

Please use this copy of the consultation questions in discussion with your network, colleagues or contacts. Once you have decided the answers to the questions here, please submit them **only** via the [online survey](#).

Please do not submit responses in writing, via our mailbox, unless the online survey is not accessible to you. That's because we cannot include your yes / no responses as part of our data analysis.

An early years national funding formula

**And changes to the way the three-
and four-year-old entitlements to
childcare are funded**

Copy of the consultation questions

Page 1 – About you

Q1 – Would you like to provide your e-mail address?

Q2 – Would you like to tell us the name of your organisation?

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Q3 – We'd like to know which area of the early years sector your answers represent. Which of these categories best describes your role in the sector?

(A drop down menu of different categories of respondent)

Early years practitioner or teacher

Provider (private) – full day care

Provider (private) – sessional

Provider (voluntary) – full day care

Provider (voluntary) – sessional

Childminder

Maintained Nursery School

Children's Centre

Independent school

Primary school – maintained

Primary school – Academy

Primary school – Free School

Local Authority

Parent / Carer

National organisation or representative group

Academic, researcher or journalist

Other

If you have answered 'other' please provide more details:

Q4 – In which region do you work?

(A drop-down menu of the 9 regions of England)

North East

North West

Yorkshire and the Humber

East Midlands

West Midlands

East of England

Greater London

South East

South West

Q5 – If you are not responding as a local authority, which local authority you work in?

(A drop-down menu of all local authorities)

Q6 – If you are a childcare provider, do you consider yourself to work in a:

(Please tick as many boxes as apply to you)

chain of providers?

single setting?

rural, or sparsely populated community?

inner city area?

area of deprivation?

Q7 – If you are a childcare provider, how many children can your individual setting offer places to?

10 or fewer children

11-30

31-60

61-90

Over 91 children

Q8 – If you are a childcare provider, do you offer the free entitlement to:

three-and four-year olds?

two-year olds?

Page 2 - Early Years National Funding Formula

On this page, we ask your views on our proposals for the way money is distributed from Government to local authorities. That's the Early Years National Funding Formula and its component parts.

Q9 – Should there be an early years national funding formula (to distribute money from Government to each local authority)?

(Please see paragraphs 89-96 in the Consultation Document)

Yes

No

Unsure

10% reduction for some LA's is a significant amount; however, this should not impact on the increased rates for other LA's

Q10 – Considering a universal base rate of funding which does not vary by local area...

(Please see paragraphs 98-101 in the Consultation Document)

Should a universal base rate be included in the early years national funding formula?

Yes

No

Unsure

Is 89.5% of overall funding the right amount to channel through this factor?

Yes

No

Unsure

Clarification is needed about where the retained element will be taken from (i.e base rate or overall funding envelope)

Q11 – Considering an additional needs factor...

(Please see paragraphs 102-112 in the Consultation Document)

Should an additional needs factor be included in the early years national funding formula?

Yes

No

Unsure

Do we propose the correct set of metrics?

Yes

No

Unsure

Do we propose the correct weightings for each metric?

Yes

No

Unsure

LA's should be given flexibility to Set own metrics

Q12 – Considering an area cost adjustment...

(Please see paragraphs 113-119 in the Consultation Document)

Should the early years national funding formula include an area cost adjustment?

Yes

No

Unsure

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

Unsure

Q13 – 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:

(A text box allows you to write an answer freely)

Eligibility criteria for FSM threshold should be raised especially in London to take account of London Living Wage.

Q14 – 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%?

(Please see paragraphs 91-93 in the Consultation Document)

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Page 3 - Two technical questions

Here we take the opportunity to ask your opinion on two technical funding questions - feel free to skip these questions if they are not familiar to you.

Q15 – To implement the increased hourly rate for the two-year old free entitlement...

(Please see paragraphs 122-123 in the Consultation Document)

Should we retain the current two-year-old funding formula?

Yes

No

Unsure

Should we use the additional funding secured at the spending review to uplift local authorities' allocations based upon this?

Yes

No

Unsure

Q16 – 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?

(Please see paragraphs 124-126 in the Consultation Document)

Yes

No

Unsure

Page 4 - A high pass-through of local authority funding to providers

On this page, we can assume that money from Government has now been distributed fairly to local authorities. Here, we ask your views on the proposed high pass-through of local authority funding to childcare providers in their area.

Q17 – Should Government set the proportion of early years funding that must be passed on to providers?

(Please see paragraphs 132-140 in the Consultation Document)

Yes

No

Unsure

We would prefer to retain flexibility

Q18 – 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

Q19 – If you would like to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

(A text box allows you to write an answer freely)

We believe that LA's should be able to retain some flexibility in managing the pass through to providers and the centrally retained element should be 10%. The recent White Paper acknowledges the increased duties on LA's and this reform adds additional responsibilities that need to be funded through the retained element.

Page 5 - How money is distributed from local authorities to childcare providers

On this page, we seek your views on how money should be distributed by local authorities to all the childcare providers in their area.

Q20 – Should local authorities be required to give the same universal hourly base rate to all childcare providers in their area?

(Please see paragraphs 141-146 in the Consultation Document)

Yes

No

Unsure

Q21 – Considering funding supplements that local authorities could choose to use (above the universal base rate)...

(Please see paragraphs 150-156 in the Consultation Document)

Should local authorities be able to use funding supplements?

Yes

No

Unsure

Should there be a cap on the proportion of funding that is channelled through supplements?

Yes

No

Unsure

Q22 – If you agree that there should be cap on the proportion of funding that is channelled through supplements, should the cap be set at 10%?

