

Early Years Reference Group

Date: 27th November 2008
 Time: 6.30pm
 Venue: Kidderminster Room
 Attendees: Richard Keble, Alison Cartwright, Alison Hitchins, Andy McHale, Catherine Shearwood, Chris Hurley, Gill Barkas, Lyn Breakwell, Matt Whiteley, Melanie Henderson, Naomi Christlow, Nicky Ross, Pat Croom, Sharon Bryan, Sue Pickering, Jacqui Deval-Reed, Trish Mallinson, Irene Whittaker, Sue Peasgood, Wendy Bevan, Andrea Williams, Rose Large

Apologises: Geoff Taylor-Smith, Cherrill Illingworth, Prue Winton

1.	Welcome & Introductions Richard Keble introduced himself as Chair in the absence of Geoff Taylor-Smith. Others at the meeting introduced themselves.	
2.	Notes of previous meeting (25 th February 2008). Agreed as a correct record of the meeting.	
3.	Matters Arising a) Redrafting the Terms of Reference, still outstanding. b) Other items for action on the agenda.	AH
4.	Update on DCSF Guidance on the Single Formula a) AMcH outlined the work by DCSF with the pilot authorities and the issuing of guidance. A summary of the guidance has been produced highlighting the key issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – New formula must cover all providers. – LAs to learn from cost surveys undertaken locally. – Formula to be on an hourly rate of actual children on roll. – Should not just replicate current provision but should address deprivation, flexibility and look to the future. – Whilst the formula must be compiled with common principles the hourly rates can vary across the range of providers. – The policy for provision <u>must</u> drive the formula. – The fifteen hours entitlement can be split between providers. The difficulty with this is that the schools cannot charge so therefore the schools will always have the larger portion of the hours. To illustrate this it is possible for the 15 hours to be taken: Model 1] – 5 in a school and 10 in a private provider – school will only get the 5 hours. Model 2] – 10 in a school and 10 in a private provider – school will get the 10 hours and it will not be split pro-rata and the private provider will charge for the additional hours. b) Recognised there are many fundamental issues that still need to be revised.	
5.	Cost Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMcH referred to the summary report on the survey. Some returns did not give financial information. • In common with other authorities the information was 	

	<p>variable with different interpretations on the questions and widely ranging figures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis followed from this survey. However, it was found the results of survey did not give the information required to provide a secure hourly rate. • The partner authority we have worked with found the same. • Recognised & appreciated that there was an awful lot of work for no benefit for this exercise but some providers may have found the exercise useful. 	
6.	<p>DCSF Funding Early Years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCSF looking at the next 3 year funding round. Raising the question as to whether they need an Early Years budget. Currently DSG for school provision & Grant for the extended entitlement & grant for Children's Centres/Extended Services etc. • DCSF asking do they need an Early Years Budget which include all these funding streams? Does this need to be ring fenced? No clarity from DCSF at the moment. • Will need to look at the regulations that govern the funding e.g. the method of counting & funding in the future, as these are not compatible at the moment. Consultation likely to take place in Spring 2009 on these changes to regulations. 	
7.	<p>Potential Entitlement Models</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AH introduced this item. Approach taken was to look at the delivery of the fifteen hours entitlement across the different sectors. • These models based on the Somerset work and consideration of the Worcestershire provision. • Generally agreed with the categories to deliver the NEF. (Set up/Put away, Planning, Team Meetings, Administration etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Maintained Nursery Class <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Team Meetings at 9.5 hours too low. Looking more at 1 hour a week. With 35 or 39 hours a year. – Admin at 50 minutes may not be sufficient. b) Maintained Nursery School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Admin; why is this so high for this sector? Explained this is because this is for a nursery school only & not spread across other age groups. – Team Meetings not sufficient, should be more. Querying the way the headteacher's salary is being dealt with. c) Childminder <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Funding for appraisal & Staff Review. – Meeting with parents probably outside their free hours. d) Independent School Nursery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team meeting issue the same as maintained schools. e) Independent School – Reception class 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team meetings. <p>f) Voluntary Setting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team meetings more hours inline with other settings. • Planning & Assessment takes up more time? Response if they are doing assessment recording then may not be delivering the free entitlement. • Meeting with parents, likely to be more than recommended. • Once the PVI goes above 20 need a supernumerary member of staff. This may need to be accounted for. <p>g) Private Nursery As other comments from other settings.</p>	
8.	<p>Next Stages</p> <p>a) Following the work this evening, officers will be looking to model the policy provision to reach an hourly rate for each provider.</p> <p>b) Want to do this as soon as possible so that providers see the implications on staffing.</p> <p>c) This has to go back to the Schools Forum & a level of consultation will have to take place during 2009.</p> <p>Likely dates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools Forum in February, therefore need to do the modelling in January/February with a meeting of this Reference Group during that time. • Consultation will need to take place after February but well before the County Council elections in June. 	
9.	<p>Date of next meeting Thursday 5th February 2009. 6.00 for 6.30pm (Papers going out the week before)</p>	
10.	<p>A.O.B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AH raised the issue of keeping all providers informed. • Agreed that the list of reps will be circulated widely as well as directing people to the County Council School Forum web site. 	