



# WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

A Meeting of the **SCHOOLS FORUM** will be held at the Rivermead Primary School, Loddon Bridge Road, Woodley, RG5 4BS on **WEDNESDAY 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 9.30 AM**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andy Couldrick', written in a cursive style.

Andy Couldrick  
Chief Executive  
Published on 13 September 2016

This meeting may be filmed for inclusion on the Council's website.

Please note that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of these images or recordings is not under the Council's control.



# **WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **Our Vision**

A great place to live, an even better place to do business

## **Our Priorities**

Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential

Invest in regenerating towns and villages, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth

Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and supported by well designed development

Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough

Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services

## **The Underpinning Principles**

Offer excellent value for your Council Tax

Provide affordable homes

Look after the vulnerable

Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life

Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency

Deliver quality in all that we do

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM

### Schools Representatives

John Bayes	Governor - Foundry College - Chairman
Paul Miller	Governor - St Crispins - Vice-Chair
Ian Head	Governor - Aldryngton Primary
Helen Ball	Primary Head - Polehampton Infant
Ali Brown	Primary Head - Nine Mile Ride Primary
Sally Hunter	Primary Head - Wescott Infant
Brian Prebble	Primary Head - Rivermead Primary
Elaine Stewart	Primary Head - Aldryngton Primary
Mandy Turner	Primary Head - Shinfield Infant
Sylvia Allen	School Business Manager - Hawkedon Primary
Julia Mead	School Business Manager - St Sebastian's CE Primary
Carol Simpson	School Business Manager - Colleton Primary
Liz Meek	Special School Head - Addington School
Ginny Rhodes	Secondary Head - St Crispins
Derren Gray	Academy Headteacher - The Piggott School
Janet Perry	Academy Business Manager - The Holt School
Kerrie Clifford	Maintained Nursery Acting Headteacher
Mary Davies	Maiden Erlegh School
Vacancy 4	Special School Head

### Non School Representatives

Vacancy	Roman Catholic Diocese
Anne Andrews	Oxford Diocese
Richard Dolinski	Wokingham Borough Council Representative
James Taylor	Wokingham and Bracknell College
Vacancy	Early Years Forum

### Observers

Funding Reform Team	Education Funding Agency, Maintained Schools Division
---------------------	---

ITEM NO.	WARD	SUBJECT	PAGE NO.
1		<b>ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN</b> To elect a Chairman of the Forum for the 2016/2017 academic year.	
2		<b>ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN</b> To elect a Vice-Chairman for the 2016/2017 academic year.	
3		<b>APOLOGIES</b> To receive any apologies for absence.	
4		<b>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</b> To receive any declarations of interest.	
5		<b>WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL'S PROPOSED</b>	5 - 22

**RESPONSE TO THE EARLY YEARS FUNDING  
CONSULTATION**

The Forum to consider Wokingham Borough Council's response to the Government's consultation on the changes to funding for three and four year olds.

**CONTACT OFFICER**

**Luciane Bowker**  
**Tel**  
**Email**  
**Postal Address**

Senior Democratic Services Officer  
0118 974 6091  
luciane.bowker@wokingham.gov.uk  
Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

**SCHOOLS FORUM 21 September 2016**

**EARLY YEARS FREE ENTITLEMENT**

## **Government Consultation of Changes to the Single Funding Formula for Early Years Free Entitlement**

### **Purpose of Report**

To outline and agree proposals for Wokingham Borough Council's responses to the Government consultation " *An early years national funding formula; and changes to the way the three- and- four -year-old entitlements to childcare are funded*"

Attached documents:

**Appendix 1** Summary of government proposals, challenges and opportunities for WBC

**Appendix 2** Proposed WBC consultation response

### **Background**

In August 2016 the Government released a long- awaited consultation on changes to the single funding formula for early years free entitlement. The single funding formula governs the amount of money given to local authorities to fund the free entitlement for two, three and four year olds in their area. The Government is seeking responses by 22 September 2016.

This follows a consultation which was released by the Government in April 2016 entitled '*Childcare free entitlement: delivery model*' which looked at the delivery model for the free entitlement and the changing role of the Local Authority within that model. The Government has yet to respond to this consultation.

Both of these consultations provide further clarity on the future of the free entitlement and give more information about how the new 30 hour entitlement for working families should be administered. It also changes the rules which govern the free entitlement and the local funding formulae each local authority has to distribute the funding to their providers.

