**9 Should there be an early years national funding formula (to distribute money from Government to each local authority)?**

Yes
No
Unsure

**10 Considering a universal base rate of funding which does not vary by local area...**

|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Should a universal base rate be included in the early years national funding formula? |  |  |  |
| Is 89.5% of overall funding the right amount to channel through this factor? |  |  |  |

**11 Considering an additional needs factor...**

|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Should an additional needs factor be included in the early years national funding formula? |  |  |  |
| Do we propose the correct set of metrics? |  |  |  |
| Do we propose the correct weightings for each metric? |  |  |  |

**12 Considering an area cost adjustment...**

|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Should the early years national funding formula include an area cost adjustment? |  |  |  |
| Should that adjustment be based on staff costs (based on the General Labour Market measure) and on nursery premises costs (based on rateable values)? |  |  |  |

**13 If you have any comments or recommendations for alternative metrics or weightings to be used in the early years national funding formula, please explain here**:

We generally support the proposed metrics. In particular, we welcome the efforts made to target support for children with SEND as well as those from disadvantaged backgrounds. We also support the recognition of staff costs, and how they can contribute to large geographical cost differentials.

However, any model for staff costs should also include the cost of quality in staffing. It is only high quality early education that has a positive effect on children’s outcomes, while average quality adds no value, and poor quality risks jeopardising children’s wellbeing.[[1]](#footnote-1) There is evidence that staff wages are a significant influence on quality in early years provision, with a £1 difference in average hourly wages between ‘good’ and ‘outstanding’ settings.[[2]](#footnote-2)

We feel unable to fully answer question 11 with regards to the proposed weightings because we do not have enough information about how these levels were calculated and whether they are appropriate given local patterns of need. It is vital that any funding levels need to be decided on a solid evidence base, and that decisions are both transparent and responsive to new data.

National allocation for free early education and childcare should include additional capital funding to support market development. An hourly rate passed through to providers is unable to support large one-off investments necessary to address local sufficiency challenges. We are concerned that the proposed methodology includes no consideration of local sufficiency challenges, particularly in light of the roll out of the 30 hour offer and the impact of a new allocation methodology on local authorities where there is low take-up of the free offer. The proposed structure of local early years funding, with tight constraints on ‘centrally retained’ spending, makes it unclear how local authorities will be expected to extend provision and address sufficiency challenges in future. We would encourage the Department to ensure that these factors are taken into account in order to fairly allocate resources to local authorities to meet policy aims in the early years.

**14 To what extent do you agree with the proposed funding floor limit, so that no local authority would face a reduction in its hourly funding rate of greater than 10%?**

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

**15 To implement the increased hourly rate for the two-year old free entitlement...**

|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Should we retain the current two-year-old funding formula? |  |  |  |
| Should we use the additional funding secured at the spending review to uplift local authorities’ allocations based upon this? |  |  |  |

**16 Considering the Dedicated Schools Grant, should the free entitlement be capped at 30 hours for children of eligible working parents and 15 hours for all other children?**

Yes
No
Unsure

**17 Should Government set the proportion of early years funding that must be passed on to providers?**

Yes
No
Unsure

**18 Do you think that 95% is the correct minimum proportion of the money that should be passed from local authorities to providers?**

Yes, I agree
No, 95% is too high
No, 95% is too low
Unsure

**19 If you would like to explain a response you’ve submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:**

While funding for the two year old offer is distributed more transparently than for the current three and four year old offer, funding is not adequate in all areas. The impact of the funding shortfall is visible in varying levels of take-up and less choice for parents taking up the offer in many areas as some providers opt out. We are concerned that the Department’s proposals will mean that low take up of the two year old offer becomes tolerated in a number of areas because local authorities with sufficiency challenges will have little flexibility to invest in new provision or incentives for providers. The Department should ensure that progress in increasing take up of the two year old offer does not stall by ensuring there is flexibility to use a proportion of the early years block for place development and by continuing trajectory funding for areas with take up below 70 per cent.

