

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE: 9 MARCH 2017

**BFC PROPOSALS FOR EARLY YEARS
FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS FROM APRIL 2017
Director of Children, Young People and Learning**

1 PURPOSE OF DECISION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement from the Schools Forum on proposals for 2017-18 Early Years budgets, including the structure and values to be attributed to the Bracknell Forest Council Early Years Funding Formula (EYFF). There is also a decision for the Forum to consider in line with the statutory funding framework.
- 1.2 Comments are being sought so that these can be presented to the Executive Member on 14 March when a formal decision on these matters is planned to be taken.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

To NOTE:

- 2.1 That the vast majority of responses to the consultation proposals on the Bracknell Forest Council Early Years Funding Formula supported the proposals made by the Council (Annexe A, Restricted Annex C and paragraphs 5.15 to 5.18).
- 2.2 The summary financial implications anticipated from the proposals on provider hourly funding rates, (paragraph 5.12).

To AGREE:

- 2.3 That taking account of the responses from providers, the following items are implemented as set out in the consultation document:
- a) the Bracknell Forest Council Early Years Funding Formula for 3 and 4 year olds (as summarised at Table 1).
 - b) the hourly funding rate for 2 year olds be increased to £5.46.
 - c) the Early Years Special Educational Needs and Disability Living Allowance Inclusion Fund Policy should be as set out in Annex 5 of the list of Annexes document that supported the consultation.
 - d) the budgets to be centrally managed by the council for:
 - i. SEN inclusion fund at around 1% of funds.
 - ii. Provider contingency at around 1.5% of funds.
 - iii. BFC services at around 3% of funds.
- 2.4 That taking account of the responses from providers, that eligibility for deprivation top up funding is assessed and updated on a termly basis, with

eligibility to flexibility and quality top up funding assessed and updated once a year.

2.5 That the additional £0.034m of funds now available are added to the Provider Contingency budget.

2.6 The original Early Years budgets are set at the amounts set out in Annex B of this report, including the ring-fenced amounts for the Disability Access Fund and the Early Years Pupil Premium.

2.7 That there are appropriate arrangements in place for Early Years provision.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 The proposals made are considered to be the best available, taking account of the national and local priorities, provider responses from the consultation and the estimated level of available resources.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 These have been considered in earlier reports to the Schools Forum.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

5.1 This report presents proposals on the Early Years Block element of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) that the Department for Education (DfE) allocates to Local Authorities (LAs) to fund provisions and support for children up to 5, including:

1. funding for three and four year olds entitlement to free education and childcare
2. participation funding for disadvantaged two year olds
3. the early years pupil premium
4. specialist and general support services.

DfE Reforms

5.2 The Forum has previously received an update on DfE funding proposals for 2017-18 in respect of EY services. This reported that in order to deliver the national policy objective of enabling more families to work by extending the free entitlement to childcare from 15 to 30 hours per week for parents that want to work, there would be £1 billion additional funding by 2019-20 to increase provider funding rates to encourage the development of the additional places that will be required from increased take-up. The key issues and changes required are:

1. the extension to 30 hours per week for eligible children would commence from September 2017
2. to encourage providers to increase capacity to ensure sufficient places are available, funding rates should increase

Unrestricted

3. to ensure funds are allocated to Local authorities (LAs) on a consistent and objective basis rather than continue with historic spending levels, an Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) would be introduced
4. changes would be made to the way LAs could implement their local EY funding arrangements including:
 - a. changing the factors that can be taken into account in the determination of a provider's hourly funding rate
 - b. requiring at least 95% of an LAs EY funding to be passed on to providers, with at least 90% of the amount paid to providers having to be allocated through a uniform base rate that must be set at the same amount for all providers, irrespective of the setting type or characteristics
 - c. clarifying the expectation of arrangements to be put in place to ensure children with special educational needs or disabilities (SEND) can properly access the free entitlement.

Provisional estimate of Early Years Block DSG income

5.3 As set out above, the DfE are introducing new funding arrangements for LAs to deliver their Early Years provisions and services for 3 and 4 year olds with an Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) with four component parts:

1. A universal base rate for each 3 and 4 year old to be paid at £3.53 per hour for each eligible child;
2. Deprivation addition, based on eligibility to Free School Meals of pupils in Key Stages 1 and 2, to be paid at £2.13 per hour for each eligible child;
3. English as an additional language (EAL) addition, based on Key Stages 1 and 2 numbers, to be paid at £0.29 per hour for each eligible child;
4. Disability Living Allowance (DLA) addition, based on Department for Works and Pensions data of eligible children under 5, to be paid at £0.79 per hour for each eligible child.

An Area Cost Adjustment (ACA) is then applied in each LA based on addition labour costs and a Nursery rateable value cost adjustment. The uplift for BF is a factor of 31%.

5.4 Taking account of the estimated number of eligible children in each element of the EYNFF and the ACA uplift, the DfE has calculated the hourly funding rate for BF for 2017-18 at £4.93. This is the funding rate once the EYNFF is fully implemented. There will be 2 years of transitional funding protection where those LAs receiving the largest gains have a deduction taken in order to finance funding protection in other LAs. This results in a £0.27 per hour deduction in BF and therefore an initial rate of £4.66. Assuming a similar number of hours are provided at the DfE funding census points of each January during 2017-18 as were in 2016-17, then 1,010,110 hours will be funded by the DfE, delivering £4,707,110.