The full consultation document can be found at the link below:

<https://consult.education.gov.uk/early-years-funding/eynff>

The consultation lays out proposals to deliver major changes to the early years funding system:

- A. at the national level, the early years funding that is distributed from central government to local authorities; and
- B. the local level arrangements that local authorities use to distribute that funding to childcare providers on the front line.

### **Impact on Wokingham**

The consultation is split into a number of sections which seek to change the way funding is firstly distributed to local authorities and then subsequently distributed to providers for delivering the free entitlement.

Attached to this document is the proposed response to the consultation (Appendix 2). It must be noted that responses are limited to the format prescribed by the consultation which limits the amount of explanation that can be given with an answer.

It appears that the proposed new formula will see an increase in the overall early years allocation in both 2017-2018 and 2018-2019. This is in addition to the proposed increase in number of funded hours delivered from September 2017 due to the introduction of the 30 hours free entitlement for working families. The illustrative figures given by the consultation for 2017 – 2018 would see a significant uplift in the average hourly rate in Wokingham from the current £3.75 per hour. This adjustment to the hourly rate is mainly due to recognition that current government allocations at a local authority level should be determined by costs of delivery such as staff wages and cost of premises (area cost adjustment). The formula also takes into account the number of children claiming FSM in the borough as well as children with English as an additional language (EAL) and children claiming disability living allowance (DLA).

Part of the consultation restricts the number, type and size of supplements that can be used when distributing funding to early years providers. Currently providers receive:

Base rate + High/low cost + Flexibility + Quality + Deprivation.

At present the supplements make up 18% of the total amount providers receive. This local formula was agreed in consultation with providers and school's forum and has changed little over the past 5 years. These supplements have been used to incentivise providers to further meet the needs of families in Wokingham by providing high quality provision led by highly qualified staff and offered in a flexible way that meets the needs of working families.

The proposal in the government consultation would limit the size of supplements to 10% as well as limiting the type of supplement that can be used.

Wokingham's current formula would therefore need to change to meet the new requirements if the proposals were adopted by Government. WBC should consider if the new formula will need to be weighted towards incentivising providers to meet the needs of working families; a statutory duty for the Local Authority from September 2017. A higher financial incentive here could result in the removal of other supplements. The only supplement that must be retained is deprivation.

The local authority will consult on the new formula with all providers and school's forum in time for providers to set budgets for the next financial year.

The consultation also proposes limits to the amount of centrally retained funding for local authorities to provide administration and support services. Currently in Wokingham no funds are centrally retained for this purpose; however the government is proposing a maximum limit of 5% in the future.

There is also a proposal to provide a single base rate across all types of providers. Our current formula does this already however it must be noted that maintained nursery classes and our maintained nursery school automatically receive the high cost supplement due to the Early Years Foundation Stage requirement to be led by a qualified teacher. It also must be noted that we currently pay a lump sum supplement to our maintained nursery school (Amleside) which the consultation suggests should be withdrawn over the next two years – additional funding will be given to cover part of this supplement for the next two years in addition to the formula mentioned above.

Finally the consultation proposes 2 mechanisms for providing support for children with additional needs.

Firstly it proposes to introduce a requirement on Local Authorities to have an Inclusion Fund to support children accessing the free entitlement. In Wokingham we already have this in form of the Early Years Inclusion Fund which is funded from the Early Years Block. It must be noted that with the introduction of 30 hours there will be significant pressure put on this fund when the new entitlement is introduced in September 2017.

Secondly it proposes the formation of a Disability Access Fund which will be given to providers directly for every 3 and 4 year old child in their setting who attracts Disability Living Allowance. This would be paid as an annual lump sum per child in addition to the hourly rate.

## **Conclusion**

The proposals in the Governments consultation will have a large impact on all early years settings. It is likely that there will be an uplift in the rates that will be paid to

providers however as our current formula is not compatible with the proposals it will need to be changed. Until this new formula is agreed it will not be possible to state the exact rate providers will receive. The impact of the introduction of the statutory duty for the local authority to secure 30 hour places is likely to be a factor in the makeup of this new formula however the details of this will need to be consulted on with key stake holders as soon as the government has replied to this consultation.

