

## Schools Forum Early Years Working Group (SF-EYWG)

Date: 24<sup>th</sup> May 2016 at the PDC  
Time: 10.00am – 12.30pm

Name	Designation/ Representation
Melian Mansfield (MM)	<b>CHAIR</b>
Ngozi Anuforo (NA)	Early Years Commissioning Manager
Charles Cato (CC)	Early Years Finance
Steve Worth (SW)	Finance Manager
Christine Yianni (CY)	Business Support Officer
Susan Tudor-Hart (STH)	PVI Settings Rep
Luisa Bellavita (LB)	West Green Playgroup
Lou Colley (LC)	PVI Settings Rep
Zena Brabazon (ZB)	Rowland Hill
Julie Vaggers (JV)	Rowland Hill
Nick Hewlett (NH)	Interim Principal Advisor for Early Years
Karyn Parker (KP)	Childminders
Duwan Farquharson (DF)	Willows
Dawn Ferdinand (DaF)	Willows
Sharon Easton	Headteacher
Sarah Hargreaves (SH)	Clerk
Suzanne Mcgowan	Observing Clerk

### 1. Welcome and Apologies

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Suzanne Mcgowan who is a new Clerk and is observing the meeting.
- 1.2 Apologies were noted from: Christine Yianni, Charles Cato, Ngozi Anuforo and Nick Hewlett who are all in a 30 Hours meeting. Also from Dawn Ferdinand and Duwan Farquharson who are at meetings in school and Sharon Easton who has resigned from this group.
- 1.3 It was noted that with Sharon's resignation there is now no primary head representation on this group. Julie Vaggers will raise it at the next primary heads meeting and ask for volunteers. **Action JV**

### 2 Minutes and Matters Arising

- 2.1 The minutes of the SF-EYWG meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2016 were agreed, signed and returned to the Chair for filing.
- 2.2 **Matters arising**
  - 2.2.1 Pt 5. The balance between EY and HNB funding was discussed. It was noted that £395,000 is allocated to follow all children who meet the thresholds across all settings. Last year £385,000 was used towards the overspend and not on the HNB. Early support money is not backdated and is paid in arrears. Concern was expressed that if money is

not available to settings children with higher needs will be left at home; similar to some of those with EHCP.

- 2.2.2 Pt 5. As generally, children under 3 years do not have EHCPs there may be a need to reserve places for them. Melian to suggest to Vikki Monk-Meyer that this issue goes to the next HNB meeting on June 16<sup>th</sup> **Action Chair**  
Julie said that there is evidence in children's outcomes, that reserving places for those with higher needs has a positive impact. Rowland Hill has discussed this with Woodlands Park and Pembury House. Julie will circulate the slides for dissemination.  
**Action JV, Clerk**
- 2.2.2.1 It is likely to be discussed at Schools Forum in the autumn, but the group wished to be more pro-active and have a discussion in the sub-groups 1<sup>st</sup>.
- 2.2.3 Pt 5.11. Providers have now received an indication of the number of children who will be eligible for Pupil Premium funding. PVI settings will receive the money termly from the EY Commissioning team. School nurseries and children centres will receive it in the school cash flow on the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month. The funding is based on estimated child numbers in April and then adjusted when the actual data is provided. It was noted that not all PP funding relates to lower achieving children. Members discussed whether they could use PP for staff training; it seems to depend on the view of the Ofsted inspector on the day, it is necessary to show a direct benefit to a specific PP child.
- 2.2.4 Pt 5.12 Providers asked again for clarity as to what the payments received refer to. As NI numbers are being used to confirm eligibility it should be possible to use the same system with providers, it is assumed. It was generally **agreed** that the previous paper based system was easier to use. PVIs asked if it was possible to pay PP to pay on a different date so that it was clear that it was separate to other funding? Will be carried forward to the next meeting when the officers are present. **Action Chair**
- 2.2.5 Pt 3.8. It was clarified that the claw back was due to a drop in the number of 3-4 year olds attending settings. It was felt that if the 2 year old project improved then the children would be there when they turned 3. Rowland Hill said that they are taking children before they are 3, so that they are in place ready to take a 3 yr old place. Under the 30 hours statutory guidance settings a grace period is proposed for when a parent's circumstances change. The grace period will start from when the LA is notified by the DfE about the change in parents' circumstances. The length of the grace period is to be decided. If they are eligible for funding as 2 year olds settings will be OK as the funding continues until the term after they are 3, when they will then get 3 yr old funding. The issue for settings is with the non eligible 2's.
- 2.2.5.1 It is possible to have a staggered intake of children; with parents accepting a place, but deferring entry or to put their child there part time. Some settings expressed concern as to the impact of this practice on nursery numbers. It was noted that it may be cheaper for children with special needs to stay in the nursery; so they could be allocated there by the school with a guarantee of a school place later. Other LA's insist that the child goes straight into Yr 1.
- 2.2.5.2 It was accepted that the responsibilities of the public and private sectors are different. Julie will provide details of a lawyer who has been involved with the APPG for nursery schools. **Action JV**
- 2.2.5.3 It was noted that some new build flats are being built on the assumption that there will be 0.7 children per household, so this will affect where families live. It was **agreed** that the group needs to have a plan as to how this can be tackled across the different settings.
- 2.2.6 Pt 4. There is an issue with Universal Credit in that parents need to be able to prove that they are looking for a job in order to get it. If they then get a job they are expected to start the next day; the case of a single parent with a 3 month old baby was given as an example of where this had happened.
- 2.2.7 Pt 7.2 Members had attended the forum briefings on the Childcare Free Entitlement Delivery Model.
- 2.2.8 The October headcount sets the budget for primary schools for the following September; the January count is used locally as numbers can change quickly.

