

Notice of Meeting

Schools Forum – Supplementary Agenda

Monday, 14th March, 2022 at 5.00pm
On Zoom

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 8 March 2022

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact Jessica Bailiss on (01635) 503124
e-mail: jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at
www.westberks.gov.uk



Agenda - Schools Forum to be held on Monday, 14 March 2022 (continued)

Forum Members: Tom Barlow, Reverend Mark Bennet, Dominic Boeck, Jonathon Chishick, Melissa Cliffe, Catie Colston (Vice-Chairman), Jacquie Davies, Emily Dawkins, Hand, Keith Harvey, Jon Hewitt, Caroline Johnson, Ross Mackinnon, Catherine McLeod, Maria Morgan, Gemma Piper, Chris Prosser, David Ramsden, Campbell Smith, Graham Spellman (Chair), Phil Spray and Charlotte Wilson

Agenda

Part I

		Page No.
7	<i>Appendix A - EIA for Schools' in Financial Difficulty Report (Melanie Ellis)</i>	1 - 4
8	<i>Appendix B - EIA for iCollege Review Report (Jacquie Davies/Michelle Sancho)</i>	5 - 8
9	High Needs Block - Use of funds transferred from Schools Block to HNB 2022-23 (Jane Seymour)	9 - 26
10	Early Years Budget 2022/23 (Avril Allenby/Lisa Potts)	27 - 34

Sarah Clarke
Service Director: Strategy and Governance

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact Stephen Chard on telephone (01635) 519462.



West Berkshire
C O U N C I L

Appendix A

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010), which states:

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;*
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:

 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;*
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.*
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.*

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality (the relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected, but on the significance of the impact on them):

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the Council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Schools' Forum to make:	Award of Schools in Financial Difficulty funding
Name of Service/Directorate:	Finance and Property/Resources
Name of assessor:	Melanie Ellis
Date of assessment:	8.3.22

Is this a ?		Is this policy, strategy, function or service ... ?	
Policy	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	New or proposed	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Strategy	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Function	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is changing	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Service	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(1) What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	To award funds to a school in financial difficulty
Objectives:	To prevent schools going into deficit/being further in deficit
Outcomes:	School would have adequate funding
Benefits:	School would have adequate funding

(2) Which groups might be affected and how? Is it positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this?			
<i>(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation)</i>			
Group Affected	Potential Positive Impacts	Potential Negative Impacts	Evidence
Age	none	none	
Disability	none	none	
Gender Reassignment	none	none	
Marriage and Civil	none	none	

Partnership			
Pregnancy and Maternity	none	none	
Race	none	none	
Religion or Belief	none	none	
Sex	none	none	
Sexual Orientation	none	none	
Further Comments:			

(3) Result	
Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please provide an explanation for your answer: no just reimbursing a school	
Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please provide an explanation for your answer: no just reimbursing a school	

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered ‘yes’ to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a EqIA 2.
 If an EqIA 2 is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the EqIA guidance and template – <http://intranet/index.aspx?articleid=32255>.

(4) Identify next steps as appropriate:	
EqIA Stage 2 required	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Owner of EqIA Stage Two:	
Timescale for EqIA Stage Two:	

Name: Melanie Ellis

Date: 8.3.22

Please now forward this completed form to Pamela Voss, Equality and Diversity Officer (pamela.voss@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010), which states:

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;*
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:

 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;*
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.*
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.*

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality (the relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected, but on the significance of the impact on them):

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the Council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Schools' Forum to make:	That the Schools' Forum agrees the proposals of the task and finish group set out in section five of the report.
Name of Service/Directorate:	Education
Name of assessor:	Michelle Sancho
Date of assessment:	8.3.22

Is this a ?		Is this policy, strategy, function or service ... ?	
Policy	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	New or proposed	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Strategy	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Function	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Is changing	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Service	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

(1) What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	Financial arrangements in the funding of placements at iCollege and clarity around admission procedures implemented
Objectives:	To agree proposals recommended by Task and Finish Group
Outcomes:	Proposals regarding the funding of iCollege places and types of places are accepted
Benefits:	Primary and Secondary schools will be clear about the funding of iCollege placements

(2) Which groups might be affected and how? Is it positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this?			
<i>(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation)</i>			
Group Affected	Potential Positive Impacts	Potential Negative Impacts	Evidence
Age	Access to 6 week blocks of intervention at	None noted	Support gained from schools following consultation with all

	<p>iCollege for young people</p> <p>Access to permanent single roll places at iCollege</p> <p>Access to commissioned places for primary pupils</p>		<p>secondary schools and with the primary schools. The proposals are likely to help reduce suspensions and permanent exclusions for vulnerable young people.</p>
Disability			
Gender Reassignment			
Marriage and Civil Partnership			
Pregnancy and Maternity			
Race			
Religion or Belief			
Sex			
Sexual Orientation			
Further Comments:			

(3) Result	
Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please provide an explanation for your answer:	
Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please provide an explanation for your answer:	

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a EqlA 2.