### **Direction of travel for Wokingham**

Early Years Funding levels in Wokingham have always been historically low due to the funding allocated from central government and the proposed increase will go some way to ensuring providers are able to continue to deliver high quality childcare in Wokingham Borough.

It is agreed that an increase in funding for 2 year olds will continue to incentivise providers to provide places and acknowledges the costs associated with supporting children and families from disadvantaged backgrounds.

We know from government indication of eligible families for the additional 15 hours free early years entitlement and from our own survey of parents that more early years places will need to be created to meet an increase in demand. We are also aware that even with an increase to the hourly funding rate that may be received should the government proposals be accepted, that funding rates will be less than the market rate per childcare place. It is therefore suggested that early years providers are incentivised to meet the needs of their working families through the introduction of a supplement which will enable providers to gain the highest hourly rates of funding.

The amount of money available to incentivise providers to either offer flexibility and / or 30 hours free entitlement for working parents is limited if the percentage of funding available to distribute through supplements is set at a maximum of 10% (currently 18% in Wokingham). If the government proposal is agreed at 10%, Wokingham would suggest a high proportion of this is allocated to providers who offer 30 hours free entitlement.

It is welcomed that the Government are giving consideration to the funding for disabled children through a Disability Access Fund; however we know that the number of children in Wokingham aged 0-5 years in receipt of Disability Living Allowance is very low. Children may not have been diagnosed at this early age but may still have a significant need.

Parents of children with SEND are often discouraged from working longer hours due to the financial implications for an early years provider to fund the additional support required to fully meet the needs of the child. The Early Years Inclusion Fund only partially meets the cost associated with providing 1:1 support for a child with SEND and is allocated proportionately to the number of hours the child attends. With the



introduction of 30 hours free entitlement for working parents, this level of funding would not be sufficient to meet the needs of children with SEND to attend for more than 15 hours with the same high levels of support. Consideration will therefore need to be given to how early years providers are financially supported to meet the needs of children with SEND in the future and if funding levels should be increased.

Our future plans will include further consultation with early years providers and school's forum on the content of the revised single funding formula once the Government response to this consultation has been published; however, the Government recognises that late confirmation of final funding rates may create challenges for both providers and LAs. To mitigate this, indicative hourly rates for each local authority have been published and LAs and providers are being encouraged by the Government to start discussions as soon as possible, although these figures cannot show what every early years provider will actually receive.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **SCHOOLS FORUM 21 September 2016**

### **Appendix 1**

#### **Summary of the Early Years Funding Consultation September 2016**

##### **Government Proposals**

1. Introduce Disability Access Funding
2. Expectation that providers will be better off as LA's must passport 95% of the funds; therefore savings will be picked up by LA's. Its assuming that the LA topslices to provide such services as Training support and specialist services. Therefore by including these in the base rate they are expecting LA's to introduce buy back services.
3. Introduce the Early Years National Funding Formula for 3&4 year olds for the 15 hour entitlement from April 2017; then the additional 15 from September.
4. Committed to uplift the average Early Years funding rate to an average of £4.88
5. To change both how funds are allocated to LA's and how LA's can then distribute amongst providers.
6. Inclusion of an Area Cost Adjustment to reflect variations in local costs.
7. Limit the number of supplements and cap these at 10% of the hourly funding rate.
8. Optional Growth supplement – given to those who offer 30 hours
9. Introduce a universal per child base rate.

##### **Impact Assessment**

1. New rates in force from April 2017
2. Protection up to a maximum of 10% of a LA's baseline (maximum loss = £628k)
3. 1 in 4 chance of seeing a funding reduction
4. Reduce value of supplements to a maximum of 10% of total average rate
5. Expectation of a fresh approach as to how money is distributed.
6. Transitional protection to be removed from maintained nursery schools by 2019/20
7. Disability Access Funding is an annual amount paid to a setting – ie not part of the formula funding. – this is not expected to cover all the additional costs.
8. Minimum Funding Guarantee is removed for providers as it is believed that the 95% pass through rate will make MFG unnecessary.
9. The rates given in the Annexes are based on the assumption that a change to a universal rate will be implemented immediately, also the 10% supplement cap from day 1, Maintained Nursery Schools will not have the universal base rate, they will have additional funding and protected for 2 years.

