

NORFOLK SCHOOLS FORUM

AGENDA

Meeting on Friday 27 January 2023 09:00 – 12:00

Venue: Room JB031 Jubilee Building Easton College

Members will be asked on the day for their permission to record the meeting to support the preparation of the minutes. The recording will be deleted once the minutes are approved.

Individual members, named below, are asked to provide verbal reports for these items.

09:00	1 Welcome and Introductions Apologies	Report	
09:05 – 09:10	2 Election of Chair/Vice Chair		
09:10 – 09:45	3 DSG Safety Valve Update and Additional 1% SB to HNB Block Transfer Vote		Decision
09:45 – 10:40	4 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)		
	a) Proposed Schools Budget including central costs (papers to follow shortly)		
	b) Pupil variations 2023-24	3-5	Decision
	c) Early Years – outcome of consultation	6-38	Recommendation
	d) Notional SEN – survey feedback	39-45	Discussion
10:40 – 11:00	COFFEE		
11:00 – 11:30	5 Minutes of Last Meeting and Matters Arising	46-55	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Catering Contract – inflationary cost and food price costs Action: Sam to clarify extra costs involved The catering contract brochure is due for publication to schools. The contract has been extended by 12 months, as allowed within original contract, through a deed of variance. This is currently being finalised. Prices reflect current costs within the sector.		

- **De-delegation**
Decision 2 – Contingencies
Action: Sam to find out when delegation of finances was removed.
Childrens services has discussed this with the Chair. The issues raised are being internally reviewed, this request will not return to Schools Forum.

Decision 7a – Growth Plan
Action: Sam to ask Isobel Horner for further information that could be shared with Forum
The Growth Plan was considered by Norfolk County Council’s Cabinet on 11th January 2023, item 9 (supplementary agenda) available here: <https://norfolkcc.cmis.uk.com/norfolkcc/CalendarofMeetings/tabid/128/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/496/Meeting/1904/Committee/169/Default.aspx>

Decision 8c, 8d and 9 – bring back in January for a decision
All included within the item 4a on the agenda

- Notional SEN – supply information to support a decision in January
Covered by agenda item 4d
- Disapplication requests for exceptional premises and amalgamation funding (for info only)
Copies of the papers agreed by Forum Members via email are attached to the end of this agenda for reference purposes

11:30 – 11:45	6 Review Membership	56-58	Information
11:45 – 12:00	7 Review Future Meeting Plan (paper to follow shortly)	59	Decision
	8 Any Other Business		
	9 <u>Date of Next Meeting</u>		
	15 March 2023 09:00 – 12:00 hours		

Schools Forum

Item No. 4b

Report title:	Planned Growth (Pupil Variations) 2023/24
Date of meeting:	27 January 2023

Executive summary

To inform Schools Forum of pupil variations requested in APT for 2023/24

Local authorities are no longer expected to request approval from the Secretary of State to increase the pupil numbers used for calculating funding for specific schools where:

- there has been, or is going to be, a reorganisation, or;
- a school has changed, or is going to change, its admission limit.

Instead, the ESFA expects local authorities to present any pupil variations to their Schools Forum to illustrate the impact to overall funding and specific schools' budgets.

The exception to this is that any request for a negative pupil variation adjustment would still require a disapplication with compelling evidence as to why it should be approved. Norfolk has not requested any negative adjustments for 2023/24.

For new schools, the regulations require that local authorities estimate the pupil numbers expected to join the school in September and fund in the Authority Proforma Tool (APT) submission accordingly. Norfolk has no new mainstream schools for 2023/24.

The information for Norfolk's pupil number variations on the initial budget shares for 2023/24 is attached. The effects on those individual schools' budgets have been estimated as the budgets for 2023/24 are still being processed but the final figures will be brought back to Schools Forum in March.

The modelling of estimated numbers has been based on a 1.5% transfer from Schools Block to High Needs Block, with +0.5% MFG protection and +2.56% cap on gains (Option 1 of the funding consultation, updated with actual data). This shows a total difference of £524,148 in pupil variations when compared to the October 2022 census based estimated school budgets.

