First - Tier Tribunal

The appeal is allowed. The Tribunal substitutes for the Decision Notice dated 2nd. December, 2015 the following notice -

“The Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills shall within twenty - eight days of receiving this Decision provide to the Appellant the requested information, namely the documents contained in the closed bundle served on the Tribunal for the hearing of 19th and 20th. September, 2016, subject to the editing indicated in Schedule 2 to this Decision.”

David Farrer Q.C.

Tribunal Judge

Authorities

Common Services Agency v Scottish Information Commissioner [2008] 1 W.L.R. 1550.

R (Department of Health) v Information Commissioner [2011] EWHC 1430.

Farrand v Information Commissioner [2014] UKUT 310 (AAC).

Goldsmith International Business School v IC & Home Office [2014] UKUT 563 (AAC)

Foster and Rodriguez-Noza v Information Commissioner and Nursing and Midwifery Council [2015] UKUT 0449 (AAC).

Abbreviations

<u>FOIA</u>	The Freedom of Information Act, 2000
<u>The DN</u>	The Decision Notice
<u>The FDPP</u>	The First Data Protection Principle.

Our Decision

The Background

1. This appeal relates to information created by Ofsted inspectors for the purposes of a report on Ely College which followed an inspection on 11th. And 12th. February, 2015, conducted by a lead inspector and four assistant inspectors (“AIs”). After an oral hearing on 28th. April, 2016, the Tribunal ruled that Ofsted was not entitled to rely on the exemption provided by s.31(1) of FOIA and ordered it to disclose the requested information, subject to determination of the extent to which disclosure must be modified so as to respect third party rights to protection of personal data. Ofsted was joined as a party and was directed to produce a memorandum setting out what it contended were the relevant principles which should govern the withholding of personal data, their application to the otherwise disclosable information in this case and the extent to which disclosure of what were submitted to be personal data would breach the FDPP, hence would be unlawful.
2. Its submissions were closely linked to a detailed and instructive witness statement made by Richard McGowan, the senior FOIA manager within Ofsted, who gave oral evidence and made a number of observations at the hearing at the Tribunal’s invitation.
3. The ICO was likewise directed to set out his submissions as to the stance adopted by Ofsted and duly did so. Both respondents added skeleton arguments shortly before the hearing.
4. Mr. Boam had intended to attend the open sessions of this resumed hearing but was unable to do so. He was content for the hearing to proceed. His role would have been limited to submissions as to relevant principles and their application to documents that he had not seen. Whilst in no way belittling the value of his participation, we doubt whether the outcome would have been fundamentally different, had he been able to attend.

5. It will be apparent that this decision should be read in conjunction with the decision of 16th. May, 2016, which sets out shortly the relevant background, namely the Ofsted inspection of Ely College, which led to a finding that it should be subject to special measures and, in consequence, to Mr. Boam's request.
6. The DN upheld Ofsted's reliance on s.31 (1) and did not, therefore, address the issue of data protection. Since we have found that the requested information should, in principle, have been disclosed to the Appellant, the absence of any finding as to the extent of disclosure, having regard to the protection of personal data means that the DN was in this further respect not in accordance with law for the purposes of s.58 (1)(a) of FOIA; hence the above terms of this Decision.
7. A schedule is attached to this Decision. It contains the Tribunal's findings as to what documents and parts of documents must be withheld in order to respect the FDPP. It also indicates which parts of documents which Ofsted proposed to redact should be disclosed. The documents to which it refers are identified as "B34" etc. in accordance with the indexing system adopted in the bundle of "Closed Material" prepared for the September hearing.

The classes of document

8. Mr. McGowan's statement exhibited the School Inspection Handbook, as published in January, 2015. This set out what inspectors must do, before, during and after the inspection, what schools can expect and how schools will be judged, that is to say the various aspects of their performance that will be evaluated and how such evaluation should be approached.
9. An Ofsted inspection is recorded in "Evidence Forms" ("EFs") which detail a wide range of observations, consultations, meetings and examinations of available data. Their format is prescribed by the Handbook and requires identification of the

inspector (the “OIN”), the recorded activity (the “EF number”), the type of observation and, where relevant, the year group, the number of pupils present and other characteristics of the observed group. The greater part of the requested information consists of such forms, the majority of which are handwritten.

10. Additionally, there are nearly eighty pages of emails and pre - inspection notes, as to which the relevant features were the naming of support staff and quite junior civil servants, email addresses and personal telephone numbers and some irrelevant personal comments and communications. These are personal data of no interest to the Appellant or the general public. Redaction of such data before disclosure of this information was unquestionably required. Some data are outside the scope of the request. Finally, there are references to the issue considered under category (viii), most of which will be excluded for the reason given at §46. No further finding is necessary and there is no further consideration of this category in this Decision.

11. The Ofsted memorandum and Mr. McGowan’s statement classified the EFs by reference to the type of activity that they recorded. The value of this analysis was that it focused scrutiny on whose personal data were at stake as regards each form to be considered - form teacher, senior staff member, governor, parent, pupil or inspector. In many case, of course, the personal data of more than one such group could be involved.

12. Mr. McGowan identified eleven classes of which the last two covered the information referred to in §10. The remaining nine were these -

- (i) Lead inspector ’s checking and correction of assistant inspectors’ work.

This took the form of handwritten comments on EFs, mostly critical of an omission or inconsistency.

- (ii) Lesson observations, Inspector “learning walks” - reading pupils’ work and checking teachers’ marking.

The observations record the date and time and generally describe the subject matter of the lesson, pupils’ response and significant events within the lesson together with the inspector’s verbal and numerically graded assessment of what he/she has observed. The number and type of teachers present is frequently noted. The remaining activities in this class involved relatively few features tending to identify individuals.

- (iii) Feedback from staff to inspectors

The EFs recording this prescribed form of consultation contain some emphatic opinions and direct quotations from the teachers interviewed but do not directly identify them.

- (iv) Meetings with senior staff

These meetings involved references in EFs to staff resources and comments by inspectors on the senior staff consulted.

- (v) Meetings and discussions with pupils

Such contact is required by the Handbook. Meetings are generally with groups of pupils sharing a particular characteristic, e.g., SEN pupils or those in receipt of pupil premium. Pupils’ responses are clearly recorded, as is to be expected.

(vi) Correspondence from parents

There is only one example but it involves disclosure of the particular problems of that parent's child.

(vii) Examination of staff vetting records and case studies of pupils

Inspectors review the progress of individual pupils and record details unique to each.

(viii) The position of the Chair of Governors

The concerns of the inspection team as to his apparently conflicting roles were recorded.

(ix) Data relating to small groups of pupils and complaints from parents

Significant data as to the age and year group of such pupils and the particular behavioural problems or learning difficulties that they presented or experienced appear on the EFs.

The law,

13. Personal data are defined in s.1(1) of the Data Protection Act, 1998 ("the DPA") as

"...data which relate to a living individual who can be identified-

- (i). *From those data, or*
- (ii). *From those data and other information which is in the possession of, or is likely to come into the possession of, the data controller.”*

and include any expression of opinion about the individual . . .”.

14. As to disclosure of personal data, the FDPP is set out in Schedule 1. Part 1 §1 to the DPA. It reads -

“Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully, and in particular, shall not be processed unless-

- (i). at least one of the conditions in Schedule 2 is met, and*
- (ii) in the case of sensitive personal data, at least one of the conditions in Schedule 3 is also met”.*

15. Condition 6(1) of Schedule 2 (the only condition which requires consideration here) provides -

“The processing is necessary for the purposes of legitimate interests pursued by the data controller or by the third party or parties to whom the data are disclosed, except where the processing is unwarranted in any particular case by reason of prejudice to the rights and freedoms or legitimate interests of the data subject”.

The issues and the practical considerations informing the Tribunal’s decisions.

16. Two possible questions arise as to each item of information which Ofsted proposes to exclude :

- (i) Is it the personal data of a third party, that is to say anybody other than Mr. Boam ?
- (ii) If it is, would its disclosure be unfair so as to breach the FDPP ?

17. The first question requires us to consider whether references to individuals or groups of people are such as could lead to the identification of an individual or of a number of individuals forming the group, where the information applies to all its members. If such data is processed in anonymised form, it ceases to be personal data - see *Common Services Agency v Scottish Information Commissioner [2008] 1 W.L.R. 1550* at §27 per Lord Hope, giving effect to Recital 26 of EC Directive 95/46/EC -

“Whereas the principles of protection must apply to any information concerning an identified or identifiable person; whereas, to determine whether a person is identifiable, account should be taken of all the means likely reasonably to be used either by the controller or by any other person to identify the said person; whereas the principles of protection shall not apply to data rendered anonymous in such a way that the data subject is no longer identifiable ...”

