**Responses from the funding formula consultation**

5.3

1. **Do you agree with the Early Years Funding Formula as outlined in the consultation document?**

Yes 8 No 8

1. **Do you agree with the full pass on of 2yr funding allocation from the DfE to provide the hourly rate in the consultation?**

Yes 11 No 1 Blank 4

|  |
| --- |
| I'm answering no because there is no option for don't know as you're asking me, as a provider, to give you a black and white answer on a complicated document I have no prior in depth working knowledge of. As the hourly rate is still less than I charge per child per hour, then I think it should be as high as possible. |
| I cannot agree with the funding due to the fact that it is just not enough to cover the shortfall and we are being used by the government. We are being expected to provide a high quality service for a fraction of what it costs to deliver. We are being asked to halve the amount of families we serve, giving children double the hours, therefore losing the only way we have of charging parents the actual cost of caring for their child for those who currently take more than their funder fifteen hours. This will see settings close; it is as simple as that. I propose that the wording is changed from 'free' entitlement to 'supplemented' entitlement, and that providers are able to charge for extras, such as high ratios, experience staff, Forest school sessions, yoga, baking etc. This is the ONLY way Banes will continue to have enough settings, and the ONLY way that we could consider offering the 30 hours. |

1. **Do you agree with the 5 rate options for funding children eligible for their 3+ entitlement to be implemented from April 2017?**

Yes 7 No 6 Blank 3

|  |
| --- |
| Yes, however the hourly rates could be increased to actually cover the cost of providing high quality childcare. |
| It is highly unlikely that we will be able to afford to employ an EYQT at any time in the future. So a formula that restricts our funding rate because of this feels a little unfair. |
| The multiple breakdowns are what make this system hard to understand. The hourly rate should be based on a child's requirements (always thought that was the purpose of early years education!) not whether I have a degree. It means that childminders without degrees, as an example, are paid less than people able to employ from a pool of staff. They might be providing children with better one on one care but this formula doesn't value that as it's linked to opening hours and a high investment in qualifications. |
| Some providers in the charitable sector, such as our Playgroup simply cannot operate for any more hours than our current 19 per week unless other users of our village hall stop using it. Yet we have the same staff costs as other settings and these will increase in the same way as the minimum wage and pension’s requirements come in. It is therefore unreasonable to discriminate against us with a lower rate on this basis. We are a key part of the pre-school offer in our village and there would be a significant gap if we were to close. This formula needs to take into account where providers sim play cannot offer the extra hours rather than choosing not to. |
| Not very clear to which rate applies to us |
| Personally I think that you should give as much as you possibly can to ALL settings across Banes. Penalising settings that cannot offer the 30 hours seems wrong. We all know that this increase is nowhere near enough to cover costs, it is a tiny rise for an extremely underfunded sector and I cannot feel happy or grateful for that. |

1. **Do you agree with the revisions to the Deprivation Supplement to be implemented from April 2017?**

Yes 9 No 4 Blank 3

|  |
| --- |
| Base rate is too low. Flexibility entitlement is good for those providing more than 38 wks. and we could do the 10 hrs per day. Graduate lead supplement - is that one per nursery...what if you have more than one graduate lead? I feel that the deprivation supplement should not necessarily be on postcode. This would lead to the funding being distributed unevenly. We have quite a few families on our books, that drain a lot of resources and time....we wouldn't stand to re-coup any of these costs if the deprivation funding was the only reflection of funding to help with these families who may or may not come from areas of deprivation. |
| There are children in Area 4 who are facing the same level of poverty as those in areas 1 & 2 it feels unfair that they shouldn't receive the same level of help |
| Don't recall reading info on this |
| There are families all over Banes that are struggling and need help now and then, not just the families from these areas only. My setting is in an affluent area, and yet we have several families struggling and their children need extra support. However I genuinely do not know how it could be changed, it just seems to be to have little flexibility. |

1. **Finally please add any further comment including your willingness to offer the new extended EYE**

|  |
| --- |
| Yes we are willing to implement the 30 hour EYE, as at present we do have the capacity. |
| Can't comment on whether we'd offer it or not without full understanding the terms and conditions we'll be needed to act under. Specifically, additional charges and the legality surrounding charging them and how many spaces we'd need to offer and whether we can cap those spaces. Currently all of our parents have intimated they'd want to take up the offer and if our expansion plans aren't passed, we would be unable to cater for this demand. |
| We are happy to provide the extended offer to our families and local children and will do our best to provide all that we can. |
| The increase in funding seems more attractive but I've been registered for 7 years now and this is still less per hour than when I started working in 2010. I lowered my prices when I went back to work last year after maternity leave so EYE hasn't seen a real increase in pay even with the government’s belief they are investing heavily. I'm not sure how I tally up working for less than £5 an hour per child, which is harder to manage as its term time only and I have to feed my own family all year round. I'm subsidising both parents and the government, and then have to rely on the government low income schemes to survive! These extra hours mean offering more of my spaces and time to a much lower rate of pay, so other people can earn more. I'm not likely to offer it to many parents, if at all. |
| We are more than happy to offer the extended EYE but cannot as the village hall hours offered to us (19/ week) are the maximum the hall can let us have due to other regular users. |
| The rate of £3.95/ hour based for the 15 hours/ week is not enough to cover full nursery cost and hence we will suffer a large deficit. This deficit will be even bigger if we were to opt for the 30 hours/week and hence not a practical option for us. |
| Although the new funding rates are a step in the right direction if we offered the extended hours it will still not be enough to pay the increased rent and staff wages |
| Always been willing to offer the new extended EYE but rate is still not sustainable. Key to making this so will be the ability to build in additional charges. |
| I am happy to offer the extended hours. However the number of hours I can actually do will depend on a number of factors.  Firstly the spaces I have. Secondly I do a minimum of 5 continuous hours a day to make my hours practical in terms of spaces. I will ask parents/ carers for a VOLUNTARY contribution towards snacks and outings.  I have heard that some settings are charging for extras that I feel are unreasonable. Like “Green spaces" or compulsory long days. I would appreciate a tightening of the rules surrounding this, as the funding is supposed to be FREE. Thanks. |