### 3 Consultation Response to the DfE

- 3.1 There has been no response to the Early Years consultation.
- 3.2 Some Schools and PVI's have responded to the Council questionnaire; a 2 week extension has been given.
- 3.3 It was generally **agreed** that there is a need for more places and for capital funds to support their development, but that the questions on the questionnaire were rather mixed up. Melian to raise this with officers as it was a LA questionnaire, not a statutory one.
- Action MM**
- 3.4 Ngozi to be asked for a summary of the responses when they have been received.
- Action NA**
- 3.5 Members asked for clarification as to which authorities had been the pilots and what they were paying to settings:

York	Withdrawn
Islington #	
Brighton #	
Hove #	£3.38 (1 <sup>st</sup> 15 hours) to 3.95 ph after for 3-4 yr olds
Newham #	
Camden #	
Herts #	£4.62 (1 <sup>st</sup> 15 hours) to 4.88 ph after for 3-4 yr olds
Northumberland	

To be checked at the next meeting. **Action CC**

- 3.5.1 Whilst members were in favour of partnership arrangements between providers concern was expressed as to who got the 1<sup>st</sup> 15 hours funding and who got the higher funding! Also, that the 1<sup>st</sup> 15 hours is deemed to be education and the rest of the time childcare.

### 4. Update on Funding Formula

- 4.1 No update has been received yet from the DfE on the Early Years consultation. Steve confirmed that the Stage 1 response had been sent in. There can be little planning until the actual figures are received and the impact on settings can then be assessed.
- 4.2 Steve informed the group that last week London Councils wrote to the DfE opposing the funding cuts and stated that funding should be levelled up rather than down in order to ensure a more even playing field.
- 4.3 Although the average funding cut will be 1.5%, for Haringey it is likely to be more like 10%. In addition there will be the reduction in the rebate for contracted out national insurance; although Steve reminded members that with the minimum funding guarantee it will be some time before the full 10% cut is reached. It was noted that £500m will be allocated to allow those authorities who are due to gain from the funding changes to reach parity earlier.
- 4.4 It is difficult to compare different types of settings as the methodology for schools and EY settings is different.
- 4.5 The government wants all schools across the country to receive the same per pupil funding, although the area costs adjustment (a small uplift for more expensive areas) will benefit London. Members wondered if this simplification of the funding system was in preparation to make the move to national Academies easier.
- 4.6 There is currently less clarity around EY funding, but there is no reason to not assume that there are plans in the pipeline for a national funding formula for EY.
- 4.7 Members discussed ways in which to engage with the Tory LAs in London as they are also likely to be affected and possibly have more influence on government. Zena and Melian to think about further.
- Action ZB, MM**

- 4.8 Steve confirmed that all places up to age 16 are currently funding on the LBH formula. Post 16 they are funded by the EFA, regardless of provider – which acts as a national funding formula for 6<sup>th</sup> Form provision.
- 4.9 The group suggested that the School Forum should take a corporate view on the minimum funding guarantee. The amount of flexibility in the regulations to be assessed.

**Action MM**

- 4.9.1 It was noted that in the 2 year transition period from 2017-19 the LA can set their own minimum funding guarantee in consultation with schools. (it therefore does not necessarily have to be set at 98.5% of current funding).
- 4.9.2 Overall the pot of money stays the same, it is the distribution between settings which can alter. In answer to a question it was confirmed that this does not affect PVI settings.

