

**TO: SCHOOLS FORUM  
DATE: 28 JANUARY 2010**

---

**BFC PROPOSALS FOR THE  
EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA (EYSFF)  
(Acting 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 the proposed Bracknell Forest Council Early Years Single Funding Formula and other related matters. Comments are being sought on the composition of the Formula so that these can be presented to the Executive Member in February when a formal decision on this is planned to be taken.
- 1.2 This report also provides an update on the implementation timescale for the changes which the DCSF has now extended by 1 year to April 2011, although LAs can still implement in April 2010 if they wish, subject to agreement from the DCSF. This report proposes an April 2010 implementation date for BFC.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the responses to the consultation proposals on the Bracknell Forest Council Early Years Single Funding Formula at Annexes A and B are NOTED together with the summary of outcomes and key comments at paragraphs 5.9 to 5.27;
- 2.2 That the Bracknell Forest Council Early Years Single Funding Formula should be as set out in the consultation document, amended for the changes detailed in paragraphs 5.31 to 5.38;
- 2.3 That the proposals for the other finance related matters that were supported through the responses to the consultation as set out in paragraph 5.8 are AGREED;
- 2.4 That the financial implications envisaged, based on 2008-09 data as set out in paragraphs 5.39 to 5.42 are included in the proposals for the 2010-11 Schools Budget;
- 2.5 That an application be made to the DCSF for the Early Years Single Funding Formula to be implemented in April 2010 through the Pathfinder route (paragraph 5.47).

**3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 The proposals made are considered to be the best available, taking account of the work of the Provider Representative Group, national and local priorities, provider responses from the consultation and the estimated level of available resources.
- 3.2 All LAs are required to have in place a common funding formula for providers of the free entitlement for early years education and childcare. Agreeing to the proposals in this paper ensures that the required work and decision making processes will have been completed in time to allow for an April 2010 implementation.

**3.3 Delaying implementation to April 2011 is not considered the best option as relevant work has been completed and providers are engaged and generally supportive of the plans. Workloads and uncertainty would be increased if the process is extended.**

#### **4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

4.1 These have been considered in earlier reports to the Provider Representative Group.

#### **5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

##### **Background**

5.1 Members of the Forum are aware through previous reports that all LAs are required to introduce a common Funding Formula for providers of the free entitlement for early years education and childcare (referred to as the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF), or the "Formula"). This will replace two arrangements currently in place, one relating to the maintained sector, the other relating to PVI providers. The budget totals to around £3m.

5.2 The Forum has previously agreed that a Provider Representative Group (the "Group") be set up to lead this work, including agreeing the content of a consultation paper. This work concluded in November 2009, with the consultation subsequently distributed to all providers on 11<sup>th</sup> November, requesting responses by 11<sup>th</sup> December. During this period, 3 evening briefing sessions were made available for providers to ask questions and to hear the key elements of the consultation being explained.

##### **Summary of the consultation proposals**

5.3 There are some key requirements from the DCSF in terms of making the changes in Early Years funding that had to be included in the consultation document as follows:

- a. All providers must be funded on the basis of hours attended, not on the length of session offered. This represents no change to PVI providers but moves maintained sector providers from 38 week funding at 2½ hour daily sessions for each child on roll in January, irrespective of attendance to actual hours;
- b. Funding must be recalculated at least on a termly basis, to reflect any changes in participation. Again, this represents no change to PVI providers, but moves maintained sector providers from annual funding based on January attendance to termly participation rates;
- c. Funding for deprivation must be recognised in the Formula. This is also a requirement in the general Funding Formula for Schools as the DCSF consider this an effective way to target resources to close the attainment gap arising from deprivation.

5.4 In addition to the statutory requirements, the Group agreed that the BFC EYSFF should:

- a. Comprise a single hourly base rate to cover common core costs, based on average provider costs, with different levels of funding by provider type where this was supported by reliable evidence from the cost surveys and other related work;
- b. Aim for a relatively high hourly base rate to fund common core costs so as to achieve predictability and stability of funding for all providers;
- c. Include hourly supplements, payable in addition to the hourly base rate to promote national and local policy objectives for:
  - i. Deprivation;

- ii. Quality of provision (as measured through workforce qualifications);
- iii. Additional Educational Needs (if a suitable measure can be identified);
- iv. Flexibility of provision outside the basic 5 half day sessions available at fixed times Monday – Friday.
- d. Include transitional funding arrangements to protect providers facing the largest changes in funding;
- e. Be affordable within the current Early Years funding envelope.
- f. Where it is not practical to divide costs in a maintained school to those relating to the Nursery Class, or to prevent cost increases, then this funding would not be included in the EYSFF but remain within the general Funding Formula for Schools. This mainly relates to premises costs, such as business rates and building insurances, and professional services bought back from the Council.

5.5 Taking account of the factors described above in paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4, the EYSFF included in the consultation document, **based on 2008-09 prices and data**, was as set out below in Table 1, with different rates for the maintained and PVI sector providers that reflect their different cost bases.

Table 1: Hourly funding rate for the EYSFF proposed in the consultation with providers

<b>Element of the Formula</b>	<b>Proposed Hourly Funding</b>	
	<b>Maintained</b>	<b>PVI Sector</b>
<b><u>Hourly base rate</u></b>		
<b>Gross hourly base rate:</b>		
Average staff and employer on-costs	£2.20	£1.75
Sickness and other staff absence	£0.15	£0.30
Cost pressure from maintaining staffing ratios etc	£0.25	£0.25
Cost of staff training	£0.10	£0.10
Support costs	£0.60	£0.65
Accommodation	£0.00	£0.35
Profit element	£0.00	£0.10
<b>Sub total - Gross hourly base rate</b>	<b>£3.30</b>	<b>£3.50</b>
<b>Deductions from hourly base rate (to remove duplicate funding)</b>		
Deprivation – costs included in gross hourly base rate	-£0.10	-£0.10
Quality– costs included in gross hourly base rate	-£0.15	£0.00
<b>Sub total - deductions from gross hourly base rate</b>	<b>-£0.25</b>	<b>-£0.10</b>
<b>Base Hourly Rate - Minimum Funding Level</b>	<b>£3.05</b>	<b>£3.40</b>
<b><u>Supplements</u></b>		
Deprivation	£0.00 - £0.30	£0.00 - £0.30
Quality	£0.00 - £0.45	£0.00 - £0.45
AEN	tbd	tbd
<b>Sub total – supplements</b>	<b>£0.00 - £0.75</b>	<b>£0.00 - £0.75</b>
<b>Total Hourly Rate: Maximum</b>	<b>£3.05</b>	<b>£3.40</b>
<b>Total Hourly Rate: Minimum</b>	<b>£3.80</b>	<b>£4.15</b>
<b>Current hourly funding</b>	<b>£3.30</b>	<b>£3.66</b>

5.6 The financial implications from the proposals at provider level, based on the 2008-09 data, were also set out in the consultation document, a summary of which is follows:

- a. There would be 23 providers gaining; 7 less than 3%; 4 between 3% and 6%; 7 between 6% and 9%; 5 more than 9%.
- b. There would be 40 losers; 25 less than 3%; 6 between 3% and 6%; 9 between 6% and 9%.
- c. Maximum provider increase in hourly funding is 12.1% with the largest reduction at 7.1%.
- d. Of the 23 providers that have increased hourly funding, 14 are in the maintained sector and 9 in PVI.
- e. All 40 of the providers that have a decrease in hourly funding are in the PVI sector.
- f. 1 provider in the maintained sector has no change.
- g. Overall, around £0.050m has been moved from PVI to maintained sector (1.6% of the total budget).
- h. On average, 92.5% of funding will be allocated through the hourly base rate and 7.5% through supplements where providers meet the qualifying criteria.

5.7 There are 4 main reasons why the PVI sector tend to lose money in the initial proposals:

- a. Staff qualifications are generally lower in PVI settings, resulting in a lower cost base being included in the hourly base rate, and less top up funding for quality, as measured through workforce qualifications. The new arrangements should act as a financial incentive to providers to improve staff skills and subsequently receive extra funds.
- b. Based on provider location, 93% of maintained providers are classified as deprived with only 48% of PVI providers. Maintained schools therefore receive a greater proportion of the mandatory deprivation funding top-up.
- c. The current BFC PVI funding rate is relatively high. Based on 2009-10 data from the 19 local Councils in South East England, the BFC rate is the 3rd highest. The provider rate in BF has been increased at high rates in recent years, in line with increases in school funding, where there have been pressures around pay, including performance pay and workforce developments that may not have been replicated in the PVI sector. Therefore, when undertaking a base budget approach to future funding, which has been possible from the provider cost surveys, which has implied funding in excess of costs.
- d. It is believed that a number of providers are using the funding for the free entitlement to subsidise the more expensive provisions for 2 year olds which parents must pay for and is more expensive to provide due to lower adult : child ratios. If the fees for 2 year olds can be kept as low as possible, there is a greater likelihood of keeping higher numbers in the setting, including keeping the 2 year olds when they are 3 and 4 and within the free entitlement.

5.8 Other issues also included in the consultation, were as follows:

- a. Specific, short term, targeted funding should be available to help sustain providers experiencing financial difficulty where the LA considers the setting is necessary to meet its statutory requirement to ensure sufficient education and childcare is available to meet local needs. This is proposed to be a growth item for next year's Schools Budget and is included on the separate budget paper on this agenda;
- b. The current payment arrangements for PVI settings would remain in place with two payments per term, one based on expected participation levels, paid at the start of term and one based on actual participation, paid at half term;

- c. For maintained providers, the indicative budget would be given each year alongside their main school budget, recalculated each term on actual census data and providers notified accordingly;
- d. Other than participation rates, data used for funding purposes should be updated once a year at the January prior to the commencement of each financial year to provide stability of funding through the hourly rate which could otherwise change on a termly basis and also remove the need for additional data collection and processing.