These pupil variations are lower than the estimated £1m set aside out of the growth factor provided by DfE for the modelling of all consultation options in the autumn term due to some schools reaching the full term of their reorganisation in 2022/23.

In-year growth identified by the Admissions team continues to be funded via the in-year top-sliced growth fund for Sept '23-March '24 (Sept '23-August '24 for

academies), for which a £0.711m growth fund was agreed at the November Schools Forum meeting (plus £0.390m for the pre-opening costs of two new schools).

No action required: Information only.

2023/24 Pupil Variations based on Option 1 from consultation - 1.5% transfer, +0.5% MFG & +2.56% cap, calculated using DfE's APT with final data						
School	Reason	Oct '22 Census NOR	Budget based only on Oct '22 NOR	Estimated Pupils Sept '23	Budget using (5/12 x Oct '22 NOR + 7/12 x Sept '23 NOR)	Difference Due to Pupil Variation
			£		£	£
White House Farm	Growing school	164	806,678.80	224	950,404.14	143,725.34
Wymondham College Prep School	Growing school	233	1,038,768.61	292	1,190,374.02	151,605.42
St Clement's Hill Primary Academy	Growing school	208	1,012,773.04	268	1,159,703.97	146,930.93
Heartwood CofE Primary & Nursery	Reorganisation	176	974,126.42	206	1,056,013.16	81,886.74
		781	3,832,347	990	4,356,495	524,148

Schools Forum

Item No. 4c

Report title:	Early Years Funding Formula 2023-24
Date of meeting:	27 January 2023

Executive summary

This paper sets out confirmation of the early years funding rates that Norfolk will receive for 2023-24 as well as provides a summary of the responses received to the LA's autumn early years consultation on the 2023-24 early years funding formula. Input received from the EY Consultative Group is also included.

Proposals for the 2023-24 early years funding formula are set out in the paper and a recommendation from Schools Forum is sought.

A final decision regarding the formula will be taken by Norfolk County Council's (NCC) Cabinet on 30th January, along with other decisions regarding the DSG budget.

Schools Forum is asked to:

- **Consider feedback from the early years formula consultation;**
- **Consider input received from the EY Consultative Group;**
- **Discuss the LA's proposals for changes to the 2023-24 early years funding formula.**
- **Make a recommendation for the final 2023-24 early years formula.**

1. Introduction

Following the LA's autumn early years consultation survey, and as agreed at the November 2022 Schools Forum meeting, responses from the survey were discussed with a new EY Consultative Group for their additional input. The LA are now seeking a recommendation from Schools Forum on the final formula for 2023-24. A final decision regarding the formula will be taken by Norfolk County Council's (NCC) Cabinet on 30th January, along with other decisions regarding the DSG budget.

The DfE published indicative Early Years Block allocations in December 2022, including confirmation of increased hourly rates that Norfolk will receive in 2023-24.

The 2023-24 published rate for Norfolk's 3- and 4-year-old funding is £4.90/hr from which all provider basic hours, supplements (including Teachers' Pay Grant and Teachers' Pension Employee Contribution Grant) and central costs must be funded. The £4.90/hr includes £0.06/hr towards Teachers' Pay Grant (TPG) and Teachers' Pension Employer Contribution Grant (TPECG) which in 2022-23 were separate grants for schools, and excluding that the rate receive is £4.84/hr which is an increase of £0.23/hr compared to the 2022-23 rate of £4.61/hr.

For 2-year-old funding, Norfolk will receive £5.71/hr in 2023-24, which is an increase of £0.14/hr compared to the 2022-23 rate of £5.57/hr.

For Maintained Nursery Schools, Norfolk will receive supplementary funding of £3.80/hr to pass to the 3 nursery schools. This includes £0.53/hr towards TPG and TPECG which in 2022-23 were separate grants for schools. Excluding the TPG/TPECG for an equal comparison the rate received is £3.27/hr so there has been an increase of £0.61/hr compared to the 2022-23 rate of £2.66/hr.