5.5 In terms of how the BFC funding rate compares to other LAs, as set out above, for 2017-18 this will amount to £4.66, with the average rate across England set at £4.77 and for the 19 LAs in the south east, there is an average rate of £4.75. Once the transitional funding protection is removed, the BFC rate rises to £4.93, with the average for England, as expected, remaining unchanged at £4.77, and the south east average increasing to £4.80. Therefore, once the transitional funding protection ends,

Unrestricted

the BFC funding rate will be 3.3% above the national average rate and 2.7% above the regional average.

- 5.6 In addition to the estimate of income to be received in relation to the current maximum of 15 free hours weekly education and childcare set out above, with this rising to 30 hours for eligible families from September 2017, there will be additional hours taken. The DfE has undertaken a provisional estimate based on national data and a range of assumptions and this calculates 219,184 additional hours of take up, which at £4.66 per hour, equates to further funding of £1,021,400.
- 5.7 The DfE are not proposing any significant changes to the way that LAs are allocated funding for the most disadvantaged 2 year olds as there is a relatively new allocation basis. The DfE have increased LA funding rates by 7.1%, which for BF results in an hourly funding rate of £5.88. Using current levels of take-up hours of 108,527, this indicates funding receipts of £638,140.
- 5.8 In addition to the funding set out above that will be delivered through the EYNFF, LAs will also receive additional, specific resourcing for the EY Pupil Premium at £0.53 per hour per child, and a Disabled Access Fund (DAF) to be paid to providers at £615 per eligible child. DfE estimate funding of £23,690 and £26,600 respectively. Both of these funding allocations are ring-fenced and must be allocated by LAs in accordance with DfE requirements.
- 5.9 Total estimated funding from the EY DSG Block in 2017-18 is therefore £6,414,940, as summarised below in Table 1.

Table 1: Estimated EY Block DSG income for 2017-18

Ref:	Item	Estimated amount
5.4	Funding for 3 & 4 year olds: existing 15 hours	£4,707,110
5.5	Funding for 3 & 4 year olds: additional hours	£1,021,400
	Sub total: 3 & 4 year olds	£5,728,510
5.6	Funding for 2 year olds	£638,140
5.7	Funding for Early Years Pupil Premium	£23,690
5.7	Funding for Disability Access Fund	£24,600
	Total	£6,414,940

EY DSG income is recalculated in-year to reflect actual participation at each January census and therefore all amounts in Table 1 are estimates and subject to change once relevant data becomes available.

BF consultation

- 5.10 In order to establish an appropriate local EY funding framework where this is permitted by the DfE, a consultation document was approved by the Forum for distribution in December. As well as needing to be affordable within the level of estimated income, which from Table 1 above is £5,728,510, the following key priorities were applied in formulating proposals:

Unrestricted

1. Target financial support to children that need it the most to succeed who providers then prioritise
2. Increase the number of free entitlement hours
3. Maximise quality of provision
4. Maximise the amount of funds paid to providers

5.11 The key element of the funding framework relates to the structure of the Early Years Funding Formula (EYFF) and the weightings to be applied to each factor and the associated proposals are summarised below in Table 2, with the full consultation document and supporting papers available to view at:

<http://schools.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/finance/early-years-funding-reform>

Table 2: Summary of the proposed BF Early Years Funding Formula

EYFF Element	Consultation proposals	Outline hourly funding rate
Deprivation Supplement	4% of EYFF via IDACI scores (low income families by post code) where more than 1 in 5 children are from low income families. Top up funding increase where 1 in 4 and again where 1 in 3 children are from low income families. 1% of EYFF via child eligibility to EY pupil premium.	£0.16, £0.32 or £0.48 £0.77.
Flexibility Supplement	1% of EYFF via a range of flexible measures e.g. extended day, weekend or, school holiday provision to attract additional funds	£0.05, £0.10, £0.15.
Quality Supplement	3% of EYFF via setting leadership qualification above Level 5 with 30% funding addition where above Level 6.	£0.14 or £0.18.
Uniform base rate	91% of EYFF and balancing amount after deduction of funds for supplements.	£4.00
	Average provider rate	£4.39
	Funding from DfE to BFC	£4.66

5.12 If all of the proposals in the BFC consultation are accepted, taking account of the assumptions used in generating the financial information, the following highlight changes are expected in provider funding rates:

1. 7 providers receive up to a 5% increase in hourly rate. Of these, 5 no longer receive qualification supplement (have Level 4 leaders), 1 gets lower quality, 1 no longer gets deprivation.
2. 24 providers receive an increase between 5% and 10%. Of these, 19 get lower quality of which 14 partially offset the loss with higher deprivation, 5

Unrestricted

receive low increases in deprivation, 1 receives a low increase in deprivation and less quality, 1 receives no supplements now or before.

3. 15 providers receive an increase of between 10% and 15%. 10 get higher deprivation, 5 get higher deprivation and less quality
4. 17 providers receive at least a 15% increase. All of these are schools, so benefit from 26% increase in base rate (see comment below). 16 also receive higher deprivation and less quality. 1 receives less deprivation and less quality.

The most significant factor influencing the outcome on provider funding rates is the DfE requirement for the same amount of hourly base rate to be paid to all providers with at least 90% of funding having to be distributed through the base rate factor. With the existing differential funding rates of £3.17 for maintained schools and £3.70 for PVI sector providers, it is inevitable and unavoidable that schools will receive the highest increases in hourly funding rates.

- 5.13 In addition to the proposals for the BF EYFF, other key questions on the consultation document related to:
1. The criteria to apply to determine the level of financial support for young children with special educational needs or disabilities should receive.
 2. Maintaining a contingency to manage in-year changes, in particular relating to extra payments to providers where additional hours are delivered or to provide short term specific financial support where there is a danger of insufficient places being available to children in an area if a provider closes.
 3. Capping the amount of funds to be managed centrally by the council to 3%, compared to the maximum permitted level of 5%
 4. The funding rate to be paid to providers delivering the free entitlement to 2 year olds

- 5.14 The two evening briefing sessions were attended by 81 people representing 61 providers. Written responses were received from 34 settings (47% of total). This is considered an excellent rate of response and the fact that fewer written replies were received than the number of providers attending the briefings is viewed as a positive sign in that the proposals do not cause concern to the non-respondents.

Annex A provides a numerical analysis of responses to all the questions, with confidential Annex C detailing the specific comments received.

Summary outcomes

- 5.15 Annex A shows that for the vast majority of the 27 questions posed, respondents supported the proposals made in the consultation, with at least 50% of respondents agreeing with the proposal in 25 of the 27 questions.
- 5.16 For the 2 questions with less than 50% agreement with the proposal, question 13 related to the criteria to be used for the quality supplement, where 47% agreed with the proposal, 35% disagreed and 18% did not make a response. Excluding the no response replies, then 57% support the proposal.
- 5.17 For question 15, this related to the frequency of data collection from providers to calculate eligibility to top up supplement where an annual or termly option was offered. There is a mixed response to this question with 61% preferring deprivation

Unrestricted

supplement to be updated on a termly basis, 57% preferring quality to be updated annually, with equal 50% support for annual and termly update for flexibility.

Detailed comments from providers

5.18 A number of providers made comments on the proposals and these are set out in full in the confidential Annex C. In summary:

1. 8 providers made comments on the proposed DAF (question 18). 2 supported the proposals, 5 made suggested change to the allocation of funding to providers, but this has to follow the DfE requirements, so is not permitted to change, with 1 provider requesting that the Education Health Care Plan (EHCP) process is accelerated. Whilst this comment is understandable, the process requires a period of validation of need and evidence that additional funds are required and has a statutory timeframe of 20 weeks to complete.
2. 7 providers made comments on the SEN Inclusion Fund (question 23). 4 supported the proposals, 1 requested that more notice was provided on SEN children entering settings although for September admissions, this is normally known by the end of April and is considered sufficient to plan transition, 1 requested that the relevant provider attended the panel. Here the intention is to have neutral members, including a representative from an early years setting but it would not be appropriate for a setting to represent their own request. 1 requested greater clarity, particularly around children with complex needs. The draft policy indicates that where specific interventions to support children are not successful, then the expectation is that a statutory assessment for an EHCP could commence.
3. There were 18 other comments from providers, some raising more than one matter with the general themes being:
 - a. Childminders are concerned that the funding rate to be paid is below what they are currently charging and therefore if they move to delivering the free entitlement they will suffer a loss of income. However, the amount that can be paid is directly linked to the funding provided by the government and hourly rate proposals meet the DfE conditions. 94.3% of funds received by the DfE are proposed to be passed on directly to providers through the EYFF, and when the SEN Inclusion Fund, DAF and Provider Contingency are included – the expectation being that these funds will ultimately be passed to providers – then 97.2% of funds will be received by providers.
 - b. The Quality supplement should include Ofsted ratings and leadership qualifications below level 5. However, the DfE do not allow this approach. Quality can only be recognised through qualifications or where high quality providers support others to develop their settings.
 - c. EAL support should be available to a wider range of languages. The current contract is supporting 20 languages. If more are required then providers need to present the requirement to the EY Team to consider whether further developments are possible.

Changes now proposed

5.19 Based on the responses to the consultation from providers, where there was a 47% response rate, and the vast majority indicating support for the proposals, the Forum is recommended to agree implementation of the original proposals with the exception of the Provider Contingency that should be increased by £0.034m to £0.119m. The

Unrestricted

increase relates to the amount of unallocated funding available after reviewing the costs of the proposals and adding in the extra, specific £0.025m funding that will be received for the DAF.

- 5.20 In respect of question 15 that sought views on the frequency of checking provider eligibility to flexibility top up funding, there was 50% support for a termly update and 50% for annual update. To minimise data collection from providers, it is proposed to collect this information annually, which is the current arrangement. Other responses clearly support termly calculation of deprivation funding top ups and annual collection of quality data, and these timings are recommended to be agreed.

Next Steps

- 5.21 The Forum is recommended to agree this approach to setting the Early Years Block related budgets to the Executive Member and also confirm that as a consequence, appropriate arrangements are in place for Early Years provisions, which the LA is required to consult with the Forum on each year. This will allow for the new Funding Formula to be implemented at April 2017 and provisional budgets issued to providers in February.
- 5.22 As there are some significant changes from current funding arrangements, a review of the impact of the new arrangements will be undertaken towards the end of 2017 to consider whether any refinements are required for 2018-19.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal issues are addressed within the main body of the report.