The policy rationale for the two year old offer is to improve outcomes for children among those most likely to fall behind in the early years. Yet the evidence suggests the involvement of graduate leaders and a package of family support is crucial in improving outcomes for children, including those under three in early education.[[3]](#footnote-3) Funding currently takes no clear account of these factors. In the long-term, the Family and Childcare Trust would like to see funding allocations informed by a robust assessment of the cost of delivering high quality care to ensure that the two year old offer is successful.

Given that the majority of local authorities are gaining funding, and some are gaining considerably, a target for them to pass through funding is sensible and will ensure that the additional funding reaches the front line to improve quality**.** However, the introduction of the cap suggested that there are concerns that local authorities are wasting money that could be going to providers. In fact, we have found that this funding can generally be traced to specific uses other than staff or administration costs such as grants for maintained early years providers, funding for free school meals in PVI settings, a package of family support delivered alongside the free offer, developing two year old places and increasing the number of places available to children with SEND. The type of services that providers might buy back appear to constitute a relatively small proportion of centrally retained spending. As far as possible local authorities should continue to have the flexibility to make strategic decisions to direct funding to improve outcomes for children in light of local circumstances.

We are also concerned that the Department’s data on centrally retained funding is not complete. It appears that 29 local authorities claimed to have no centrally retained spending in 2015/16. Without these ‘nil returns’, the average spend across the remaining local authorities is 8.4 per cent. We know that many if not all of these 29 local authorities do in fact spend funding centrally on early years support and it is likely that funding for these services is simply coming from elsewhere in the local authority’s budget. We are therefore concerned that both the seven and five per cent targets are based on a very rough estimate and could be excessively blunt. We also note that among the local authorities that did report centrally retaining spending, there is very significant variation, ranging from less than one per cent to 32 per cent, with a standard deviation from the average of 6.7 per cent.

We would like to see greater clarity of the role that local authorities are expected to play in managing the local childcare market and improving quality, more robust evidence on how this support is currently funded and a clear understanding of how this role will be adequately funded in future. The Department must consider carefully the consequences for local services and ultimately families of imposing sudden and potentially dramatic changes in spending patterns within local authorities.

**20 Should local authorities be required to give the same universal hourly base rate to all childcare providers in their area?**

Yes
No
Unsure

**21 Considering funding supplements that local authorities could choose to use (above the universal base rate)...**

|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Should local authorities be able to use funding supplements? |  |  |  |
| Should there be a cap on the proportion of funding that is channeled through supplements? |  |  |  |

**22 If you agree that there should be cap on the proportion of funding that is channeled through supplements, should the cap be set at 10%?**

Yes, I agree with a 10% cap
No, the cap should be higher than 10%
No, the cap should be lower than 10%
I'm unsure

**23 Should the following supplements be permitted?**

|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deprivation |  |  |  |
| Sparsity / rural areas |  |  |  |
| Flexibility |  |  |  |
| Efficiency |  |  |  |
| Additional 15 hours of childcare |  |  |  |

**24 When using funding supplements, should local authorities have discretion over the metrics they use and the amount of money channelled through each one?**

|  | Yes - over the metric they use | Yes - over the amount of money | No - over the metric they use | No - over the amount of money | Unsure when it comes to metrics | Unsure when it comes to the amount of money |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deprivation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sparsity / rural areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flexibility |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional 15 hours of childcare |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**25 If you agree that efficiency (efficient business practices that provide excellent value for money) should be included in the set of supplements, do you have a suggestion of how should it be designed?**

Our research has found that there are some opportunities for increasing efficiency within the childcare market, for example, through mergers of small providers in order to make savings on back office costs.[[4]](#footnote-4) However, it should be noted that opportunities for efficiencies are limited. Some nurseries implement ratios below the statutory limit. While this may be a result of inefficient practices in a minority of settings, the majority have developed their business model of what works for them and the parents that use their services, taking into account the characteristics of the setting such as the physical environment, the experience and training of staff and the needs of individual children. We would urge caution in assuming that there were efficiencies that could be gained from increasing ratios.