If an EqlA 2 is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the EqlA guidance and template – <http://intranet/index.aspx?articleid=32255>.

(4) Identify next steps as appropriate:	
EqlA Stage 2 required	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Owner of EqlA Stage Two:	
Timescale for EqlA Stage Two:	

Name: Michelle Sancho

Date: 8.3.22

Please now forward this completed form to Pamela Voss, Equality and Diversity Officer (pamela.voss@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website

High Needs Block - Use of funds transferred from Schools Block to HNB 2022-23			
Report being considered by:	Schools Forum 14th March 2022		
Report Author:	Ian Pearson, Jane Seymour, Michelle Sancho		
Item for:	Decision	By:	All Forum Members

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report sets out proposals for use of the funds which will be transferred from the Schools Block to the HNB in 2022-23.

2. Recommendation

2.1 To agree the use of funds transferred from the Schools Block to the HNB in the 2022-23 financial year

2.2 To request impact reports from Local Authority Officers on the projects funded from Schools Block Transfer in March 2023

2.3 To request impact reports from secondary schools which have received funds from the HNB for EBSA in October 2022 (for 2021-22 financial year) and in March 2023 (for 2022-23 financial year)

Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

3. Introduction

3.1 Following consultation with schools, it has been agreed that a transfer of 0.25% of the Schools Block will be made to the High Needs Block in 2022-23. This amounts to £300,200.

3.2 Initial proposals for use of this funding were brought to the HFG and Schools Forum in January 2022. It was agreed that the proposals would be worked up in more detail including projected savings for further consideration at the March 2022 meeting.

3.3 It was also agreed that the second proposal for additional support for children with SEND in the early years would be considered by the Early Years Funding Group.

4. Proposed use of Schools Block Transfer 2022-23

4.1 Since these proposals were previously brought to the forum, additional information for proposals 3 and 4 has been added to Table 1 below. Additional information for proposals 1, 2 and 5 has been added in the appendices to this report.

4.2 It should be noted that at the time of the previous report, proposal 2 had not been worked up. A sum for early years and SEND had been notionally allocated with the intention that a proposal would be developed following discussion with the Heads' Funding Group, the Schools Forum and the Early Years Funding Group. Use of these funds was also discussed with relevant stakeholders at the SEND Strategy Early Years Workstream group. The proposal outlined as proposal 2 in the table below and in Appendix 2 is largely based on input from the SEND Strategy Early Years Workstream Group.

4.3 Comments about use of funding for early years and SEND received from the Early Years Steering Group were as follows:

"I agree that some funding needs to be allocated to train people in strategies to support children with ASC as this is becoming more and more prominent in all early years settings"

Proposal 2 would support children with autism and those on the pathway for assessment for autism and is therefore consistent with this comment.

"It would be nice though if some money was allocated to those with physical disabilities. ASC seems to get a lot of attention and although this is needed it does sometimes feel that other disabilities are forgotten about. I'm not sure how the money could be used to support this but there are children with physical needs who are very intelligent but can't attend mainstream settings due to access difficulties and staffing numbers."

There was no specific proposal for use of funds to support children with physical disabilities. There is funding available through the Early Development and Inclusion Team to ensure that children with SEND including children with physical disabilities can access early years settings.

Table 1

Proposed use of Schools Block Transfer in 2022-23

	ITEM	COST	Success Criteria	Projected savings
1.	EDIT 0.4 post to reduce waiting times and give more support to children with SEND transitioning in to school. (Additional capacity could be absorbed by existing staff on a temporary basis for 12 months). <i>See also Appendix 1 for more detail</i>	£26,387	Of 126 children known /referred only 107 are allocated (85%). The 19 unallocated to be taken on to caseload. Waiting time for new children	Avoidance of one local maintained special school placement due to improved transition to mainstream school would

			referred in the year before starting school to reduce from 1 to 3 months to 1 month maximum. Waiting time for younger children to be reduced from 3 to 6 months to 3 months maximum. All children referred in the year before transition to have at least 2 terms of intervention prior to transition.	save approximately £26,000 including place funding.
2.	Funding for training of early years settings and parents to support children under five who have social communication difficulties and who may be waiting for speech and language therapy intervention and / or for autism assessment. 0.2 FTE speech and language therapist on a temporary 12 month basis. <i>See also Appendix 2 for more detail</i>	£31,323 (£18,200 for 0.2 speech and language therapist plus possibly additional part time early years teacher).	Parents / carers will report having better understanding of how to support their child's social communication and feeling more confident in using strategies at home. Early years settings will report having better understanding of how to support children's social communication and feeling more confident in using strategies within the setting.	If one child does not need an Education, Health and Care Plan as a result of earlier intervention, this would result in a saving of approximately £10,000 per annum. Avoidance of one local maintained special school placement due to earlier intervention would save approximately £26,000 including place funding.
3.	SEMH Practitioner to provide a rapid response to children at risk of exclusion in order to avoid exclusions and associated costs. (Temporary 12 month	£41,490	Prevention of permanent exclusions	Avoidance of 3 permanent exclusions @ £20K per

	<p>contract). Following the pandemic suspensions have increased in secondary schools. Pupil at Risk meetings have been established to identify those at risk of exclusion but up until now there has not been a resource available to support pupils identified. The SEMH practitioner would provide interventions for those identified at PAR meetings.</p>			<p>exclusion. Saving of £60,000</p>
4.	<p>Extension of I-College Provision £90,000 to extend I-College provision to provide Year 7 and 8 places. Secondary Headteachers were surveyed to gain their view regarding need. 100% of those that responded (5 secondary schools and iCollege) were supportive of such provision. Among the comments were:</p> <p>“I very much welcome the idea of £90k from the high needs block being used for KS3”</p> <p>“I could easily tell you the names of more than 3 students in each of years 7, 8 and 9 who are in danger of permanent exclusion, and I imagine every secondary colleague in the authority could do the same”</p> <p>“Primary schools have some very flexible arrangements in place that cannot be replicated in secondary school, and as such these pupils often struggle despite the very intensive and long term transition work in place”</p> <p>“I support greater provision, if [my school] has on average one per year and then there are 10 secondary schools there may well be at least 10 students who need this each year (more post pandemic)”</p> <p>“My feeling is that with lower literacy and numeracy levels as a result of the remote learning periods in the last two years, this will exasperate the gap between pupils in the coming year or so and it is likely more young people will struggle to settle well into the mainstream learning environment.”</p> <p>Evidence from iCollege admissions to Integration over the last 5 years shows</p>	£90,000	Prevention of permanent exclusions and associated costs and specialist placements	<p>Avoidance of 2 permanent exclusions at £20K per exclusion. Saving of £40,000. Avoidance of one specialist placement at £62,000. Total estimated saving £102,000.</p>

<p>that a need has arisen, and is increasing, for provision for lower Key Stage 3 learners. See table below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Year 7</th> <th>Year 8</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>17/18</td> <td>1 PEX</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18/19</td> <td>1 InReach</td> <td>1 PEX</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19/20</td> <td>1 InReach 1 EHCP</td> <td>2 InReach 1 EHCP</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20/21</td> <td>3 InReach</td> <td>6 InReach</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21/22 (to March 22)</td> <td>1 PEX 1 InReach</td> <td>3 InReach 3 awaiting EHCPs</td> <td>8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(These figures do not include learners with EHCPs in the 'Pod Plus' Year 7 & 8 provision, currently 12 in number)</p>			Year 7	Year 8	Total	17/18	1 PEX	0	1	18/19	1 InReach	1 PEX	2	19/20	1 InReach 1 EHCP	2 InReach 1 EHCP	5	20/21	3 InReach	6 InReach	9	21/22 (to March 22)	1 PEX 1 InReach	3 InReach 3 awaiting EHCPs	8			
	Year 7	Year 8	Total																									
17/18	1 PEX	0	1																									
18/19	1 InReach	1 PEX	2																									
19/20	1 InReach 1 EHCP	2 InReach 1 EHCP	5																									
20/21	3 InReach	6 InReach	9																									
21/22 (to March 22)	1 PEX 1 InReach	3 InReach 3 awaiting EHCPs	8																									
5.	<p>Funding for delegation to secondary schools to support young people with EBSA (which they could use to buy in to the central service if they wish) @ £11,100 per school</p> <p><i>See also Appendix 3 for more detail</i></p>	£111,000	<p>Young people in secondary schools experiencing EBSA show improved attendance</p> <p>Avoidance of specialist placements for young people of secondary age experiencing EBSA</p>	<p>Avoidance of one specialist placement could save £62,000. If two specialist placements can be avoided the saving will be £124,000.</p>																								
Total		£300,200																										

Appendices

1. Additional information re proposal 1
2. Outline proposal from Speech and Language Therapy Service in respect of proposal 2
3. Additional information re proposal 5
4. Equalities Impact Assessment

Schools Block Transfer to HNB 2022-23

Project 1: Temporary additional staffing in Early Development and Inclusion Team (EDIT)

Background

The Early Development and Inclusion Team (EDIT), previously known as the Pre School Teacher Counsellor Service, consists of 1.7FTE teachers who are specialists in SEN and early years and who support children under five who have significant special educational needs. Children are usually referred by Health, either by paediatricians or health visitors, although in some cases they can be referred by early years settings. EDIT teachers will assess children and deliver a programme of support, modelling strategies which can be used by parents to support their child's development and reviewing on a regular basis. They also support children in early years settings, offer training to staff, support with transition in to settings or school, run groups for children on the caseload and their parents and make or assist with EHC applications where they are needed. In addition, the EDIT team manage a budget for children who need one to one support in order to access early years settings.