## **Challenges for Wokingham Borough**

1. WBC passports 96.6% of funding therefore difficult not to pass on any rate reductions to providers. The remainder is retained as contingency.
2. Numbers of new eligible families in September 2017 are unknown.
3. Settings cannot be compelled to offer 30 hours
4. Settings must therefore be incentivised to offer 30 hours
5. Many settings deliver additional “non-funded hours” at market rates
6. Market rates exceed funding rates
7. Majority of the 30 hour entitlement will be delivered by Private and Voluntary sector.
8. Intention is that funding levels will be determined by local costs and local markets.
9. Supplements cannot exceed 10% of overall funding rate.
10. Whilst a LA can receive a 10% reduction pa, they can only pass on a 5% reduction pa when setting their rates.
11. Disability Living Allowance does not equal SEN; a child could have a low cost high incidence special educational need which requires support but does not attract DLA.
12. Local Authorities are being encouraged to set up SEN Inclusion funds
13. Transitional protection for maintained schools for 2 years – clearly indicates a reduction in school funding
14. Cost pressures – such as National Living Wage and Pension Auto enrolment.
15. WBC does not currently passport monies from its High Needs Block to 3 and 4 year olds unless the setting requests money via the moderation panel.  
Going forward as only disabled children will be able to access funding through the formula, those with Special Educational needs will become a pressure on the centrally retained HNB.
16. Removal of quality supplement does not free up a significant sum in WBC’s formula.
17. Inclusion Fund to be set up and money drawn from either Early Years Block or High Needs Block or a combination of the two blocks. Funding would then be passed to providers as top ups on a case by case basis. ( Note – Schools Block monies cannot be used)

## **Opportunities**

1. We have until 2019/20 to be “on formula” but are encouraged to do so earlier.
2. Review current sufficiency and develop strategic direction to ensure sufficient provision available in the continually growing Borough of Wokingham.
3. Following the Cost of Childcare Review; the response to the subsequent consultation on childcare delivery model will be published in the autumn – will also set out final proposals upon the delivery model.

4. New Disability Access Fund supporting disabled children ( but not those with SEN)
5. The document frequently refers to new entrants into the childcare market – clearly anticipating a sufficiency of provision issue.
6. The DfE dropping the Quality Supplement can pave the way for its removal in the WBC formula which was not working as an incentive to providers in reality.

### **Method of Allocation to Local Authorities**

1. (Base Rate + Additional Needs) \* Area Cost Adjustment  
BR = 89.5%  
AN = FSM 8%, EAL 1.5%, DLA 1%
2. This does not mean each LA will receive the same rate, but it does mean that differences can be explained – rather than being a historical rate.
3. Same rate to be allocated for 15 hour and 30 hour provision.
4. Funding based on participation not place numbers.

### **Suggested Tasks / Analysis**

1. Calculate what 10% Supplements would look like.
2. Do we wish to review the 3.6% that we currently retain for contingency (£229k)?
3. Contingency is classified as pass through but should be kept to a minimum.
4. Consider if 89.5% the correct level of base funding
5. Explore buy back models and how we currently charge / cost for setting improvement support, training etc.
6. Optional Growth Supplement – how could this work? What proportion of funds would we allocate using this?
7. Inclusion Fund – how much? Access criteria, how would monies be allocated?
8. Impact of removing high cost supplement will impact school settings.
9. Calculate a universal rate.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SCHOOLS FORUM 21 September 2016**

**Proposed Response to the Early Years National Funding Formula Consultation**

**Appendix 2**

Questions 1 -8 – identification questions

**Early Years National Funding Formula**

<p><b>9.</b> Should there be an early years national funding formula (to distribute money from Government to each local authority)? Yes/No</p>	<p><b>Yes</b> – The current formula disadvantages our providers significantly as it does not take into account the high costs of wages and premises in Wokingham Borough. We currently receive one of the lowest hourly rates across the country.</p>
<p><b>10.</b> Should a universal base rate be included in the early years national funding formula? Yes/No</p> <p>Is 89.5% of overall funding the right amount to channel through this factor? Yes/No</p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - there needs to be a base rate that reflects the average cost of providing funded hours across the country which then has supplements added to reflect local market conditions in each area.</p> <p><b>Yes</b> – providing the additional 10.5% supplements accurately reflect costs in the local area.</p>
<p><b>11.</b> Should an additional needs factor be included in the early years national funding formula? Yes/No</p> <p>Do we propose the correct set of metrics? Yes/No</p> <p>Do we propose the correct weightings for each metric? Yes/No</p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - costs to support children with additional needs are higher per funded hour than for children without additional needs. It is therefore important that more funding is allocated to areas where there a significant number of children with additional needs.</p> <p><b>Yes</b> – they give additional funds in relation to the costs of providing for children with additional needs.</p> <p><b>No</b> 8% for free school meals is too high as eligible children could already attract EYPP. We believe it should be more evenly split between DLA and FSM and EAL.</p>

