

PART A - Initial Equality Screening Assessment

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality and diversity.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provide a record of both the process and decision. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality and diversity
- whether or not equality and diversity is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an Equality Analysis (Part B).

Further information is available in the Equality Screening and Analysis Guidance – see page 9.

1. Title	
Title: Home to School Policy	
Directorate: Regeneration and Environment	Service area: Community Safety and Street Scene
Lead person: Karen Mudford – Head of Fleet & Transport Services	Contact: Karen.mudford@rotherham.gov.uk
Is this a:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy / Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service / Function <input type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify	

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening
<p>A revised Home to School Policy was presented to Cabinet 18th December 2023 and the decision to conduct a public consultation was approved.</p> <p>This Equalities Screening relates to a further report being presented to Cabinet 18th March 2024, where the decision to adopt the Policy is sought.</p>

3. Relevance to equality and diversity

All the Council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees, or the wider community – borough wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality and diversity.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, disability, sex, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, civil partnerships and marriage, pregnancy and maternity and other socio-economic groups e.g. parents, single parents and guardians, carers, looked after children, unemployed and people on low incomes, ex-offenders, victims of domestic violence, homeless people etc.

Questions	Yes	No
Could the proposal have implications regarding the accessibility of services to the whole or wider community? <i>(Be mindful that this is not just about numbers. A potential to affect a small number of people in a significant way is as important)</i>	X	
Could the proposal affect service users? <i>(Be mindful that this is not just about numbers. A potential to affect a small number of people in a significant way is as important)</i>	X	
Has there been or is there likely to be an impact on an individual or group with protected characteristics? <i>(Consider potential discrimination, harassment or victimisation of individuals with protected characteristics)</i>	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns regarding the proposal? <i>(It is important that the Council is transparent and consultation is carried out with members of the public to help mitigate future challenge)</i>		X
Could the proposal affect how the Council's services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom? <i>(If the answer is yes you may wish to seek advice from commissioning or procurement)</i>		X
Could the proposal affect the Council's workforce or employment practices? <i>(If the answer is yes you may wish to seek advice from your HR business partner)</i>		X

If you have answered no to all the questions above, please explain the reason

If you have answered **no** to all the questions above please complete **sections 5 and 6**.

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above please complete **section 4**.

4. Considering the impact on equality and diversity

If you have not already done so, the impact on equality and diversity should be considered within your proposals before decisions are made.

Considering equality and diversity will help to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and take active steps to create a discrimination free society by meeting a group or individual's needs and encouraging participation.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below using the prompts for guidance and complete an Equality Analysis (Part B).

- **How have you considered equality and diversity?**

Equality and diversity have been considered, with a specific focus on the protected characteristics related to the Equality Act 2010 as well as additional factors related to Home to School Policy specifically.

The different stakeholders involved, including children/ young people, parents/carers, transport operators and RMBC, carry implications for equalities. The most pertinent ones for children/young people are age and disability, but marriage/civil partnership and religion/faith are considered with respect to the parent/carer and their choice of school. EAL and socio-economic factors also need to be considered.

- **Key findings**

Of the protected characteristics detailed in the Equality Act 2010, age and disability are predicted to carry the most implications for equalities. There are also broader socioeconomic and English as an Alternative Language (EAL) implications to be considered. Finally, there may be implications for religion/belief, especially with respect to parents of pupils eligible for Home to School support, who opt to send their child to a school with a religious character.

Age

The Home to School Policy aims to assist children aged 5-16 years old (i.e. statutory school age) as well as learners aged 16-19 years old in further/higher education and training and continuing learners with a learning difficulty and/or disability (LLDD) aged 19 years and over.

Different provisions and eligibility criteria exist depending upon the child's age group. Examples include, but are not limited to, statutory walking distances, extended rights for children/young people from low-income families and financial hardship considerations.

Disability

The Home to School Policy includes specific measures for children with EHCPs and/or SEN. Section 39 of the Children and Families Act 2014 governs the naming of a school in a child/young person's EHCP. RMBC provides a local offer for SEND children, which is available at: <https://www.rotherhamsendlocaloffer.org.uk/>

This Policy includes Learners aged 16-19 years in further education and training and continuing learners with a learning difficulty and/or disability (LLDD) aged 19 years and over.

