

Report Title:	Pupil Growth funding 2024-25
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No – Part I
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Amy Tisi
Meeting and Date:	Schools Forum 16 November 2023
Responsible Officer(s):	Lin Ferguson – Executive Director of Children’s Services Tracey Anne Nevitt – Finance Business Partner
Wards affected:	All

## REPORT SUMMARY

*The purpose of this report is to provide the schools Forum with the operational guidance changes for 2024-25 relating to the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Pupil Growth fund; the current Pupil Growth fund budget forecast, schools in receipt of growth fund in this financial year and proposed school pupil growth funding changes for 2024-25. Details are set out in sections 4-6.*

### 1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

**RECOMMENDATION:** That Schools Forum notes the report:

- i) **ESFA Operational Guidance for 2024-25 in relation to Schools Growth funding and allowable spend.**
- ii) **Items for consultation with the Schools Forum members.**
- iii) **Including the reported budget and forecast for this financial year 2023-24.**

### 2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

#### Options

**Table 1: Options arising from this report**

Option	Comments
Schools Forum to note the contents of the report and approve the three proposals. To make comments on the growth fund budget. <b>This is the recommended option.</b>	Pupil growth funding proposals for 2024-25 onwards to ensure range of options to cover temporary and permanent expansion within RBWM schools. Unit rate uplift to RBWM growth funding allocations and remove risk of non-compliance with DfE guidance
Do nothing. This is not recommended.	The failure to comply with 2024-25 operational guidance to implement growth funding proposals at or above the DfE minimum funding for 2024-25.

## **Background**

- The Schools Growth Fund
- 2.1 The Growth Funding is allocated to local authorities within the Schools Block funding, as part of the Dedicated Schools Grant.
  - 2.2 For 2024-25, growth fund allocations to local authorities will be calculated using the same methodology as previous year, based on the growth in pupil numbers between the October 2022 and October 2023 censuses. The DfE will not offer any funding protection to local authorities. For further details please see the [schools NFF technical note](#).
  - 2.3 As it is within the schools block, a movement of funding from the schools formula into the growth fund would not be treated as a transfer between blocks. The local authority (LA) will consult the schools forum on the total growth fund for the new financial year once the settlement is received and the draft schools formula has been calculated in January 2024.
  - 2.4 Growth funding for growing schools and Bulge classes must be agreed by the LA in advance. This report details the proposals for January 2024 onwards.
  - 2.5 The Growth fund can only be used for:
    - Support growth in the pre-16 pupil numbers to meet basic need.
    - Support additional classes needed to meet the infant class size regulation.
    - Meet the costs of new schools (these are new schools identified from the latest census data). e.g., Lead in costs, diseconomy of scale, goods and services necessary to allow the school to admit pupils. Primary and secondary schools only.
    - The DfE will continue to fund start-up and diseconomy costs for new free schools where they are not being opened to meet the need for a new school as referred to in [section 6A of the Education and Inspections Act 2006](#).
  - 2.6 The growth fund must not be used to support:
    - schools in financial difficulty (due to exceptional circumstances): any such support for maintained schools should be provided from a de-delegated contingency
    - general growth in individual schools (due to popularity) where there is no overall pupil number growth in the local area. This is managed through lagged funding. This includes cases where academies have admitted above pupil admission numbers (PAN) by their own choice.

## **Demand for school places and possible need for bulge classes**

- 2.7 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead has a legal duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet demand.
- 2.8 Projections of future demand are done annually and reported to the DfE in the School Capacity (SCAP) survey in July. The 2023 projections have been circulated to schools and will be reported to Cabinet in November 2023.
- 2.9 Aside from potentially expansion of secondary provision in Datchet/ Wraysbury, and of primary provision in South East Maidenhead, the

projections are not suggesting a need for any permanent increases in school capacity in the medium term. There are, however, some local issues that may need temporary increases in capacity:

- Primary provision in Datchet, where demographic data indicates a potential need for a bulge class for Reception in September 2025.
- National curriculum year groups 4, 5 and 6 in Maidenhead, where the number of available places in the town is very low, as set out in Table 2.