Increasing efficiency could require one-off expenditure such as the costs involved in a merger. Additional funding to support providers to make these changes would be welcome and helpful to the childcare market. A supplement to the hourly rate would do little to support efficiency. The costs to increase efficiency are likely to be upfront costs, and once the changes have been made, we would expect to see running costs decrease. Given that many childcare providers operate with very tight profit margins, they are unlikely to be able to make an upfront investment even if they know that it will bring savings and/or a higher hourly rate further down the line. Funding to improve efficiency should come from additional funding to support market development rather than a supplement to hourly rates.

There is also the opportunity to support efficiency through delivering business support to providers. Providers, particularly smaller settings and childminders, may benefit from support in running a small business. Delivering this support could be particularly crucial in helping to nurture the childminder market and reverse the decline in numbers. Childminders are often self employed individuals with little experience of running a business. Local authorities are well placed to provide this support. Given the narrow margins that the smallest providers operate under, paying for this support is likely to act as a barrier to uptake and so we would urge it to be provided free at the point of use without counting as money held back by local authorities.

**26 If you agree the delivery of the additional 15 hours of free childcare should be included in the set of supplements, do you have a suggestion of how should it be designed?**

As with efficiency, changes that a provider might need to make to be able to provide the additional 15 hours of free childcare are likely to involve one-off expenditure, such as expanding premises to increase capacity. Therefore, it would be more sensible for providers to be able to access additional funding that would help them to expand provision rather than a higher hourly rate if they are offering the full free 30 hours.

There may be calls for a higher hourly rate for the additional 15 hours from providers that have been cross subsidising the free 15 hours from charges for wraparound hours or younger children. We know that this practice is commonplace as the hourly rate in some areas has not covered providers’ costs for the free entitlement. Going forward, we would want to see an hourly rate that covers costs, therefore making cross subsidisation or a higher hourly rate for the additional 15 hours unnecessary. In order to do this, the government needs to be gathering information on the costs of providing high quality early education and use this information to determine hourly rates across the country. In the meantime, we would urge the Department to afford local authorities flexibility and share evidence from the early implementers programme to ensure that a supplement for the additional 15 hours is well-designed. It should also take care not to disadvantage providers only offering 15 hours.

**27 If you think that any additional supplements should be permitted which are not mentioned here, please set out what they are and why you believe they should be included:**

Local authorities should also be able to provide a supplement for graduate leadership. There is extensive evidence of the role that graduate qualifications can play in an early years settings to create a high quality learning environment.[[5]](#footnote-5) In order for every child to benefit from graduate teaching, we estimate that around 35 per cent of the early years workforce would need to hold a relevant graduate qualification, but currently just 13 per cent do.[[6]](#footnote-6) Until we reach this required level, local authorities should be able to use a supplement to encourage graduate leadership. Employing graduate staff acts to increase operating costs for a provider and so necessitates this higher rate, particularly for smaller providers. While some larger chains might be able to reduce costs by, for example, utilising higher ratios or lowering administrative costs, smaller providers or those with low margins will find it hardest to train and employ graduates and benefit the most from supplements.

It is worth noting that a graduate supplement alone is not enough to bring the required improvements to the early years workforce. The government must commit to making graduate-led care a minimum standard as soon as possible. The upcoming workforce development strategy should outline a clear plan for a range of interventions that will improve the skills and qualifications of the early years workforce.