Borough Finance Officer

- 6.2 The financial implications arising from this report are set out in the supporting information and can be managed within the overall level of resources anticipated for Early Years provisions and support services.

Impact Assessment

- 6.3 There are no specific impact assessments arising from this report as the admissions policy is not being changed.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.4 The most significant issue anticipated from the proposals is failure to deliver the number of additional free hours required by parents. This is being mitigated by the expectation that provider funding rates will increase by an average of 14.1%.
- 6.5 However the majority of provision within the private, voluntary and Independent sector will only receive between 2.5% and 10% and it is possible that a number of providers will struggle to be sustainable particularly as they will not be able to charge for the additional hours above the 15 hours free entitlement as they currently do. This could result in some providers opting out of the scheme and charge parents direct. Most schools could receive the full amount available, and many have the capacity to extend, but currently many are not keen to change their model.

Unrestricted

- 6.6 There is also the possibility that with a new funding formula, funds allocated to providers will exceed the budget. This could be as a result of additional hours needing to be paid, or providers becoming eligible to higher rate top up payments than those currently anticipated. There could also be additional cost pressures to support children with SEN. These will be managed through the £0.119m contingency and High Need Block budgets.
- 6.7 Many providers operate in community/church halls where it may not be possible to expand provision. There is a lack of available space in the borough for providers to rent.
- 6.8 There will be added pressure to recruit additional, qualified, staff at the appropriate levels as there is already a shortage.
- 6.9 The council is working closely with all providers offering business and practice advice, support and guidance and encouraging collaborative working between providers. This will also mitigate some of the above risks.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 All providers in Bracknell Forest; trades unions and other interested parties.

Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Responses to a written consultation document, two evening briefings to providers and the same presentation to bursars in schools at the scheduled briefings.

Representations Received

- 7.3 The representations received are summarised in the body of this report and detailed in the annexes.

Background Papers

None

Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: Strategy, Resources and Early Help 01344 354061
David.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance 01344 354054
paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Karen Frost, Head of Prevention and Early Help 01344 354024
karen.frost@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Doc. Ref

G:\Executive\Schools Forum\81) 090317\Proposed Early Years Funding Formula etc.doc

	QUESTION	Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
	<u>In respect of the mandatory deprivation top up supplement:</u>							
1	Do you agree that the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) should continue to be used as the deprivation measure? (IDACI is a geographical measure of deprivation at post code level, ranked by severity of deprivation, calculated from government from data that identifies areas with the lowest levels of family income).							
	Yes	9	11	1	4	3	28	82.35%
	No	0	0	0	0	1	1	2.94%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%
2	Do you agree that the Early Years Pupil Premium data should be introduced as a new deprivation measure, with eligible children attracting enhanced hourly rate funding? (EYPP is measure of deprivation mainly based on families receiving income support benefits).							
	Yes	9	10	0	4	3	26	76.47%
	No	0	1	1	0	1	3	8.82%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%
3	What proportion of funds do you think should be allocated through the deprivation measure in the BF EY Funding Formula?							
	Around 3% (£0.133m existing amount)	1	5	0	1	0	7	20.59%
	Around 4% (£0.178m)	2	1	1	0	0	4	11.76%
	Around 5% (£0.222m and recommended amount)	6	5	0	3	4	18	52.94%
	No response	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%

Unrestricted

QUESTION		Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
<u>Assuming the deprivation supplement measures are IDACI and EYPP:</u>								
4	What relative weighting should be applied to IDACI and EYPP?							
	IDACI at 80% and EYPP at 20% (recommended weighting)	7	5	1	4	2	19	65.52%
	IDACI at more than 80% and EYPP less than 20%	1	2	0	0	1	4	13.79%
	IDACI at less than 80% and EYPP at more than 20%	1	3	0	0	1	5	17.24%
	No response	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.45%
5	For the IDACI measure, do you agree that funding should be further targeted so that providers with 1 in 3 children from a deprived background receive 3 times the basic rate (Band 3 at £0.48), those with 1 in 4 children from a deprived background 2 times the basic rate (Band 2 at £0.32) and those with 1 in 5 children from a deprived background the basic rate (Band 1 at £0.16)?							
	Yes	8	9	1	4	4	26	76.47%
	No	1	1	0	0	0	2	5.88%
	No response / unsure	0	1	0	0	5	6	17.65%
6	Do you agree that to reflect the circumstances in childminder settings, the deprivation top up through the IDACI should only apply where data indicates at least 1 in 3 chance that the child(ren) are from deprived backgrounds (average score of at least 0.33), and that in such circumstances, funding will be applied at the lowest level, Band 1, estimated at £0.16 per hour? NB childminders would be funded on the same basis as all other providers for EYPP children?							
	Yes	9	9	1	3	3	25	73.53%
	No	0	0	0	0	1	1	2.94%
	No response / unsure	0	2	0	1	5	8	23.53%