<p><b>12</b> Should the early years national funding formula include an area cost adjustment? Yes/No Should that adjustment be based on staff costs (based on the General Labour Market measure) and on nursery premises costs (based on rateable values)? Yes/No –</p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - it costs significantly more to provide care in Wokingham than other areas or the country.</p> <p><b>Yes</b> - this will give a true reflection of the main cost drivers behind providing childcare in the borough.</p>
<p><b>13</b> 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:</p>	<p>This would be the list of explanations as above for the questions regarding the metrics</p>
<p><b>14</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Strongly Agree</b> – although it does not affect us we understand the damage this could do to the market in other areas if there is a large reduction in rates paid.</p>

### Two Year Olds and DSG capping

<p><b>15</b> Should we retain the current two-year-old funding formula? Yes/No</p> <p>Should we use the additional funding secured at the spending review to uplift local authorities' allocations based upon this? Yes/No</p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - There appears to be no issue at the moment with it as it recognises the increase in cost for providing 2 year old provision.</p> <p><b>Yes</b> - Yes any uplift in funding for 2 year olds will continue to incentivise providers to provide places. As the rate to provide 3 and 4 year old places increases it is important to maintain the differential between the two rates or two year old places will be lost.</p>
<p><b>16</b> Considering the Dedicated Schools Grant, should the free entitlement be capped at 30 hours for children of eligible</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>



working parents and 15 hours for all other children? Yes/No	
---	--

### Pass Through Rate

<b>17</b> Should Government set the proportion of early years funding that must be passed on to providers? Yes/No	<b>Yes</b> – we currently do not retain any of the funding centrally
<b>18</b> 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	<b>Yes</b> – 95 % seems a reasonable central retained funding limit as this balances the cost of providing the administration and support against providing enough funding for providers
<b>19</b> If you would like to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:	Comments made above <i>Any additional responses from providers/schools forum</i>

### Distribution of Funding by Local Authorities

<b>20</b> Should local authorities be required to give the same universal hourly base rate to all childcare providers in their area? Yes/No	<b>Yes</b> - there is an injustice if different providers are given different rates for providing the same care. We currently have a level base rate so will not affect us although all maintained nursery classes automatically get high cost supplement for being teacher led. <i>The main issue here will be the lump sum paid to Ambleside as a maintained nursery school which should be supported for the next two years. Some additional funding will be available to support this but not the full amount</i>
<b>21</b> Should local authorities be able to use funding supplements? Yes/No  Should there be a cap on the proportion of funding that is channelled through supplements? Yes/No	<b>Yes</b> - LA's need to be able to incentivise the market to meet parent's needs and these differ in different LA areas.  <b>No</b> - it should be up to the LA to decide. If the cap is too low it limits the LA from offering high levels of incentive to meet parents' needs in particular areas.
<b>22</b> If you agree that there should be a cap on the proportion of funding that is channelled through supplements, should	<b>No the cap should be higher than 10%</b> We currently have 18% split over 4 supplements. If we reduce the amount

<p>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</p>	<p>of supplements available 10% may not be enough to incentivise the market.</p>
<p><b>23</b> Should the following supplements be permitted? Yes/No</p> <p>Deprivation</p> <p>Sparsity/rural areas</p> <p>Flexibility</p> <p>Efficiency</p> <p>Additional 15 hours of childcare</p>	<p><b>Yes</b> – it costs more to support a child from a deprived background</p> <p><b>Yes</b> – if needed in an area. <i>It would not be needed in our borough</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b> – this is an important factor in meeting the needs of our working families.</p> <p><b>No</b> – this would be very difficult to quantify and there is a danger that if implemented it will detrimentally affect good practice in settings who spend extra to ensure high quality.</p> <p><b>Yes</b> - this is an important factor in ensuring that the LA has enough places to meet their statutory duty. It could be linked with flexibility supplement to have a greater impact</p>
<p><b>24</b> When using funding supplements, should local authorities have discretion over the metrics they use and the amount of money channeled through each one? Yes/no to metrics and amount of money for each one.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - to all as LAs in consultation with providers are best placed know the local market conditions and what will incentivise them.</p>
<p><b>25</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Do not agree</b> - This would be very difficult to quantify and there is a danger that if implemented it will detrimentally affect good practice in settings who spend extra to ensure high quality.</p>
<p><b>26</b> 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- free text</p>	<p>This could be linked to flexibility and also be available for those doing stretched offer as long as they provide 1140 hours of funded care. Should be left to local LAs to decide for their area rather than set nationally</p>
<p><b>27</b> If you think that any additional</p>	<p>No further supplements - it should be</p>

