

**Schools Forum Early Years Working Group
17th November 2021 at 1pm. Virtual meeting**

Name	Designation/ Representation
Melian Mansfield (MM)	CHAIR. Chair of Pembury House Nursery School
Ngozi Anuforo (NA)	Head of Strategic Commissioning, Early Help and Culture
* Gladys Baah-Okyere (GBO)	PVI Settings Rep
Luisa Bellavita (LB)	PVI Settings Rep
Joanna Conroy (JC)	Childminder
Duwan Farquharson (DF)	Willow Director of Business
* Jane Griffin (JG)	SBM Seven Sisters Primary School
Nick Hewlett (NH)	Principal Advisor for Early Years
Sian McDermott (SMc)	Nursery Head Rep (Rowland Hill)
Storm Moncur (SM)	Childminder
Susan Tudor-Hart (ST-H)	School Forum PVI Settings Rep
* Lucy Walker-Collins (LW-C)	Primary Rep (Stroud Green Primary School)
Melanie Widnall (MW)	Principal Advisor for Early Years
Christine Yianni (CY)	Childcare Sufficiency Manager
Grant Bright (GB)	Primary Rep (Rokesly Primary School)
Also Present	
Sarah Hargreaves (SH)	Senior Governance Officer

* denotes absence

1. Welcome and Apologies

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- 1.2 Introductions were made and Grant Bright was welcomed to his 1st meeting. Apologies have been received from Lucy Walker-Collins.
- 1.3 NH said he would speak to GB-O about whether she can continue to attend. **Action NH**

2. Minutes of the meeting of 30th September 2021

- 2.1 Pt 4.4.1 It was noted that the APPG referred to is the nursery schools APPG.
- 2.2 Pt 5.1 It is in fact not yet known if there will be a clawback in funding from the DfE for 2020.
- 2.3 Pt 6.2 The meeting with Cllr Brabazon has not happened and is unlikely to; to be removed as an action.
- 2.4 The minutes were **agreed**, they will be signed and returned to Ngozi for safe keeping when this is next possible.

3. Matters arising not on the agenda

- 3.1 Pt 3.1 The issue of the need for transparency in school's funding has been raised with Ali Mohammad in Finance; it is hoped that he will be able to resolve it. MM said that she would also speak to Ali. **Action MM**

3.1.1 Duwan spoke, as agreed, to the Harringay and West Green SBM group. This consists of 12 schools; 4 reported similar issues. It was **agreed** that it would be useful for someone from the EY team to attend the next NLC meeting to discuss further. Ngozi **agreed** to attend on 19th January. **Action NA**

3.2 Pt 3.4 The meeting between Ngozi and Cllr Brabazon hasn't happened yet. **Action NA**
1.15pm Nick Hewlett left the meeting.

3.3 Pt 3.5 The possibility of childminders being used in settings rather than agency staff has been considered but it is felt that there could be a range of safeguarding issues to be mindful of and there could be logistical issues. It was noted that agency staff are expensive, especially when it is teaching posts which need to be covered due to Covid isolation.

4. High Needs Block minutes, 8th October, for information

4.1 SMC expressed concern that the assertion that funding for EY SEND cases was an "inefficient" use of funding was an untested hypothesis which could lead to assumptions about the benefit of reducing funding. As an untested hypothesis it is not currently included in the EY Review or as part of the SEND strategy. There are already financial changes affecting the maintained nursery schools.

4.1.1 It was **agreed** that the 0-25 year strategy should underpin both the EY and SEND reviews.

4.1.2 The need for EY to have a higher profile as part of an early intervention strategy was noted. The majority of SEND funding is spent post age 14, whereas spending earlier may have a larger impact on outcomes for children.

4.2 A related point was noted that the number of early years EHCPs was deemed to be high. This raised alarm bells as an EHCP is one of the few ways, currently, to access funding for pupils with SEND. If this funding was to be curtailed it would be even harder for EY to form part of an effective early intervention strategy.

4.2.1 It was noted that the driver should be to look at whether the best support is being offered to children; an EHCP might not be the best or only strategy. The annual reviews are also important.

4.3 The above points will be raised at the HNB meeting and the SEND review meeting.

Action SMC, NA, MM

5. DfE Updates and Impact on Local Finance

5.1 NA reminded members that the LA receives funding, of around £20m, from the DfE for a projected number of children and they then make adjustments later on depending on the actual numbers of children in attendance at settings.

5.1.2 Due to the unusual circumstances in 2020-21 the DfE asked for additional data in order to be able to make accurate adjustments. The January census took place as usual and then there was an additional one held in June.

5.1.3 LAs have been told to expect a decision "in November" of the final 2020 allocation. £19m of the £20 was spent but it is not known if the other £1m will be subject to clawback. It is unclear if the DfE will be using the whole year data on which to base their decisions or just the spring census data. The impact of the lockdown months is therefore unclear currently.

5.4 It is not known what the hourly rate will be. Some funding has been made available to cover the increase for the FEE (£160m in 2022-23, £180m 2023-24 and £170m 2024-25). The rate from April 2022 should be known in the next 2 weeks; settings will be written to in December. There is still some variation in what LAs are paying in the hourly rate as they use different weightings.

1.45pm Storm Moncur joined the meeting.

5.5 Some members felt that any increase in funding should be put into the base rate so that all settings benefit.

5.6 The LA has a statutory requirement to set a formula. After discussion, it was **agreed** to recommend to School Forum to keep the formula the same as it currently is for now. £76,000 will be used for the Quality Supplement. 2015 was the last time it was formally reviewed.

