

CBC SFF Consultation outcomes

Consultation responses

Number of responses				
Maintained schools: 8	Private, Voluntary and independent (PVI): 34			Total: 42
Base hourly rate - Basic Structure				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1: Common rate plus social deprivation Option 2: Common rate without social deprivation Option 3: Different rate with social deprivation Option 4: Different rate without social deprivation 				
Option 1: 13	Option 2: 7	Option 3: 20	Option 4: 2	Nil: 0
Social Deprivation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 bands using IMD for LSOAs – low, medium and high 				
Agree: 24	Disagree: 8	Unsure: 10	Nil: 0	
Nursery School Headteachers				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to provide nursery school lump sum 				
Agree: 20	Disagree: 11	Unsure: 11	Nil: 0	
PVI Administration				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leave nursery and lower school lump sums intact and establish lump sum for PVI administration 				
Agree: 29	Disagree: 9	Unsure: 4	Nil: 0	
Sustainability				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish lump sum for qualifying providers with fewer than x pupils up to the equivalent of funding for x pupils where viability of provision necessary for sufficiency 				
Agree: 23	Disagree: 7	Unsure: 11	Nil: 1	
Rent, rates and premises costs				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1: Leave rents, rates and conditions survey allocations for schools intact and fund costs for PVI providers on uptake Option 2: Leave rents, rates and conditions survey allocation for schools intact and fund PVI providers at two set amounts – 1) those registered for up to 24 children and 2) those above 24 children 				
Option 1: 18	Option 2: 20	Unsure: 2	Nil: 2	
Quality funding for PVI sector				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate funding to all PVI providers on qualification of staff using 3 bands based on pupil uptake 				
Agree: 19	Disagree: 12	Unsure: 11	Nil: 0	
Qualified teachers and nursery nurses in the maintained sector				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a formula factor based on pupil uptake for qualified teachers and nursery nurses in maintained schools 				
Agree: 21	Disagree: 7	Unsure: 14	Nil: 0	
Meals provision				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to fund free meals and school meals by current funding mechanisms 				
Agree: 34	Disagree: 3	Unsure: 5	Nil: 0	
Special educational needs (SEN)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the current funding mechanisms for funding children with SEN in maintained and PVI sectors 				
Agree: 37	Disagree: 2	Unsure: 3	Nil: 0	
Single pupil count				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All settings counted and funded termly on uptake 				

Agree: 34	Disagree: 3	Unsure: 4	Nil: 1
Transition funding			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guaranteed minimum funding level per child per hour (no setting receiving less than an average of £x per hour even if the formula suggests a lower figure) 			
Agree: 33	Disagree: 4	Unsure: 4	Nil: 1
Schools MFG			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2010-11 MFG calculation should use the same methodology of counting for both the base year and the funding year 			
Agree: 24	Disagree: 4	Unsure: 13	Nil: 1

Comments (Please note – not all comments have been included and those included are representative of those received. They are not written in any order of preference.)

Base hourly rate - Basic Structure
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for social deprivation factor, core rates provide level playing field Option 3 – need to retain current levels of funding SFF should start from same base rate As accredited childminder funding does not cover hourly rate Does a childminder have similar costs as more formal settings, shouldn't all settings provide similar care and have similar staff in place? Option 1 seems a fairer starting place Need to know what differential rates include SFF should be just that – unsure how social deprivation would be calculated.
Social Deprivation
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should follow the child but can change termly Additional funding should be based on assessment of individual needs Unsure about use of Acorn Index DCSF requires deprivation factor Providers cost survey showed it cost more to educate a child in the maintained sector, so this should be reflected in the differential base rate Agree with the use of Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) but would like to see it extended beyond Local Super Output Areas (LSOAs). Could use same process as FFEE.
Nursery School Headteachers
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All settings have an administrative lead or a committee Lump sum would need to cover headteacher plus on-costs All settings should get a lump sum / include under level of quality? All full daycare settings require graduate leader by 2015 So long as nursery is attached to main school – don't see the need for nursery school headteacher Again one amount for all, when is a headteacher better qualified than a teacher with EYP status As this reads as a requirement there is no choice but to agree All nursery / early years provision should be funded to employ a teacher I think it is very difficult because schools get a lot of support whereas PVI settings don't get as much. However, I do agree nursery schools need a headteacher DCSF requirement for nursery schools to have a headteacher The day that nursery schools are run by an EYP would be a retrograde step.