Copies of the consultation document will be available at the meeting if required.

### **Summary outcomes from the consultation process**

- 5.9 The three evening briefing sessions were attended by 43 providers (68% of total), 9 (60%) from the maintained sector and 34 (71%) from the PVI sector. Subsequent to this, 27 (42%) written responses were received, 5 (33%) from the maintained sector and 22 (45%) from the PVI sector. This is considered an excellent rate of response and the fact that fewer written responses 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.
- 5.10 In such a detailed and in places complex consultation that ultimately proposes a redistribution of funding with some providers facing a loss of income, it is to be expected that there will be some disagreement to the proposals. In order to provide a consistent review of the responses, this report assumes that where there are less than 15% of all providers disagreeing with a proposal, then this is not significant enough to consider making a change. Where there are more than 15% of providers in disagreement, then the proposal does need to be reconsidered. The following sections therefore highlight the questions where at least 15% of all providers disagree with the proposal. This equates to between 9 and 10 providers and 30% of respondents to the consultation.

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

### **Main comments to the proposals**

- 5.11 Annex A shows that for the vast majority of the 40 questions posed, respondents supported the proposals made in the consultation, with the majority of responses to 38 of the 40 questions being either in agreement or undecided on the proposal. Where there was less support for the proposals, 7 questions had over 30% of respondents (9 providers) disagreeing with the proposals. For 2 questions, there were a majority of providers answering "No" to the proposal, although one of these questions was whether there was a suitable factor available to recognise Additional Educational Needs in the EYSFF. Therefore, only one proposal was not supported by the majority of respondents.
- 5.12 As set out above, the following paragraphs detail the proposals where at least 30% of respondents did not support the proposal. In addition to seeking a "yes", "no", "undecided" comment to each question, at the end of each section, providers were invited to make any general comments they had in order that alternative proposals could be considered.
- 5.13 In making responses, providers were asked to consider the whole EYSFF and not to focus too closely on each element as the funding was built up on average costs as there would inevitably be parts that looked under or over funded. If this approach is not taken, there is a danger that providers only comment on the elements of the Formula that adversely affect them and not those where they receive favourable funding. In all of this, it needs to

remembered that all of the funding is allocated, and if more is to added to one element of the EYSFF, an equal amount of deduction needs to be made somewhere else.

#### The Hourly base rate (questions 4-13)

- 5.14 The hourly base rate is financially the most significant part of the EYSFF as it is proposed to allocate 92.5% of all funds. It is built up from a number of different elements at average provider cost, such as direct staff costs, training etc and questions were posed to providers on each element.
- 5.15 Whilst 9 PVI providers (14% of all providers) do not agree that the significant cost elements are included in the proposed funding rate (question 4), no other items have been identified for inclusion so there is insufficient information to consider whether any other costs need to be added.
- 5.16 On a similar theme, 12 (19% of all providers) do not agree with the calculation proposed for average staff costs for inclusion in the base rate (question 5). However, only 3 specific comments were made on this issue. One respondent wanted funding for improved adult : child ratios which is not within the scope of the consultation, another said that PVI providers should be funded on national pay scales and not actual costs, but this does not reflect the current cost base which is the fundamental approach adopted that was supported by 74% of respondents, with the final comment indicating extra costs for providers needing to pack away before and after sessions. It is unclear how widespread this issue is, and the base rate includes £0.25 to cover general costs of providers around staffing expenses that are outside the basic assumptions in the EYSFF.
- 5.17 10 PVI providers (16% of all providers) did not support the calculation of support costs that relates to learning resources, some premises costs and general expenses around administration, management and professional services, such as ICT support (question 10). Four comments were received to support this view. One mentioned that not all providers had photocopiers, internet etc at their workplace and did this at home, so not all of these expenses were included in the cost surveys. Another comment suggested the proposal did not cover enough costs in that building maintenance costs should be included, but this is proposed to be funded within another element of the EYSFF, the accommodation element. The view was also expressed by two respondents that maintained sector providers should meet these costs from the main school budget, but the calculation of the Nursery Class budget to be taken away from schools supported at question 2 included the current funding for these costs in the age weighted pupil unit so the relevant funds are proposed to be added into the EYSFF and therefore this is where the costs need to be charged. The final comment received on this question relates to accommodation and is therefore dealt with the other similar comments in the following paragraph.
- 5.18 10 PVI providers (16% of all providers) did not support the calculation of accommodation costs at question 12, which is half of PVI provider respondents. As set out in the consultation document, results from the costing surveys indicated extremely varied costs in the sector, ranging from mortgages on houses to pepper corn rates for church halls and long term lettings agreements. One comment stated that Ofsted has limited the size of setting in their accommodation to 24 children thereby limiting the admissions and therefore funding received for accommodation. Larger settings that admit more children receive more funding but accommodation hire costs are generally fixed for the rooms and facilities used, thereby disadvantaging smaller providers. The other two comments made on this relate to having relatively low participation rates and therefore do not receive sufficient income to cover costs.
- 5.19 9 comments were received on the general issue of the proposed hourly base rate. Two were generally supportive, with a third provider unsure whether it will fully cover costs. A

further two providers suggested that funding for accommodation was insufficient, which makes five in total when added to those detailed with question 12 at paragraph 5.18. The remaining four providers suggested that the maintained sector is treated more favourably, for example through the funded staffing ratios and that they have more capacity to absorb the erratic changes in income than the PVI sector has to deal with from a smaller income base.

#### Supplementary payment for deprivation (questions 14-18)

- 5.20 Whilst none of the proposals were opposed by the 15% of providers set as the significance threshold in paragraph 5.10, 13 (21% of all providers) did make a comment on this element of the EYSFF. Nine of the comments believe that funding should be allocated based on a child's postcode, rather than the current proposal to use setting location as the child post code is considered a more accurate measure of deprivation in a setting. Of the remaining comments, three providers supported a deprivation element and one opposed it.

#### Supplementary payment for quality of provision (questions 19-20)

- 5.21 This section of the consultation did not find favour with the PVI sector providers that made a response. 15 PVI providers (23% of all providers) did not agree that staff qualifications were the most appropriate measure for quality of provision (question 19). Furthermore, 10 PVI providers (16% of all providers) did not agree with the proposed bands of funding being proposed (question 20).
- 5.22 This element of the EYSFF is structured around national and local priorities where improving workforce qualifications is seen as a key driver for making improvements in the quality of provisions. The only alternative suggested was the Ofsted inspection judgement, but this is considered inappropriate as it reflects a judgement from a short period inspection and may not be reviewed for 5 years. Also, not all providers have been inspected by Ofsted so there would be difficulties in establishing the level of funding for these settings.
- 5.23 Four respondents believed that the proposals favoured the maintained sector and the higher salaries paid, three suggested that qualifications don't always result in higher quality workforce as experience and practical skills also have a role to play and one respondent believed funding should be allocated where all staff are Level 3 as this is a major achievement. Finally, two respondents commented that they could not afford to train staff to the higher levels because the funding only increases when staff have achieved the new qualifications.

#### Supplementary payment for additional educational needs (questions 22-25)

- 5.24 The consultation proposals on AEN related to seeking views on whether AEN should be recognised in the EYSFF as the Provider Representative Group could not reach a clear view on this as a suitable, objective and readily available measure had not been identified. EAL had been identified as a potential measure but there were concerns that this did not always result in an AEN and additional cost requirement.
- 5.25 Of the responses received, 17 providers (27% of all providers) wanted an AEN measure in the EYSFF, with 16 (25% of all providers) supporting use of EAL, with funds allocated where the setting had 5% or more of its intake with EAL (question 23). In addition, 22 respondents (34% of all providers) supported a request being made to the Schools Forum to set aside funding in a budget to be managed by the Council (question 25). Of the general comments received, seven respondents specifically supported the creation of a specific budget to support special educational needs.

### Transitional funding arrangements (questions 29-35)

- 5.26 Whilst there was general support to the proposals to limit changes in hourly funding rates to no more than 3% in any one year, over a four year period, it has subsequently been established that the DCSF require transitional arrangements to last no more than three years and a new proposal is set out below at paragraph 5.37. The proposal to review this after two years, to fix the data used for funding purposes for the duration of the transitional period for relevant providers and to fund any costs associated with transition from new growth were generally supported through the responses and therefore remain unchanged.

### Overview of comments from the briefing sessions

- 5.27 Notes of comments were taken at each of the briefings and whilst these may not have filtered through in the responses, they are considered an important part of the process as they allowed the general mood of the meeting to be judged which cannot so easily be captured from reading written responses. The main themes arising from these meetings were:
1. that deprivation should be measured by child post code, not that of the provider as used in the consultation document.
  2. the qualification supplement should be calculated from the full time equivalent staffing qualifications and not from an average of the head count as used in the consultation document.
  3. PVI's are seen as being disadvantaged compared to maintained schools. In particular due to their relatively small size, with schools able to use other parts of their budget to subsidise early years, the current admissions policy, which has a great impact on how they operate, and the national pay scales that create high costs and are funded accordingly due to the actual cost approach taken in the EYSPF.
  4. Some PVI providers incur additional accommodation costs due to restrictions on their buildings. For example, this can limit the number of children that can be admitted or require additional time to be spent on set up and pack away for each session.