Unrestricted

QUESTION		Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
<u>In respect of a discretionary rurality / sparsity top up supplement</u>								
7	Do you agree that there is no case for a rurality / sparsity supplement?							
	Yes	8	9	1	4	2	24	70.59%
	No	1	2	0	0	2	5	14.71%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%
<u>In respect of a discretionary flexibility top up supplement:</u>								
8	Do you agree that a flexibility supplement should be in place in BF?							
	Yes	9	6	1	3	4	23	67.65%
	No	0	4	0	1	0	5	14.71%
	No response / unsure	0	1	0	0	5	6	17.65%
<u>Assuming a flexibility top up supplement is agreed:</u>								
9	Do you agree with the local definition at Annex 4 of the list of Annexes document around providing the free entitlement without restrictions of hours or days of availability, including early and late in the day, during school holidays, weekends attempting to accommodate changes in patterns of attendance, and innovative arrangements agreed by the Director of Children, Young People and Learning?							
	Yes	6	7	1	4	4	22	64.71%
	No	2	4	0	0	0	6	17.65%
	No response / unsure	1	0	0	0	5	6	17.65%

Unrestricted

	QUESTION	Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
10	What proportion of funds do you think should be allocated through the flexibility top up in the BF EY Funding Formula?							
	Around 0.7% of total funds (£0.028m current level)	2	4	0	1	1	8	23.53%
	Around 1% (£0.044m recommended level)	6	6	1	3	3	19	55.88%
	Around 1.5% (£0.061m)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
	No response / unsure	1	1	0	0	5	7	20.59%
	<u>In respect of a discretionary quality top up supplement:</u>							
11	Do you agree that a quality supplement should be in place in BF?							
	Yes	9	10	1	3	1	24	70.59%
	No	0	1	0	1	3	5	14.71%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%
	<u>Assuming a quality top up supplement is agreed:</u>							
12	What proportion of funds do you think should be allocated through the quality top up in the BF EY Funding Formula?							
	Around 2.0% of total funds (£0.087m)	0	1	0	2	1	4	11.76%
	Around 3% (£0.131m, and recommended level)	8	6	1	2	2	19	55.88%
	5.5% (£0.240m, current amount)	1	3	0	0	0	4	11.76%
	No response / unsure	0	1	0	0	6	7	20.59%

Unrestricted

QUESTION	Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
13 Do you agree that funding should be further targeted so that settings with Graduate Level 6 leaders and above receive base rate funding plus 30%, around £0.18 per hour, and those with Foundation Degree Level 5 leaders receive base rate funding at around £0.14 per hour and those with lower level leadership qualifications would not receive any top up funding?							
Yes	9	4	1	1	1	16	47.06%
No	0	7	0	3	2	12	35.29%
No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	6	6	17.65%
<u>In respect of a discretionary English as an Additional Language (EAL) top up supplement:</u>							
14 Do you agree that support to providers with EAL children should continue to be delivered through a specialist contract managed by BFC?							
Yes	7	9	1	4	2	23	67.65%
No	2	2	0	0	2	6	17.65%
No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%

Unrestricted

QUESTION		Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
<u>In respect of updating provider eligibility to hourly top up supplements:</u>								
15	For each of the following top up supplements, do you prefer an annual or termly update to determine provider eligibility?							
	Deprivation (requires LA activity) Annual	2	6	0	2	1	11	39.29%
	Deprivation (requires LA activity) Termly	7	5	1	1	3	17	60.71%
	Flexibility (requires LA and provider activity) Annual	6	5	0	2	1	14	50.00%
	Flexibility (requires LA and provider activity) Termly	3	6	1	1	3	14	50.00%
	Quality (requires LA and provider activity) Annual	7	5	0	2	2	16	57.14%
	Quality (requires LA and provider activity) Termly	2	6	1	1	2	12	42.86%
<u>In respect of the uniform hourly base rate:</u>								
16	Taking account of your views on the right amount of funds to be allocated through top up supplements, and having to cap the total to no more than 10% of funds, how much do you think should remain to fund the uniform hourly base rate?							
	Below 91% of total funds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
	Around 91% of total funds (recommended level)	8	8	1	3	4	24	70.59%
	Above 91% of total funds	1	3	0	0	0	4	11.76%
	no response	0	0	0	1	5	6	17.65%

Unrestricted

QUESTION		Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
<u>In respect of updating provider eligibility to hourly top up supplements:</u>								
17	Do you agree that the uniform hourly base rate is introduced at April 2017 rather than being phased in over 2 years?							
	Yes	9	11	1	3	4	28	82.35%
	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	1	5	6	17.65%
<u>Meeting children's additional needs: Disability Living Allowance</u>								
18	18. Do you have any comments on the policy proposed to support children with disabilities, as set out in sections 2 and 6 of Annex 5 of the list of Annexes document?							
	Yes	4	3	0	0	1	8	25.00%
	No	4	8	1	4	7	24	75.00%
<u>Meeting children's additional needs: SEN Inclusion Fund</u>								
19	Do you agree that there should be 3 levels of additional support; low at up to 6 hours a week, moderate at above 6 and up to 9 hours a week, with high at above 9 and up to 15 hours a week?							
	Yes	7	11	1	4	4	27	81.82%
	No	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.03%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	15.15%