18. The test for determining whether data have been sufficiently anonymised so that they cease to be personal data is, therefore rigorous. Cranston J., giving judgment in *R (Department of Health) v Information Commission [2011] EWHC 1430*, stated that the chances of identification must be “*extremely remote.*” The ICO’s Code of Practice, “Anonymisation: managing data protection risk” puts that principle into effect and draws attention to the fact that data common to every member of a group are the personal data of every member, an observation relevant to this appeal. Plainly, the Tribunal must have careful regard to the acute deductive powers of those familiar with the school and understandably curious as to the individuals referred to. In the section “The reasons for this decision”, we

refer in more detail to the features within the content of the EFs, which offer clues to “insiders” as to which teacher, form or particular group (e.g., special needs (SEN) pupils) are described. We bear well in mind that a reasonable possibility of identification means that the relevant data are not anonymised.

19. Where we concluded that disclosure of an EF might involve the personal data of the teacher of a lesson and that such disclosure would be unfair, we did not further examine the issue of the anonymisation of the pupils.

20. The correct approach to the disclosure of what remains personal data has been considered by the UT in *Farrand v Information Commissioner [2014] UKUT 310 (AAC)* §20. What is “fair” involves a consideration of all the features of the particular case and may be assessed generally before the specific tests imposed by paragraph 6(1) of Schedule 2 are applied. We are guided by the principles underlying Paragraph 6 (1) and the sequence of prescribed tests, which were analysed in *Goldsmith International Business School v IC & Home Office [2014] UKUT 563 (AAC)* and *Foster and Rodriguez-Noza v Information Commissioner and Nursing and Midwifery Council [2015] UKUT 0449 (AAC)*.

21. In this case, what is fair depends to a significant degree on what leaders, teachers and pupils reasonably expected from the inspection, specifically, whether they foresaw the possibility of individual identification. What was expected depends in large measure on the stated purposes of an Ofsted inspection, which relate to the overall performance of a school, not to the achievements or failings of individual teachers or other staff members.

22. The effects of publicity on the wellbeing and/or employment of the individual are, likewise, factors to be considered.

23. In judging what is necessary disclosure for the purpose of paragraph 6(1), it is also right to take account of the content of the report itself. Where it criticises, for example, the leadership of the school in particular respects, that is, in our judgment, material to the question whether it is necessary to disclose EFs which do no more than repeat that criticism.
24. As to paragraph 6(1), neither respondent questioned Mr. Boam's legitimate interest in understanding the justification for the report's conclusions and the contrast with Ofsted's previous assessment. Indeed, the observations and reasoning contained in an Ofsted report are almost invariably matters in which the community has a proper and powerful interest. Whether the identification of any of the individuals concerned is necessary for the effective pursuit of such interests is, however, less clear. The Tribunal concludes that, with a few exceptions, the test of necessity is not satisfied. Indeed, Mr. Boam has not argued the contrary.
25. We have no doubt that, as regards this appeal, disclosure of the personal data of any pupil would be unfair.
26. Where the requirements of paragraph 6(1) are not satisfied because disclosure is not necessary, disclosure would breach that condition, hence would be unfair, even though the personal data were favourable to the individual, for example a commendation as to the quality of his teaching or praise for a pupil's contribution to the lesson. No consent to disclosure has been obtained from any adult involved; indeed, it would have been wholly inappropriate to seek it.
27. That is a summary of the matters to which we have had regard in answering the two questions identified in paragraph 16. We have not attempted to repeat and expressly apply them in each and every assessment made below.

The reasons for our decision

28. The question which dominated argument and deliberation is whether each EF under consideration disclosed the personal data of a third party. In a significant number of cases it did not and the schedule includes such EFs unedited. Many EFs were provisionally redacted in order to anonymise their contents; the Tribunal was required to judge whether such redaction sufficed for that purpose or exceeded what was required. There were numerous EFs as to which the respondents agreed that no reasonable redaction could protect the personal data which they contained.
29. We accept that there are limits to reasonable redaction. In a few cases the time and cost required to achieve anonymity are disproportionate to the value of what is disclosed. In others, the excisions required for anonymisation must be so drastic that what remains is incoherent or even meaningless. In such cases it is reasonable to exclude the whole EF. That has been done in a substantial number of cases.
30. At paragraph 18 we indicated that this decision would deal with certain of the “clues” to identity contained in the EFs, hence the obstacles to anonymising them. It is convenient to describe such clues and decide on their effect by reference to the different categories of EF proposed by Ofsted and listed in paragraph 12.
31. Category (i) relates to the Lead inspector’s comments on his colleagues’ EFs, which, if they can be linked to a particular inspector, are clearly personal data within DPA s.1. The EFs include the initials and OIR of the inspector conducting the recorded activity, the year group and the subject. The first two pieces of information, which are direct identification, could easily be excluded without devaluing the document. The great majority of EFs are completed by hand. We were told by Mr. McGowan and we accept that the role of individual inspectors is frequently a matter of considerable interest and concern to schools where an

unfavourable assessment has been made and that handwriting can be matched against other EFs. The inspectors monitored only forty lessons and it is likely that those present remembered them much more clearly than routine lessons with no inspector present.

32.If the OIR and the initials were removed, we are uncertain that the AI would be identifiable from the other clues but do not find that the risk is remote. Treating the comments as the AI's personal data, we do not consider that disclosure would be fair since the purpose of the inspection is not to assess minutely his or her performance and none would expect comments on the completion of an EF to enter the public arena. Nor would the requirement of necessity in paragraph 6(1) of Schedule 2 be satisfied, in the Tribunal's view. Nothing in the lead inspector's comments undermines the findings that the AIs made. The checking and corrections will be excluded. Much of the content of these EFs also requires exclusion under category (ii) as teachers' and possibly pupils' personal data; hence the whole EF is generally excluded.

33.Category (ii), consisted of lesson observations and a number of "learning walks", a broadly similar activity. The obvious concern is the personal data of the teacher(s) and the pupils. The teacher's personal data are almost inevitably engaged if the particular lesson is identifiable. The same applies to the pupils' personal data, where the inspector makes any generally applicable comment about class conduct or response to the lesson. This category contained a large number of EFs which, the Tribunal finds, shared problems common to the whole category, as regards the difficulty of combining effective anonymisation with the preservation of coherence and informative value. As regards the AI, each contained the identifying features already noted. Furthermore, they included the year group, the subject, the time and date of the observed activity and references to salient events within the lesson. Most included the status of adults present. Which lessons were observed, which teacher conducted it and which children were present could and

can be readily discovered by those with access to the school's records. A substantial number of excluded EFs within this category also fall within category (ix).

34. Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind that we are concerned with the chances of identification of teacher and pupils from these EFs, indeed from all the EFs under consideration, not today, but about five weeks after the inspection took place, when Mr. Boam made his requests and when recollection of the lessons by the participants was probably much fresher than it is now.
35. We find that, with very few exceptions, this category of EF could only be anonymised by editing to an extent that would leave nothing that was readily comprehensible or informative. Accordingly, we direct that, save as to the exceptions and to the extent noted in the schedule, nothing from EFs in this category should be disclosed.
36. The Tribunal nevertheless notes as a matter of importance to parents and the wider public that the EFs record a widespread failure of older pupils to grasp basic mathematical principles, which is clearly a matter for serious concern.
37. As to category (iii) (feedback from teaching staff), the Ofsted Inspection Handbook emphasises, not surprisingly, the importance of preserving the anonymity of the responding teacher, so far as reasonably possible. Their opinions of the school are plainly their personal data and disclosure of such personal data would undoubtedly be unfair, given their reasonable expectation of anonymity. Again, the question is: could the entries in the EFs identify the consultee to those who know him/her?
38. There are only three EFs as to which a finding is required because the majority of EFs classified under this heading involve a teacher's response to inspector

feedback following an observed lesson. They are therefore redacted in part or, more often, entirely, for reasons already given in relation to category (ii). As to those three, Ofsted submits that the opinions expressed and the terms in which they are framed may point colleagues to the identity of the staff member concerned. Again, we are not sure that that is correct but accept that it is possible. We therefore approve the editing of those EFs which Ofsted proposes with the few exceptions indicated in the schedule for the reasons given there.

39. Category (iv) (Meetings of inspectors with senior staff) raises issues as to the protection of the personal data of such staff, since the performance of individual leaders is discussed with the head and deputy head teachers and vice versa. This category of information must also be assessed; taking account of the Ofsted report's emphatic and wide - ranging findings as to this most important group of staff. In brief summary -

- seriously deficient planning and management of the education of pupils;
- failure to evaluate and acknowledge the poor quality of much of the teaching;
- inadequate experience;
- a lack of specialist expertise.

(these last two weaknesses, plainly, not a matter for criticism of the individual).

