

Early Years Reference Meeting (EYRG)

Date	11/5/09	
In Attendance:	Geoff Taylor-Smith (Chair), Andy McHale, Alison Hitchins, Trish Mallinson, Nicky Ross, Sue Peasgood, Andrea Williams, Prue Winton, Naomi Christlelow, Chris Hurley, Lyn Breakwell, Rose Large, Matt Whiteley, Irene Whittaker, Sharon Bryan, Pat Groom.	
Apologies:	Cherrill Illingworth, Wendy Bevan	
	Notes	Action
Notes of the Previous Meeting (26 th February 2009)	<p>Apologies sent by Sharon Bryan and Pat Groom not recorded.</p> <p>Notes of previous meeting agreed as correct.</p>	
Matters Arising	<p><u>Terms of Reference (TofR)</u></p> <p>Draft circulated by AH. Agreed to hold meeting prior to those timetabled by the Worcestershire Schools Forum. The TofR were then agreed.</p> <p>Need to consider the future meeting cycle.</p> <p><u>SEN Provision</u></p> <p>AH advised of the current position with a SEN planning group considering the issues. Particularly for high cost SEN, there are differences between all sectors including nursery assessment provision and nursery plus places in the maintained sector. There is a requirement for a coherent plan</p>	

	<p>and the establishment of key principles.</p> <p>High level need is currently resourced from the NEF grant.</p> <p>It was suggested that funding for this may have to be considered as part of a Phase 2 for the Single Funding Formula (SFF) but this may be a risk. There is no DCSF requirement to include this within the new SFF. The current entitlement models include a time allocation for high incidence SEN.</p> <p>It was agreed a timeline and further discussion was required.</p>	AH
DCSF Update on Progress	<p>AMcH introduced the report, which summarised the key issues from a recent DCSF review of the early implementation from the pilot LA's.</p> <p>Key issues were: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some LA's that considered the sectors separately have not been able to implement SFF in 2009. • Some LA's had gone with a single base rate for all providers. • Deprivation is now a mandatory component of the SFF. • Some LA's had supplements for quality, flexibility, rurality, SEN and EAL. • All providers must be provided with indicative budgets before the start of the financial year which must be adjusted to reflect participation during the year. 	

	<p>The EYRG noted: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were no real surprises in the report. • There could potentially be stability issues for the maintained sector. • The PVI sector would need to continue to manage their income streams with traditionally a low point in September and a high point in July. • Need to look a cash flow and payment profiles for PVI's. 	
<p>Consultation Document Further Draft</p>	<p>AMcH introduced the item and confirmed this draft contained the comments made at the last meeting and included a glossary.</p> <p>The EYRG were concerned that the document was technical but appreciated the need to share all the issues.</p> <p>It was agreed not to include the detail of the proposed entitlement models in the document but include detail on what they include and reference to the WSF web site where they will be detailed.</p> <p>It was also agreed to issue with a covering letter explaining the DCSF requirements and the role of the EYRG and its representatives.</p> <p>Further comments on the draft were invited with a timescale for circulation by 8th June.</p>	<p>GTS/AH/AMcH</p> <p>All</p>
<p>Deprivation</p>	<p>Given that there is a mandatory requirement to include this as a factor in the SFF, the EYRG considered the issue further.</p>	

	<p>The group were advised that the maintained schools formula included a deprivation factor based upon ACORN data of individual pupil records linked to school attended. This targeted significant pockets of deprivation cut off at 25% or above of the school roll.</p> <p>Post code records of PVI providers were available so it could be possible to endeavour to replicate this in the SFF. However there were concerns that it could be time consuming and the level of allocated resource might not be significant. Given the data set it would have to be an annual allocation at the start of the year not adjusted termly. The EYRG requested that this be pursued and included in the consultation document.</p> <p>If this were not possible then consideration would be required for an alternative measure e.g. Super Output Areas, Free School Meals, etc.</p>	AMcH/TM/NR
Next Stages and Timescales	<p>The EYRG considered and agreed the report detailing the proposed timescales. The intention was to issue the consultation document in the second week in June 2009.</p> <p>It was proposed to hold 3 area meetings on 6th, 7th and 9th July 2009 to support the consultation process. Details TBC.</p>	AH
Any Other Business	<p>The group were advised that a meeting had been held with the HT's of the maintained schools with NC.</p>	

Date of Next Meeting: - Monday 21st September 2009 6.00pm for 6.30pm County Hall