**28 Finally, for this page, if you want to explain a response you’ve submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:**

Supplements are a useful way for local authorities to manage the local childcare market and to incentivise developments that better meet the needs of parents. While we support efforts to simplify funding, we do not believe that the childcare market, which contains providers with a range of costs as well as a range of local sufficiency challenges, is in a position where excessively narrow constraints on supplements is appropriate. In addition, childcare funding will also be changing significantly over the coming years and local authorities will need to monitor the market and work with providers to make sure that parents’ needs are met. Capping the use of supplements would limit local authorities’ ability to respond to and improve the local market. The market faces significant issues around quality, sufficiency, accessibility and flexibility, and these vary considerably between local areas. Local authorities need to be able to use incentives in order to make improvements where needed locally. In light of this, it is important that local authorities are able to work with providers to support the market to meet the needs of parents. Supplements are a useful way to do this. Once the market is consistently meeting needs around quality, sufficiency, accessibility and flexibility, then we would support a cap on supplement use.

Some local authorities currently pay a higher base rate for childminders.[[7]](#footnote-7) Childminders provide a vital component of the childcare market, with some parents preferring the home environment and some childminders able to offer greater flexibility in their hours. Local authorities pay a higher rate to childminders for one of two reasons: to incentivise higher qualifications, or to recognise childminders offering flexible services must manage low occupancy so need a higher payment to offer this service. Childminder numbers are declining in England, and the Department should consider how this funding formula will affect childminder numbers. Central and local government could nurture the market by supporting childminder networks and providing business support and start-up grants.

Introducing a universal base rate is desirable in terms of requiring the same quality and practice from all providers. We would like to see the universal funding rate linked to increased expectations of quality in PVI provision, ultimately with a convergence of standards across maintained and PVI settings. This will ensure funding is distributed fairly to providers that have high quality standards and deliver good value for money for the public. Maintained sector nurseries currently often face higher costs as a result of teacher lead provision and requirements around admissions and inclusion. Equalising funding is an opportunity to spread good practice across all provider types and develop a clear roadmap to delivering graduate-led care to all children. For some smaller sessional providers and childminders, the Department should also encourage local authorities to work with providers to arrange shared graduate leaders and graduate-led childminder networks. Nursery classes in schools are also currently bound by the School Admissions Code. As part of equalisation of funding, we would like to see a statutory admissions code of practice spread to all centre-based provision to ensure fair access to care, prioritising access for the most disadvantaged children, reducing cherry-picking of parents so that the most profitable providers must serve a whole community rather than a narrow group of parents, and securing value for money for public investment.

The drawback of the universal base rate is that it reduces the ability of local authorities to manage the local childcare market. Currently local authorities can use different rates as an incentive to increase supply where needed in a particular sector (for example, childminders). While we would support moving towards the universal base rate becoming the norm, local authorities should still be able to implement different rates where particular issues in the local market exist.

The department must also make sure that the universal base rate leads to quality improvement across the board, rather than a reduction in quality in the maintained sector. The most disadvantaged children are most likely to attend free early education in a maintained setting: 63 per cent of children in the most deprived decile compared to 17 per cent in the least deprived decile (NAO, 2016). Maintained early years providers must meet higher staffing requirements set out in the EYFS framework, higher inclusion requirements set out in the statutory SEND Code of Practice, and adhere to the schools admissions code. It is important that maintained providers continue to be funded at a sufficient level to meet these standards.

**29 Should there be a Disability Access Fund to support disabled children to access their free entitlement?**

Yes
No
Unsure

**30 Should eligibility for the Disability Access Fund be children aged 3 or 4 which are a) taking up their free entitlement and b) in receipt of Disability Living Allowance?**

Yes
No
Unsure

**31 When it comes to delivering the funding for the Disability Access Fund, is the most appropriate way the existing framework of the Early Years Pupil Premium?**

Yes
No
Unsure

**32 If you want to explain a response you’ve submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:**

We support the principle of the Disability Access Fund. However, we note that ISOS Partnership report *Research on funding for young people with special educational*