The 16-19 Student Bursary Fund may provide disabled young people receiving both

Employment Support Allowance and Disability Living Allowance the maximum bursary of £1,200.

The implications for Home to School Policy also need to be considered in light of disabled parents/carers. Where a child/young person is required to be accompanied to school, and their parent/carer have disabilities or mobility problems as defined by a medical professional, which would make it difficult for them to accompany their child, RMBC may provide transport assistance when appropriate medical evidence has been provided from a healthcare professional.

Independent Travel Training contains specific advice on how best to support SEND children, in referencing The Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0 to 25.

Religion/belief

Some parents opt to send their child to a school with a religious character; there are provisions which balance the parents' wishes in line with the Policy.

Marriage/civil partnership

Some children may spend time between addresses, such as in cases where their parents have separated and/or are divorced. The policy stipulates that Home to School is only provided from one address, but measures must be made to ensure that the provision is practical and meets the individual child's/young person's transport needs.

Other

Socio-economic factors are considered throughout the policy and eligibility criteria are designed to enable parents appropriate access and provision to Home to School transport.

Those with EAL may struggle to understand the document; the front of the draft policy includes a statement that:

"If you or someone you know needs help to understand or read this document, please contact us": education.transport@rotherham.gov.uk , with translations of this statement available in Slovak, Kurdish Sorani, Arabic, Urdu and Farsi."

Due consideration needs to be given to how best to communicate the proposed Policy changes.

• **Actions**

Overall, the draft Policy provides adequate provision to ensure full compliance with Education Act 1996 and the Equality Act 2010.

The main areas for reducing negative impact are centred around the following: age, disability and EAL. As part of the Equality Analysis, further consideration needs to be made regarding how to improve accessibility for EAL. Therefore, it is necessary to

Appendix 4

consider this as part of a wider corporate communications strategy in the long term, whilst in the interim using regular contact between Council officers and groups such as Special Heads, Parent Carer Forum, Headteachers and those representing the young people themselves, to ensure that anyone needing assistance with the process of applying for transport solutions may be fully supported and where necessary ensuring channels of communication with language specialists are available.

Additional data may need to be ascertained with respect to protected characteristics when considering reducing negative impact. Examples include, but are not limited to, when RMBC needs to know how best to address and mitigate circumstances where a child lives at two separate addresses and/or is SEN.

Date to scope and plan your Equality Analysis:	08/02/2024
Date to complete your Equality Analysis:	08/02/2024
Lead person for your Equality Analysis (Include name and job title):	Jacob Huggins National Management Trainee

5. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening:

Name	Job title	Date
Jacob Huggins	National Management Trainee	18/01/24
Steve Elling	Policy & Equalities Manager	14/02/2024
Karen Mudford	Head of Fleet & Transport Services	15/02/2024

6. Publishing

This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given.

If this screening relates to a **Cabinet, key delegated officer decision, Council, other committee or a significant operational decision** a copy of the completed document should be attached as an appendix and published alongside the relevant report.

A copy of **all** screenings should also be sent to equality@rotherham.gov.uk For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file and also published on the Council's Equality and Diversity Internet page.

Date screening completed	15/02/24
Report title and date	Home to School Policy Review
If relates to a Cabinet, key delegated officer	March 2024 – Full cabinet meeting

Appendix 4

decision, Council, other committee or a significant operational decision – report date and date sent for publication	and report
Date screening sent to Performance, Intelligence and Improvement equality@rotherham.gov.uk	15/02/24

PART B – Equality Analysis Form

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality and diversity.

This form:

- Can be used to prompt discussions, ensure that due regard has been given and remove or minimise disadvantage for an individual or group with a protected characteristic
- Involves looking at what steps can be taken to advance and maximise equality as well as eliminate discrimination and negative consequences
- Should be completed before decisions are made, this will remove the need for remedial actions.

Note – An Initial Equality Screening Assessment (Part A) should be completed prior to this form.