- 5.7 The DfE has announced a national £150m for Early Years Catch-up funding. However, Haringey is not one of the areas targetted in the bidding round.
- 5.8 Funding of £200m per year will also be available for holiday activities and food, however, it is not clear if this has to be bid for.
- 5.9 It is anticipated that maintained nursery school funding will remain unchanged over the 2022-23 period.

6. Deprivation Supplement Update

- 6.1 A clear and transparent single funding formula is a statutory requirement. This has been in place since 2011 and was reviewed in 2015. It was **agreed** that it should be child focused and be used to support better outcomes for children.
 - 6.1.1 Any deprivation supplement only has to apply to 3 and 34 year olds, not the 2's; which some LAs have questioned.
 - 6.1.2 Child level deprivation data will now be used rather than IDACI which is based on where settings rather than children are located. For the 2021-22 allocations the IDACI data from 2019 was used.
 - 6.1.3 With some parents losing their Universal Credit entitlement and having to work longer hours, subsidised childcare is increasingly important for them.
 - 6.1.4 LAs can use Quality, Flexibility, Scarcity, Sufficiency etc as factors but Deprivation is the only statutorily required factor to be included. Haringey has decided to continue including Quality as a factor and funding £76,000 for the Peer Support Programme.
- 6.2 The 5% centrally retained allocation funds Ngozi's and Melanie's teams.
- 6.3 The base rate will remain at £5.13 ph for all providers, with some adjustments for various factors.
- 6.4 It was **agreed** that any review of the Deprivation Supplement would need to consider what the purpose of the review is, taking into account how deprivation within the borough has changed since the last review in 2015. It would need to be clear what was trying to be improved. Care should be taken that a postcode lottery is not created; there are pockets of deprivation in the more affluent areas.
- 6.5 Any review will need to be mindful that any overall reduction in the number of children will automatically lead to a reduction in funding.
- 6.6 It was felt that there are 5 questions which any review needs to address:
 - Is the deprivation measure, underpinning the current supplement, child focused?
 - Should the deprivation supplement include an allocation for "additional support" within a mainstream settings (see p82 of the Guidance)
 - Is the deprivation supplement delivering better outcomes for children and how do we know?
 - How could the deprivation supplement support better outcomes for children?
 - Is the deprivation supplement rate at the right level for the expected outcomes?
 It was **agreed** that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th points are hard to answer.
- 6.7 *For the purposes of modelling, members asked if the 2's should be automatically assumed to become eligible for funding when they turn 3. If they were modelled into the figures as though they were 3 it could assist with future funding requirements.* CY said this was possible to run with anonymised data and she would look into it. Data to come to the next meeting. **Action CY**
- 6.7.1 It was felt that this would be a useful exercise to see if the children are being captured in the data as well as any financial modelling. Many children have moved home during lockdown.
- 6.7.2 Care is needed as this exercise will only target those children who are already in the borough, not those who enter when they are over 2. If it is those who are already in the system who are catered for the others may be missed. However, tracking children as they move through the age range will help to show the added value of the settings they attend.
- 6.8 The next meeting is scheduled for January but an additional meeting can be arranged once the funding rates are known for April 2022 onwards, if needed.

2.30pm Sian McDermott and Grant Bright leave the meeting.

7. Members Updates

- 7.1 PVI settings extended their thanks to Maria Schmidt from Public Health for her assistance during the pandemic. Some families have got lax around the distancing and masking requirements and the information from PH has helped settings enforce the requirements. Settings were disappointed to hear that Maria is leaving the borough. Katy Harker will be taking over from her.
- 7.2 The increase in salary costs will hit most settings. CY reminded settings that Business Support is available for all settings, if required.
- 7.3 There are children turning 5 in January who don't have school places; mainly from Romanian families. They didn't apply for a place. PVI settings are now helping them to do so.
- 7.4 Some settings are full and others have several vacancies.
- 7.5 SM will speak to JC about childminders working in settings. **Action SM, JC**
- 7.6 It has been noted that the needs of children coming into settings are higher than in the past.
- 7.7 NA said that these and other issues are being raised with the DfE constantly, for example at the Heads of Early Years and APPG meetings, however, so far, no response has been received. All boroughs have similar issues and increased levels of need for all age groups. Funding levels are important but so are the increasingly complex levels of need.
- 7.8 Members **agreed** that it is important that the current EY and SEND reviews are joined up together. The issues of EY children with SEND needs should not be ignored.

8. Date for Next Meeting

- 8.1 **Agreed as 6th January at 10am-noon** via Teams.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending.

There being no further business the meeting closed at **3.05pm**.

Signed:

Date:

Actions from the EYF minutes: 17th November 2021

Item	Action	By Whom
1.3	To speak to Gladys Baah-Okyere regarding her attendance at these meetings	NH
3.1	To speak to Ali Mohammad regarding the remaining finance issues for settings	MM
3.1.3	To speak to the next Harringay and West Green SBM meeting	NA
3.2	To arrange a meeting with Cllr Brabazon	NA
4.3	To raise the issues discussed at the HNB meeting on 8 th Oct at the HNB and SEND review meetings	SMc, NA, MM
6.7	To model the data for 2's becoming 3 for the next meeting	CY
7.5	To discuss further the possibility of childminders working in settings	SM, JC