40. These EFs either identify the senior staff member by rank or refer to a small group of possible candidates, which would give staff and pupils a substantial chance of identifying the subject. The Tribunal does not consider that they can be adequately anonymised whilst retaining informative value. As regards the fairness of disclosure, we note the trenchant overall criticism of this group in the report as a matter relevant to the necessity of disclosure for Mr. Boam's legitimate interests. The EFs contain more detailed references to the failings of individuals, which are damaging to them but probably add little to the public's understanding of the shortcomings of Ely College's performance as a whole. We except from this one

reference to a failure of the head teacher, which, we conclude can be fairly disclosed as representing the management of the school, necessary to Mr. Boam's legitimate investigation and outweighing any prejudice to her rights and interests.

41. We also direct disclosure of critical references to the Trust adviser at C1, C60, C61 and C62. They reflect a striking ignorance of the school's failings by the representative of the sponsoring Trust, which, in the Tribunal's judgment, is not just a matter of individual shortcomings but a significant weakness in the governance of the school, as relating to the performance of the Trust. We do not consider that that weakness is clearly spelt out in the report. Disclosure is not unfair; it is necessary to a proper evaluation of the inspection and the public interest outweighs any prejudice to the rights and interests of the advisor. Further examples are unnecessary and will remain redacted

42. Otherwise we endorse the proposed redactions.

43. The great majority of EFs falling within category (v) (Inspectors' meetings or discussions with pupils) have already been dealt with in all material respects in assessing categories (ii), (iii), and (iv). One of the two outside that group referred to opinions of the School Council, which could not, in our view, identify the pupils. The other, a questionnaire addressed to twelve pupils within a lesson observation appears to the Tribunal to involve a small group of pupils some of whom might be identified from the record of their responses. We conclude that this was rightly excluded.

44. Category (vi) involves one parental complaint from which the child concerned could quite readily be identified. It will be excluded.

45. Category (vii) (vetting records for staff and pupil case studies) includes one staff record, where the specification of the subject taught reduces the number of

possible subjects to a degree that could result in identification of the individual. Neither the general requirement of fairness nor the specific test in paragraph 6 is satisfied. It will be excluded. A second EF in this category is excluded within category (iii). The remaining EFs relate to particular pupils. Most are highly specific; two are less so but still capable of leading to an individual pupil. One refers to a governor; this is considered under category (viii).

46. Category (viii) consists of a series of EFs referring to the potential conflict of interest arising from the employment by the school of the chair of governors, who had been a governor for some years, to run business enterprise and partnerships for the school. This was a longstanding governance issue that should have never have arisen in the first place but which governors and senior school leaders should have resolved as a matter of urgency by requiring the Chair to stand down from his office or his job. The Tribunal concludes that disclosure is not unfair and is necessary for the presentation of a proper view of the standards of administration within Ely College. Moreover, it cannot be said that any of the individuals concerned, least of all the Chair himself, could have expected that this irregularity would escape disclosure. This is not simply a funding issue, as was submitted by Ofsted at the hearing. It was rightly regarded by the lead inspector as a significant failure of leadership and a matter of grave concern, when discovered. The Tribunal understands that it was thought to lie outside the inspectors' remit. If it did, which we should find surprising, it is, nevertheless, a matter of public importance. That said, we do not consider it necessary to disclose more than the brief references contained in a short selected series of EFs, and two emails, which convey the nub of the information. A complete publication of all the EFs and emails in which the matter is referred to is unwarranted as is a minute account of the details of the Chair's business, which add very little to the issue of principle.

47. Category (ix) (small groups of pupils and pre - inspection complaints) is straightforward. As regards D83, an EF dealing with racism, and bullying, the

number of logged cases of bullying, safety incidents and homophobic behaviour can be disclosed, in the Tribunal's view, without the risk of identification, provided the sanctions applied, which could point to individual offenders, are excluded. Though immaterial to the question of anonymity, we think that such information is important to parents and prospective parents. Otherwise, none of the information is clearly anonymised and all should be excluded.

48. These are the reasons for the decisions as to exclusion and redaction of data recorded in the schedule 2. In large measure, though with a number of exceptions, they accept the submissions that the Tribunal received from the respondents.

49. Our decisions are unanimous.

David Farrer Q.C.

Tribunal Judge,

3rd. October, 2016

The Schedule

An entry in the simple form “B4”, without comment or qualification, indicates that the whole page is to be excluded.

In the interests of simplicity, where the whole document is excluded from a category, it is listed for exclusion only under the first category from which it must be excluded.

“AIB” means that the page is to be disclosed as edited in the “Closed Material” bundle submitted by Ofsted for the hearing. In some cases, this is subject to the removal of part of the redaction.