When completing this form consider the Equality Act 2010 protected characteristics Age, Disability, Sex, Gender Reassignment, Race, Religion or Belief, Sexual Orientation, Civil Partnerships and Marriage, Pregnancy and Maternity and other socio-economic groups e.g. parents, single parents and guardians, carers, looked after children, unemployed and people on low incomes, ex-offenders, victims of domestic violence, homeless people etc. – see page 11 of Equality Screening and Analysis Guidance.

1. Title	
Equality Analysis title:	
Home to School Policy Review	
Date of Equality Analysis (EA):	
08/02/2024	
Directorate:	Service area:
Regeneration and Environment	Community Safety and Street Scene
Lead Manager:	Contact number:
Karen Mudford	07554436548
Is this a:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy / Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service / Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

If other, please specify

2. Names of those involved in the Equality Analysis (Should include minimum of three people) - see page 7 of Equality Screening and Analysis Guidance

Name	Organisation	Role (eg service user, managers, service specialist)
Jacob Huggins	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	National Management Trainee
Karen Mudford	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Head of Fleet & Transport Services
Elise Squires	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Transport Business & Projects Manager

3. What is already known? - see page 10 of Equality Screening and Analysis Guidance

Aim/Scope (who the Policy/Service affects and intended outcomes if known)

Provision of Home to School Transport in line with statutory obligations, for eligible children and young people boroughwide.

What equality information is available? (Include any engagement undertaken)

The report provides details of the Policy review and seeks to revise the existing Policy in accordance with renewed Department for Education (DfE) and legislative requirements.

Home to School travel is an integral part of the school system that ensures that no child of compulsory school age is prevented from accessing education to fulfil their potential, as a result of a lack of transport or cost of transport.

The Council have a statutory responsibility to make suitable travel arrangements to and from school for eligible children of compulsory school age. Statutory guidance is published by the DfE and sets out what local authorities must do to comply with the law.

The RMBC Home to School Policy is updated with minor changes each year to ensure it reflects the academic dates and complies with statutory duties for 'Post 16 Transport Policy Statement Obligations', however updated statutory guidelines were published by the DfE in June 2023 following a public consultation in 2019 and stakeholder comments provided in 2022/2023. Prior to that, the guidelines were last published by DfE in July 2014.

Given the recent update to the statutory guidance, there is now a significant requirement to review and revise the current Home to School Policy 2023/2024 in preparation for the new academic year 2024/2025, which the Council is obliged to complete in time for the next normal school admissions round.

A previous equalities screening assessment was completed in December 2023, which sought approval to commence consultation on any changes that may be required in relation to the current policy; this was approved by Cabinet 18th December 2023.

Appendix 4

Following the consultation, this Cabinet report now recommends that the revised policy is adopted, and as part of this work, there has been a further equalities screening assessment and equality analysis completed.

Overview

All of the quality information extracted follows the focus of the equalities screening. In particular, data regarding age of resident and disability are compared against the national average for context.

The overall focus of the Home to School Policy is ensuring that children can get to and from school. As a result, it is important to focus on statistics relating to children/young people specifically; for example, 18.6% of Rotherham residents are schoolchildren students in full-time education.

Disclaimer

The following data is extracted from the following sources:

- 2021 UK Census (England and Wales only) – Office for National Statistics
- Fingertips, Public Health Data – Office for Health Improvements & Disparities
- Local area Special Educational Needs and Disabilities report for unknown – SEND research from Department for Education
- RMBC data

All data is up to date as of the publication of the individual data source.

Religion and belief

The following information below represent the religious breakdown of Rotherham:

- No religion, 39.8%
- Christian, 49.0%
- Buddhist, 0.2%
- Hindu, 0.3%
- Jewish, 0.0%
- Muslim, 5.1%
- Sikh, 0.2%
- Other religion, 0.4%

Age

The main consideration for age surrounds the percentage of school age children in the Borough and the potential impact that this has on the provision of the Home to School Policy.

18.9% of Rotherham residents are aged 15 and under, which is higher than the average in England and Wales. Between 2011 to 2021, the ratio of people aged 15 years and under in Rotherham fell by -0.2pp.

Appendix 4

There is considerable variation between wards regarding the percentage of people aged 16 years or under resident.

The three wards with the highest respective populations are:

- East Herringthorpe (24.5%)
- Eastwood & East Dene (23.8%)
- Rotherham Central (22.9%).

Meanwhile, the three wards with the lowest respective populations are:

- Thorpe Hesley (13.4%)
- Greasbrough (14.0%)
- Maltby West & Hellaby (15.5%).

It may be worth noting that these areas tend to be more highly densely populated compared to wards with both sparse and older populations on average. Current Home to School Policy should evaluate equality with respect to differences between children accessing Home to School transport in concentrated vs. remote areas within Rotherham.

Disability and Health

Overall, the number of children with learning difficulties known to schools in Rotherham (26.1 per 1,000) is lower than the national average in England (34.4 per 1,000). This trend is consistent, when subdivided into moderate and severe learning difficulties. However, with respect to profound and multiple learning difficulties known to schools, the number of children is higher than the national average in England (1.55 per 1,000 vs. 1.29 per 1,000).

Rotherham is within the 75th percentile for children with autism known to schools (26.2 per 1,000); this is considerably higher than the average in England (18.0 per 1,000).

21.3% of Rotherham residents declare themselves disabled under the Equality Act 2010; 11.4% of residents state that their day-to-day activities are limited a little, whilst 9.9% of residents that their day-to-day activities are limited a lot.

7% of Rotherham residents either have bad or very bad health

Other considerations

(i) EAL

According to the 2021 Census, 1% of Rotherham residents aged 3 years and over do not have English as their main language and/or cannot speak English well. Wards within Rotherham with the rates above the Borough average include:

- Rotherham Central (7.5%)
- Masbrough & Bradgate (5.8%)

- Eastwood & East Dene (5.0%)
- Rotherham South (3.8%)

During the consultation preparation, we ensured that changes to Home to Policy assessed, not only the individual child's/young person's circumstance, but also that of the parent(s)/carer(s). Currently, 57.8% of Rotherham residents aged 16 and over are economically active, whilst 11.5% of Rotherham residents aged 5 and over provide some form of unpaid care.

(ii) EHCP and SEND

The Home to School draft Policy contains specific provisions and requirements for children/young people with an EHCP and/or SEND. Section 6.1 details the process for naming a school in a child/young person's EHCP and Section 6.6. details alternative provision improvement plan related to SEND.

There are currently 986 ECHP/SEND children of compulsory school age, 138 EHCP post-16 students and 59 EHCP post-19 students receiving Home to School Transport.

The following information summarises the number of children/young people receiving specific provisions detailed in the Home to School Policy:

1. Parental Payment Arrangements (parents/carers receive funds to transport their eligible child/young person): 144 (various age ranges)
2. Successful Independent Travel Training Candidates – now travelling on public transport, who were previously on assisted transport: 10 (various age ranges)
3. Candidates on ITT programme: 4 (various age ranges)
4. Unavailable Network Service (where there is no public service operating for eligible mainstream travellers: 22 (various age ranges)
5. Zoom Zero Travel Pass issued: 1033 (various age ranges)

In the academic year 2022/23, 4.6% of pupils in Rotherham had an EHCP, higher than the average across all schools in England of 4.2%. Meanwhile, 15.8% of pupils in Rotherham had an EHCP, higher than the average across all schools in England of 12.9%.

(iii) Socioeconomic factors

Socioeconomic factors, including deprivation, also play a key role in eligibility for Home to School Transport. As a result, it is important to highlight that Rotherham generally exceeds the average across English with respect to child deprivation. For example, the percentage of children (under 16s) in absolute low-income families in Rotherham is 17.9%, which is higher than the average in England (15.3%). Equally, the percentage of children (under 16s) in absolute low-income families in Rotherham is 22.9%, compared to 19.9% across England.

<p>(iv) <u>Multiple protected characteristics</u></p> <p>Sometimes, it is acknowledged that protected characteristics overlap and that protected characteristics are transient. For instance, the percentage of teenage mother in Rotherham is 1.3%, whilst the average across England is 0.6%. In recognising the role of both age and maternity in this given example, the Home to School Policy ought to recognise the extent to which diversity operates across protected characteristics.</p>	
<p>Are there any gaps in the information that you are aware of?</p> <p>No gaps in the information have been identified.</p>	
<p>What monitoring arrangements have you made to monitor the impact of the policy or service on communities/groups according to their protected characteristics?</p> <p>Consultation has been carried out with several stakeholders, as detailed in the section below.</p> <p>Details of the online consultation is available below:</p> <p><u>Have your say on the Home to School Transport Policy – Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council</u></p> <p>The most pertinent questions relating to equalities are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within the current policy, is it easy to understand if a child is eligible for assisted 'Home to School Transport' for those with special educational needs and disabilities? - How clear do you think the current policy explains transport eligibility, for young people over the age of 16? 	
<p>Engagement undertaken with customers. (date and group(s) consulted and key findings)</p>	<p>Note: Digital/postal consultation activity is not listed. Some consultation events occurred over days and weeks; the dates given below are the completion dates:</p> <p>19/01/2024 – North Regional LA Forum 08/02/2024 – Parent/Carer Forum 09/02/2024 – SENDCO Network 22/02/2024 – School Event – Elements Academy 22/02/2024 – Special School Headteachers 22/02/2024 – Introductory Meeting – SYMCA 22/02/2024 – External transport operators</p> <p>Further information can be found in Appendices 2 & 3 of the Cabinet Report.</p>
<p>Engagement undertaken with staff (date and group(s) consulted and key findings)</p>	<p>12/12/2023 – RMBC Legal Team – Katie Etheridge 04/01/2024 – CYPS/R&E SMT Working Group</p>

4. The Analysis - of the actual or likely effect of the Policy or Service (Identify by protected characteristics)

How does the Policy/Service meet the needs of different communities and groups? (Protected characteristics of Age, Disability, Sex, Gender Reassignment, Race, Religion or Belief, Sexual Orientation, Civil Partnerships and Marriage, Pregnancy and Maternity) - see glossary on page 14 of the Equality Screening and Analysis Guidance)

Age

The Home to School draft Policy considers the eligibility for children/young people between the age of 5-16, with one exception:

Children below to ages of 5 years may be eligible for Home to School transport if they start compulsory education before the age of 5; RMBC is able to exercise discretionary powers under these circumstances in order to grant specialist transport.

In addition, the Home to School draft Policy also provides information on eligibility of transport provision for:

1. learners aged 16-19 years in further education and training.
2. continuing learners with a learning difficulty an/or disability aged 19 or over.

Disability, EHCP and SEND

Current policy states the following with respect to EHCP:

“Section 39 of the Children and Families Act 2014 governs the naming of a school in a child/young person’s EHCP. Parents/carers have the right to ask for a particular school to be named in their child/young person’s EHCP and the LA must name that school in the plan unless it would be unsuitable for the child/young person’s age, ability, aptitude, special educational needs, or incompatible with efficient education of others, or the efficient use of resources.

Where a parent would prefer their child/young people to attend a school that is further away from their home address than the nearest school that would be able to meet their needs, the LA will consider whether arranging home to school transport to the preferred school would be incompatible with the efficient use of resources.

If the LA determines that providing transport to the parent/carer’s preferred school would be incompatible with the efficient use of resources, the Local Authority may name the parents/carer’s preferred school on the condition that the parent/carer arranges the travel or provides some or all of the cost of the travel.”

RMBC are satisfied that this measure mitigates any potential negative equalities impacts, balances the need for efficiency in resources and helps parents/carers make informed decisions.

Section 6.2 provides detail on disabled person's passes, which may be available to some Rotherham residents, including severely disabled children who cannot travel alone; this offer may also extend to the care giver, subject to eligibility requirements. The Home to School draft Policy directs people to the relevant links.

- Pupils with an EHCP will have their individual transport needs assessed by colleagues in C&YPS, against the Home to School Assessment Matrix criteria considering the distance, their age, mobility and the effect of their complex needs on their ability to travel. Areas for consideration are extent of each of the following categories of need, and likelihood/frequency of:

Mobility

Medical

Behavioural

Vulnerability

Practicality (available travel on public services network)

Training (consideration of suitability for Independent Travel Training)

Using the matrix scoring system, the most suitable and appropriate travel solution is offered to the family. This travel solution has to be accepted by the family who have the right to appeal if they feel this is not suitable. Appeals process is contained within policy.

In addition to the above, individual transport care plans are requested for some specific medical and mobility issues and for some allergies.

Where a child/young person is required to travel in a wheelchair, a home visit and risk assessment are undertaken prior to transport being put in place.

Civil partnership/marriage

The Home to School Policy considers circumstances where a child is resident at two separate addresses:

“The home address is considered to be the one where the child/young person resides with their primary parent/carer, and where the child benefit monies are paid to, or where the young person is registered on the electoral register. Where parents do not live together, and the child spends part of the week with each parent, the LA will not provide transport assistance to and from two separate addresses.”

Does your Policy/Service present any problems or barriers to communities or Groups?

The primary barrier identified is regarding accessibility for those with EAL.

Otherwise, with respect to the protected characteristics outlined in the Equality Act 2010, there are no discernible problem or barriers to particular individuals, communities or groups.

Does the Service/Policy provide any positive impact/s including improvements or remove barriers?

As detailed previously, the Home to School Policy makes specific provision for age and disability, the respective protected characteristics most impacted by this Policy.

What affect will the Policy/Service have on community relations? (may also need to consider activity which may be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another)

No effects on community relations with respect to the Home to School Policy have been identified; it is not anticipated that one group will benefit at the expense of another.

Please list any **actions and targets** that need to be taken as a consequence of this assessment on the action plan below and ensure that they are added into your service plan for monitoring purposes – see page 12 of the Equality Screening and Analysis Guidance.

5. Summary of findings and Equality Analysis Action Plan

If the analysis is done at the right time, i.e. early before decisions are made, changes should be built in before the policy or change is signed off. This will remove the need for remedial actions. Where this is achieved, the only action required will be to monitor the impact of the policy/service/change on communities or groups according to their protected characteristic - See page 11 of the Equality Screening and Analysis guidance

Title of analysis: Home to School Policy Review
Directorate and service area: Regeneration and Environment – Community Safety and Street Scene
Lead Manager: Karen Mudford
Summary of findings:
Overall, the findings have revealed that the Home to School Policy Review and all of its associated stages are compliant with the Equality Act 2010. The main protected characteristics considered in this Equality Analysis have been age and disability, with the Policy containing specific provisions to address each group.
With respect to age, it is noted that the concentration of young people varies significantly by council ward whilst, with respect to disability, the number of children/young people with profound and multiple learning difficulties is relatively high. This raises questions regarding ensuring that support provided by current transport providers and RMBC is adequate and tailored to specific needs.
The main area for improvement is ensuring provision for those who have EAL, including children/young people and parents/guardians. Whilst there is a reference to EAL support within the body of the Policy, RMBC need to ensure informed consent between each relevant stakeholder regarding the specifics of the Policy.

Action/Target	State Protected Characteristics as listed below	Target date (MM/YY)
Monitor equalities in the application of the Policy including any collection of equalities data and assessment any barriers to inclusion	A, D, S, RE, RoB, C, O	03/24
The Policy is subject to an annual review; the results of the consultation and implementation will then be carefully considered as part of our commitment towards a cycle of continuous improvement	A, D, S, RE, RoB, C, O	03/24

*A = Age, D= Disability, S = Sex, GR Gender Reassignment, RE= Race/ Ethnicity, RoB= Religion or Belief, SO= Sexual Orientation, PM= Pregnancy/Maternity, CPM = Civil Partnership or Marriage. C= Carers, O= other groups

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state those that have approved the Equality Analysis. Approval should be obtained by the Director and approval sought from DLT and the relevant Cabinet Member.

Name	Job title	Date
Jacob Huggins	National Management Trainee	08/02/2024

7. Publishing

The Equality Analysis will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given.

If this Equality Analysis relates to a **Cabinet, key delegated officer decision, Council, other committee or a significant operational decision** a copy of the completed document should be attached as an appendix and published alongside the relevant report.

A copy should also be sent to equality@rotherham.gov.uk For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file and also published on the Council's Equality and Diversity Internet page.

Date Equality Analysis completed	08/02/24
Report title and date	Home to School Policy Review
Date report sent for publication	
Date Equality Analysis sent to Performance, Intelligence and Improvement equality@rotherham.gov.uk	