### Conclusion

- 5.28 This is a detailed, and in some places complex consultation which aims to be transparent to providers and to enable issues to be identified and considered.
- 5.29 There was a very good attendance at the evening briefing sessions (68% of all providers) which was followed up with a lower level of written responses (42% of all providers). Responses are generally supportive of proposals, although as expected with some providers set to lose funding, a number of negative replies were received. As set out in paragraph 5.11, the majority of responses to 38 of the 40 questions were either in agreement or undecided on the proposal. Where there was less support for the proposals, 7 questions had over 30% of respondents (9 providers) in disagreement. Only one question, the use of staff qualifications to measure quality of provision, had more respondents disagreeing than agreeing with the proposal, although no suitable alternative was identified.
- 5.30 Insufficient negative responses are considered to have been received to make any significant changes to the proposals contained in the consultation and where there has been disagreement, very few alternative proposals have been made. However, a number of changes are recommended and these are set out below from paragraph 5.31.



### Changes now proposed

- 5.31 Reviewing the responses and further checking of the original proposals has identified some areas where the suggested changes will result in improvements, to either reflect a better solution or in one instance, to correct an error. In making changes to the proposals, it is important to remain focused on the key objectives of the changes which require a consistent approach to funding for all providers, that it is built around the actual cost bases of different provider types and that providers receive financial incentives to improve quality and tackle deprivation where this is significant.

Financial implications of the new proposals are set out between paragraphs 5.39 and 5.42.

- 5.32 There was one fairly significant error in the consultation document and this related to the £0.15 deduction to the maintained sector hourly base rate to prevent double funding when the qualification supplement is added. This amount did not include the £0.10 added to the qualification rates at the end of the review process as an additional incentive to providers over and above the actual cost increase to improve staff qualifications. The deduction should therefore be £0.25 and a further £0.10 deduction needs to be made to the hourly funding rate of all maintained sector providers. This correction reduces the overall cost of the proposals by £0.028m.
- 5.33 The issues raised around accommodation costs are not surprising considering the wide range of facilities being used with varying costs. This is seen as a real issue which was highlighted in the consultation and therefore an additional £0.05 is proposed to be added to the hourly base rate. This will go to all PVI providers (none in the maintained sector), and will cost £0.029m and effectively spends the additional funds freed up in paragraph 5.32.
- 5.34 Two changes are proposed to the data to be used in allocating funds to providers. For deprivation, it is proposed to use the postcode rating for the child home address, rather than provider location as the view from responses is that this would be more appropriate. To ensure that settings receive the same hourly funding rate for all children, a ranking will be calculated for each provider based on the average deprivation score from each child. This ranking will then determine whether the provider receives the deprivation supplement or not. Based on the 2008-09 data, this change in data results in 11 providers receiving an increase in their hourly funding (2 in maintained sector and 9 in PVI) 13 providers receiving a decrease (4 in maintained and 9 in PVI), and 15 subject to no change. The overall allocation of funds has reduced by £0.003m.
- 5.35 The second data change is proposed on the workforce qualifications data where full time equivalent weightings will now be applied to calculate the average qualifications in a setting rather than using straight head count data. This impacts only in the PVI sector, when at the deadline for this report, updated information from 7 providers indicated that 5 would receive an increase in hourly funding and 2 a decrease. This allocates a further £0.006m. If these returns are representative of all providers, overall costs would increase by £0.042m
- 5.36 In respect of AEN funding, whilst a majority of respondents supported allocating funds based on EAL where this is more than 5% of a setting's intake, this is not recommended to be adopted as EAL does not always result in a cost increase. The final proposals of this report therefore only recommend retaining a central budget to support pupils with special educational needs.
- 5.37 Changes are also required to the initial proposals around transitional funding arrangements. In order to meet DCSF requirements, it is now proposed to move providers straight to the EYSFF where the change is less than 2.5%, with all other providers moving to the EYSFF by an equal third of their change over a three year period. This proposal is

broadly cost neutral, even after allowing for a reduction in the threshold proposed in the consultation from 3% to 2.5% before protection applies.

- 5.38 Assuming all of the above proposed changes are agreed, Table 2 below sets out the proposed hourly funding rate for the EYSFF, which based on 2008-09 data, will result in an overall increase in costs of £0.011m compared to current arrangements.

Table 2: Hourly funding rate for the EYSFF after reviewing the outcomes from the consultation

Element of the Formula	Proposed Hourly Funding	
	Maintained	PVI Sector
<b><u>Hourly base rate</u></b>		
<b>Gross hourly base rate:</b>		
Average staff and employer on-costs	£2.20	£1.75
Sickness and other staff absence	£0.15	£0.30
Cost pressure from maintaining staffing ratios - etc	£0.25	£0.25
Cost of staff training	£0.10	£0.10
Support costs	£0.60	£0.65
Accommodation	£0.00	£0.40
Profit element	£0.00	£0.10
<b>Sub total - Gross hourly base rate</b>	<b>£3.30</b>	<b>£3.55</b>
<b>Deductions from hourly base rate (to remove duplicate funding)</b>		
Deprivation – costs included in gross hourly base rate	-£0.10	-£0.10
Quality– costs included in gross hourly base rate	-£0.25	£0.00
<b>Sub total - deductions from gross hourly base rate</b>	<b>-£0.35</b>	<b>-£0.10</b>
<b>Base Hourly Rate - Minimum Funding Level</b>	<b>£2.95</b>	<b>£3.45</b>
<b><u>Supplements</u></b>		
Deprivation	£0.00 - £0.30	£0.00 - £0.30
Quality	£0.00 - £0.45	£0.00 - £0.45
AEN	£0	£0
<b>Sub total - supplements</b>	<b>£0.00 - £0.75</b>	<b>£0.00 - £0.75</b>
<b>Total Hourly Rate: Maximum</b>	<b>£2.95</b>	<b>£3.45</b>
<b>Total Hourly Rate: Minimum</b>	<b>£3.70</b>	<b>£4.20</b>
<b>Current hourly funding</b>	<b>£3.30</b>	<b>£3.66</b>

Financial implications arising from the proposals

- 5.39 The financial implications from the proposals at provider level, based on 2008-09 data, are set out in Annex C with Annex D illustrating the impact of the transitional protection arrangements, a summary of which follows, with where relevant, a comparison with the impact arising from the original proposals:
- a. There would be 29 providers gaining (was 23); 13 less than 2.5%; 9 between 2.5% and 5%; 6 between 5% and 10%; 1 more than 10%.

- b. There would be 32 losers (was 40); 14 less than 2.5%; 10 between 2.5% and 5%; 8 over 5%.
- c. Maximum provider increase in hourly funding is 12.1% (no change) with the largest reduction at 5.7% (was 7.1%).
- d. Of the 29 providers that have increased hourly funding, 10 are in the maintained sector (was 14) and 19 in PVI (was 9).
- e. Of the 32 providers that have a decrease in hourly funding, 2 are in the maintained sector (was 0) and 30 are in the PVI sector (was 40).
- f. 3 providers, all in the maintained sector, face no change (was 1).
- g. Overall, around £0.025m (1.2% of the PVI budget) has been moved from PVI to maintained sector (was £0.050m – 2.3% of the PVI budget).

5.40 The proposed amendments have clearly reduced the significance of the changes and go some way to allaying the fears expressed by PVI providers.

5.41 In addition to the cost of running the EYSFF, a number of proposals have been made in the consultation to set Council managed budgets to support the new arrangements. These are set out below in Table 3.

Table 3: Financial implications arising from the proposals

Item	Amount £m
Net impact from EYSFF (2008-09 data) (1)	+0.011
<b><u>Budgets to be managed by the Council (estimated amounts):</u></b>	
Sustainability Fund	0.015
SEN fund	0.015
Contingency for in-year growth, additional qualifications top-ups, unforeseen items etc	0.045
<b>Total proposed Council managed budgets</b>	<b>0.075</b>

(1) This includes all of the proposals now being made in respect of funding to be directly allocated to providers at the start of each financial year. Whilst one of the objectives was to make sure any changes could be funded from within existing funds, the operation of a Formula based approach was always going to make this difficult. An increase of £0.011m is considered insignificant on this £3m budget.

5.42 At this stage, the initial 2010-11 budget proposals have included provision for the additional costs arising from this paper. All budget decisions will need to be reviewed by the Schools Forum in February in the light of more up to date data, which may require further changes.

**Views of the Provider Representative Group**

5.43 Due to the adverse weather conditions, the Provider Representative Group meeting scheduled for 13 January to review the outcomes from the consultation and make recommendations to the Forum had to be cancelled. A further meeting has been scheduled, and whilst this will be before this meeting of the Forum, it will be after the publication deadline for this report. Therefore, a verbal update on views of the Provider Representative Group is proposed to be made.

### **Date for implementation**

- 5.44 The EYSFF was originally required to be in place by April 2010, but has now been delayed by one year to April 2011 as on 10<sup>th</sup> December, Dawn Primarolo, the Minister for Children, Young People and Families indicated that “a significant number of local authorities are experiencing difficulty in developing their EYSFF. More recently, parents and providers, from both the maintained and the PVI sectors, have expressed concerns about the potential adverse impact on provision if the EYSFF is introduced now.”
- 5.45 This decision was taken following a survey of LAs. “The data and information we have collected now suggests that less than a third of local authorities will be in a secure position to implement their EYSFF from April 2010. While it is difficult to generalise about the underlying reasons it seems clear that some local authorities have experienced serious difficulties in obtaining accurate data from their providers, while others have simply found the task extremely challenging.”
- 5.46 The position in Bracknell in terms of readiness to implement is that processes are well advanced with a small number of concerns from providers – as set out above in the outcomes from the consultation – and therefore an April 2010 change can be achieved. A delay at this stage is considered unnecessary due to the good progress made and would prolong the process which in turn would impact on workloads and create uncertainty for providers. There is also a danger that it would be difficult to pick up momentum once the process had been slowed down.
- 5.47 The Forum is therefore recommended to support an application to the DCSF from the Council to be a Pathfinder authority that will implement the EYSFF in April 2010.

### **Next Steps**

- 5.48 Subject to any comments from the Provider Representative Group, final proposals for the EYSFF agreed by the Forum will be presented to the Executive Member for a decision in February.
- 5.49 The proposals in this paper, if agreed, will allow for the new Funding Formula to be implemented at April 2010 and provisional budgets issued to providers in March.

## **6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS**

### **Borough Solicitor**

- 6.1 The relevant legal requirements are contained within the body of the report.

### **Borough Finance Officer**

- 6.2 The financial implications arising from this report are set out in the supporting information and will need to be considered as part of the overall Schools Budget and will be subject to Executive Member decision in accordance with the budget strategy of the Schools Forum and the Council.

### **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 proposal will reduce the level of funding allocated to some providers. Whilst there is a transitional funding scheme in place to phase the changes in over three years and £0.015m in a Sustainability Fund to assist providers facing financial hardship, there remains a risk that some providers will go out of business creating gaps in available places. However, a greater risk to provider profitability relates to a reduction in the number of children attending settings for reasons of parental choice and other factors outside the impact of this report which are therefore separate issues.

## **7 CONSULTATION**

### Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 All providers in Bracknell Forest; teacher associations and non teaching unions.

### Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Responses to a written consultation document from the Acting Director of Children, Young People and Learning, three evening briefings to providers, presentation to bursars in maintained schools.

### Representations Received

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

## Background Papers

Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009

Childcare Act 2006, Section 7

The 2006 Code of Practice on the provision of nursery education places for 3 and 4 year olds

The Extension to the free early education entitlement for 25 percent of 3 and 4 year olds: Interim guidance for local authorities July 2008

Draft DCSF Funding Regulations

Children's Plan – Building Better Futures

Various reports to the Single Funding Formula Representative Group

10<sup>th</sup> December letter from Dawn Primarolo, the Minister for Children, Young People and Families

## Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: Performance and Resources  
[David.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:David.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

01344 354061

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance - 01344 354054  
[paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

Karen Frost, Early Years and Childcare Manager – 01344 354024  
[karen.frost@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:karen.frost@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

Doc. Ref

G:\New Alluse\Executive\Schools Forum\43) 280110\Proposed Early Years Single Funding Formula

EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION							
ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Current Funding Arrangements:</b>							
1	Do you agree that where for simplicity, it makes sense for certain costs and associated funding levels for maintained nursery classes to be met by the main school budget or central Council budget, then this continues?						
	Yes	17	5	22	81%	34%	
	No	0	0	0	0%	0%	
	Undecided	5	0	5	19%	8%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
2	Do you agree with the calculation proposed at Appendix C to determine the level of funds in maintained nursery classes to be removed from the existing main school budget and in future included in the Formula?						
	Yes	10	5	15	56%	23%	
	No	3	0	3	11%	5%	
	Undecided	9	0	9	33%	14%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
<b>Establishing current costs:</b>							
3	Do you agree that data from the cost surveys should be used to establish current costs of different types of settings, unless it is considered incomplete or unreliable, in which case other supplementary surveys and data sources should be used?						
	Yes	15	5	20	74%	31%	
	No	5	0	5	19%	8%	
	Undecided	2	0	2	7%	3%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
<b>Conclusions and recommendations on Formula composition</b>							
<b>The Hourly Base Rate:</b>							
4	Do you agree that the proposed elements of the hourly base rate cover the significant cost elements facing the majority of providers?						
	Yes	9	4	13	48%	20%	
	No	9	0	9	33%	14%	
	Undecided	4	1	5	19%	8%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
5	Do you support the calculation made to establish the average direct staff cost?						
	Yes	7	5	12	44%	19%	
	No	12	0	12	44%	19%	
	Undecided	3	0	3	11%	5%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	

## EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
<b>6 Do you agree that for long term absences other than for sickness, such as maternity leave, the existing arrangements should be retained for maintained nurseries where the LA holds the funds and meets the costs, with a funding allocation made to PVI providers who would be responsible for paying any cover requirements?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	18 1 3 0	5 0 0 0	23 1 3 0	85% 4% 11% 0%	36% 2% 5% 58%	27 64	64
<b>7 Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for sickness and other staff absence?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	15 2 5 0	5 0 0 0	20 2 5 0	74% 7% 19% 0%	31% 3% 8% 58%	27 64	64
<b>8 Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for when settings are staffed below the minimum staff / child ratios that are assumed in the Formula?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	12 6 4 0	5 0 0 0	17 6 4 0	63% 22% 15% 0%	27% 9% 6% 58%	27 64	64
<b>9 Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers to finance continuous staff training?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	15 5 2 0	5 0 0 0	20 5 2 0	74% 19% 7% 0%	31% 8% 3% 58%	27 64	64
<b>10 Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for support costs?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	9 10 3 0	5 0 0 0	14 10 3 0	52% 37% 11% 0%	22% 16% 5% 58%	27 64	64
<b>11 Do you support the proposal to only fund PVI providers for accommodation, with maintained schools continuing to be funded for the accommodation costs of their Early Years provisions through their main school budget?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	19 1 2 0	5 0 0 0	24 1 2 0	89% 4% 7% 0%	38% 2% 3% 58%	27 64	64



## EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
12	<b>Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to PVI providers for accommodation?</b>						
	Yes	4	14		52%		22%
	No	0	10		37%		16%
	Undecided	1	3		11%		5%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
13	<b>Do you support the calculation made to establish a profit element for PVI providers?</b>						
	Yes	3	17		63%		27%
	No	1	6		22%		9%
	Undecided	1	4		15%		6%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
<b>Supplementary payments to the hourly base rate</b>							
<b>Deprivation:</b>							
14	<b>Do you agree that relative deprivation should be measured via the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index?</b>						
	Yes	5	16		59%		25%
	No	0	3		11%		5%
	Undecided	0	8		30%		13%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
15	<b>Do you agree that the deprivation supplement needs to be funded from a deduction to the Hourly Base rate?</b>						
	Yes	5	9		33%		14%
	No	0	8		30%		13%
	Undecided	0	10		37%		16%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
16	<b>Do you agree that the total funds allocated by deprivation measures to providers should be set at around 3% of the total budget, half the proportion of funding received by BFC through deprivation measures from the Government?</b>						
	Yes	4	10		37%		16%
	No	0	6		22%		9%
	Undecided	1	11		41%		17%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
17	<b>Do you agree that only the 60% most deprived providers should receive deprivation funding?</b>						
	Yes	5	12		44%		19%
	No	0	6		22%		9%
	Undecided	0	9		33%		14%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	

## EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
<b>18</b> Assuming only 60% of providers receive funding for deprivation, do you agree that funding should be further targeted so that the top 10% be funded at 3 times the basic rate (Band 3), the next 25% at 2 times the basic rate (Band 2) and the final 25% at the basic rate (Band1)?  Yes No Undecided No reply	1 2 19 0	4 0 1 0	5 2 20 0	19% 7% 74% 0%	8% 3% 31% 58%	27 64	
<b>Quality of provision:</b> <b>19</b> Do you agree that relevant staff qualifications data is the most appropriate measure for quality of provision?  Yes No Undecided No reply	4 15 3 0	5 0 0 0	9 15 3 0	33% 56% 11% 0%	14% 23% 5% 58%	27 64	
<b>20</b> Do you agree that the proposed bandings and their relative funding proportions are correct?  Yes No Undecided No reply	5 10 7 0	5 0 0 0	10 10 7 0	37% 37% 26% 0%	16% 16% 11% 58%	27 64	
<b>Quality of provision - funding adjustment for maintained sector providers:</b>							
<b>21</b> Do you agree that to ensure an equitable level of funding between providers, that the direct staff cost element of the Hourly Base rate for maintained sector providers should be reduced by £0.15 to remove double funding?  Yes No Undecided No reply	12 3 7 0	4 0 1 0	16 3 8 0	59% 11% 30% 0%	25% 5% 13% 58%	27 64	
<b>Other items for consideration around provider funding</b>							
<b>Supplementary payment to providers for Additional Educational Needs:</b>							
<b>22</b> Do you think the Formula should include an element to fund additional educational needs?  Yes No Undecided No reply	13 5 4 0	4 1 0 0	17 6 4 0	63% 22% 15% 0%	27% 9% 6% 58%	27 64	
<b>23</b> Do you think that funding should be paid directly to providers for English as An Additional Language where there are more than 5% of children in the setting?  Yes No Undecided No reply	13 2 7 0	3 1 1 0	16 3 8 0	59% 11% 30% 0%	25% 5% 13% 58%	27 64	

## EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
<b>24 Do you have any suggestions on a readily available, objective factor that could be used to recognise the costs of additional educational needs?</b>  Yes No Undecided No reply	3 13 6 0	2 3 0 0	5 16 6 0	19% 59% 22% 0%	8% 25% 9% 58%	27	64
<b>25 Do you agree that the Schools Forum should be requested to set aside contingency funding to support providers admitting children with special educational needs, where agreed with the Council?</b>  Yes No Undecided No reply	17 0 5 0	5 0 0 0	22 0 5 0	81% 0% 19% 0%	34% 0% 8% 58%	27	64
<b>Sustainability and sufficiency of providers:</b>							
<b>26 Do you agree that additional financial support should be paid to providers where this is necessary for the Council to meet its duty to ensure sufficient places are available?</b>  Yes No Undecided No reply	19 0 3 0	5 0 0 0	24 0 3 0	89% 0% 11% 0%	38% 0% 5% 58%	27	64
<b>27 Do you agree that additional financial support should be paid to providers where this is necessary for the Council to meet its duty to ensure sufficient places are available?</b>  Yes No Undecided No reply	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0% 0% 0% 0%	0% 0% 0% 100%	0	64
<b>28 Do you agree that the proposed eligibility criteria should be adopted as the policy?</b>  Yes No Undecided No reply	11 1 10 0	5 0 0 0	16 1 10 0	59% 4% 37% 0%	25% 2% 16% 58%	27	64
<b>Transitional funding arrangements:</b>							
<b>29 Do you agree that transitional arrangements should be put in place to smooth the financial impact of the Formula?</b>  Yes No Undecided No reply	20 1 1 0	5 0 0 0	25 1 1 0	93% 4% 4% 0%	39% 2% 2% 58%	27	64

## EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
<b>30 Do you agree that the maximum change in the hourly funding rate that a provider should face each year is 3% (either increase or decrease)?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	15 3 4	4 1 0	19 4 4		70% 15% 15%		30% 6% 6% 58%
				27		64	
<b>31 Do you agree that where a provider faces a change in funding of no more than 6% that this should be phased in over 2 years?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	12 6 4	4 1 0	16 7 4		59% 26% 15%		25% 11% 6% 58%
				27		64	
<b>32 Do you agree that where a provider faces a change in funding of more than 6%, that 3% should be implemented in the first year, with the balance implemented equally over the next 3 years?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	14 2 6	3 2 0	17 4 6		63% 15% 22%		27% 6% 9% 58%
				27		64	
<b>33 Do you agree that the transitional funding scheme should last for up to 4 years, with a review after 2 years?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	14 6 2	3 2 0	17 8 2		63% 30% 7%		27% 13% 3% 58%
				27		64	
<b>34 Do you agree that to incorporate stability and predictability of funding for providers, those providers within the scheme at April 2010 will have their funding data frozen and receive confirmed hourly funding rates for the whole period they qualify for transition?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	6 7 9	5 0 0	11 7 9		41% 26% 33%		17% 11% 14% 58%
				27		64	
<b>35 Do you agree that if any additional costs arise from the transitional arrangements that the Schools Forum be requested to allocated new funds?</b> Yes No Undecided No reply	19 0 3	5 0 0	24 0 3		89% 0% 11%		38% 0% 5% 58%
				27		64	

**EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION**

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Payment arrangements to providers:</b>							
36	Do you agree that payments to providers should continue to be made on the current twice termly basis?						
	Yes	22	4	26	96%	41%	
	No	0	0	0	0%	0%	
	Undecided	0	1	1	4%	2%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
<b>Frequency that data used for funding purposes should be updated:</b>							
37	Do you agree that where there is a choice on updating data used for funding purposes that this should be done once a year from the January census return?						
	Yes	14	4	18	67%	28%	
	No	6	1	7	26%	11%	
	Undecided	2	0	2	7%	3%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
<b>Flexibility:</b>							
38	Do you agree with the local definition of flexibility?						
	Yes	14	3	17	63%	27%	
	No	4	0	4	15%	6%	
	Undecided	4	2	6	22%	9%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
39	Do you agree with the proposed flexibility test that must be met to receive additional funding?						
	Yes	11	3	14	52%	22%	
	No	5	0	5	19%	8%	
	Undecided	6	2	8	30%	13%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
40	Do you agree with the proposed funding thresholds for settings for additional flexibility of provision, based on weekly hours, once the test has been met?						
	Yes	11	3	14	52%	22%	
	No	5	0	5	19%	8%	
	Undecided	6	2	8	30%	13%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
41	Do you agree with the proposed hourly supplement rate for flexibility of provision?						
	Yes	11	3	14	52%	22%	
	No	4	0	4	15%	6%	
	Undecided	7	2	9	33%	14%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
<b>Number of responses:</b>		22	5	27			
		44.90%	33.33%	42.19%			

### FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Do you agree that where for simplicity, it makes sense for certain costs and associated funding levels for maintained nursery classes to be met by the main school budget or central Council budget, then this continues?</b>	
	St Michaels's Childcare Trust	As long as the same items are included in the PVI formula
<b>2</b>	<b>Do you agree with the calculation proposed at Appendix C to determine the level of funds in maintained nursery classes to be removed from the existing main school budget and in future included in the Formula?</b>	
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	On discussion with colleagues it was felt that this can not allow for the extra workload management have to meet to sustain a voluntary setting in terms of time management and professional costs for company procedures etc. Time given and not charged for - unlike schools with admin officers etc
	South Hill Park Pre-school	It would appear that maintained nursery classes will still benefit from far more funding as a result of being part of the school. I will cover this in Q10
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	No evidence is presented that everything has been included and that maintained nurseries will still receive subsidies from the main school budget. Indeed, schools with an eye on future pupil numbers in the school and with their school budgets behind them, have many opportunities to do a "loss leader" for their nurseries. PVI do not have the financial security to do the same and are therefore disadvantaged
<b>3</b>	<b>Do you agree that data from the cost surveys should be used to establish current costs of different types of settings, unless it is considered incomplete or unreliable, in which case other supplementary surveys and data sources should be used?</b>	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Does the data used provide a true reflection of costs – PVI staff seem to do a fair amount of unpaid work
	Little Acorns Montessori School	This data seems to be incomplete and also items such as rental costs have been grossly underestimated
	Plus Three Nursery Schools –FW	The current proposals do not reflect our current hiring costs. A figure of £10 p/h was quoted yet all 3 of my settings are substantially more than that, one hiring is almost £17 p/h. Settings that set up and clear away each day pay staff costs of additional 33 % per day. The current proposal fails to take this into account. The PVI settings that set up/clear away will be the biggest losers under this proposed formula, yet we have the highest costs, this is wrong! Staff pay rises have also not been taken into account.
	South Hill Park Pre-school	However we have not been told when data has been considered incomplete or unreliable. Data will vary enormously as PVI settings can be very different, but this does not make the data invalid
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	As long as there is a full consideration of reliability and completion for all data
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	Contrary to question 2, there is no list of the data categories included. This indicates a lack of understanding of PVI costs.
	The College Nursery	With the many different ways that settings are run it is a complicated issue and very difficult to make it fair across the board
<b>4</b>		
<b>5</b>	<b>Do you support the calculator pm made to establish the average direct staff cost?</b>	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Staff costs-we supplement our early years funding from main budget to ensure a ratio of 1:9 in the nursery
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Pack away settings have different staffing requirements due to lack of appropriate facilities eg toilets outside of the main hall requiring staff, access and safe cover for outside areas, kitchen access. Have to cover staff costs and hall rental for set up and pack away time for a 2.5 hour session although your model was worked out on 2 x 2.5 hours sessions per day. NB: How about central government initiative costs - this consultation, EYFS-can't be covered in admin costs.
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	In PVI's, staff pay is very much based on what can be afforded from the funding, not on national pay scales. In the interests of fair competition, the staff costs should be reworked based on national pay scales, not what is being paid. With schools taking 4 year olds and probably subsidising them from the main school budget (as a "loss leader") PVI's are forced to take 2 year olds to survive. Staffing levels for this are 1:4 and not 1:8, so staffing ratios are too low in the formula. So we have unfair competitive situation between schools, with their financial might, and PVI's who are forced into to taking 2 year olds to survive but without the funding for the increased staffing levels required.
<b>6</b>		No comments

## FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

<b>7</b>	<b>Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for sickness and other staff absence?</b>	
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	No evidence is presented to support the assertion is presented for PVI's. Schools with their larger staffs are able to provide short-term cover for sickness without breaking their staffing ratios. PVI's have to pay staff cover to maintain their ratios. So 12 days, based on school data, is probably too low for a PVI
<b>8</b>		No comments
<b>9</b>	<b>Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers to finance continuous staff training?</b>	
	South Hill Park Pre-school	PVI settings would have a high staff training cost than maintained. We have more staff and many of them come into the job completely unqualified. To reach a high quality we support all staff to then reach their full potential
<b>10</b>	<b>Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for support costs?</b>	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Not all facilities available on site e.g. photocopier, printer, pc, internet. Use of these tends to be at home in own time.
	South Hill Park Pre-school	Support costs do not cover enough. Premises costs need to include maintenance when PVI settings own their buildings or are responsible for them. It seems very unfair to provide the same costs to both maintained and PVI for 'running costs' and 'admin' as maintained nurseries would receive much of this from the school - they would not have a separate electricity bill or their own cleaner/caretaker/printing bills/recruitment costs etc etc
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	Support and accommodation costs are based on 30 children. If OFSTED sets a lower level, these PVIs are immediately disadvantaged in the formula. At St Michael's the OFSTEAD limit is 24. We would take more but we are not allowed to. However, in the formula the support and accommodation costs are the same as for a larger setting. The formula must include the regulated number of places in a setting to adjust for the relatively higher overhead costs in a small settings.
	The College Nursery	Maintained should be meet by the main school budget
<b>11</b>		No comments
<b>12</b>	<b>Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to PVI providers for accommodation?</b>	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	BFBC charge high rental and offer no reduction for long term rental compared to figures used as averages. Figures based on maximum size setting might not be full but rental stays the same.
	South Hill Park Pre-school	The accommodation calculation assumes that a setting would be able to just have funded children all in the same session. As much as you would like to you CANNOT ignore our 2 year olds. We may not receive funding for them but without them many of us would not have a business (due to schools taking children into reception at age 4). Therefore BFC would have to find them somewhere to go - I doubt there are enough nursery spaces & these do not suit all parents

## FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

<b>13</b>	<b>Do you support the calculation made to establish a profit element for PVI providers?</b>	
	Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-school	Its hard to know if all of the above will work until its in practice. We hope that it will cover our costs
	Braken Bears Day Nursery	The funding required for accommodation in the PVI sector should be at least double this calculation to cover the cost
	Building Blocks Pre-school	How has this been calculated - no information provided
	Little Acorn Montessori School	Maintained sector gets more money for staff where only 2 are required for 26 children and PVI given less but have to fund more staff and encourage graduate entry? Does not add up. The amount of money given to PVI's is being cut radically, we have to pay to give money to the maintained sector - not £3.60 to £3.40 but in real terms £3.80 to £3.40!!!
	Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	When minimum staff/child ratios were discussed have you calculated the fact that groups such as ourselves run at a 1:6 ratio to take into account 2 year old children – and therefore am I correct in understanding that the 25 pence per hour covers this? With regard to accommodation - your figures only cover for 3 hours per day = £5700 my groups accommodation is in excess of £11500 per annum as we are open for 6 hours maybe I have not understood correctly
	Newbold School	While this works all right for our setting I know several providers were upset that their large accommodation costs would not be covered by this new calculation
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	Costs are erratic and likely to increase considerably- will there be appropriate measure for PVI's? Staff costs cannot allow for the mixed age ranges PVI's have to meet to sustain and potential debt from fee's charged. Although a separate issue, may affect sustaining some PVI's in the future. We could not sustain on grant funded places alone, especially with the erratic transition to nursery currently.
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	My understanding of the single funded formula was to offer a 'more level playing field' between PVI and maintained sector, from current proposals this is clearly not the case eg will the PVI sector receive fruit for the children? We were initially informed that once the single funded formula was introduced that non of us would be worse off and some of us would be better off, this is clearly not the case with my settings loosing 7.14% 7.14% and 1.64% respectively. We are barely able to sustain on the current funding, cuts will inheritably mean reducing outcomes for children due to our inability to afford all 'the extras' we like to provide our children
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	The principle of putting as much as possible into the base funding is sound - as long as the base data is accurate
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	Profit: As charities, PVI's are not allowed to make profits by the Charity Commission. The Trustees are required to reinvest in the facility whilst ensuring their liabilities and risks are covered by holding adequate reserves. The level of reserves has to be justified to the Charity Commission. The biggest liability is closure and redundancy costs. I suspect that many PVI's do not hold sufficient reserves for this, eg one terms salary plus statutory redundancy costs. In addition this liability is salary related so increases each year. So the "profit" element has to be sufficient to establish the reserves required to cover liabilities and then increased in line with the salary element each year.
	The College Nursery	Those PVI that have charity status cannot make a profit
	Wasps	Nurseries in maintained schools have the back of the school budget. Size of the setting should allow the registered ofsted number not element based on 30 children
<b>14</b>	<b>Do you agree that relative deprivation should be measured via the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index?</b>	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Pockets of people in housing association properties now incorporated in all new builds so deprivation more spread around
<b>15</b>	No comments	
<b>16</b>	<b>Do you agree that the total funds allocated by deprivation measures to providers should be set at around 3% of the total budget, half the proportion of funding received by BFC through deprivation measures from the Government?</b>	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Where is the "other half" and what is it used for?
<b>17</b>	No comments	



## FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

<b>18</b>	<b>Assuming only 60% of providers receive funding for deprivation, do you agree that funding should be further targeted so that the top 10% be funded at 3 times the basic rate (Band 3), the next 25% at 2 times the basic rate (Band 2) and the final 25% at the basic rate (Band1)?</b>	
	Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-school	Deprivation should be based on a child's postcode and not on the provider's postcode
	Birch Hill Pre-school	Where a setting is established in a new build area including low cost housing how can deprivation accurately be established on postcode
	Chavey Down Pre-school	Due to my rent being the highest in the borough to lose money because of not being in a deprived area seems slightly unfair
	Harmans Water Playgroup	Yes, but there is deprivation in other areas and if this is to be done it needs to be done fairly - percentage is vague
	Holly Spring Pre-school	Many deprived families are not living in deprived areas don't know how accurate this is
	Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	As discussed at the meeting I do agree that deprivation should not be measured by the post code of the setting - but by the postcodes of the children attending the setting.
	Newbold School	I'm not sure what to make of this really. If I had seen a nursery in a deprived area I might understand better what the extra funding goes towards.
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	Deprivation should be measured on the postcode/family income of the child and not the setting
	South Hill Park Pre-school	BFC need to be sure that the deprivation money is used to benefit those that are deprived eg extra staff/training/resources. In some ways it would be better if the deprivation funding was completely separate. We would be visited by someone who could help us put in place measures that would really help and then receive the money for this.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	As long as the calculation does not seriously penalise or threaten the sustainability of any settings then the deprivation formula makes democratic sense
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	Deprivation costs should be based on the address of the child, not that of the PVI setting as there are pockets of low cost housing. Deprivation ratios are 1:6 not 1:8 so the formula needs to be corrected.
	The College Nursery	I agree that something needs to be done to support children in the most need. Is the 60% locally or nationally?
	Wasps	Deprived areas are not only in certain postcode areas but low cost housing is a requirement to all new build houses therefore these areas need to be considered to. If the ratios are 1:6 in these areas this needs to be monitored to ensure the funding is used for this purpose
<b>19</b>		No comments
<b>20</b>	<b>Do you agree that the proposed bandings and their relative funding proportions are correct?</b>	
	Braken Bears Day Nursery	This whole section is biased towards school ie maintained sector. This does not look at the PVI sector in terms of overall quality who may have high levels of NVQ3 but not have level 4
	Chavey Down Pre-school	Level 3 I feel is a major achievement and to have to tell staff that is not high enough for us to receive more money will be a very sore point
	Harmans Water Playgroup	I think it ensures groups are striving for the best BUT it is a no win situation for PVI, on our income we will struggle to employ/keep & train a QTS once we pay for them to be educated, they will then move on, our money will be lowered & we have to start over again, on less money.
	Holly Spring Pre-school	I see that in theory this is good but impossible for PVI to maintain. It costs to train, to employ & then don't stay in PVI sector. Impossible, cost us a lot of money for little/no gain. But I can see it is beneficial to child in theory. Is there anything for an outstanding group, this would insure excellent provision
	Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	Staff qualifications does not reflect the quality of the provision. We have just received outstanding overall from ofstead and we do not employ a degree qualified person. Quality should be measured by ofstead judgements not by qualifications.
	Newbold School	I have qualified and unqualified staff. Frequently the unqualified staff are more able than the qualified. As more and more staff become qualified it may even out.
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	Maintained sector has pay scales to attract graduates; 1:13 ratio with increase % of staff highly qualified. PVI's have many staff to enable various ratio requirements - increasing % figures qualification data should allow for how many staff have NVQ 2/3 - not just leaders as in PVI's leaders are involved with many management duties nursery leaders do not have to undertake eg staff management/contracts/CRB's/references etc therefore qualified staff is key to quality 1:1 with children
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	Quality should also be measured on ofsted outcomes
	South Hill Park Pre-school	The highest 'quality' (& therefore highest payment) will be given to a setting where there is a qualified teacher and one level 3. A ratio of 1:13 is NOT quality, it is outrageous. To have a range of staff who are qualified to level 2/3 and at least one person working towards a foundation degree or similar represents a far higher quality level. Qualified teachers may have done a minimal amount of 'Early years' study within their degrees.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	Although I agree that qualifications are an important part of a skilled work force there is no guarantee that this translates into a quality service delivery - it is a component. This sector is (PVI) predominately staffed by committed people with practical skills

## FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

	St Michael's Childcare Trust	The qualification element must be weighted by the hours worked by the individual staff, not average of all PVI staff. Many lower qualified staff only work a few hours whereas the high qualified staff work full time. The average qualification level is therefore higher than has been allowed for.
	The College Nursery	There's no account of experience and a qualification doesn't guarantee quality
	Wasps	Need to base it on full time equivalent not number of staff. Also take into account the hours staff work. PVI settings should be funded the same so they can employ staff on the same grades this improving the quality of the PVI workforce. As schools are now taking 4 yr olds, settings forced to take 2 year olds therefore ratios lower so staff costs higher.
<b>21</b>	<b>Do you agree that to ensure an equitable level of funding between providers, that the direct staff cost element of the Hourly Base rate for maintained sector providers should be reduced by £0.15 to remove double funding?</b>	
	Harmans Water Playgroup	It should be down to the parent to decide childcare arrangements, schools don't provide full day care at this age, parents needing to get back to work etc. We are meant to be doing what is best for the parent & child THIS IS NOT
	Holly Spring Pre-school	This is wrong we are doing what is best for parent/child, giving flexibility. We are meant to be working together to provide wrap around care.
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	The "double funding" reduction for maintained providers should be more as they have many opportunities to cross subsidise from their main school budget and better financial security.
<b>22</b>	<b>Do you think the Formula should include an element to fund additional educational needs?</b>	
	College Town Infant	Additional Ed needs should be needs led
	The College Nursery	Per child with additional needs
<b>23</b>	<b>Do you think that funding should be paid directly to providers for English as An Additional Language where there are more than 5% of children in the setting?</b>	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Threshold should be higher ie 8% of a 52 place setting ie 4 pupils
	The College Nursery	Keep it the same as now
<b>24</b>	<b>Do you have any suggestions on a readily available, objective factor that could be used to recognise the costs of additional educational needs?</b>	
	College Town Infant	Sen Register
	Meadow Vale Primary	Agree with a central fund- difficult as not many enter nursery with a statement
	Building Blocks Pre-school	As and when needed
	The College Nursery	"Every child matters" each child needs are so different
<b>25</b>	<b>Do you agree that the Schools Forum should be requested to set aside contingency funding to support providers admitting children with special educational needs, where agreed with the Council?</b>	
	Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-school	I thought the local authority provided extra funding for additional needs. I am not sure it should be part of the funding formula.
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Not all settings have EAL or SEN children in attendance whereas some settings have a lot (depends on area)
	Harmans Water Playgroup	I have reservations that will be successful at present we receive no or very little help in this area, this needs to be seriously looked at, as groups will be more reluctant not to take these children, as the costs will be too high. It take staff time & dedication typing reports and attending reviews etc as well as the actual care. Have really strong feelings on this subject, something needs to be done
	Holly Spring Pre-school	At the moment it is hard to receive funding for SEN. Staff put in a lot of hard work & it should be rewarded accordingly
	Little Acorn Montessori School	This funding has been dealt with separately historically and should remain that way otherwise this money could disappear into the larger budget
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	At this early stage of care it can take time to identify and have acknowledged concerns about SEN. This can affect the costs of our care as we 'manage' the situation in the interim period. We have in the past sustained the cost of extra support ourselves to ensure quality of care for the child. How can this be best supported?
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	I feel strongly that SEN funding should remain separate per child individual need and not per setting in the formula
	South Hill Park Pre-school	Again I feel this should be separate from the rest of the funding. Somebody could visit settings to determine how best we could help children will EAL or SEN. This may be additional staff training, resources etc. In this way the money is always spent on the purpose intended.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	Special needs must be kept separate from the formula to ensure that each need is independently assessed and appropriately supported
	The College Nursery	This could help with extra support for the staff and not necessarily on going
	Wasps	Hard to collect data so better to allocate on a needs basis as now.

## FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

26		No comments
27		No comments
28	<b>Do you agree that the proposed eligibility criteria should be adopted as the policy?</b>	
	Building blocks pre-school	How quickly can additional financial support be provided when so much information is required
	South Hill Park Pre-school	My fear is that poor quality settings will be 'rewarded'. The council need to ensure that settings are not kept open 'artificially' if the real reason for them not having enough children is that parents do not think they are good enough.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	Financial support should only be made available once normal assessments have been exhausted
29		No comments
30		No comments
31		No comments
32	<b>Do you agree that where a provider faces a change in funding of more than 6%, that 3% should be implemented in the first year, with the balance implemented equally over the next 3 years?</b>	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Too Long
33	<b>Do you agree that the transitional funding scheme should last for up to 4 years, with a review after 2 years?</b>	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Too Long
34		No comments
35	<b>Do you agree that if any additional costs arise from the transitional arrangements that the Schools Forum be requested to allocated new funds?</b>	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	It seems that council run/sure start type settings have gained the most whereas the PVI's which already struggle to cover costs will lose money. We feel unsupported and unwanted.
	Little Acorn Montessori School	There should be an annual review as government change could be radical changes
	Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	If your proposal hourly funding for my nursery decreases as proposed it will mean staff redundancies
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	When this formula comes in, potentially PVI all need to purchase new database systems to accommodate hourly rate rather than a sessional rate and also to be able to offer more flexible care
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	Providers need to make reasonable assumptions as part of their planning - this however cannot be unrealistic and be fully protected against the general and 'unknown' challenges facing the economy in the next few years
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	The 3% step is large. It is the difference between profit and loss for some PVI's. To have it imposed year on year until the formula value is reached will be a disaster. Schools with their school budgets behind them will have no problem. The funding reduction could result in redundancy costs and will drive PVI's out of business. PVI's with small reserves will not be able to absorb the change. It takes time to adjust staffing or attract additional children.
	The College Nursery	From where?
36	<b>Do you agree that payments to providers should continue to be made on the current twice termly basis?</b>	
	South Hill Park Pre-school	This works well for us.

## FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

<b>37</b>	<b>Do you agree that where there is a choice on updating data used for funding purposes that this should be done once a year from the January census return?</b>	
	Sandy Lane Primary	Recalculation Jan & April & Sept
	Bracken Bears Day Nursery	The number of children in the nursery changes termly-the calculation of the data should be termly. If data was gathered at the beginning of the year only this would be at a period of low occupancy which would affect the cash flow for a whole year. January is the period when children leave to go to school
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Argument for this is unclear as changes occur from term to term
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	Data should be collected termly and changes made termly, however, would increase admin
	South Hill Park Pre-school	Changes may occur during the year, eg staff reaching a higher level of qualification, and this should be reflected termly
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	January is not allowing a reliable barometer. Some form of annual averaging should be considered. Perhaps mean, mode reflection at head count day each term
	The College Nursery	The child population at PVI nurseries changes constantly, for us week by week so a termly update would be better. The same as the funding
	Wasps	This should be more regular
<b>38</b>	<b>Do you agree with the local definition of flexibility?</b>	
	The College Nursery	This is how we operate now and have done for many years. Some PVIs are limited by external factors and may only be able to meet some of the criteria will they be recognized. We offer flexibility to all children (2-5 yrs) are we considered inflexible where a GF child chooses only to attend the set hours, but over 2.5 days or different times to sessional hours?
<b>39</b>		No comments
<b>40</b>		No comments
<b>41</b>	<b>Do you agree with the proposed hourly supplement rate for flexibility of provision?</b>	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Has no intention of changing its current practice ie 12.5 hours
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Settings in community halls may have difficulty providing the level of flexibility required to get any additional payment and it may not be sustainable to provide that flexibility. We will struggle to provide 15 at all.
	Harmans Water Playgroup	But for some groups it is not easy to increase hours
	Little Acorn Montessori School	Smaller groups in hired halls will be penalised under this system whilst the maintained sector benefits - unfair as there is often little choice as to hours of opening and number of children in settling etc.
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	The 'leeway' may be difficult to sustain unless funding allows for an hour either side - staffing and maintaining such flexibility may otherwise prove costly
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	For settings based on community halls, we are unable to extend our hours due to the hall being used in the afternoon by other users. It is unfair that we are penalised because of this
	South Hill Park Pre-school	It is difficult to agree with the proposed hourly rate supplement rate at this stage as we do not have our own calculations regarding the cost to the setting.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	The flexibility concept is fine in principle. With no boundaries to work to it is possible that full flexibility will not be able to be met at a management price/cost. Each setting will face different challenges and limitations so flexibility will have different meanings to each setting.

## FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

	<b>Additional comments</b>	
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	The PVI sector should be extremely concerned of their future in Bracknell Forest, should this proposal be adopted. Other local authorities appear to have achieved a much fairer outcome for both the maintained and PVI sector. As part of the PVI sector in Bracknell Forest I currently feel very threatened, unwanted and unloved. Thankyou to the government who have now delayed the single funded formula until April 2011 which now allows the PVI time to make our decisions and take any actions necessary
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	<b>The formula:</b> from my days at university, the maxim of my research professor has served me well in my later career: "If it looks wrong, it is wrong. If it looks right, it is still probably wrong!" Looking at Appendix I, "the anticipated proposed changes", if the formula is correct, I would expect to see an equal number of setting which gain or lose from the formula, indicating that the average impact is correct. To have 14 maintained schools receiving an increase in funding and none a decrease looks wrong. To have only 9 PVIs having an increase but 40 having a decrease also looks even more wrong. With maintained receiving an additional £58,520 but the PVIs having £50,533 of funding removed is the wrong answer.
		The formula may be correct but it is populated with parameters that are probably cause of the imbalance between maintained and PVIs. In other words, the costs of PVIs are being under estimated and the maintained sector over estimated. When challenged at the meeting over this, BFBC staffs defence was "this is what the formula produced and the formula is right". Well if it looks wrong it is wrong. Unless of course there is an obvious reason why the funding balance has been wrong in the past but no such reason was offered at the meeting. Within the formula, there are many opportunities eg in support and accommodation costs, where a small change from maintained to PVI would address the imbalance. With Limited reserves, PVIs are at risk of being put out of business by BFBC unless this imbalance is addressed.
		<b>Recommendations</b> - I recommend that having addressed the other issues with the formula that this consultation has identified: 1: The parameters in the formula are adjusted until there are no net movement of funds between the maintained and PVI sectors. 2: That within each sector, there are as many winners as losers. We will then have confidence that the funding formula and the continued provision of Early Years Education will be successful.