**Table 2: Spare places in Maidenhead primary schools, Autumn 2023**

	Yr R	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Yr 6
Maidenhead Town	44	31	23	31	6	1	1
Maidenhead Villages	64	53	49	33	27	34	25
Total	108	84	72	64	33	35	26

- 2.10 The shortage of places in Years 4, 5 and 6 could be addressed by opening one or more ‘bulge’ classes. This is where a school takes an additional class in one year group. Other year groups are not affected, and the bulge class closes once the larger year group leaves school (in this case at the end of Year 6). Despite several requests from the local authority, none of the four schools with physical capacity has agreed to take a bulge class.
- 2.11 The main concern for schools considering bulge classes is around the revenue funding, and particularly the funding for the additional teacher/teaching assistant(s). Under current ‘School Growth Fund’ arrangements schools got the full funding to run a bulge class for one year only. Revenue to support the additional teaching staff in subsequent years was expected to be generated by the additional pupil numbers reported in the Autumn school census.
- 2.12 Sufficient revenue funding was, however, only be generated if the bulge class was mostly full. This didn’t always happen, however, and led to some schools running deficit budgets.
- 2.13 The alternative to providing additional places as proposed above is to provide home to school transport to those schools with places. For Datchet this is likely to mean schools in Windsor, whilst for Maidenhead most of the available places are in the villages outside of the town. This means that these children will be taught outside their local communities and are also likely to be eligible for free home to school transport.
- 2.14 A market testing exercise carried out earlier this year indicated that a 16 seat minibus running from central Maidenhead to a village school would cost £34k per annum. A 30 seat coach would be £61k per annum. Costs from Datchet to Windsor would be similar, depending on exactly which schools had places available in September 2025.
- 2.15 There is, therefore, a clear risk of adding to the home to school transport costs quite significantly, if it continues to be difficult to place junior age children in Maidenhead schools, or if a bulge class is needed and not added at Datchet.

### 3. Key Implications

3.1 The key implications are set out in Table 3.

**Table 3: Key Implications**

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
The Schools Forum to note the contents of the report. To consider and approve the three proposals for RBWM pupil growth fund arrangements 2024-25.	The Schools Forum do not engage in the consultation process.	Schools Forum engage with the consultation process and Schools forum members vote and approve the pupil growth fund proposals.	Schools Forum engage with the process providing insight into the impact on RBWM schools.	Schools Forum engage with the process providing insight into the impact on RBWM schools of the funding formula with comparative data relating to other local authority schools.	16 November 2023.

### 4. Operational Guidance and minimum funding

4.1 From 2024-25 the DfE have stipulated in the operational guidance a minimum amount local authorities can allocate to individual schools eligible for pupil growth funding. The calculation below applies to all school types.

4.2 The primary growth factor value can be used for all school types – recognising there is one teacher pay scale and that this funding is a minimum value.

4.3 DfE Minimum Growth funding calculation per eligible school:

- Primary Growth Factor value £1,550 \* Pupil Numbers \* ACA

4.4 The growth funding allocation by local authorities to growing schools is for the period September to March and is therefore 7/12ths of the financial year. Academy schools will also receive 5/12ths (April – August) of the published growth fund allocation in the following financial year, paid by the local authority and funded by the ESFA. The Area cost adjustment (ACA) for RBWM's DSG schools block is 1.0579.

4.5 The RBWM current growth fund rate is £35,577. This is the lump sum paid to schools for the period September to March for a growing school or bulge

class. A further 5/12ths is payable to Academy schools at £25,412. The RBWM rate is below the new DfE minimum for 2024-25.

- 4.6 The minimum payable to RBWM schools for September to March for a new class of 30 pupils in 2024-25 will now be £1,639 per pupil, based on £1,550 \*1.05790 Area Cost Adjustment. For a full class of 30 pupils the calculation is (£1,550 \* 30 pupils \*1.0579 ACA) = £49,192.

## **5. Pupil Growth Funding 2024-25.**

- 5.1 DfE Guidance states that the local authority criteria should provide a transparent and consistent basis for the allocation of funding, which may be different for each phase.
- 5.2 Local authorities propose the criteria and funding methodology for the Growth Fund and under the powers and responsibilities of the Schools Forum guidance, the Schools Forum members decide to either support or decline the proposals.
- 5.3 The RBWM proposes to consult with the Schools Forum on the growing schools funding rate change, proposal for funding protection for bulge classes and funding of additional places above PAN.

### **Proposals for 2024-25**

- 5.4 The first proposal is to ensure that RBWM schools in receipt of growth funding are funded at or above the new DfE minimum growth fund calculation for 2024-25 onwards.
- 5.5 All schools with approved growth funding for growing schools or year 1 of the bulge class funding will be funded on the same pupil or lump sum rate following the 2024-25 consultation with the Schools Forum.
- 5.6 The amounts detailed in the table below assumes a class of 30 pupils. All academy schools receive the annual sum. Maintained schools are funded at 7/12ths.