The LA consulted early years providers in autumn to gather input on how the funding formula should be changed in 2023-24 to take into account any additional funding received. LA representatives met with the Early Years Consultative Group to discuss consultation feedback at the end of November. The feedback from the consultation and the EY Consultative Group is included in this paper.

The formula to be recommended to NCC's Cabinet needs to take account any changes proposed due to the increases in these hourly rates.

A recommendation is sought from Schools Forum.

2. Consultation with Early Years Providers

The LA, at the September 2022 Schools Forum meeting, announced its intention to early years providers on changes to the 2023-24 funding formula during the autumn term. The consultation survey ran from 19th October to 15th November.

Subsequently, at the November 2022 Schools Forum meeting, the LA and School Forum agreed for the LA to discuss feedback from the survey with an Early Years Consultative Group prior to bringing a report to Schools Forum in January with a proposed formula for their recommendation. The EY Consultative Group met on 30th November to give their feedback on the survey responses.

Consultation Responses

The LA received 148 complete responses to the survey, and a further 113 partial responses. Only complete responses are counted in the survey results. The results are provided below (see Appendix A for comments):

What type of early years provider are you? Please select one answer only.		
Answer Choice	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Childminder	33.8%	49
2 Childcare on domestic premises	1.4%	2
3 Private	24.8%	36
4 Voluntary	13.8%	20

5	Independent	6.2%	9
6	Academy	5.5%	8
7	Maintained	9.0%	13
8	Other (please specify):	5.5%	8
		answered	145
		skipped	3

In which district council is your provision located? Please select one only.

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Breckland	11.0%	16
2	Broadland	22.1%	32
3	Great Yarmouth	7.6%	11
4	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	16.6%	24
5	North Norfolk	10.3%	15
6	Norwich	13.8%	20
7	South Norfolk	18.6%	27
		answered	145
		skipped	3

In what role are you completing the survey? Please select one answer.

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Childcare practitioner with management responsibility	27.6%	40
2	Childminder	33.1%	48
3	Headteacher	6.9%	10
4	Committee member	2.1%	3
5	Owner	15.2%	22
6	Other (please specify):	15.2%	22
		answered	145
		skipped	3

Please rank the factors in order of importance to you as a provider for 3- and 4-year-old funding.

Answer Choice		Total Score	Overall Rank
1	Base Rate	662	1
2	Quality Supplement	384	2
3	SENIF	365	3
4	Flexibility Supplement	341	4
5	Deprivation Supplement	333	5
Please provide your rationale for your ranking to enable understanding for when decisions are being taken: See Appendix A for comments			
			<i>answered</i> 139
			<i>skipped</i> 9

Do you currently receive a deprivation supplement?

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	44.1%	63
2	No	46.9%	67
3	Do not know	9.1%	13
			<i>answered</i> 143
			<i>skipped</i> 5

Which of the following options would you prefer? Please choose one answer only.

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Maintain the current criteria.	46.3%	62
2	Remove the criteria 11-20% most deprived.	11.2%	15
3	Combine the current criteria to those living in the 0-20% most deprived parts of the county.	42.5%	57
Please provide your rationale for your preference to enable understanding for when decisions are being taken: See Appendix A for comments			
			<i>answered</i> 134
			<i>skipped</i> 14

Does your provision currently meet the Quality Supplement criteria?

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	63.2%	91

2	No	27.8%	40
3	Do not know	9.0%	13
answered			144
skipped			4

Which of the following options would you prefer? Please choose one answer only.

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Maintain the current criteria.	62.9%	88
2	Remove the supplement from the formula.	12.1%	17
3	Change the current criteria.	25.0%	35
Please provide your rationale for your preference to enable understanding for when decisions are being taken: See Appendix A for comments			
answered			140
skipped			8

Does your provision currently meet the Flexibility Supplement criteria?