## Funding by provider under the proposed Formula (2008-09 data)

Provider	Osfted URN	Provider Type	Actual 2008-09			Total cash funding from the proposed Formula				Change + more / - less	% comparison cash			Indicative hourly rates			Change + more / - less		
			Participation (hours)	Funding from BFC		Hourly Base Rate	Supplements		Total Funding for the year		Increase	Decrease	No change	Hourly Base Rate	Supplements			Total Funding for the hour	
				For the year	By the hour		Deprivation	Quality							Deprivation	Quality			
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	
Fox Hill Primary	109805	Maintained	5,700	£18,810	£3.30	£16,815	£1,140	£1,425	£19,380	£570	3.03%				£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	109807	Maintained	15,200	£50,160	£3.30	£44,840	£3,040	£3,800	£51,680	£1,520	3.03%				£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Wildmoor Primary	109812	Maintained	9,500	£31,350	£3.30	£28,025	£0	£2,375	£30,400	£-950		-3.03%			£2.95	£0.00	£0.25	£3.20	£-0.10
College Town Infant and Nursery	109828	Maintained	20,900	£68,970	£3.30	£61,655	£2,090	£5,225	£68,970	£0			0.00%		£2.95	£0.10	£0.25	£3.30	£0.00
Owlsmoor Primary	109870	Maintained	17,100	£56,430	£3.30	£50,445	£1,710	£4,275	£56,430	£0			0.00%		£2.95	£0.10	£0.25	£3.30	£0.00
New Scotland Hill Primary	109883	Maintained	13,300	£43,890	£3.30	£39,235	£0	£3,325	£42,560	£-1,330		-3.03%			£2.95	£0.00	£0.25	£3.20	£-0.10
Birch Hill Primary	109893	Maintained	23,750	£78,375	£3.30	£70,063	£4,750	£5,938	£80,750	£2,375	3.03%				£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Crown Hill Primary and Nursery	109922	Maintained	21,375	£70,538	£3.30	£63,056	£4,275	£5,344	£72,675	£2,138	3.03%				£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Wooden Wood Primary	109928	Maintained	22,325	£73,673	£3.30	£65,859	£4,465	£5,581	£75,905	£2,233	3.03%				£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Wildridings Primary	109941	Maintained	24,700	£81,510	£3.30	£72,865	£4,940	£11,115	£88,920	£7,410	9.09%				£2.95	£0.20	£0.45	£3.60	£0.30
Meadow Vale Primary	109942	Maintained	24,225	£79,943	£3.30	£71,464	£4,845	£6,056	£82,365	£2,423	3.03%				£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Newbold School	110141	PVI	7,725	£28,274	£3.66	£26,659	£773	£1,931	£29,363	£1,089	3.85%				£3.45	£0.10	£0.25	£3.80	£0.14
Squirrels Day Nursery	119242	PVI	10,398	£38,055	£3.66	£35,882	£1,040	£0	£36,922	£-1,133		-2.98%			£3.45	£0.10	£0.00	£3.55	£-0.11
Cherry Town Nursery	119248	PVI	6,775	£24,796	£3.66	£23,381	£0	£1,355	£24,736	£-61		-0.25%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01
Owlsmoor Pre-School	119250	PVI	16,770	£61,378	£3.66	£57,873	£1,677	£0	£59,550	£-1,828		-2.98%			£3.45	£0.10	£0.00	£3.55	£-0.11
The Old School Day Nursery	119251	PVI	13,868	£50,755	£3.66	£47,857	£0	£2,774	£50,630	£-125		-0.25%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01
Teddies Nurseries	119252	PVI	11,590	£42,419	£3.66	£39,997	£1,159	£0	£41,156	£-1,263		-2.98%			£3.45	£0.10	£0.00	£3.55	£-0.11
PAWS Nursery	119256	PVI	18,180	£66,539	£3.66	£62,739	£0	£0	£62,739	£-3,800		-5.71%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
RMA - Lakeside Nursery	119258	PVI	14,712	£53,848	£3.66	£50,773	£0	£2,942	£53,715	£-132		-0.25%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01
Sandhurst Nursery School	119260	PVI	23,670	£86,632	£3.66	£81,685	£0	£0	£81,685	£-4,947		-5.71%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
WASPS Pre-School	119261	PVI	19,805	£72,486	£3.66	£68,347	£0	£0	£68,347	£-4,139		-5.71%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-School	119262	PVI	13,238	£48,449	£3.66	£45,683	£0	£3,309	£48,992	£543	1.12%				£3.45	£0.00	£0.25	£3.70	£0.04
Carousel Nursery School	119268	PVI	4,960	£18,154	£3.66	£17,117	£0	£1,240	£18,357	£203	1.12%				£3.45	£0.00	£0.25	£3.70	£0.04
Garth Under 5's Nursery	119269	PVI	6,363	£23,287	£3.66	£21,957	£1,273	£0	£23,229	£-57		-0.25%			£3.45	£0.20	£0.00	£3.65	£-0.01
The Ark Pre-School	119271	PVI	4,975	£18,208	£3.66	£17,169	£0	£1,244	£18,412	£204	1.12%				£3.45	£0.00	£0.25	£3.70	£0.04
The College Nursery	119277	PVI	13,160	£48,166	£3.66	£45,415	£2,632	£3,290	£51,337	£3,172	6.58%				£3.45	£0.20	£0.25	£3.90	£0.24
College Town Montessori Nursery Ltd	119278	PVI	14,490	£53,033	£3.66	£50,005	£0	£3,623	£53,627	£594	1.12%				£3.45	£0.00	£0.25	£3.70	£0.04
Building Blocks Pre-School	119286	PVI	8,880	£32,501	£3.66	£30,645	£0	£1,776	£32,421	£-80		-0.25%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01
Little Acorns Montessori School	119290	PVI	10,770	£39,418	£3.66	£37,167	£0	£0	£37,167	£-2,251		-5.71%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
St Michael's Childcare Trust	119299	PVI	17,695	£64,764	£3.66	£61,065	£3,539	£0	£64,604	£-159		-0.25%			£3.45	£0.20	£0.00	£3.65	£-0.01
South Hill Park Pre-School	119301	PVI	19,770	£72,358	£3.66	£68,226	£3,954	£3,954	£76,134	£3,776	5.22%				£3.45	£0.20	£0.20	£3.85	£0.19
Ascot Baptist Church Pre-School	119302	PVI	7,053	£25,812	£3.66	£24,338	£0	£0	£24,338	£-1,474		-5.71%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
Crowthorne Village Pre-School	119317	PVI	8,720	£31,915	£3.66	£30,093	£0	£1,744	£31,837	£-78		-0.25%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01







Provider	Ofsted URN	Provider Type	Actual funding rate 2008-09	Indicative funding rate 2008-09 through BFC	Change in funding	Change in funding	Within transitional funding protection scheme?	Transitional adjustment per hour 2010-11	Indicative hourly rate 2010-11	Change from 2008-09	Transitional adjustment per hour 2011-12	Indicative hourly rate 2011-12	Change from 2010-11	Transitional adjustment per hour 2012-2013	Indicative hourly rate 2012-13	Change from 2011-12
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
Harmans Water Primary	130949	Maintained	£3.30	£3.40	£0.10	3.03%	Yes	£0.03	£3.33	0.91%	£0.03	£3.36	0.91%	£0.04	£3.40	1.21%
Sandy Lane Primary	133619	Maintained	£3.30	£3.30	£0.00	0.00%	No									
Great Hollands Primary	134304	Maintained	£3.30	£3.50	£0.20	6.06%	Yes	£0.07	£3.37	2.12%	£0.07	£3.40	2.12%	£0.06	£3.50	1.82%
The Pines Primary and Nursery	134740	Maintained	£3.30	£3.70	£0.40	12.12%	Yes	£0.13	£3.43	3.94%	£0.13	£3.46	3.94%	£0.14	£3.70	4.24%
Binfield Pre-School	159101	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Braken Bears Day Nursery	509756	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
Pines Community Pre-School	509758	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Winkfield Montessori	955614	PVI	£3.66	£3.70	£0.04	1.09%	No									
Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	EY225660	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
The Family Tree Nursery	EY262359	PVI	£3.66	£3.85	£0.19	5.19%	Yes	£0.06	£3.36	1.64%	£0.06	£3.39	1.64%	£0.07	£3.85	1.91%
Teepee Day Nursery	EY263716	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
The Mortarboard Nursery School	EY269662	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Rectory Lane Nursery School	EY292438	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Eagle House School	EY297376	PVI	£3.66	£3.70	£0.04	1.09%	No									
Harmans Water Pre-School	EY312359	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Busy Bees Montessori	EY314825	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Children's House Nursery	EY320968	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Lambrook Haileybury School	EY349670	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Plus Three Nursery - Farley Wood	EY357460	PVI	£3.66	£3.45	-£0.21	-5.74%	Yes	-£0.07	£3.23	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.26	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.45	-1.91%
Plus Three Nursery - Newell Green	EY357469	PVI	£3.66	£3.45	-£0.21	-5.74%	Yes	-£0.07	£3.23	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.26	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.45	-1.91%
Plus Three Nursery - Martins Heron	EY357477	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
Sports Centre Pre-School	EY366001	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
The Oaks Pre-School	EY368053	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Footsteps at St Josephs	EY375203	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Holly Spring Pre-School	EY377858	PVI	£3.66	£3.95	£0.29	7.92%	Yes	£0.10	£3.40	2.73%	£0.10	£3.43	2.73%	£0.09	£3.95	2.46%
Pavillion Pre-School	EY385228	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Dolphin Nursery (Bracknell) Ltd	EY385381	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Meadowbrook Montessori School	EY387762	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Bramleywood Nursery	EY391711	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Birch Hill Pre-School	EY392849	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
Chavey Down Nursery School	EY393320	PVI	£3.66	£3.45	-£0.21	-5.74%	Yes	-£0.07	£3.23	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.26	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.45	-1.91%