Exclusions, redactions and removals of redactions.

Category 1 - Lead inspector’s checking and correction of team inspectors’ work

D1 D3 D18 (AIB) D27 D28 D29 D30 D36 (without redaction Top right) D37 (AIB save redaction top right) D61 D78

Category 2 - Lesson observations, inspector “learning walks” and observation (reading of pupils’ work and teachers’ marking)

C2 C3 C17 C18 C19 C20 C21 C22 C23 C24 C25 C26

C46 (AIB) C47 (AIB save disclose “Conduct in assembly” and its 2 bullet points and undo redaction within “Large site” bullet point.) C48 (AIB) C51 (disclose unredacted) C86 C87 C88 C89 C91 C92 C95 C99C103

D5 D11 D12 D13 D22 D23 D25 D27 D28 D29

**D30 D31 D39 (AIB) D43 D45 (AIB) D52 D57 D58 D59 (AIB) D61
D66 (AIB) D70 D71 D73 D75 D77 D78 D79 D80**

Category 3 - Feedback from School staff to inspectors

C10 C49 C50(AIB) C79 (disclose unredacted. Not identifiable.)

Category 4 - Meetings between the inspection team and senior staff in the School –

B61 (AIB) B62 (AIB) B77 (AIB) B80 B81 B86 B87¹

C1 (AIB save disclose reference to “Trust advisory”) C8 (AIB) C11 (AIB)

C12 (AIB) C13 (AIB) C40 (remove redaction) C42 (AIB) C43 (remove redaction) C47 (see Cat. (ii)) C48 (AIB) C54 (Disclose both references to HT but maintain redaction re DHT) C60 (AIB) C61 (AIB save disclose first redacted passage) C62 (AIB save disclose first redacted passage) C71 (AIB) C76 (AIB) C80 (AIB) C97 (AIB) C98 (AIB)

D6 (AIB) D7 (AIB) D8 (AIB) D9 (AIB) D12 D13 D17 (AIB) D20 (AIB) D21 (AIB) D62 (AIB) D63 (AIB) D64 (AIB) D67 (AIB) D69 (AIB)

E44 (AIB) E46 (AIB save disclose fourth redaction re CoG)

Category 5 - Inspectors’ meetings and discussions with pupils

¹ Whether or not otherwise unfair to disclose B80 - 87, it is unnecessary, given the content of the report.

**C4 C5 C17 C18 C20 C21 C23 C24 C 46 (AIB) C47 (AIB save
remove redaction of “that was dangerous etc“. – see category 2) C48 (AIB)
C49 (AIB save two redactions under section 5 to be removed.) C50 (AIB)
C104 (AIB) C105 C106**

**D18 (AIB) D19 (AIB) D47 D49 D57 D58 D59 (AIB) D61 (AIB) D65
(AIB) “AIB SAVE REMOVE REDACTION OF “THAT WAS DANGEROUS
ETC.” - SEE CATEGORY 2.”**

Category 6 - Correspondence from parents

D53

Category 7 - Examination of vetting records for staff and case studies of pupils –

B33 (AIB)

C36 C37 C38 C39 C42 (AIB)

D56 (AIB)

Category 8 - Propriety of Governors in role .

**B14 (Disclose without redaction) B15 (Disclose without redaction) B22
(Remove redaction of §§ 1 - 4 under “History”) B23 (AIB) B24 (AIB) B25
(AIB) B77 (Disclose without redaction) B91 (AIB)**

**C14 (AIB) C15 (AIB) C16 (AIB) C55 (AIB) C56 (AIB) C57 (AIB) C58
C61 (AIB) C62 (AIB save disclose first redacted passage) C73
(AIB) C80 (AIB) C83 (remove redaction) C93 (AIB)**

**D20 (AIB save remove third redaction re CoG)) D37 (AIB) D56 (AIB)
D65 (AIB)**

E43 (AIB) E44 (AIB save remove fourth redaction at foot of page.) E46 (AIB) continuing into E47 (AIB) E49 (AIB save remove redaction at foot of page)

Category 9 - Examination of data about small groups of pupils and complaints by parents prior to inspection.

B2 (AIB) B8 (AIB) B59 (AIB)

C29 (AIB) C41 (AIB) C59 (AIB) C86 C91 C99

D35 (AIB) D38 (AIB) D40 (AIB) D42 (AIB) D44 (AIB) D83 (Remove redactions save for results of logged incidents.)

Out of Scope of Request

E56-E58