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	71.3%	102
2	No	21.7%	31
3	Do not know	7.0%	10
answered			143
skipped			5

Which of the following options would you prefer? Please choose one answer only.

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Maintain the current criteria.	71.5%	98
2	Remove the supplement from the formula.	15.3%	21
3	Change the current criteria.	13.1%	18
Please provide your rationale for your preference to enable understanding for when decisions are being taken: See Appendix A for comments			
answered			137
skipped			11

Does your provision currently apply for SENIF funding?

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	47.2%	68
2	No	50.0%	72
3	Do not know	2.8%	4
<i>answered</i>			144
<i>skipped</i>			4

Which of the following options would you prefer? Please choose one answer only for each row (option).

Answer Choice		Maintain the current rate	Decrease the current rate	Increase the hourly rate	Response Total
1	£1.13: Low and Emerging - Need Average is below 3	56	7	68	131
2	£1.50: Low and Emerging Need - Average is between 3 and 4	49	4	76	129
3	£6.50: Complex and Medical Need - Average is 4 or more	67	5	60	132
Please provide your rationale for your preference in relation to 3- and 4-year-old SENIF Funding to enable understanding for when decisions are being taken: See Appendix A for comments					
<i>answered</i>					133
<i>skipped</i>					15

From April 2021, SENIF was extended to 2-year-old children. This is financed by reducing the 2-year-old base rate paid to providers. Which of the following would you prefer? Please choose one only.

Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	The continuation of top slicing the allocation to fund additional support for funded 2-year-olds with SEN.	56.3%	71
2	To enable an increase in the 2-year-old base rate consider removing the ability to apply for SEN funding (SENIF) for funded 2-year-olds which would mean each child is funded at the same rate irrelevant of need.	43.7%	55
Please provide your rationale for your preference in relation to 2-year-old SENIF Funding to enable understanding for when decisions are being taken: See Appendix A for comments			
<i>answered</i>			126
<i>skipped</i>			22

3. EY Consultative Group Feedback

The Early Years Consultative Group reviewed the consultation responses in detail and concluded there was no consensus for any significant change from the current funding formula. They agreed therefore to maintain the current optional supplements at existing rates and current level of the SEN and Inclusion Funds.

The group examined the impact of possible changes to Deprivation supplement rates and concluded it would be beneficial for the sector to maintain the existing budget but combine the two rates into a single rate.

The group met before confirmation of funding rates from the DfE but agreed that any additional funding should be used to maximise the base rate to benefit all providers equally.

4. Proposals

4.1 3- and 4-year-old Hourly Base Rate

The current hourly rate to providers is £4.08/hr.

The 3 and 4-year-old allocation for Norfolk will increase by £0.23/hr for Norfolk in 2023-24 from £4.61/hr to £4.84/hr, but in addition, a further £0.06/hr has been allocated to cover costs of the previously separately funded Teachers' Pay and Pension Grants, bringing the rate received in Early Years Block to £4.90/hr.

After allowing for supplements, TPG/TPECG, and central costs the proposed hourly base rate to providers for 2023-24 is **£4.31/hr** (an increase of £0.23/hr).

The increase in national living wage is £0.92/hr from April 2023, so for 3-and-4-year-olds, this is a minimum additional cost to providers per hour per place of £0.115/hr (1:8 ratio). The £0.23/hr proposed increase is, therefore, sufficient to cover the rising cost in wages.

4.2 3- and 4-year-old SEN Inclusion Fund (SENIF)

The local authority proposes to maintain the 3- and 4-year-old SENIF fund at the currently level of £0.850m for 2023-24 to meet demand for low and emerging need.

4.3 Supplements

Following feedback from the LA's autumn consultation with providers and from the EY Consultative Group, it is proposed that deprivation and other supplements will remain in the formula for 2023-24.

This is a change in direction from the comprehensive autumn 2020 EY funding consultation which at that time indicated a move towards removing discretionary

supplements, to reach a standard base rate for all providers, was favoured amongst responses.

