

FAIR FUNDING CONSULTATION AUTUMN TERM 2010
LOCAL FUNDING FORMULA AND FAIR FUNDING SCHEME ISSUES 2011/12

AGENDA ITEM 4
EARLY YEARS REFERENCE GROUP
17th JANUARY 2011

	Category of Provider/Responder	Nursery/ First/ Primary with NC		First/ Primary without NC		Middle		Sec/High		Special		Short Stay		Early Years PVI excl. Childminders		Other		Total	
		Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
	Number of All Providers	55		123		21		28		10		6		294		0		537	
	Number of EY Providers	55		0		0		0		4		0		294		0		353	
	Number of Responses	5		8		0		6		0		0		46		1		66	
	% of Responses to Number of All Providers	9		7		0		21		0		0		16		N/A		12	
	% of Responses to Number of EY Providers	9		N/A		N/A		N/A		0		N/A		16		N/A		14	
		Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Q1	Do you support the changes proposed as detailed for: - The introduction of a new EYSFF model for the funding of 'school run non maintained provision'; and Minor changes to the existing model for childminders?	3	1	7	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	10	1	0	44	12
		5	0	6	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	33	3	1	0	47	4
Q2	Do you support the proposal to allow maintained nurseries to charge parents for additional hours, if the above conditions are met?	3	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	13	1	0	42	13
Q3	Do you support the proposal for the WSF to: - Consider the effect of any mainstreaming of grants when known including reviewing the allocation of the former TPRG? Decide on the methodology for mainstreaming any grants?	3	0	6	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	0
		3	0	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	0
Q4	Do you support the proposal for ceasing the place led funding from April 2012 for the LRC's and to re-distribute this into support for learners with SEN (secondary)?	0	1	4	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4
Q5	Do you support extending the existing multi-year sign up arrangements for another year for 2011/12?	4	1	4	3	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	6
Q6	Do you support the proposals for additional service trading as detailed?	2	3	5	2	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	7
Q7	Do you support that the methodology for determining the treatment of the CRC will be determined by the LA in consultation with the WSF?	4	0	5	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	2

Note Respondents did not, in some cases, answer all the questions

Comments on the consultation questions

Q1 EYSFF Models

Nursery/First/Primary with NC

There needs to be some transitional protection funding for school nurseries for 2011/12.

The provision of increased levels of funding for school run non-maintained provision compared to maintained nursery funding may mean pressure for maintained to close and reopen as school run non-maintained. This could be detrimental to the quality of education in those settings.

If our maintained Nursery proves to be unsustainable following the introduction of the Single Funding Formula we may need to consider alternative options to continue our provision and this model of funding may be beneficial.

First/Primary without NC

This seems to make perfect sense. The flexibility that PVI can provide on their funding model needs to be an aspiration for school nurseries.

Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) Sector

This make a mockery of the systems that have been in place to provide quality provision across a range of providers. It further increases issues of sustainability for the PVI sector, who do not have the many benefits of a school e.g. VAT, etc. The EYSFF should look more to equalise rather than threaten existing provision. The school run non-maintained provision has the advantage of access to school facilities, significant educational and management capabilities and subsidised costs. Will require the 'school run non-maintained provision' to adhere to the NEF requirements for PVI's.

Cannot respond as will depend on whether we lose out financially when provision is already ran on a tight budget. We feel playgroups and pre-schools should be funded equally with nurseries as we have to meet the same standards in all areas requiring the funding of extensive out of hours work.

Not sure why 'school run non-maintained provision' requires a different amount?

The 'school run non-maintained provision' have access to school facilities and so are at an advantage.

The information is insufficient and unaware of the different rates in the EYSFF.

Concern due to the opening of a Children's Centre nearby impacting on numbers. This could mean the school extending nursery numbers.

Changes seem fair but it is the funding rates which will determine the financial sustainability of pre-schools.

If maintained schools have empty places does this mean the facility is not required. There appears to be a shortage of school not nursery places.