Rationale

A reduction in the size of the EDIT team by half some years ago, as part of a savings strategy, has resulted in the team having to restrict its activities and children waiting longer for support. The team has had to prioritise older children who need support to transition in to a setting or school, which gives less time for earlier intervention with younger children. This has been exacerbated by late referrals from Health, apparently as a result of the pandemic, meaning that some children with quite profound needs are going in to school with inadequate support.

Currently, of the 126 children known or referred to the EDIT Team, only 107 are allocated to an EDIT teacher (85%), with 19 children (15%) on a waiting list and unable to be allocated due to staffing restrictions. Children who are referred in the year before starting school are prioritised by the team, but waiting times are still 3 months on average. Some of these children may have only one term or less of intervention before transition to school. Younger children have to be given lower priority; waiting times for them vary from 3 to 6 months.

Current waiting times limit opportunities to support children early at a critical stage of their development, meaning they are likely to experience more difficulties in early years settings and primary schools, particularly if there has not been adequate opportunity to support and train staff and if EHC applications have been delayed. A poor transition experience may even mean in some cases that children who might have been supported successfully in mainstream schools may need to attend special schools, or may need to attend earlier than might otherwise have been the case.

Proposal

Recruit an additional 0.4 EDIT teacher in order to reduce waiting times and give more support to children with SEND transitioning in to school as well as earlier support to younger children. Additional capacity could be absorbed by existing staff on a temporary basis for 12 months.

Aims

To provide expert intervention as early as possible for children referred to the EDIT service, in order to maximise their development

To ensure children under five with SEND have support prior to transition and a well planned and successful transition to primary school

Success criteria

- Waiting times for new children referred in the year before starting school to reduce from 1 to 3 months to 1 month maximum.
- Waiting times for younger children to be reduced from 3 to 6 months to 3 months maximum.
- All children referred in the year before transition to have at least 2 terms of intervention prior to transition.
- Children supported by EDIT experience a successful transition in to school, as reported by parents and schools

Cost

A 0.4 EDIT teacher would cost £26,387 per annum including on costs.

Savings

Avoidance of one local maintained special school placement due to improved transition to mainstream school would save approximately **£26,000** including place funding.

Speech & Language Support for Social Communication in the Early Years for West Berkshire

Rationale: there is a long wait for Children and Young people to be seen for an Autism assessment and increasing waits to access a Speech & Language Therapist. Many children on the Speech & Language Therapy caseload have social communication difficulties and the most effective strategies are those carried out every day by those closest to the child. The communication environment that a child is in makes a big impact on their social communication development. It is therefore important that families and staff in EY settings are confident in how to support their children, knowing what strategies they can use and when/who to ask for help.

ECAT (Every Child a Talker) is an initiative funded by the Early Years Service in West Berkshire. The project funds 2 consultants a Speech & Language Therapist (0.1wte) and Early Years Teacher. ECAT focuses on encouraging the communication skills of young children through work with pre-school settings. The whole team working in the setting is involved in supporting ECAT and they have a lead practitioner (known as an ELLP) who attends termly cluster meetings. ECAT is currently bought in by individual settings. Each setting involved in the initiative has three areas that they focus on:

1. Identifying and supporting children who may be 'at risk of delay';
2. Developing the knowledge and skills of all of the practitioners who work within the setting;
3. Helping parents to understand the stages of development of speech and language skills and how they can encourage their child's development.

Although ECAT is a great and important provision it does not have capacity to specialise in social communication issues.

Proposal:

- Use the budget being offered to boost and build on the existing work from ECAT with the distinction of this project being aimed at supporting specifically the area of social communication.
- Fund 0.2wte SLT and 0.1-2 wte EY practitioner to develop then deliver training and support with the following outcomes:
 1. Children and their families will report they are well supported and understand their child's social communication development.
 2. Adults supporting children with social communication difficulties feel confident about the support they can give and know when and where to seek help.

These 2 outcomes would mean that children and their families and the adults that support them would be enabled to manage the communication difficulties within the child's daily life ensuring they have their needs met and are included as far as is possible.