supplements should be permitted which are not mentioned here, please set out what they are and why you believe they should be included – free text	kept as simple and transparent as possible. If the cap of 10% is implemented there would not be enough room within the 10% to have any more supplements with enough weight to create incentives for the desired outcomes
<b>28</b> Finally, for this page, if you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here: Free Text	Comments made in each question. <i>Responses gained from providers/schools forum</i>

### Funding for disabled children

<b>29</b> Should there be a Disability Access Fund to support disabled children to access their free entitlement? Yes/No	<b>Yes</b> - additional funding for disabled children will take pressure off the inclusion fund (EYIF)
<b>30</b> Should eligibility for the Disability Access Fund be for children aged 3 or 4 which are a) taking up their free entitlement and b) in receipt of Disability Living Allowance?	<b>Yes</b> – However the main issue with this is there are very low numbers of children aged 3 and 4 who claim DLA even though they may be eligible.
<b>31</b> 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?	<b>Yes</b> – it would make administration much easier and processes are already in place to ensure payment. The main issue would be timing of the payment. This may need to be looked at to ensure that payment reaches the provider as soon as the child starts
<b>32</b> If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here	Comments made above <i>Additional responses from providers/schools forum</i>

### Funding for children with Special Education Needs

<b>33</b> 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	<b>Disagree</b> – In Wokingham providers are well informed of the support on offer and the advice and encouragement to engage with parents at an early stage.
<b>34</b> Should local authorities be required to establish an inclusion fund?	<b>Strongly Agree</b> – we already have one in Wokingham and it is working well

Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree	(Early Years Inclusion Fund – EYIF)
Would an inclusion fund help improve the supply of appropriate support children receive when in an early years setting?	<b>Yes-</b> it works well at the moment however there will be pressure on the level of funding we can offer with the extension of entitlement to 30 hours.
<b>35</b> 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	None as one is in place already although there will be increased pressure on it with the new entitlement.
<b>36</b> When it comes to the SEN inclusion fund, should local authorities be responsible for deciding:  The children for which the inclusion fund is used? Yes/No  The value of the fund? Yes/No  The process of allocating the funding? Yes/	<b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  All of these are in place at the moment and there is no reason to change the flexibility of the local authority to decide based on local knowledge of need.
<b>37</b> 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	<b>Agree</b> - as the funding is being passed in kind to providers it should not be counted in the 5% retained
<b>38</b> If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here-	Comments as above <i>Additional responses from providers/schools forum</i>

### Transition to a new funding system

<b>39</b> 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	<b>Agree</b> – the full increase is taking two years and the providers need the full increase as soon as possible however the decrease in other LAs makes this understandable.
<b>40</b> To what extent do you agree with the	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b> - we do not

<p>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</p>	<p>currently retain funding centrally</p>
<p><b>41</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Agree</b> – The minimum funding guarantee will not be needed in the future if the 5% retention cap is introduced</p>
<p><b>42</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Agree</b> – this will not affect us as we already have a level base rate. There will be an effect on our Maintained Nursery School; however the lump sum they receive will be protected for 2 years</p>
<p><b>43</b> If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:</p>	<p>Comments as above <i>Additional responses from providers/schools forum</i></p>

### Equality Assessment

<p><b>44.</b> Please provide any representations and/or evidence on the impact of our proposals for the purposes of the Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010). The protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race (including ethnicity); religion or belief; sex and sexual orientation</p>	<p>There are no clear negative impacts of these proposals on equality as defined in the Equality Act 2010.</p>
---	--

This page is intentionally left blank