## Proposal A – Permanent Expansion Growth Funding

**Table 4: Pupil Growth Expansion Funding 2024-25 Options**

<b>Growth Funding</b>	Annual	7/12ths	Sept - March (7/12ths)	April- August (5/12ths)	Annual
New Class - 30 pupils	Pupil Unit/ lump sum	Pupil Unit	All schools	Academy schools	Total
	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Model 1</b> ESFA minimum 7/12ths calculation £1,550* ACA 1.0579* Pupil numbers	2,811	1,640	49,192	35,137	84,330
<b>Model 2</b> AWPU (Primary rate 2023-24)	3,585	2,091	62,729	44,807	107,536
<b>Model 3</b> Lump sum + Main sc6 teacher	87,934		51,295	36,639	87,934
RBWM 2023-24 lump sum	60,989		35,577	25,412	60,989

5.7 RBWM 2024-25 growing schools funding proposals include a range of options from the ESFA. Model 1, minimum funding 2024-25, model 2, funding at the local basic entitlement rate in the schools' revenue formula (known as AWPU- Age weighted pupil unit) and model 3 a lump sum.

5.8 The AWPU rate and main scale 6 teacher's costs are the 2023-24 rates. These rates will be updated annually and reflected in the final growth fund allocations.

5.9 A school with approval by the local authority for a permanent expansion for basic need, will receive funding for each year a new additional class is added each September.

### **Bulge classes**

5.10 Bulge classes must be agreed in advance by the Local Authority and comply with the DfE guidance supporting basic need and not due to changes in popularity. Bulge classes are allocated to schools to fund temporary growth in pupil numbers, where growth in numbers is not expected in future year groups.

5.11 Basic need bulge classes currently receive one year's bulge class funding and no funding protection in the following year.

5.12 It is assumed that a school with a bulge class will have a full class on Census in the following year and be in receipt of formula funding in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year. However, allocating a school a bulge class does not guarantee the expected increase in pupils will result in a full class being registered at that school. Parents may choose to send some of the pupils to another local school. This may result in teachers costs for the class exceeding the formula funding for a number of years, leading to a financial pressure on the school's budget.

- 5.13 Due to parental choice and the issues this can create with funding bulge classes, another option has been developed to temporary increases in pupil numbers and bulge class funding protection. Two proposals are listed below.
- 5.14 Table 5 summarises a proposal to protect bulge class funding for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and future years for low intake at the school. In effect this will be funding ‘missing’ pupils where a full class is not on the October Census in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and future year.
- 5.15 The 2<sup>nd</sup> proposal under consideration is to allocate the temporary increase in a year group numbers to several schools within an area and fund the increase in agreed places above the Planned Admission Number (PAN).
- 5.16 Year 1 funding will remain at the level of the agreed model detailed in table 3.

**Proposal B – Funding protection year 2 onwards**

- 5.17 Table 5 and 6 details several pupil funding protection levels and an example of school funding for ‘missing’ pupils at a Junior School.
- 5.18 In the first year each Bulge class would receive funding based on the growing schools agreed funding rate as per Table 4.
- 5.19 The following years funding will be based on the difference in pupil numbers between the actual year group numbers and the expected NOR. For example, 2 classes of 30 pupils, compared to actual numbers of 48 pupils overall. 12 ‘missing’ pupils funded.
- 5.20 The options for funding for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year onwards are for the pupil rate to either to be based on the AWPU £3,584.54 or the ESFA £1,550 minimum funding rate, on a sliding scale as detailed on the table below.
- 5.21 Bulge Class Protection funding year 2 onwards:

**Table 5 Proposal B**

Bulge Class Funding Protection	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
A	85% of missing pupils	60% of missing pupils	40% of missing pupils	20% of missing Pupils
B	90% of missing pupils	60% of missing Pupils	40% of missing pupils	N/A
C	95% of missing pupils	N/A	N/A	N/A

- 5.22 Table 6 below includes an estimate for a junior school with 12 ‘missing’ pupils. The unit rate for this example is based on the Primary AWPU of £3584.54 for 2023-24. A full year’s funding is reflected in Table 6.

**Table 6 Junior School Bulge Class Protection Funding:**

	Year 2 (School Yr4) 12 missing pupils	Year 3 (School Yr5) 12 missing pupils	Year 4 (School Yr6) 12 missing pupils
	£	£	£
A	36,562	25,809	7,528
B	38,713	25,809	7,528
C	40,864	0	0

5.23 The protection funding for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year reduces the risk to the school funding of insufficient schools' formula funding in subsequent years. The local authority's annual growth fund commitment and actual costs will vary greatly dependent on the individual school's pupil numbers each October.