These outcomes have not yet been co-produced and may need to be developed further with those involved with the project as it starts.

Speech & Language Therapy Provision:

Aims of the Provision: Children in West Berkshire will be supported by a Speech and Language Therapist who can support families and settings to meet their social communication needs through:

1. Delivering joint training sessions for EY settings (including childminders)
2. Delivering joint training sessions for families

3. Providing coaching sessions after the training for families and setting staff
4. Creating virtual support for developing social communication

Recommended provision:

0.2 wte (1 day) band 6 (specialist)SLT

0.2 wte Band 6 SLT on a 52 week term basis: £18200

Possible outline of provision:

Staff in settings/childminders:

Will be offered an initial training session on social communication (in the context of other language skills and language development) and then further follow up sessions to cover strategies that can be implemented. Specific coaching for the attendees to help them to implement appropriate strategies which will support social language and communication.

Families:

Will be offered training session on social communication (in the context of other language skills and language development) and then follow up sessions offered to cover strategies that can be implemented at home. Specific coaching for the attendees to help them to implement appropriate strategies which will support social language and communication.

The details of how many sessions of training over the year and where and how they are delivered would need to be scoped by the therapist who runs the project (alongside the offer from ECAT).

The training sessions could be a mix of workshop vs presentation style and could be virtual vs face to face. It may be within the scope of the project to produce some videos to help support families who have children with social communication difficulties.

Liaison with Autism Berkshire is recommended to see where there is opportunity for co-production.

Training in the specific interventions of Attention Autism and Intensive Interaction may be additional training that can be bought in by accredited trainers and offered to Early Years Settings across West Berkshire.

Schools Block Transfer to HNB 2022-23

Project 5: Funding to support young people who are emotionally based school avoiders (EBSA) in secondary schools

Background

One of the main pressures on the High Needs Block is the increasing numbers of children being placed in independent and non maintained special schools, particularly children with autism and children with SEMH (Social, Emotional and Mental Health difficulties). Children and young people with SEMH and Autism form the largest proportion of those placed externally.

The incidence of emotionally based school avoidance was seen to be rising prior to the pandemic, but its prevalence has been exacerbated by Covid, as children who were already experiencing anxiety about attending school became accustomed to being at home during lockdown and found it even harder, or in some cases impossible, to return to school.

Rationale

In 2021, an exercise was undertaken to try to identify the number of children displaying emotionally based school avoidance in West Berkshire schools. Teams which contributed to the collation of data on incidence of EBSA included the SEN Team, the Autism Team, the Educational Psychology Service, the Emotional Health Academy, the Therapeutic Thinking Team, the Education Welfare Service, the Virtual School and Children's Social Care Teams. Approximately 250 children were identified as EBSA. This did not include children who were EBSA and who had been moved to specialist placements or children who were put on to Elective Home Education by their parents because of their high levels of anxiety about school attendance.

Children who are EBSA are at high risk of poor life outcomes. In addition, where school avoidance is entrenched to the point of becoming irreversible, a number of children are having to be placed in specialist schools. There is increasing pressure for EHC assessments of children who are EBSA as well as for the provision of specialist placements. In 2019-20 there were 79 children in specialist placements for ASD or SEMH at a total annual cost of £3,024,323. In 2020-21 this had increased to 87 children and a total cost of £3,445,031, a rise of approximately £421K in just one year.

An exercise undertaken in 2021 identified that of 87 children placed in specialist schools for ASD or SEMH, at a conservative estimate at least 11 were emotionally based school avoiders prior to being placed. These children were attending placements costing typically £53,000 per year, therefore the total cost to the HNB was approximately £583,000. In addition there were at the time 5 cases under statutory assessment where school attendance had ceased entirely and parents were seeking specialist placements. There were also 6 children with EHCPs who were EBSA and who were receiving Personal Budgets to support the families with provision of Elective Home Education, at a total cost of approximately £58,000 per annum.

This exercise is currently being updated and will without doubt show a further increase in children who are under EHC assessment due to EBSA and also in the numbers of young people placed in specialist schools due to EBSA.

Not all children who display emotionally based school avoidance will go on to need specialist placements. However, given the high cost of placements and the benefits to most children of remaining in mainstream school, it is important that we try to intervene earlier and more effectively in order to reduce the number of cases reaching this point.

In March 2021, the Schools Forum agreed to fund, for primary schools (and any secondary schools which chose to opt in), a package of support for children experiencing EBSA in order to avoid specialist placements. This included access for schools to an EBSA fund, via the EBSA Forum, and support from an EBSA Team consisting of a part time EBSA Coordinator / EWO, a part time Educational Psychologist and a part time Emotional Health Academy Worker. This project is showing promising results and will be fully evaluated in autumn 2022. It has been agreed by the Schools Forum that this project will continue to be funded in 2022-23.

Secondary schools (apart from one) chose not buy in to this project in 2021-22 and instead opted to share what would have been the cost of an equivalent secondary project in order to make their own arrangements to support children with EBSA. Schools will be asked to report on the use and impact of these funds in autumn 2022.

The pressure which children who are EBSA is putting on the HNB continues to be a significant issue and therefore there is an ongoing need to support secondary schools in their efforts to reintegrate and maintain young people with EBSA in a mainstream environment.

Proposal

Allocation of £111,000 for delegation to secondary schools to support young people with EBSA at £11,100 per school.

Schools may use these funds creatively to support young people experiencing EBSA. This might include, for example, funding of tutors, TA support, on line learning packages or mental health support.

Secondary schools would be able to use their allocation to buy in to the Local Authority's EBSA Service if they chose to do so.

Aims

To enhance support already provided by secondary schools for children who are experiencing emotionally based school avoidance in order to improve outcomes for those children

To retain young people who are experiencing EBSA in mainstream secondary schools wherever possible and avoid specialist placements

Success criteria

- Young people in secondary schools experiencing EBSA show improved attendance

- Avoidance of specialist placements for young people of secondary age experiencing EBSA

Cost

£111,000

Savings

Avoidance of one specialist placement could save £62,000. If two specialist placements can be avoided the saving will be **£124,000**.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 4

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010), which states:

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;*
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;*
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.*
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.*

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality (the relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected, but on the significance of the impact on them):

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the Council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Schools' Forum to make:	Approve use of Schools Block transfer in to High Needs Block for 5 specified invest to save projects
Name of Service/Directorate:	Education / People
Name of assessor:	Jane Seymour
Date of assessment:	9.3.22

Is this a ?		Is this policy, strategy, function or service ... ?	
Policy	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	New or proposed	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Strategy	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Function	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Is changing	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Service	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

(1) What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	To provide additional support and services to enable children with SEND to remain in mainstream education settings and reduce pressure on the HNB
Objectives:	<p>To provide additional support to children in the early years through the EDIT Team in order to intervene earlier and improve transition in to school</p> <p>To improve skills and confidence of staff in early years settings to support children with speech and language difficulties and social communication difficulties</p> <p>To provide earlier intervention for children at risk of exclusion and avoid permanent exclusion</p> <p>To increase provision at I-College for young people at risk of exclusion</p> <p>To enhance support provided by secondary schools for children who are emotionally based school avoiders to improve their attendance and prevent placement breakdown</p>
Outcomes:	<p>Reduced exclusions</p> <p>Increased inclusion in mainstream settings</p>

	Avoidance of specialist placements
Benefits:	Better outcomes for children with SEND Reduced pressure on the HNB

(2) Which groups might be affected and how? Is it positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this?

(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation)

Group Affected	Potential Positive Impacts	Potential Negative Impacts	Evidence
Age	N/A	N/A	
Disability	All the projects outlined in this report are designed to improve support and services for children with SEND so that their needs are met and they are able wherever possible to remain in mainstream settings with peers.	None	
Gender Reassignment	N/A	N/A	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/A	N/A	
Pregnancy and Maternity	N/A	N/A	
Race	N/A	N/A	
Religion or Belief	N/A	N/A	
Sex	N/A	N/A	
Sexual Orientation	N/A	N/A	
Further Comments:			

(3) Result	
Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> NoX <input type="checkbox"/>
Please provide an explanation for your answer: The impact of the proposals is only positive.	
Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> NoX <input type="checkbox"/>
Please provide an explanation for your answer: See above.	

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a EqlA 2.

If an EqlA 2 is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the EqlA guidance and template – <http://intranet/index.aspx?articleid=32255>.

(4) Identify next steps as appropriate:	
EqlA Stage 2 required	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Owner of EqlA Stage Two:	
Timescale for EqlA Stage Two:	

Name:

Jane Seymour

Date: 9/3/22

Please now forward this completed form to Pamela Voss, Equality and Diversity Officer (pamela.voss@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website

Early Years Budget 2022/23

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 14th March 2022

Report Author: Avril Allenby and Lisa Potts

Item for: Decision **By:** All Forum Members

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the proposal for the Early Years budget 2022/23, which is based upon the recommendations of the Early Years Funding Group.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 For the Schools Forum to agree the 2022/23 budgets as detailed in 6.6.

Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

3. Funding Framework for 2022/23

- 3.1 The funding rate determined for West Berkshire for 2022/23 for 3 to 4 year olds has increased by 17p from £4.84 to £5.01 per hour.
- 3.2 Local Authorities are required to set an average funding rate for providers for 3 and 4 year olds which is at least 95% of the authority's funding rate (£5.01 for West Berkshire). This minimum funding level is referred to as the pass through rate.
- 3.3 The funding rate paid for 2 year olds has increased by a 21p uplift from £5.90 to £6.11 per hour.
- 3.4 The Early Years Pupil Premium Grant (EYPPG) is to continue and is increasing from £0.53 to £0.60 per hour.
- 3.5 A Disability Access Fund (DAF) payment of £800 per child per year will be made for children in receipt of Disability Living Allowance.
- 3.6 An SEN Inclusion fund also continues.

4. Forecast Outturn for 2021/22

- 4.1 The figures in the forecast below are based on actual hours for the 2021/22 year, with a small contingency to allow for any final changes in the Spring 2022 hours.
- 4.2 There is a forecast overspend of £48k on the delegated funds, with a £12k saving on the centrally managed funds.

- 4.3 It has been forecast that we will need to return £206k of the current year funding to the DFE, but final figures won't be known until July 2022.
- 4.4 The 2020-21 funding adjustment of a further £150k funding is the adjustment from the prior year.
- 4.5 Whilst we set the budget to be £1.1m overspent, the forecast shows an improving position with £916k overspend.
- 4.6 The table below shows the forecast outturn for 2021/22:

	2021/22 Budget Set £	2021/22 Forecast £	2021/22 Variance £
Funds Delegated to Early Years Providers			
PVI Providers (90036)	6,251,270	5,914,130	-337,140
Nursery classes in Mainstream Schools (90037)	1,561,780	1,838,560	276,780
Maintained Nursery Schools (90010) (including MNSS lump sum)	854,510	855,848	1,338
2 Year Old Funding (90018)	635,540	705,187	69,647
Pupil Premium Grant (30%) and deprivation funding (70%) (90052)	200,350	237,699	37,349
Total Delegated Funds	9,503,450	9,551,424	47,974
Centrally Managed Funds			
Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (90017)	270,770	269,800	-970
Early Development Intervention Team (EDIT) (90287)	60,190	60,190	0
SEN Inclusion Fund (90238)	90,000	90,000	0
Disability Access Fund (90053)	23,370	12,300	-11,070
SSRs	68,510	68,510	0
Total Centrally Managed Funds	512,840	500,800	-12,040
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	10,016,290	10,052,224	35,934
Early Years DSG Block Funding In Year	-10,161,500	-9,955,920	205,580
In year overspend (under spend)	-145,210	96,304	241,514
Early Years 2020-21 funding adjustment		-149,658	-149,658
Early Years DSG Block Overspend from previous year	1,257,630	970,000	-287,630
FORECAST CUMULATIVE DEFICIT AT YEAR END	1,112,420	916,646	-195,774

5. Deficit Recovery

- 5.1 The deficit recovery plan took effect with effect from 1st April 2021. The table below shows what has been achieved in the current year, together with the plan for the next 4 years.

	actual Year 1 2021/22	forecast Year 2 2022/23	forecast Year 3 2023/24	forecast Year 4 2024/25	forecast Year 5 2025/26	Total
up to 8p reduction 3 / 4 year olds to £4.32	52,992	73,265	109,897	128,213	146,529	510,896
up to 5p reduction in quality rate to £0.61	29,751	31,312	41,749	41,749	52,186	196,746
up to 15p reduction in 2 year olds to £5.50	12,706	16,074	18,753	18,753	20,093	86,379
up to 60p reduction in deprivation to £1.40	33,957	32,965	42,384	47,094	56,512	212,912
	129,406	153,616	212,783	235,808	275,320	1,006,934

- 5.2 The deficit recovery plan set out to save £123k in year 1. The provisional figures are expected to be £129k, which is an over achievement of £6k.

	forecast		Year 1 provisional	
	hours	£	hours	£
3p reduction 3 / 4 year olds	1,831,615	£54,948	1,766,410	£52,992
3p reduction in quality rate	1,043,720	£31,312	991,694	£29,751
10p reduction in 2 year olds	133,951	£13,395	127,061	£12,706
25p reduction in deprivation	94,187	£23,547	135,828	£33,957
	3,103,473	£123,202	3,020,992	£129,406

6. Budget Model for 2022/23

- 6.1 At the Spending Review on 27th October the chancellor announced increases in the funding for the early years entitlements worth £160 million in 2022-23, £180 million in 23-24 and £170 million in 24-25. This is for local authorities to increase the hourly rates paid to childcare providers. While the Early Years National Funding formula (EYNFF) determines a local authority's funding allocation in respect of the universal and extended entitlements, local authorities determine the actual hourly rate paid to early years providers in their area using a locally determined funding formula.
- 6.2 Therefore when determining the local rates there are two factors that need to be taken into consideration. The deficit recovery and the new funding from government. The table below shows the local rates in the current financial year, the rates as per deficit recovery and the proposed rates when the new funding is applied using our local formula.

	2021/22 Current Base Rate £	2022/23 Rate as per deficit recovery £	2022/23 Proposed Rate £
3&4 year olds funding rate	4.37	4.36	4.50
Quality Rate	0.63	0.63	0.63
2YO Funding Rate	5.55	5.53	5.71
Deprivation	1.75	1.65	1.72

- 6.3 The Local Authority is allowed to fund from the grant some centrally provided services, including staffing and IT costs in relation to overseeing the delivery of the free entitlement, sufficiency of places, eligibility checking, and administration of funding payments to providers. However funding for these services is limited by the requirement to set a "pass-through rate" for 3 and 4 year olds which is at least 95% of the authority's funding rate.
- 6.4 The pass-through rate for 2022/23 is at 99.7%; which is mainly due to the high level of hours that attract the quality supplement.
- 6.5 It should be noted that 2019/20 the single base rate was increased to support all providers with the additional costs that have impacted on them over the past two years; rises in the minimum wage and pension costs alongside the introduction of the additional free entitlement to working parents. However this rise has impacted

upon the pass-through rate taking it above 100% and has resulted in the overspend position that now needs addressing.

6.6 The 2022/23 budget is shown below using the rates shown above:

	2022/23 Yr 1 Budget £
<u>Funds Delegated to Early Years Providers</u>	
PVI Providers (90036)	6,165,374
Nursery classes in Mainstream Schools (90037)	1,875,191
Maintained Nursery Schools (90010)	824,888
2 Year Old Funding (90018)	736,937
Pupil Premium Grant (35%) and deprivation funding (65%) (90052)	235,692
Total Delegated Funds	9,838,081
<u>Centrally Managed Funds</u>	
Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (90017)	281,980
Early Development Intervention Team (EDIT) (90287)	62,505
SEN Inclusion Fund (90238)	90,000
Disability Access Fund (90053)	42,400
SSRs	69,310
Total Centrally Managed Funds	546,195
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	10,384,276
Early Years DSG Block Funding In Year	-10,016,378
In Year 22/23 Shortfall	367,898
Early Years DSG Block Deficit carried forward	£916,646
OVERALL NET POSITION	1,284,544

6.7 The number of hours that are eligible for the quality rate has increased from 53% in 2019/20 to 57% in 21/22. Although we are reducing the pass through rate to providers, this is going to take some time to bring to a sustainable level.

7. Conclusion

7.1 The Early Years Block budget has been set at a level which seeks to realign the pass-through rate and reduce some of the deficit budget.

7.2 The deficit will be monitored to ensure the overall position of the block is recovering the current shortfall.

8. Recommendation

8.1 For the Schools Forum to agree the 2022/23 budgets as detailed in 6.6.

9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment.

Appendix A

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010), which states:

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;*
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;*
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.*
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.*

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality (the relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected, but on the significance of the impact on them):

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the Council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Schools' Forum to make:	For the Schools Forum to agree the 2022/23 Early Years budget.
Name of Service/Directorate:	Early Years Budget 2022/23
Name of assessor:	Lisa Potts
Date of assessment:	8/3/2022

Is this a ?		Is this policy, strategy, function or service ... ?	
Policy	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	New or proposed	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Strategy	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Function	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is changing	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Service	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(1) What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	To agree the Early Years Block budget
Objectives:	To ensure services continue to be funded
Outcomes:	Agreement to fund Early Years services as set out in the papers
Benefits:	A deliverable service

(2) Which groups might be affected and how? Is it positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this?			
<i>(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation)</i>			
Group Affected	Potential Positive Impacts	Potential Negative Impacts	Evidence
Age	None	None	
Disability	None	None	
Gender Reassignment	None	None	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	None	None	

Pregnancy and Maternity	None	None	
Race	None	None	
Religion or Belief	None	None	
Sex	None	None	
Sexual Orientation	None	None	
Further Comments:			

(3) Result	
Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please provide an explanation for your answer:	
Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please provide an explanation for your answer:	

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered ‘yes’ to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a EqIA 2.
 If an EqIA 2 is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the EqIA guidance and template – <http://intranet/index.aspx?articleid=32255>.

(4) Identify next steps as appropriate:	
EqIA Stage 2 required	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Owner of EqIA Stage Two:	
Timescale for EqIA Stage Two:	

Name: Lisa Potts **Date:** 08/03/2022

Please now forward this completed form to Pamela Voss, Equality and Diversity Officer (pamela.voss@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WB

This page is intentionally left blank