

Schools Forum Early Years Working Group (SF-EYWG)

Date: 7th October 2016 at the PDC
Time: 12 noon

Name	Designation/ Representation
Melian Mansfield (MM)	CHAIR
Ngozi Anuforo (NA)	Early Years Commissioning Manager
Luisa Bellavita (LB)	PVI Settings Rep
Zena Brabazon (ZB)	Rowland Hill
Charles Cato (CC)	Early Years Finance
Lou Colley (LC)	PVI Settings Rep
Duwan Farquharson (DF)	Willow
Dawn Ferdinand (DaF)	Willow
Nick Hewlett (NH)	Interim Principal Advisor for Early Years
Emma Murray (EM)	Primary Head Rep
Karyn Parker (KP)	Childminders
Susan Tudor-Hart (STH)	PVI Settings Rep
Julie Vaggers (JV)	Rowland Hill
Steve Worth (SW)	Finance Manager
Christine Yianni (CY)	Business Support Officer
Sarah Hargreaves (SH)	Clerk

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.
1.2 Apologies were noted from: Ngozi Anuforo, Duwan Farquharson, Julie Vaggers, Steve Worth, Christine Yianni. Karyn Parker's email address is no longer working. NH has a 'phone number which he will pass onto the Clerk. **Action NH**

2. **Minutes of the meeting of 19th September 2016 and matters arising**

- 2.1 Pt 5.1 Should say "quality and flexibility" not "mobility and flexibility".
2.2 Pt 5.1.2 Should say that "the meeting considered if flexibility should be considered as a criteria".
2.3 Pt 5.5 It was **agreed** that it would be better if this point became 5.1.3 as it followed on from the flexibility discussion in 5.1.2.
2.4 Pt 5.8 The last sentence, starting with "Members asked..." should become the 1st line of that point. "Other" should be inserted into "12p for (other) supplements".
2.5 Pt 5.8 It was clarified that the proposed 40p deprivation funding was not a DfE figure but had come from LBH's SLT and Labour Group discussions.

With the above changes the minutes were **agreed** as a correct record of the meeting and will be returned to Ngozi for safe keeping at the next meeting. **Action Clerk**

- 2.6 Pt 6 PVI providers said that those providers who had submitted proposals for capital works had not been told that the scheme would not be going ahead. Nick to write to the 6 providers concerned. **Action NH**
It was acknowledged that there are premises/buildings issues for some PVI providers.
- 2.7 Pt 5.8 Concern was expressed that 40p represents 72% of the 52p funding, whereas deprivation currently represents 46% of funding. **Members asked for modelling to be undertaken at the same rate as current levels.** **Action CC**
- 2.8 Pt 2.6 The Chair asked that the details of the work required to highlight and monitor the number of rising 3's be sent to her as previously requested. **Action Providers**
- 2.9 Pt 2.7 Melian still to ask Vikki Monk-Meyer about the CERTS SLT programme. **Action MM**
- 2.10 Pt 2.8.1 The missing 3 year olds are being sought. Headteachers confirmed that they are not attending school settings. It is not known the extent to which children moving out of the area/country is having an impact on figures. Nick will be surveying schools and reporting back after half-term. **Action NH**
It is likely that some children are with childminders, but as only 15% of childminders engage with the LA it is hard to estimate the number of children involved. Zena will ask a Cllr query on the impact of regeneration policies on schools. **Action ZB**
Members expressed concern as to the potential impact on funding if child numbers are found to be reducing.
- 2.11 Pt 4.1.3 The business planning meeting and workshops with childminders have been held. The intention is to develop 5 "childminding champions" who can then help other childminders to develop their plans.
- 2.12 Pt 5.1.1 Clarification on the meaning of "efficiency" is still to be obtained. Members are concerned that the costs involved in appointing qualified staff are not properly recognised, nor the costs of opening all year round and all day long. The DfE template appears to be predicated on the basis of a school day/year.
- 2.12.1 Members were directed to the DfE document "The Cost of Childcare Review" for further details on what "efficiency" meant, as this document has been referenced in the government's early years national funding formula consultation.
3. **EY Forum response to the EYFF consultation**
- 3.1 It is unclear as to whether the response was submitted on time. Charles to check with Ngozi as to whether an acknowledgement was received from the DfE. **Action CC**
- 3.1.2 The meeting had a discussion as to whose responsibility it is to send it in: the LA officers are possibly covered by the LA's response although in the past it has been an officer who has submitted previous responses on behalf of the Forum. Melian to discuss further with Ngozi. **Action MM, NA**
4. **Possible Financial Models**
- 4.1 Charles talked through the models he had produced using the spring 2016 data.
- 4.2 Members queried the fact that only 462 3-4 year olds are being shown as eligible for FSM. It was explained that EYPP criteria was used as the basis for FSM and the 462 is based on the returns submitted from all providers in spring 2016 including schools; all schools and settings are encouraged to provide accurate data on time. Charles will check on the percentage of settings not responding. **Action CC**
- 1.05pm** Dawn Ferdinand leaves the meeting.
- 4.3 It was clarified that funding is per child, not per setting and PTE relates to "part-time equivalent" children.
- 4.4 Under the new formula the LA will lose out on the % which is retained for central functions, but some settings may benefit. **However, concern was expressed that of the £1.9m currently held back by the centre £1.4m funds is used to subsidise childcare in the 8 maintained settings (the 3 maintained nursery schools, Stonecroft, Triangle, Woodside and Broadwaters) and with the government proposal on the early years national funding formula, this funding is not likely to be available from April 2017-18.** A future discussion is needed on the impact of this cut and the potential resultant impact on fee structures for parents. To be put on the agenda. **Action Chair**