*needs* produced for the Department for Education in 2015 did not recommend this route of funding for children with additional needs and emphasised the importance of tailored inclusion support based on the principles of clear expectations for providers, a concrete offer of additional advice and expertise from the local authority, and agreed criteria for accessing additional top-up funding. We also welcome the Department’s proposals to encourage local authorities to establish an inclusion fund and it is important that sufficient emphasis is put on this route of supporting providers. There is a risk that the Disability Access Fund could encourage local authorities to consider that their responsibility to support inclusion has been met through this payment, which would run counter to the aim of promoting broad improvements in inclusive practice in the early years. However, if administered effectively in tandem, we consider that the Disability Access Fund and Inclusion Fund have the potential to promote inclusive practice.

We would encourage the Department to consider extending the Disability Access Fund to the two year old offer. This would ensure consistent support and incentives for providers in the early years. Although two year olds eligible for free early education overwhelmingly access the offer in a private or voluntary setting, we do not have clear evidence on trends among eligible children with SEND. There is little reason to suggest that challenges and barriers for providers seeking to care for two year olds with SEND are any different to those affecting three and four year olds. In fact, some challenges are likely to be more acute because regulatory ratios are lower for this age group and private and voluntary settings are less likely to employ early years graduates with more confidence in caring for children with additional needs.

We agree that Disability Living Allowance (DLA) is an appropriate eligibility measure but note that this introduces a degree of inconsistency with the two year old offer, where children with an education, health and care plan are eligible for the offer. Anecdotal feedback suggests that in most cases children with an EHC plan will be eligible for DLA, but we would encourage the Department to explore whether any groups of children with SEND might be excluded by reliance on DLA as the sole eligiblity criterion. We would also encourage the Department to work with the Department for Work and Pensions to consider how best to increase uptake of DLA to ensure that this funding is reaching all eligible families. DLA uptake is currently lower amongst the under-fives than the over-fives raising the possibility that some younger children may be missing out.

In the absence of a robust evaluation of providers’ experience of implementing the EYPP and its effectiveness in improving outcomes for children, we do not feel able to answer question 31. We also lack information on the amount of the proposed Disability Access Fund payment per eligible child. We will be interested in the feedback the Department receives from providers and would encourage officials to explore learning from implementation of the EYPP, particularly in regard to the amount of the payment.

**33 To what extent do you agree that a lack of clarity on how parents / childcare providers can access financial support results in children with special educational needs not receiving appropriate support? (We mean children who do not already have an Education, Health and Care Plan)**

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

**34 When it comes to establishing an inclusion fund...**

|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Should local authorities be required to establish an inclusion fund? |  |  |  |  |  |
| Would an inclusion fund help improve the supply of appropriate support children receive when in an early years setting? |  |  |  |  |  |

**35 If you envisage any barriers, arising from existing practice or future proposals, to introducing a new requirement on local authorities to establish an inclusion fund, please tell us what they are and how they might be overcome:**

We consider that the primary barriers to establishing an inclusion fund will be funding pressures and a lack of clarity about the purpose and aims of the fund.

Funding pressures on local authorities to support inclusion may grow as the 30 hour offer raises parental expectations of access to a wider range of providers. Many local authorities will also be starting from a modest baseline in terms of their current early years inclusion offer and will need to commit new resources to establish a credible inclusion fund.

There will inevitably be competing priorities for inclusion funding; for example local authorities may choose to focus on raising quality in PVI settings that already care for children with SEND, to build capacity in settings to improve choice for parents, or to provide top-up payments to support full-time care (and support for providers caring for children with SEND aged one to two and not eligible for free early education and childcare).

To overcome these barriers as far as possible, we would encourage the Department to use the early education and childcare statutory guidance for local authorities to encourage local authorities to establish an inclusion fund and establish broad parameters for the purpose and administration of the fund. The principles set out in the *Research on funding for young people with special educational needs* report form a coherent potential framework. A local authority should set out:

* clear expectations about the support early years providers are expected to offer;
* a concrete offer of additional specialist advice and expertise; and
* criteria for accessing additional top-up funding alongside a clear and timely route of access.

