

Schools Funding Forum 17th January 2019

Summary of responses to the consultation with early years providers

Responses relating to the hourly rates

Provider Response
This year the cost of our business is going up more than the funding is increasing. This means we will have to find monies from other areas to fund the shortfall between the funding rates and what our business costs to run.
We feel that the nurseries rates should increase to match other local authorities.
Funding for three and four years should be increased to £5.40 and two years old should be put up to £6.00 as increase in staff wages need to be maintained to keep good staff.
3 and 4 year old funding is still well below the average hourly rate of the borough. I earn 5.50 per hour for non- funded children and researched average rates in my area to set this rate.
LA Response
The LA is restricted by the amount that we can fund for the entitlement by the central government settlement. We have ensured that any increases that are affordable are reflected in the base rate funding for the 2 year old and 3/4 year old entitlement. The central government hourly rate settlement to Havering hourly rate for two year is £5.66 and for three/four year old is £5.28. We are supportive of all providers, and are in continuous dialogue with central government on funding pressures across all educational establishments in the LA.

Responses relating to the retention of a contingency

Provider Response	LA Response
I would like to see some evidence on how the contingency fund from last year was spent and whether it was all spent - also it would be interesting to see how the money not spent from this fund was redistributed.	Any unspent contingency is relayed at the various forums at year end.

Responses relating to the SEN Inclusion Fund

Provider Response
V If there is a guarantee that SEN funding will remain free of charge or highly subsidised then I would support this contribution. I would also like to ensure the contribution is ring fenced for Early Years and any surplus left at the end of the year is given to the providers to further support any SEND children.
If retaining money, can we please confirm Send training is FREE!
LA Response
The Inclusion Fund will support primarily those children who require support at Early Years settings. The SEN training is part of a separate survey and once the responses have been collated, the LA will provide the final recommendations. LAs should target SEN Inclusion Funds at children with lower level or emerging SEN. Children with more complex needs and those in receipt of an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) continue to be eligible to receive funding via the high needs block of the DSG.

Responses relating to central retention

Provider Response	LA Response
I am strongly against the central services budget increasing by 9.6% when front line funding for children is only to increase by 2.7%. Central services may want to invest in new IT but the increase is disproportionate.	The % increase in Central Services in monetary terms is £70,000. This is the first increase that we have proposed since the new arrangements have come into force (2017-18) and is in line with the DfE guidelines of no more than 5% of the overall funding for three/four year old is to fund Central Services. The increase in budget required is less than the increase that is being funded to all providers in the base rate which is an additional £385,153.

Responses relating to more than a single issue

Provider Response	LA Response
<p>You were up front in stating that you were delivering 95.1% of the 2 year old funding given by the DFE. Not so when it came to 3 and 4 year old funding. I've calculated it, and the new rise of 12p still only means that you are delivering only 88.06818% to us which is not the stated 95% that we should be receiving. Therefore I would rather have the 95% delivered to us at £5.016 than be covering deprivation and more SEN and the money for an upgrade in a computer system that really should be funded from elsewhere. I understand the reasoning behind a contingency to fund participation not picked up at census, although it's about time that it was fed back to government that the census system as it stands does not work in practice and should be re-formulated. Whatever the decision, an upfront declaration of the amount we are being given should be clear and not hidden behind other figures. If we should receive at least 95% then that is what we should receive, it shouldn't be hidden behind other figures.</p>	<p>Currently all two year old funding that we received is earmarked for the delivery of the entitlement. This is to remain unchanged in 2019-20. We are able to project in the 2019-20 funding schedules to commence from 1st April 2019, 95.1% of the overall funding can be accounted from the on-set. The remaining 4.9% is for term-time changes that we do not receive funding for.</p> <p>For the three/four year old entitlement, we are able to project in the 2019-20 funding schedules to commence from 1st April 2019, 88.1% of the overall funding can be accounted from the on-set via the base rate and 3.0% can be funded via the mandatory deprivation factor. 3.3% of the funding is earmarked for term-time changes that we do not receive funding for. 0.9% of the funding is for the Inclusion Fund. These give rise to 95.3% of the overall funding that we are due to receive being funded direct to providers.</p> <p>The Central Support Services budget has remained unchanged since 2017-18, and the increase is to support the LA to deliver a system that is more effective and efficient for providers.</p> <p>We are supportive of providers, and are in continuous dialogue with central government on funding pressures across all educational establishments in the LA.</p>
<p>I agree to the contingency for both age ranges, but feel we should be informed of how much of that is actually needed and used and also be informed how any money not used is distributed. I agree to the central retention of £800,000 to fund the new computer systems. The increase in contribution from early years block is okay if the spending is ring fenced for early years transparent and our SEN training remains free.</p>	<p>Any unspent contingency is reported at the various forums at year end. .</p>

General points raised

Provider Response	LA Response
5(v) This is not an appropriate way to gain feedback, and should be brought to EYPRG first. The high needs block should continue to support on an equal basis as agreed last year.	EYPRG meeting was held on the 2nd of November, and this proposal was raised following the periodical review of expenditure across the DSG.
I have answered no view as I don't fully understand the question. I have read the consultation document but could not find explanation of why this needed, so felt it better to answer no view	Questions 1(i), 1(ii), 2(iii) and 2 (iv) have no view from provider. Provider could have approached LA/fellow colleagues in sector for further details if guidance is not clear enough.
Not sure what number 5V means! Also not sure what 4ii means. What does the 102 mean? Pounds?	5V means question 5, and the "V" means part 5. "4ii" means question 4, and the "ii" means part 2. The 102 is part of the amount we have proposed to retain for term-time growth for two year old which is £100,102 for 32.52 PTE children.
Any increase for the children is always for the good.	n/a.
The LA has been very supportive in all aspects of delivery since we started our provision in March 2018	This is due to the Early Years Central Support Services that we are able to provide from the centrally retained element of the funding.