PVI Administration**Comments**

- Enormous administrative load, less unpaid hours
- Would make a huge difference
- As nursery schools have increasing demands on administration would like to see lump sum review to adequately provide administrative support
- Need to differentiate between voluntary and private / independent as latter are profit making, need to ensure not giving public money to increase profits
- Agree with reservations – would the nursery and lower school lump sum remain intact or are you taking slices out of the same size pie?
- Supports efficiently run provision, no other way to recoup administrative costs
- Agree with PVI need for administrative and management costs but one system of payment should be analysed with the idea of one method to cover all types of provider so that the system would seem fairer
- Recognises extra hours worked when children have gone home
- Money needed for growth and quality of these settings, needs to go to the right organisations not to limited companies
- Keep it simple, the rate is the rate, no slight of hand please.

Sustainability**Comments**

- This is a must, would support providers in rural areas
- Smaller settings should not have to close due to lack of numbers, villages need childcare
- Could be unrealistic level of funding required
- Definitely would support PVI settings affected by once a year intake
- Need criteria before deciding
- If a business / setting is viable, it is viable!
- Efforts should be made and demonstrated for settings to accept advice and work to increase numbers.

Rent, rates and premises costs**Comments**

- Option 1 could still affect sustainability if numbers fall
- Rents and rates not according to take-up
- Let free market work, only need sustainability when there are not enough places in local authority
- Closed question makes assumption of payment. Should be proportional to numbers if 3 and 4 year olds
- We are a business not an extension of the state
- I feel we need more guidance on this.

Quality funding for PVI sector**Comments**

- Many staff still taking higher qualification in 2010, settings with no Early Years Professional (EYP) disadvantaged
- Disagree strongly, have you tried to keep a graduate in a private nursery?
- May seriously affect pre-school settings
- An allowance which considers staff qualifications and part-time employment / sessions open / could include headteacher funding here
- What about childminders who have level 4, 5 or 6 qualifications?
- Not cost effective for smaller settings to have graduate EYP

- Not measurable and will make gulf bigger between good and bad
- I think bands are biased to the schools sector or large nursery chains
- Any funding needs to be ring-fenced.

Qualified teachers and nursery nurses in the maintained sector

Comments

- Maintained settings need teachers but less staff
- Cost of employing qualified teachers, deputy head and teachers through the Threshold etc much higher than a nursery nurse
- PVI settings required to maintain higher adult:child ratios could be included in quality funding element
- Not simple
- Needs to take account of teachers on the leadership spine
- We agree in principle but with fluctuating birth rate and pupil uptake it is difficult to maintain.

Meals provision

Comments

- Equality principle
- PVI's don't get funding for free meals
- School meals need to be looked at as the size of the portions wouldn't keep a baby alive!

Special educational needs (SEN)

Comments

- It is fine how it is
- It is hard to obtain funding for children with SEN in PVI settings. It should be made easier to better support children before moving to maintained settings
- Funding differentials need to be addressed
- The current formula includes a notional figure for children with SEN. Will this be added to the SFF?
- It works
- Disagree – to make it easier to access funding for SEN as we do not always have the time or staff to gather the information or evidence.

Single pupil count

Comments

- This is the fairest method
- Nursery schools funded full-time for Year R children in the summer term
- Nursery schools admit termly, often means spare places which are filled later in the year. Having staffing levels which respond to pupil numbers will disrupt quality and continuity.

Transition funding

Comments

- Need more detail to make valid judgement
- Assume this will apply to PVI settings as well as schools – not clear
- Again this suggests various outcomes – this is not a single formula
- This would be easier for administration and staffing
- No brainer but like voting for your limbs to be cut off gradually rather than all at once!

Schools MFG

Comments

- Not qualified to comment.

Further comments

- Nursery schools under threat of being dumbed down, need funding at current levels to retain current quality, concern about deficits in funding but feel PVI settings should also receive realistic funding levels
- Not enough time to consider questionnaire (received 29/06). Document written considering primarily the maintained sector and ignores some different and specific needs of the PVI sector
- We do not have sufficient funds to support an administrator despite being very popular
- Profile of PVI settings needs to be raised / funding linked to qualifications and to assist with administration would help to recruit colleagues of the right calibre
- Distinction need to be made between voluntary and private / independent as the latter are potentially profit making
- If public money is allocated to the PVI sector it should be a requirement to meet the same financial standards as schools
- Most maintained settings have a leadership structure which is not acknowledged in consultation
- If public money is used for children in the PVI sector to improve quality we need to ensure that sufficient monitoring is undertaken to ensure standards rise and action taken if they don't
- Where is the bonus for the quality and availability of outdoor provision?
- Please stop trying to control our business. The NEF covers barely 20% of our pre-school fee income yet takes up to 90% of our curriculum time. How can that be fair?