A form of this information should both be included in both the funding agreement with providers and the local authority’s SEND Local Offer.

We would also encourage the Department to explore ways of ensuring local authorities have access to good practice guidance and routes of sharing information about inclusion support. We agree that there should be local flexibility in administration of the inclusion fund but are concerned that there is not currently a means for local authorities to benchmark their standard of practice and learn from successful local authorities.

**36 When it comes to the SEN inclusion fund, should local authorities be responsible for deciding...**

|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The children for which the inclusion fund is used? |  |  |  |
| The value of the fund? |  |  |  |
| The process of allocating the funding? |  |  |  |

**37 Where specialist SEN or SEND services are delivered free at the point of use, should they be considered as funding passed directly to providers for the purposes of the 95% high pass-through?**

Agree
Disagree
Unsure

**38 If you want to explain a response you’ve submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:**

Our conversations with sector colleagues suggest a degree of confusion about question 37. We would encourage the Department not to apply a cap to the amount of the early years block of the DSG that may be used to support inclusion, whether through free and subsidised support or through top-up payments channelled to providers. Improving inclusion in the early years is not solely an issue of funding, but resources are an important influence on progress. Under the Department’s proposals, many local authorities will be managing a difficult transition as the amount of central funding available to early years teams declines. Alongside these changes, applying a cap to inclusion funding could dampen or undermine local authority efforts to improve inclusion support in the early years.

**39. To what extent do you agree with the transition approach proposed for the Early Years National Funding Formula (money distributed from Government to local authorities)?**

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

**40 To what extent do you agree with the transition approach proposed for the high pass-through of early years funding from local authorities to providers?**

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

**41 To what extent do you agree that our proposals on the high pass-through of funding from local authorities to childcare providers makes the existing Minimum Funding Guarantee for the early years unnecessary?**

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

**42 To what extent do you agree with the transition approach proposed for introducing the universal base rate for all providers in a local authority area?**

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

**43 - If you want to explain a response you’ve submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:**

Though the consultation document acknowledges that the proposed changes could be challenging for many local authorities and providers, with 25% of local authorities estimated to lose funding, the proposed transitional approaches do not provide local authorities with sufficient time to facilitate these changes without disruption.

Many areas that will lose funding or see the lowest gains, particularly in inner London, have serious sufficiency problems. The Department has not made the case that these areas are ‘over-funded’. For many local authorities, particularly in areas that are already struggling with sufficiency, a reduction of 10% will still represent a steep funding challenge that risks destabilising the local childcare market and exacerbating existing geographical inequalities. It should also be considered that some providers will see drops of more than 10% in the funding levels they receive from local authorities. The universal base rate and the cap on the use of supplements will mean that providers who had previously benefited from a higher rate for their sector or from supplements could stand to lose out significantly. We are concerned that the Department has not provided an assessment of the response it expects among those areas and providers that will lose funding.

We feel that the short timescale of the proposed approach is particularly unnecessary given the extra £1 billion investment in the early years provided by the government, and that a longer and more carefully managed transitional period would be sensible to avoid exacerbating sufficiency challenges. In addition to extending the transitional period, the Department should explore ways of including sufficiency in the national funding formula. This might for example mean an adjustment for the distance from a take-up target. This element of funding might be conditional on a sufficiency action plan or other conditions so that extra funding is used effectively and as intended.

We recognise that the proposed 95% pass-through of funding from local authorities to childcare providers will encourage funding to reach the frontline, the minimum funding guarantee is still necessary. It is proposed that local authorities will no longer be able to use different base rates and supplements will be capped, meaning some providers could face a potentially large and disruptive drop in funding. For this reason, we feel that the existing minimum funding guarantee remains necessary and should remain at 1.5%.
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