All settings should have the same conditions and funding amounts per child proportioned dependent on sharing of settings.

Q2 EYSFF Charging for Additional Hours

Nursery/First/Primary with NC

Essential. This will improve flexibility and allow spaces to be filled. Could save potential nursery closures.

Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) Sector

This just goes further away from developing a level playing field and would be a threat to PVI organisations who offer full day care.

As we charge for extra hours over 15 at our hourly rate we feel it is only fair schools could do the same. This may have a detrimental effect on our setting if charges are subsidised by schools.

As a nursery we charge for additional hours so schools should have the same system.

Not sure - on the face of it seems fair for schools to have the same options as the PVI but there maybe implications on the benefits of the maintained sector e.g. VAT.

Seems fair however it is important that parents are not pressured into taking their free entitlement at the school in the first instance.

Parents should have to pay for any unfunded hours no matter where they are taken.

Agree as they need to cover costs.

The new funding structure appears to set up maintained and PVI's as competitors with both 'fighting' for children as a consequence of sustainability issues. If schools are allowed to charge and provide wrap around PVI's will lose further business - two settings offering the same service on the same site is poor planning.

This is a concern as it means even more direct competition from schools. As part of a Children's Centre we are finding it increasingly difficult to sustain our nurseries. We have had to change our staffing to accommodate wrap around but have lost children to the maintained sector offering 15 hours. Parents still believe a nursery place in a school means they get a school place even though we have explained this is not the case. We will not exist if the school is allowed to work in direct competition on the same site. There are issues on rent paid or not and their rate for NEF children compared to ours.

Sessions should be charged the same with no top ups with an open policy.

Not acceptable for LA nurseries to charge - they are not PVI's. There are places in the PVI sector that will be taken by LA nursery places. If charges are allowed how is this going to be monitored and audited? Guidelines are required.

Appears that the proposal will put financial pressure on the PVI sector.

This will impact on the PVI sector as schools will be able to undercut the PVI with parents being enticed to move their children to the school sector.

Yes as it brings all the EY providers in line.

No as it would disadvantage the PVI's and how can PVI's compete with the maintained sector.

The recession is having a knock on effect and marketing is expensive for PVI's. Would the maintained sector need to charge as much as the PVI's to survive?

This will make the funding system much fairer across all types of provision.

Other Consultees

This is in everyone's interests - children's, parents and schools.

Please Detail Any Further Comments You Wish To Make On Any Of The Consultation Issues: -

Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) Sector

Still very concerned on the introduction of the EYSFF as have little idea on the implications. Our setting loses money for every funded hour a child attends and as we try to deliver as flexibly as possible there are always empty hours for which we still have overheads and staff costs but no income. This means increasing fees at the younger end of the nursery to subsidise the funded children. This is not acceptable but as we are full other settings are struggling to stay sustainable. We need realistic funding or the option to charge top up fees.

We were promised a level playing field with the state sector and childminders. We have had to make staffing changes so why not in these sectors? The current rate does not meet the cost of the place so need to remove the current lower 12.5 hour amount. If the April rate is not increased setting will opt out of funding.

We need to bring an end to the inequity and unfair advantage of the maintained sector over the PVI sector. The PVI settings will only be properly be able to provide quality when NEF is appropriate, fair and equals the charged hourly rate. This is not about profit but being able to pay staff decent pay.

The constant fluctuation in places is not helpful for financial planning and the gap between funding rate and fees is challenging. There may be a need for more sustainability funding.

Have always had to work with funding restrictions where staff are funded by 'non guaranteed' pupil numbers and settings have had to be proactive in how they ensure fair treatment of staff whilst still meeting the needs of the business. It seems the maintained sector now want additional help when the PVI sector has had to do without any for the past few years. Will the idea of charging in the maintained sector confuse parents?

Over the years we have changed to provide more flexible hours for parents and if school nurseries do this we will suffer and this may cause closures.