(Please see paragraphs 157-158 in the Consultation Document)

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

Q23 – Should the following supplements be permitted?

(Please see paragraphs 159-182 in the Consultation Document)

Deprivation

Yes

No

Unsure

Sparsity / rural areas

Yes

No

Unsure

Flexibility

Yes

No

Unsure

Efficiency

Yes

No

Unsure

Additional 15 hours of childcare

Yes

No

Unsure

Q24 – When using funding supplements, should local authorities have discretion over the metrics they use and the amount of money channelled through each one?

Deprivation

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

Sparsity / rural areas

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

Flexibility

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

Efficiency

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

Additional 15 hours of childcare

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

Q25 – 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?

(Please see paragraphs 175-178 in the Consultation Document)

(A text box allows you to write an answer freely)

We do not agree with an efficiency supplement as we think some providers will use this to reduce ratios in settings to save money and reduce the amount of time/funding given to training and acquiring qualifications which we believe will impact on quality.

Q26 – 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?

(Please see paragraphs 179-182 in the Consultation Document)

As an early innovator we are currently working on this

Q27 – 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:

(A text box allows you to write an answer freely) **N/A**

Q28 – Finally, for this page, if you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

(A text box allows you to write an answer freely)

N/A

Page 6 - Funding for disabled children

On this page, we ask for your views on our proposed Disability Access Fund. This refers to Part 3 of the consultation document.

Q29 – Should there be a Disability Access Fund to support disabled children to access their free entitlement?

(Please see paragraphs 191-197 in the Consultation Document)

Yes No Unsure

Q30 – 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

Q31 – 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

Q32 – If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

(A text box allows you to write your answer freely)
2 year olds eligible for DLA should also be included.

Page 7 - Funding for children with special educational needs

On this page, we ask for your views on any lack of clarity when it comes to funding for children with special educational needs and we seek your opinions on a new inclusion fund. This page also refers to Part 3 of the consultation document.

Q33 – 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

We already have a funding system for children with SEND which providers are aware of. It is published on our Local Offer

Q34 – When it comes to establishing an inclusion fund...

(Please see paragraphs 198-210 in the Consultation Document)

Should local authorities be required to establish an inclusion fund?

- Strongly agree**
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Would an inclusion fund help improve the supply of appropriate support children receive when in an early years setting?

- Strongly agree**
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q35 – 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:

(A text box allows you to write an answer freely)

Clarity about where this fund comes from-e.g what part of the Early Years block –is it from the retained element or from the base rate or additional supplements?

Q36 – 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 Unsure

The value of the fund?

Yes No Unsure

The process of allocating the funding?

Yes No Unsure

Q37 – 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

Q38 If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here

(A text box allows you to write an answer freely)

Many LA's are already experiencing severe pressure on their High Needs block which have not kept pace with birth rate and increase in the complexity of children's needs. Any attempt to further reduce the High Needs block in order to supplement early years would only compound an already significant pressure. Is it proposed that the inclusion fund will be retained from the base rate allocation?

Page 8 - Transitions to a new funding system

This page seeks your views on our proposals to transition local authorities to the new funding arrangements. We intend to phase in funding changes gradually so that local authorities and the providers in their area have time to plan how to make the best use of their new levels of funding.

We propose to put in place a range of measures to minimise turbulence, help with transition and support 30 hours delivery. These complement the 10% funding floor that we are proposing in our national formulae and which will limit the overall reductions that individual local authorities may face.

Q39 – 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)?

*Please see paragraphs 213-216 in the Consultation Document.
We propose to cap local authority reductions in hourly rates to 5% in*

2017-18 and 5% 2018-19.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q40 – 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?

Please see paragraphs 217-218 in the Consultation Document. Our proposal is that, once fully implemented, 95% of early years funding allocated to local authorities will be passed directly to childcare providers. We recognise however that moving directly to 95% may be challenging for some areas. We therefore propose to transition the policy, starting at 93% in 2017-18 and moving to 95% by 2018-19.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

We believe 5% is too low for a retained element. It should be 10% and possibly over the next three years gradually reduce to 7% especially at a time when LA early years duties are increasing as acknowledged in the White Paper. A sensible level of resource is required to manage these reforms and duties.

Q41 – 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?

Please see paragraph 219 in the Consultation Document.

The high pass-through of funding from local authorities to childcare providers (proposed as 95% once implemented) would provide a firm guarantee of funding to the front line. As such, we propose it should replace the minimum funding guarantee for the early years, as it becomes unnecessary.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Local flexibility including retaining the minimum funding guarantee will help local authorities to manage any turbulence in the data underpinning the national funding formula.

Q42 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?

Please see paragraph 220 in the Consultation Document.

We recognise that, for some local authorities, moving to a universal 'per child' base rate of funding to providers will be a significant change. We therefore propose to allow local authorities until 2019-20 to implement this while encouraging them to do so sooner if possible and monitoring their progress.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q43 – If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

(A text box allows you to write an answer freely)

Page 9 - Equality Assessment

We want to carry out a thorough Equality Assessment and we have published an initial assessment alongside the consultation document. Under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Secretary of State is under a duty to have due regard to the need to:

- a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
- b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, in particular the need to:
 - remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
 - take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
 - encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, in particular the need to:
 - tackle prejudice, and
 - promote understanding.

Q44 – 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.

(A text box allows you to write your answer freely)

On the final page, a message will thank you for submitting your answers.

[Please now visit the online survey to submit your responses.](#)