- 4.5 After discussion it was **agreed** that using the IDACI data was a fairer way of allocating funds, as unlike IMD it does not rely on the location or size of the setting but on the postcode of the child.
- 4.6 Members asked that further details are provided showing the total funding which each setting could receive; including the up to 52p per hour supplements so that the total funding allocation is clear; at present some settings show as though they will be losing out/gaining but once all supplements are included the figures may shift. This however is difficult as there is still the question of the grounds for allocation of the remaining 12p supplement outstanding (assuming that 40p is allocated to deprivation, which is in itself not finalised yet).
- 4.7 It was clarified that the base rate of £4.74 per hour per child will be the starting point in both options shown; this will replace the different rates of per hour funding for different types of setting. The changes from the current situation are shown below using a typical “small” PVI (i.e a PVI with less than 33 children):

Current situation		New proposal	
£4.27	the highest base rate paid	£4.74	base rate per hour per child for all settings
£1.08	maximum supplement which can be received (including average of 8p for Quality)	40p	Proposed deprivation funding per hour per child
		12p	max of other supplements funding per hour per child
Total £5.35		Total £5.26	

- 4.7.1 This will mean that some settings could lose out even with the same cohort of children. **Members asked for details of how many settings are likely to be in this situation. Charles to provide the information.** **Action CC**
- 4.7.2 Schools will gain from the new formula, largely because they can share their more expensive staffing costs and their premises costs over a bigger pool of children.
- 4.8 It was noted that it is important that the borough is not seen to be working against the government’s agenda for expanding childcare for parents in work.
- 4.8.1 It was noted that if too high a percentage is put into deprivation funding then, should the minimum wage rise, there will be an impact on funding as less parents will be considered to be in poverty.
- 4.9 Currently 40 settings receive funding for “quality” and 46 for “flexibility” (across all PVIs, Children Centres, nursery schools and nursery classes). Therefore not many settings are receiving funding for the other variables.
- 4.10 In conclusion it was **agreed** that the intention is to reach an outcome which is the best possible for the highest number of settings.
- 4.11 Members asked for further figures on:
 - total funding (seen 4.6), shown as a separate column
 - deprivation funding at the current % level – which would change it from 40p to 24p, (so as to be able to compare the total funding rate per hour per setting for 2016-17 with a potential rate including 40p per hour child for deprivation)**Action CC**
- 4.12 Charles was thanked for his work to date on this.
- 4.13 There is due to be a further consultation, starting on 18th October. Melian, Charles and Susan will discuss what paperwork is sent out to settings as part of this so that it is understandable and clearly sets out the issues which settings need to consider. (There was a concern expressed that some settings would just look at the higher base rate figure and not consider the wider issues and their own situation). **Action MM, CC, ST-H**
- 4.13.1 It was **agreed** that the consultation should be on the concepts rather than the detailed figures, which will be part of the wider consultation.

- 4.13.2 Members expressed concern that the consultation is going out too early, before more detailed work has been undertaken; however, it needs to go out on 18th Oct so that the report on findings will be ready in time for Schools Forum and Cabinet in February 2017 ready for implementation from April 2017.
- 4.14 Melian will write to Cllr Weston outlining the issues, in advance of the Schools Forum decision. She will suggest that Cllr Weston meets with some Forum members asap, possibly as early as next week. **Action MM**
5. **AOB:** No items.
6. **Dates of future meetings**
- 6.1 It had been hoped to invite Vikki Monk-Meyer to the next meeting for an update on SEND funding/links between the EYF and HNB. However, she cannot make the next meeting date and members couldn't make the date she suggested, so an alternative date will be arranged, possibly in the new year.
- 6.2 The next meeting will be held on: **18th November: 9.30-11.30am** at the PDC.
- 6.2.1 Melian will ask Cllr Weston if she is able to attend. **Action MM**
- 6.2.2 Ngozi will arrange clerking as the Clerk needs to attend the bi-annual IRP training. **Action NA**

The Chair thanked everyone for attending.

There being no further business the meeting closed at **2.35pm**.

Signed:

Date: