

## Appendix 1:

### Stage 2 Consultation – Funding Early Years Education in Haringey Provider's online comments

#### Universal Base Rate

##### Proposal:

To introduce an enhanced universal base rate from April 2017:

##### Q1b – Please provide reasons for your answer:

More certainty re: funding
It makes the funding more constant over time
We need a higher base rate as the majority of supplements have been removed and we would only qualify for a very low deprivation supplement.
Option 1 Updated base rate to £4.88 as it will mean more revenue comes into school
it is still below what i currently charge as a private nursery
We believe that more should be given to deprivation, ie ( <i>sic!</i> ) Option 3 as providers who have high levels of deprivation need to provide more in order to support the development of the children.
The funding has been set at an unreasonably low level which will leave businesses out of pocket and liable to make a loss. None of the above options are acceptable levels of funding nor go anywhere near meeting the costs of London based nurseries who pay competitive salaries, invest in their nurseries and offer far more than many other nurseries.
The rate of £4.78 per hour, is not enough to provide 30 hours of childcare per child per week, for possibly 20 children
This makes sense
The base rate is low and I believe there needs to be a fairer system in place. There needs to be transparency in how funding is allocated. All settings should receive equal support.
The lower base rate causes more losses for PVI's - any increase in the base rate is welcomed to help mitigate the loss.
The greater the base the rate the better the chance for settings to be sustainable. Although the base rate is increasing for everyone there will be losers with the redistribution of supplements, which settings have used to build and improve their business/practice for the benefit of the children in the setting. The money is being taken from the children not the setting.
We agree that more that an enhanced base rate should be paid but not necessarily the illustrations shown. We believe that the universal funding should be enhanced further (see Question 3 below). The manner of introduction of the new base rate should be reconsidered to soften the transition for children who will attract lower funding.
Most of the children attending my setting come from deprived areas; this situation is not the same for all settings and distinction has to be kept.
It is fairer
It is fairer
it is a fairer option to all settings
I agree with the proposal to enhance the base rate. I am in favour of option 1.1 and option 1 i.e 4.88 and 0.30 for base rate and deprivation respectively. This is because i feel the base rate is low and it is only the base rate element that is guaranteed. The supplements will vary each year depending on the intake. I also think that deprivation does not need to

be so high as those that children that qualify will also get EYPP.

**Option 2**

Historically we have received on (*sic!*) of the lowest level of funding in the borough. Which has had a cumulative impact within the Nursery and across the school. Currently the Nursery is functioning at significant loss. With further cuts in overall spending we may not have the capacity to keep the Nursery open which is essential to our school and the community.

As [REDACTED] is not an area of deprivation we have more to gain if the base rates were to increase.

## Mandatory Deprivation Supplement

### Proposal

To select a preferred option for the mandatory deprivation supplement amongst the following:

1. Option 1 - £0.30 per hour per child
2. Option2 - £0.35 per hour per child
3. Option 3 - £0.40 per hour per child

### Q.2b – Please provide reasons for your answer

Demographics are changing and this helps to give more consistency with funding

We will not get a lot for deprivation and so we would be losing more money with options 2 and 3.

Schools in the west of the borough have been receiving less per child for many years. As we are all facing the same funding cuts there needs to be a fairer share of the funding available

The more the better to get it close to what i currently charge

As per question 1 - providers who have children with high deprivation will need additional resources in order to enhance the development of the children. This means high quality additional staff.

The more the better as the whole project is underfunded from start to finish and untenable for many nurseries to work with

Using this system will mean a higher disparity between the settings who will gain and those who will lose funding. This extra hourly rate is not earmarked for schemes to improve outcomes. Nurseries in deprived areas do not necessarily have any higher operating costs and to some extent economies of scale can be made. Whereas nurseries lower on the deprivation scale will receive no funding at all but may have higher costs. This supplement should be on a sliding scale or at least kept to minimum.

The providers who have higher levels of deprivation need more fund to support the needs of their children and enable these children to have a good level of development

Because I strongly feel that those providers that have a higher level of deprivation will require additional funding to ensure successful learning for children, development and greater input.

A higher base rate enables settings with no or low numbers of children in 'deprivation' to cover the running costs of their business. For these settings there is no additional funding available. For settings with a high number of children in 'deprivation' they will have the additional funding from the EYPP to top up.

This is the only way our business gains by the new NFF - albeit by 2p

The losses for settings is the least due to supplement redistribution. Settings shouldn't have to rely on supplements to be sustainable. Larger settings are gaining more per hour than very small settings who are losing but they have an advantage due to economies of scale. Two settings on the same site are getting different rates but the children are the same!

30p funding will allow a range of deprivation payments for the most deprived children but will also allow more to be paid on the universal base rate for all children.
I agree a high rate should go to deprivation
I agree that option 3 should be supported as I feel that the higher rate should support the deprivation
support the idea of funding children living in deprivation
Deprivation will vary each year depending on the children you have, therefore I think the base rate should be increased as that will benefit everyone and give consistency. Also, there is the EYPP which can also be used to top up for those families that qualify.
<b>It will support sustainability in other Nursery's (<i>sic!</i>)</b>
We have less FSM children our funding would be reduced and again would make the Nursery less viable.
Currently and historic client group indicates a very small % of children that would be eligible for FSM. Currently of the 89 children attending only 3 receive PP. For this reason we would select option 1.

## Discretionary Supplement

### Proposal

To introduce a discretionary supplement for quality supporting system leadership.

#### **Q 3b – Please provide a reason for your answer:**

Agree providing that the supplement reflects the cost of staff
There would need to be transparency and clear plan as how the money is going to be spent so there can be maximum impact
I would rather see the pot of money for quality shared out between all PVI's and childminders, with that money being added to the base rate which would enable us to continue providing quality education and pay for quality staff.
This is a good idea in principle - however the word "discretionary" suggests ambiguity and I fear that along with so many other government proposals - this will not be measured against clear guidelines. This supplement would need clear and achievable ( <i>sic!</i> ) parameters in place. It must be accessible and fair - which most government grants are not
The Early year's advisory team already carry out this role. This hourly amount should either be part of the base rate to allow nurseries to improve quality by identifying training needs from self-assessments, supervisions and advice from the advisory team. An alternative would be to have a graduate fund to help staff at level 3 to progress their career, bringing improvements back to the setting.
I agree in principle to this but I do not see how the managers that run these good/outstanding settings are going to be able to divide their time in order to deliver this. I look forward to seeing the plans for this.
I think this will help outstanding settings to support private and voluntary settings to improve their service and so enable all children to have a good level of development.
This will provide greater opportunities for settings that are outstanding to offer settings that require improvement support. This will help the LA have settings that provide all children the chance receive a equal service with better developmental and learning opportunities.
I believe this would work for some chosen settings but not for PVI's. I suspect the money would be distributed through the schools and children's centres not PVI's. I also have a great concern for the timing of the introduction of this funding. Surely it should start in September at the start of the academic year, as budgets/forecasts have already been set?
We need more detail on HOW settings will benefit from this. What would the requirements be to benefit from this supplement. Most settings are now Good or Outstanding and would

benefit from this money being directed into the base rate in order to limit losses, not put into a pot that may or may not be accessible for them. We strongly disagree with this supplement.

More money needs to go to all settings. We are responsible for our own improvement and need to be sustainable to deliver high quality practice and retain staff. Need to think of more imaginative ways of supporting settings without taking money from them to give to other settings eg staff exchanges, which are cost neutral.

The £67,000 should be either added to the base rate or paid to everyone as an 8p supplement (if you wish to highlight that it is being paid). This would then pay EVERY setting to help to improve Quality across the borough. It would help settings to afford to give leadership time or help settings to afford to receive advice from leaders. As, whether you are giving or receiving Quality help, it takes staffing time and the scheme proposed does not reflect this as it would not pay the setting in need of help to release staff. A universal Quality payment would also enable settings to continue to support choices they have already made or that they might wish to make in the future to enhance quality, whether regarding staffing, equipment or in other areas. Officers would be well positioned to target leadership support to reflect the key aims of the proposal. (Payment in this way would have the added benefit of allowing officers to concentrate on outcomes for the children and not the admin

It is extremely important that settings who provide quality premises, environment, resources and staff have to be compensated for the additional cost they incur for providing quality. No two nurseries are the same and parents carefully choose nursery for their child, not send them to any.

Except for the child-minder scheme as there has been lots of funding over the past years through sure start.

Except for the child-minder champion scheme as there has been lots of funding over past years through sure start on these types of interventions and with external consultants and it has not made a significant impact.

Except for the child-minders champion scheme as over the years there have been similar interventions and outside consultants that have not made a significant impact on provision.

I disagree with the proposal to implement the quality supplement as proposed. I do not agree with the proposal for the local authority to hold/ manage this central pot of £76 000. I would rather have the 0.08 per child on top of the base rate. I feel that this setting to setting support idea is more effective in schools as they have a bigger staff under head teacher. In the voluntary we have been supporting each other for as long as I can remember without a central system. What is important is for the sector is to be paid a fair base rate so we support staff development and other legal requirements such as pensions, increase (*sic!*) to minimum wage and other core costs to help us sustain our provisions. If we can't (*sic!*) meet our core costs a centrally managed setting to setting support will be of no use to us. Finally I think that we already have the Early Years team offering support to develop quality and help with SEND.

As someone who currently facilitates this proposal I welcome the opportunity for additional funds to support this program and the opportunity to share knowledge and expertise thus improving quality provision throughout the borough.

Agree – essential that funding is available for improvement and support.

It would be too difficult to make the system fair – there is already an Advisory team in place to do this. The settings in most need will lose out financially.

It will hopefully encourage providers who are not proactive in trying to improve the quality and standards of service, to be more active in getting training and support. It is a great idea to have 'on the job training' so providers who do not know, for example; how to complete an observation can get first hand training/practice by shadowing a childminder champion in their setting or elsewhere. This would encourage providers who are not as confident in formal training to access training on their level.