### **Proposal C – Numbers in excess of PAN**

5.24 This proposal would allow pupil growth funding to be allocated to schools that admit pupils in excess of their PAN for each whole term that the school made each additional place available at the request of the Local Authority. For instance, where a school makes 96 places available in a year group instead of 90 at RBWM's request, the school would be funded for 6 additional places for each full term the places are available.

5.25 A full year funding is payable to an academy school and 7/12ths for a maintained school.

5.26 Under this proposal schools would receive either AWPU £3,584.54 funding @ 7/12ths or ESFA £1,550 minimum funding per pupil/ place for the period that they make each additional place available at the request of RBWM.

5.27 The table below demonstrates the data used to establish the place numbers to be funded. It should be noted that this methodology does not 'ghost fund' places and can still result in the school subsidising some of the cost of a teacher, however it ensures every pupil is funded while remaining affordable.

**Table 7**

Funding Calculation
Fund the difference in number of pupils between the first year Autumn census and the second years autumn census.
For instance: NOR October 2022 census = 10 NOR October 2023 census = 20 Fund (20 – 10) = 10 places

5.28 RBWM propose that this option for funding additional places above PAN be made available from January 2024 onwards. Sufficient budget remains to cover the expected demand for the remainder of 2023-24



**6. Growth Funding Budget**

- 6.1 Each year local authorities receive a Pupil Growth Fund allocation within the schools block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The allocation is based on the movement of pupil numbers between the two October counts.
- 6.2 The [Schools technical guidance 2024-25](#) states that the ESFA ‘will fund the pupil numbers in middle layer super output areas (MSOAs) between the October 2022 and October 2023 school censuses. The growth allocation for each LA will be based on an amount per new primary pupil and an amount per new secondary pupil, plus a lump sum amount for each brand-new school’.
- 6.3 The current financial year Schools Block Growth Fund allocation is £1,039,740 plus £76,240 funding received via school’s block recoupment to fund the 5/12ths element of academy school’s pupil growth fund allocations.
- 6.4 The 2023-24 financial year commitments currently include 2 growing schools’ allocations for the period September 2023 to March 2024 totalling £71,154 and 3 payments to academy schools relating to academic year 2022-23 of £76,236. RBWM commitments for expanding schools have decreased in recent years and schools have been reluctant to agree to bulge classes.
- 6.5 The table below lists the current commitments for 2023-24:

**Table 8**

School	Period	£	£
St Peters Middle	Apr23-Aug23	25,412	
Furze Platt Senior	Apr23-Aug23	25,412	
Windsor Girls	Apr23-Aug23	25,412	76,236
Furze Platt Senior	Sept23 - March 24	35,577	
Windsor Girls	Sept23 - March 24	35,577	71,154
		Current Commitments 2023-24	147,390

- 6.6 Operational guidance allows local authorities to carry forward part or all of the growth fund underspend as an earmarked reserve to fund future year commitments within the schools’ block. Alternatively, part or all of the underspend can be released into the DSG budget monitoring forecast to contribute towards pressures within other blocks within the Dedicated Schools Grant.
- 6.7 RBWM 2024-25 financial year growth funding is estimated to be approximately £1,050,000. The estimate is based on the admissions pupil data per school as of September 2023. The 2024-25 budget estimate does not reflect recent movement in pupils and the final census data. Local authorities will be informed of the final 2024-25 Schools block growth fund in mid-December 2023.

## **7. Falling Rolls**

- 7.1 From 2024-25 the ESFA will fund falling pupil numbers in middle layer super output areas (MSOAs) between the October 2022 and October 2023 school censuses. The falling rolls allocation for each LA will be based on an allocation per MSOA where the pupil numbers on roll have decreased by 10% or more.
- 7.2 Based on the ESFA 2024-25 Growth and Falling rolls calculator and the September 2023 admissions data, RBWM does not expect to receive any falling rolls funding for the financial year 2024-25.

## **8. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY**

- 8.1 The School Growth Fund budget for 2024-25 will be within the growth funding element of the school's block grant.

## **9. IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no legal implications directly arising from this report.

## **10. RISK MANAGMENT**

- 10.1 There are no potential risks directly arising from this report. The proposals are within the current grant funding.