## **5 Update on the Statutory Guidance**

- 5.1 The deadline is unknown. PVIs have been responding.
- 5.2 Member **agreed** that it seemed unlikely that the DfE would pay more for childcare than for the 1<sup>st</sup> 15 hours of education. It was noted that in some parts of the document all hours have been labelled as “funded hours.”
- 5.2.1 It was noted that the 15 hours entitlement could be “stretched” so that it is available all year round, but for less hours a week rather than for the standard 38 weeks.
- 5.3 It is not permissible to ask parents to make extra contributions to funded hours.
- 5.4 It was clarified that NDNA stood for the National Day Nurseries Association.
- 5.5 It is unclear as to whether breakfast and after school clubs can be included in funded hours; as they are outside the standard 15 hours they do not have to be in the standard 3 hour blocks.
- 5.6 9am-3.30pm is counted as a “standard” day, but any hours between 6am-8pm are allowed, including Saturday and Sunday. Members wondered where the workforce would come from and also the effect on children of being in daycare for such long days. Parents can’t dictate what hours they want; the setting can decide their own opening hours. Ofsted may have a view on very non standard hours. “Sufficiency” has to be seen to be practical; schools will only be offering 8am-6pm Monday-Friday.
- 5.6.1 Members were unclear as to how parents found out about what facilities were available in their area.
- 5.7 There will be a consultation on workforce planning, to report back in November on;
- salaries
  - qualifications (GCSE English and maths a minimum)
  - experience.

Members wondered why people aren’t joining the sector and wondered how childcare as a job was promoted in careers talks in schools. It was generally felt that there was insufficient cross over between apprenticeships/training talks and working in childcare.

- 5.7.1 Woodlands Park nursery school have been working to move staff from Level 2 to Level 4 qualifications. For those employed from September 2016 old qualifications won’t count, especially those which were completed on-line. Zena to check for further information.

**Action ZB**

- 5.7.2 It was noted that many staff are parents who re-train rather than coming through the apprenticeship route.
- 5.7.3 From September only staff who have up to date paediatric 1<sup>st</sup> aid qualifications can be included in the ratios. The deadline for undertaking training is June. It was noted that it is difficult for settings to keep ratios intact when staff are off receiving training.
- 5.7.4 The LA cannot add any extra requirements to providers or place an undue administrative burden on them over and above the Ofsted requirements.
- 5.7.5 There are various job initiatives underway eg. Birkbeck University are running courses in Tottenham; although it was unclear as to whether their courses are relevant to local job opportunities. It is unknown if strategic officers are aware of these developments. Officers to be asked at the next meeting.

**Action Chair**

- 5.8 Families who have no recourse to public funds are not entitled to Pupil Premium funding, although they do get infant FSM. 3-4 year olds should be entitled to a nursery place; if they become ineligible during the term they can stay until the end of that half term.
- 5.9 There was a discussion regarding whether, if settings are charging for consumables or food, that parents should be allowed to bring their own. Members expressed concerns over nuts and other allergies and cross contamination from the home environment.

**11.40am Suzanne McGowan** left the meeting.

## **6. Feedback on the 30 hours and provider workshops**

- 6.1 Participants had looked at whether their business model was sustainable to deliver the 30 hour offer and whether going into partnership with another provider would be useful. See earlier concerns as to how funding would be allocated. Similar concerns were raised about the complexity of parents having to pay more than one provider for what is being sold as one session.
- 6.2 If only a few 30 hour places are offered, how should they be allocated? If there are offered as children turn 3, then those born Sept-Dec will be unfairly advantaged over summer births.
- 6.3 It appears that there will be no restrictions on how the free 15 hours are offered; so a setting could say that the 1<sup>st</sup> 3 hours a day are free but then you have to pay for the rest of the session and take the free hours over 5 days. It is unclear how this will sit with only having to offer 15 hours a week. It is not clear as to how primary schools will be able to offer the 30 hours.
- 6.4 Most private providers charge around £8 per hour for top-up hours having only received around £4 an hour for the 15 hours.
- 6.5 It was **agreed** that it would be harder for settings to adapt to the 30 hour offer than it was to the 15 hour one, including having to split invoices for different rates of funding for different hours.

**12.10pm Julie Vaggers** left the meeting.

- 6.6 It was **agreed** that there was a market from parents for flexible childcare, but it can be hard to cater for this demand when the funding is based on a supply side model.
- 6.6.1 PVI providers asked for early notice of any likely changes to their contracts.
- 6.7 A petition has been launched on a range of early years issues; Luisa asked people to consider signing it: [parliament.uk/petitions/122773](http://parliament.uk/petitions/122773). **Action All**
- 6.8 On 9<sup>th</sup> June there will be an overview and Scrutiny cafe/panel meeting to see what issues the public think are important.
- 6.9 It was suggested that this group arranges a meeting with the new Cabinet Member for Children & Young People, Cllr Elin Weston. Melian to ask her. **Action MM**
- 6.10 There was general agreement that the 30 hours proposals would go forward in some format. All present said that the DfE should provide information on forthcoming funding asap.

## **7. Dates of future meetings**

Further meetings will be held on:

- 15<sup>th</sup> June: 9.30-11.30am – G7
- 14<sup>th</sup> July: 1-3pm – G6

The Chair thanked everyone for attending.

There being no further business the meeting closed at **12.20pm**.

**Signed:**

**Date:**