Unrestricted

QUESTION		Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
20	Do you agree that in exceptional circumstances, alternative funding arrangements can be put in place?							
	Yes	9	11	1	4	4	29	85.29%
	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%
21	Do you agree that it is reasonable to base the funding allocation on £9.30 per hour staff costs?							
	Yes	7	10	1	2	4	24	70.59%
	No	2	1	0	2	0	5	14.71%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%
22	What level of funds do you think should be retained in the SEN Inclusion Fund for allocation to providers?							
	Less than 1%	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.45%
	Around 1%	7	11	0	4	3	25	86.21%
	More than 1%	2	0	1	0	0	3	10.34%
23	Do you have any comments on the proposed funding policy to support children with Special Educational Needs as set out in Annex 5 of the list of Annexes document?							
	Yes	2	3	0	0	2	7	21.21%
	No	7	8	1	4	6	26	78.79%

Unrestricted

QUESTION		Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
24	<p>Provider contingency:</p> <p>Do you agree that a contingency should be retained to meet the cost of in-year increases in take-up and to support providers facing financial hardship where this relates to ensuring sufficiency of places for parents and other in-year cost pressures?</p>							
	Yes	7	11	1	3	4	26	76.47%
	No	2	0	0	1	0	3	8.82%
	No response / unsure	0	0	0	0	5	5	14.71%
25	If a contingency is supported, what level of funds should it contain?							
	Around 1% of funds (£0.057m)	1	1	0	1	1	4	11.76%
	Around 1.5% (recommended level, and £0.086m)	7	8	0	3	3	21	61.76%
	Around 2.0% (current amount, £0.115m)	0	2	1	0	0	3	8.82%
	No response	1	0	0	0	5	6	17.65%
26	<p>Funds proposed to be centrally managed by the council INSIDE the 5% cap:</p> <p>Taking account of the council's statutory duties, what level of funds within the 5% cap do you consider it appropriate for the council to centrally manage on behalf of providers?</p>							
	Around 3% of funds (recommended level, £0.16m)	9	11	1	4	4	29	100.00%
	Around 4% (£0.215m)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
	Around the maximum amount of 5% (£0.27m)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%

Unrestricted

QUESTION		Schools	Pre-schools	Day Nursery	Private Nursery	Child minder	TOTAL	
27	Funding for 2 year olds:							
	Do you agree that provider funding rates should be increased by 7.1%, the same amount as the funding rate paid to BFC?							
	Yes	7	10	1	4	3	25	75.76%
	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
	No response / unsure	2	0	0	0	6	8	24.24%
	Total	9	11	1	4	9	34	
	Maximum	17			55		72	
	Response rate	53%			45%		47%	

Comments made on the consultation

Provider type	Provider	Comment
18. Do you have any comments on the policy proposed to support children with disabilities, as set out in sections 2 and 6 of Annex 5 of the list of Annexes document?		
Childminder	DW	The proposal sounds fine to me
Pre-school	Birch Hill	I agree with the proposal
Pre-school	Owlsmoor	We feel that awarding the DAF on an annual basis would lead to inequality if the child moved setting as there is no requirement for the funding to follow the child i.e. equipment may have been purchased to support the child but there is no requirement for this equipment to be sent onto the new setting and no funding will be received at the new setting to provide the necessary equipment
Pre-school	South Hill Park	Fully support the policy. My only reservation would be that perhaps there should be guideline for 'best practice' which might states that when a child leaves a setting then they could pass some money on to the new setting if it has not already been allocated towards something and also that if the care is split between 2 settings then perhaps they could agree a split in the money. I agree that this cannot be put in policy because if the money has already been spent then a setting should not have to refund it but asking settings to consider best practice for the sake of the child may be a good idea
School	New Scotland Hill	We require some further clarification of the allocation of the DAF
School	Owlsmoor	We would welcome more clarity, particularly around children who have complex needs and are admitted into mainstream schools without any support.
School	Sandy Lane	Regarding parent nominated provider: would it be possible to consider allocating the funding to the provider that provides most of the care and education? Regarding the child moving settings: Would it be possible to move the funding with the child?
School	Uplands	The process for applying for and getting an EHCP should involve quicker input from both provider and LA as the current process could take as long as the child is in nursery, so by the time the child receives an EHCP they would be ready to move to reception. This may need to involve additional Early Years intervention and support in identification

Restricted

Provider type	Provider	Comment
23. Do you have any comments on the proposed funding policy to support children with Special Educational Needs as set out in Annex 5 of the list of Annexes document?		
Childminder	DW	The proposal sounds fine to me
Childminder	RW	I do believe that extra funding should who need it.
Pre-school	Birch Hill	I agree with the proposal
Pre-school	Owlsmoor	Although schools will be given a transition fund we find, at present, that there is insufficient time between the school knowing which children will be attending and the end of the school year to arrange for all relevant professionals to attend a TAC meeting, thus enabling the school to plan sufficiently for the child's needs. We think the transition fund should also be linked to the schools being made aware earlier that a named child will be attending in September. Why is the onus being put on the provider to arrange the TAC meeting and not the child's Keyworker, as we are under the impression that it is part of their remit to liaise with all professionals involved with a child
Pre-school	South Hill Park	I think the panel needs to include someone from the setting which is making the application or someone from the panel needs to be representing the setting and have seen the child and spoken with the person applying in detail. Otherwise, potentially what is happening is that a group of professionals are making a decision but do not actually have enough in-depth knowledge of the child or what is needed in that particular setting on a day-to-day basis
School	Meadow Vale	Early intervention for SEN is crucial, therefore, clear guidance and funding availability is paramount to this
School	Owlsmoor	We would welcome more clarity, particularly around children who have complex needs and are admitted into mainstream schools without any support.

Restricted

Provider type	Provider	Comment
Other comments		
Childminder	CP	I was unable to find anywhere on the form to input my concerns about as a childminder being paid termly in arrears for the 30 hours funding from September 2017.As a self employed professional with bills to pay monthly this would be an issue for me and I'm sure many others, My main income comes from 3 yr olds I have in my care and to not get paid for a couple of months could potentially put me into considerable debt. Is there any reason why we couldn't receive this money monthly?
Childminder	WD	I feel that there should be more finances available for EAL - so that providers can use it towards buying dual language resources for their setting - which will then be retained by the setting for future use
Childminder	EC	I am a childminder and currently work alone with 24 children on my books and care for 12 every day. Settings apart from us get the deprivation supplement but I have just as many children as them plus if a child does half with another setting they would get the deprivation supplement and I wouldn't?
Childminder	JB	I think that it is ridiculous that childminders / nurseries and pre-schools should be asked to be creative in their delivery of the 30 hours "free" funding. I also think that Bracknell Forest council should not give up on fighting how this funding is delivered and should join the dialogue to help get the government to change their proposals on how it is delivered. Can I recommend that Bracknell Forest council Early Years has a look at the following Facebook group "Champagne Nurseries on Lemonade Funding" - this a group of nurseries and childminders who are campaigning to change how the "free" hours are delivered
Childminder	JW	Unfortunately I feel that I cannot complete this form as there is so much I don't understand/am not clear on. However from what I understand, my feelings are that the base rate of £4.10 is not in line with what a lot of current childminders, including myself, charge. This means a drop in income. I know that Ascot will be on a higher rate of £4.90 for doing the same job as Bracknell childminders and I feel this is unfair due to where we live. It sounds to me that being put onto the higher rate would be easier and would not incur any losses to childminders income and therefore we would not have to try and cover our losses in other ways, such as charging for administration. However, as mentioned I understand very little about this funding. I think that providing a simple on line calculator for us to input our information to calculate losses/gains (dependant on rate) would be beneficial and we would therefore have a clearer picture of how it will leave us financially.

Restricted

Provider type	Provider	Comment
Other comments		
Childminder	LF	<p>Unfortunately, the consultation documentation does not make easy reading and therefore makes it extremely difficult to comment at the level you seem to expect. I was unable to attend the arranged meetings also due to other commitments. However, what I can comment on is the effect that I believe this will ultimately have on the level of quality care provided to our youngsters in Bracknell Forest. If Childminders like me are dictated to how much they can earn from a placement, there will be an impact on the level and quality of care provided. It doesn't seem fair that any local authority, or Government can place a limit on what someone is paid and at the same time promote equality through minimum wage. I strongly believe that the impact of this initiative will be damaging to the Childminding businesses because of over complex, and under funding.</p>
Childminder	AW	<p>I do not feel in a position to complete this form due to lack of knowledge and understanding. I was unable to attend the meeting due to personal circumstances but have spoken to someone who did attend. To be honest the whole funding situation is going over my head, I do not understand how this is going to benefit my setting. I am hearing mixed reports as to how complicated the system is going to be. I am also extremely concerned regarding how this will impact me financially. I together with a many childminders work very hard and long hours for a rate that is well below the national minimum wage so to be advised that there is a potential risk of us receiving less than what we are charging per hour now is unacceptable especially when we are aware that a different Borough will have a base rate of £4.90 per hour compared to what is being offered for Bracknell Forest of £4.10. I cannot help feel that the funded 30 hours is more designed for Nursery settings than childminders working on their own and working 48 weeks a year. There has to be a lot more explanation in leman's terms so that it is fully understood and a fair hourly rate that warrants the job that the childminder does. I cannot help feel that more and more childminders will decide that this is no longer a viable career option.</p>
Childminder	RW	<p>For some reason my iPad will not let me put X in the boxes above. Obviously my main concern as a childminder is about the 30 hour free funding coming in September 2017 and how will affect my business and my income. I do have some understanding on how it will be worked out and that things still need to be finalised through Bracknell Forest Council. I'm also aware that in Ascot their base rate will be a minimum of £4.90 an hour but I also understand that is under a different Council. The deprivation supplement sounds like a postcode lottery to me and may not reflect individual circumstances. I'm not sure top ups for this and that are the way to go and not just have a higher base rate for all providers. However I will look at my business plan when we know the final verdict and see where I will have to make adjustments in order to evolve my own business</p>

Restricted

Provider type	Provider	Comment
Other comments		
Pre-school	Birch Hill	<p>Quality Supplement: If a provider has a qualification of level 4 or below and they are deemed outstanding by OFSTED then they should also qualify for a quality supplement. If its solely based on qualifications then the name of the supplement should be changed to qualifications supplement!</p> <p>EAL: Although I agree with the current arrangement for EAL it would be helpful to have small amount of funding available for resources for those languages not covered by the service. For example, I regularly seem to have Hungarian children, and funding to purchase dual language books would be beneficial.</p>
Pre-school	Chavey	<p>As much as I agree with deprivation being important I am slightly concerned that the intentions for the quality of staff top up is being reduced. I personally feel level 4 is equivalent to level 5. And even level 3 should be recognised. You will find most staff will do level 3 but anything over is hard for them with there personal lives. Also they do not receive anything more for going higher as the money is not there to pay them. If you do have a graduate and they qualify they move on straight away as there is more money for them elsewhere. This is a waste of staff time as it takes a lot of work and effort to train someone up just for them to leave. As deprivation is so important surely having staff that are qualified at level 3 or above is important, but something needs to be in place to help providers support there staff and an incentive to encourage them. I personally do not feel flexibility is as important. This I feel is unfair to those settings that are run in halls and are not able to be as flexible as others as the hall may be used at other times. Also most pre-schools are staffed by parents and that this job suits them so they can pick up and drop there children off themselves, have holidays with them. If we were to offer weekend or holiday sessions we might as well become a nursery and you will lose the quality of staff you may have already I do agree that we should receive the new base rate straight away but yet again the minimum wage is going up by 30p in April so by taking away the quality of staff for myself I am not gaining anything as I am having to pay it out to staff. EAL is important but at present not enough different languages are available to help settings and also most of the time they do not turn up to the settings which is awkward when we have informed the parents this is happening. Also they do not return messages</p>
Pre-school	Owlsmoor	<p>Question 4: We agree with 80%/20%, however we think that as the EYPP becomes embedded and more eligible parents claim this funding a heavier weighting should be given to EYPP.</p> <p>Question 15: Although we have answered this, will the new Provider Portal mean that we do not have to complete a lot of information each year on the census? Will we simply have to log on check what is correct and alter what has changed? Once we know how the Provider Portal will work this may change the answer we have given to this question.</p> <p>Also, we have answered to termly for the Flexibility but once all the changes settings are likely to make around the introduction of the 30 hours we may wish to change our answer to this as well. Therefore, there are too many factors we do not know the answers to at present to answer this question accurately.</p>

Restricted

Provider type	Provider	Comment
Other comments		
Pre-school	South Hill Park	<p>1 The SEN support funding needs careful management. Settings are finding it more and more difficult to include children with SEN and the systems in place do not always offer enough support for providers.</p> <p>2 SEN funding needs to be agreed before the beginning of the term. Where money is being used to fund extra staff we cannot wait until the term has started to know whether or not the wages will be covered because they will already be working.</p> <p>3 The PLA support for EAL is excellent where available but there are so many languages which are not covered and for those that are they seemed overstretched (I have been waiting for Polish support for over a term now).</p> <p>4 The BFC financial year runs from April whereas in practice most changes are experienced by settings from September, therefore deprivation figures are likely to change at this point too. I don't necessarily think the figures for this need to be looked at termly but they should be looked at again for the Autumn Term.</p> <p>5 My personal belief is that flexibility should be provided by having different types of quality provision, e.g. day care, school nurseries, Pre-schools, childminders all offering what they feel they can do best. The local authority should not try to impose flexibility in certain ways if a setting does not believe that is best for them as a business and a quality provider. Settings should know what their own strengths are and direct parents to other providers if they cannot meet their needs.</p>
Pre-school	Whitegrove	<p>As much as I agree with deprivation being important I am slightly concerned that the intentions for the quality of staff top up is being reduced. I personally feel level 4 is equivalent to level 5. And even level 3 should be recognised. You will find most staff will do level 3 but anything over is hard for them with there personal lives. Also they do not receive anything more for going higher as the money is not there to pay them. If you do have a graduate and they qualify they move on straight away as there is more money for them elsewhere. This is a waste of staff time as it takes a lot of work and effort to train someone up just for them to leave. As deprivation is so important surely having staff that are qualified at level 3 or above is important, but something needs to be in place to help providers support there staff and an incentive to encourage them. I personally do not feel flexibility is as important. This I feel is unfair to those settings that are run in halls and are not able to be as flexible as others as the hall may be used at other times. Also most pre-schools are staffed by parents and that this job suits them so they can pick up and drop there children off themselves, have holidays with them. If we were to offer weekend or holiday sessions we might as well become a nursery and you will lose the quality of staff you may have already I do agree that we should receive the new base rate straight away but yet again the minimum wage is going up by 30p in April so by taking away the quality of staff for myself I am not gaining anything as I am having to pay it out to staff. EAL is important but at present not enough different languages are available to help settings and also most of the time they do not turn up to the settings which is awkward when we have informed the parents this is happening. Also they do not return messages</p>

Restricted

Provider type	Provider	Comment
Other comments		
Private nursery	Rectory Lane	As a manager/owner of 2 'Outstanding' settings. There appears to be no incentive to be 'outstanding'. More emphasis has been put on the level of qualification. I am a level 6 graduate leader but there are many level 3 led 'outstanding sessions'
Private nursery	Rowans	As a manager/owner of 2 'Outstanding' settings. There appears to be no incentive to be 'outstanding'. More emphasis has been put on the level of qualification. I am a level 6 graduate leader but there are many level 3 led 'outstanding sessions'
School	Meadow Vale	A very robust, clear and well-explained consultation, thank you
School	New Scotland Hill	The timing of this consultation was not helpful
School	Owlsmoor	At this stage we are not considering taking 2 year olds