## **11. POTENTIAL IMPACTS**

- 11.1 Equalities. Equality Impact Assessments is shown in Appendix A. The Equality Act 2010 places a statutory duty on the council to ensure that when considering any new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure the impacts on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups, have been considered. It has been assessed that there are no Equality Impact risks arising from this report.
- 11.2 Climate change/sustainability. There are no climate change/ sustainability risks arising from this report.
- 11.3 Data Protection/GDPR. There are no data protection/ GDPR risks arising from this report.

## **12. CONSULTATION**

- 12.1 There is no requirement for stakeholder consultation arising from this report. Financial reporting including the Dedicated Schools Grant is regularly provided to RBWM Commissioners and the Achieving for Children Board.

### 13. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 13.1 The proposed implementation of the growth fund changes is January 2024 for proposal C and financial year 2024-25 for proposals A and B.

### 14. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

14.1 This report is supported by the following background documents:

- Schools revenue funding operational guide  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pre-16-schools-funding-local-authority-guidance-for-2024-to-2025/schools-operational-guide-2024-to-2025>
- [Schools Technical Guidance 2024-25](#)
- [Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2023](#)

### 15. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<b>Mandatory:</b> Statutory Officers (or deputies)			
Elizabeth Griffiths	Executive Director of Resources/S151 Officer	16.11.23	
Emma Browne	Director of Law, Strategy & Public Health/ Monitoring Officer	16.11.23	
<b>Deputies:</b>			
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance (Deputy S151 Officer)	16.11.23	
Jane Cryer	Principal Lawyer & Deputy Monitoring Officer.	16.11.23	
<b>Mandatory:</b> Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract			
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager	16.11.23	
<b>Mandatory:</b> Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA			

Samantha Wootton	Data Protection Officer	16.11.23	
Mandatory: Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required			
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Engagement Officer	16.11.23	31.10.23
Other consultees:			
Directors (where relevant)			
Stephen Evans	Chief Executive		
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place		
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Adult Services and Health (DASS)		
Lin Ferguson	Executive Director of Children's Services and Education (DCS)	16.11.23	1.11.23

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Children's Services	Yes/ No
---	--	---------

## REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
For information	No	No
Report Author: Tracey Anne Nevitt, Finance Business Partner, AFC		

# Equality Impact Assessment

## Appendix A

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact [equality@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:equality@rbwm.gov.uk)

www.rbwm.gov.uk



### 1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Schools Pupil Growth Fund
Service area:	Schools
Directorate:	Children's Services

#### **Provide a brief explanation of the proposal:**

- What are its intended outcomes?
- Who will deliver it?
- Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?

The intended outcome of the proposal is to provide Schools Forum details on schools growth fund proposals for 2024-25. This is a requirement to inform Schools Forum of the financial position of the Dedicated Schools Grant growth fund and consult on changes to criteria and funding methodology.

### 2. Relevance Check

#### **Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees?**

- If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues.
- Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)

Yes.

The growth fund proposals may have an indirect impact on pupils. This proposal will not require an EQIA at a later stage.

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact [equality@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:equality@rbwm.gov.uk)

### 3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

<b>Who will be affected by this proposal?</b> For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff
Stakeholders including pupils with disabilities will be indirectly affected by the proposals included within this report.
<b>Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics</b> (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) <b>disproportionately represented?</b> For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?
No, pupils with protected characteristics are not disproportionately affected. This report does indirectly impact on all pupils, including those with protected characteristics; however, as school funding is on a formula basis impact has already been considered within previous reports and decision-making processes
<b>What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How has/will equality considerations be taken into account?</li><li>• Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement?</li></ul>
Schools Forum is actively engaged throughout the Schools Formula budget setting and consultation process.
<b>What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment?</b> Please consult the Equalities Evidence Grid for relevant data. Examples of other possible sources of information are in the Guidance document.
Not Applicable

## 4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'

More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the Guidance document.

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age	This report does indirectly impact on all pupils, including those this protected characteristic; however, as school funding is on a formula basis impact has already been considered within previous reports and decision-making processes	Yes	Not Applicable
Disability	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Sex	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Race, ethnicity and religion	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Pregnancy and maternity	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Marriage and civil partnership	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Armed forces community	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Socio-economic considerations e.g. low income, poverty	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Children in care/Care leavers	There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

**5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring**

*If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.*

<p><b>What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it?</b>                  For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group</p>
<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.</li> </ul>
<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future?</b>                  See guidance document for examples of appropriate stages to review an EQIA.</p>
<p>Not Applicable</p>

**6. Sign Off**

<b>Completed by: Louise Dutton</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Approved by:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

<b>Reviewed by:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
---------------------	--------------