

## APPENDIX 1

	<b>Option 1</b> TMBC retains ownership of all devices and maintains them as part of the managed service.	<b>Option 2</b> TMBC provides devices directly to families who own them.	<b>Option 3</b> TMBC does not accept its allocation of devices from DfE.	<b>Option 4</b> Subject to a signed agreement, schools will own digital devices for children with a social worker.
<b>1. we are able to act swiftly</b>	Due to the capacity of the service, delays will be likely as the small central team would need to acquire the specialist knowledge needed to safely set up the devices as well as unpack and load software on each device (944).	Once an agreed list of eligible children is agreed. Devices could be swiftly delivered to families.	Families would not receive a device.	Once an agreed list of eligible children is agreed. Devices could be swiftly delivered to schools.
<b>2. those most in need receive support first</b>	An agreed list will be produced by Children's Social care signed off by the Assistant Director. Social workers will liaise with schools to determine those most in need.	An agreed list will be produced by Children's Social care signed off by the Assistant Director. Social workers will liaise with schools to determine those most in need.	Families would not receive a device.	An agreed list will be produced by Children's Social care signed off by the Assistant Director. Social workers will liaise with schools to determine those most in need.
<b>3. safeguarding risks to children must be minimised</b>	A best practice guide will be produced for schools. A centralised approach would not enable flexibility for schools to support existing local approaches.	Guidance could be produced for families but we would not be able to have oversight of arrangements.	Children would not be at risk on line as they would not have access.	A best practice guide will be produced for schools. A localised approach would enable flexibility for schools to support existing local approaches. Schools would also be able to lead on oversight and quality assurance.

<p><b>4. a proportionate response to risk is in place</b></p>	<p>TMBC would retain all risk and would have some continuing control to enable mitigation.</p>	<p>TMBC would retain risk but would not have any controls to mitigate risk.</p>	<p>Children would not be at risk on line as they would not have access. However, the risk to vulnerable falling behind in their learning would be high. TMBC may also be at risk in failing to meet its legal duties.</p>	<p>Schools would accept the majority of risk. However, the risk would be spread across all schools.</p>
<p><b>5. schools are able to take a lead on learning, uploading software to support their own systems and processes (this will be different in each school)</b></p>	<p>It would be very difficult to ensure that software was uploaded onto devices to suit each schools local approaches.</p>	<p>It would be very difficult to ensure that software was uploaded onto devices to suit each schools local approaches.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Schools would have total control of the devices and the subsequent learning.</p>
<p><b>6. we are cognisant of the LA's capacity to manage and maintain and additional 1000+ devices on its managed IT estate</b></p>	<p>The LA does not have capacity to oversee, organise, manage and maintain an additional 1000+ laptops</p>	<p>The LA would not have additional workload but would have consequent additional risk.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>LA would have a limited role, which it has capacity to undertake.</p>