The LA would like to continue to explore the pros and cons for the removal of the discretionary supplements with the EY reference group in future consultations.

4.3.1 Current supplements and rates

Quality supplement (optional within formula) of **£0.10** paid to Childminders with a level 3 qualification and settings working on a 1 to 8 basis with at least 1 member of staff with a level 6 qualification.

The DfE have allocated additional funding for Teachers' Pay and Pension Grants through the Early Years Block for 2023-24. Previously the grants were paid separately to schools. The DfE expect that the funding should be allocated through the quality supplement. The LA proposes to allocate the TPG/TPECG funding to schools only at a rate of £0.24 which will distribute approximately the same total funding for TPG/TPECG as received in the 2023-24 Early Years Block.

Flexibility supplement (optional within formula) of **£0.10** paid to providers who enable families to access at least 7.5 hours of funded early education for at least 2 days a week.

Deprivation supplement (mandatory within formula) of **£0.25** for children living in the 10% most deprived and 15p for the 11-20% most deprived parts of the county using the IDACI index.

Feedback from the EY Consultative Group suggested a preference to combine the two deprivation rates into a single rate which works out at **£0.21** using a weighted average of the data.

4.3.2 Teachers' Pay and Pension Grants (TPG/TPECG)

Teachers' Pay and Pension Grants (TPG/TPECG) were paid to school settings through separate grants paid to schools in 2022-23 as pupil numbers were included in the calculation of these grants for the whole school.

For 2023-24, the equivalent funding has been rolled into the Early Years Block and the DfE expects it to be allocated via the Quality Supplement.

Norfolk proposes to allocate the funding to schools with nursery classes only at a rate of **£0.24**, which is based upon delivering the additional funding equivalent to the 2022-23 grant across the number of estimated hours to be claimed within school settings.

This excludes Maintained Nursery Schools who will receive their share of TPG/TPECG via an additional rate of £0.53 within the Maintained Nursery Supplement.

4.4 Maintained Nursery Supplement

The combined total level of protection in 2022-23 for nursery schools is currently £365,342 made up of £268,413 for MNS from DfE and £96,929 additional protection provided by the LA from EY Block.

On the basis that the total protection continues to be reduced by 1.5% each year until it reaches the level funded by the DfE (i.e. no additional LA protection added), the new total protection required for 2023-24 would be £359,862 which would be funded by £329,966 for MNS from DfE (excluding the newly allocated TPG/TPECG element) and **£29,896** additional protection provided through the EY Block.

In addition, TPG/TPECG funding of £53,481 would be allocated, received from DfE as part of 2023-24 MNS allocation at a rate of £0.53/hr.

4.5 2-year-old Hourly Rate

The 2-year-old allocation for Norfolk will increase by £0.14/hr for Norfolk in 2023-24, from £5.57/hr to £5.71/hr.

It is proposed to pass the increase of £0.14/hr to providers, giving a new rate of **£5.64/hr** with £0.07/hr continuing to be retained for the 2-year-old SEN Inclusion Fund.

The increase in national living wage is £0.92/hr from April 2023, so for 2-year-olds, this is a minimum additional cost to providers per hour per place of £0.23/hr (1:4 ratio). The £0.14/hr funding increase from Government is, therefore, insufficient to cover the rising cost in wages, even for settings able to run at maximum ratios but the proposal for Norfolk will see the full increase passed on.

4.6 2-year-old Inclusion Fund

It is proposed to maintain the 2-year-old SEN Inclusion Fund at its current level of £0.050m in 2023-24 to meet demand for low and emerging need for 2-year-olds.

The fund is equivalent to £0.07/hr of the hourly rate received from DfE.

4.7 EY Block Contingency

It is proposed that the level of contingency remains at 0.5% (£236,648) of the Early Years Block for 2023-24, in line with the previously agreed contingency level (based upon a percentage of the Block) following consultation with providers on the Early Years formula.

5. 2023-24 EY Rates Proposal Summary

The proposed final formula for 2023-24, based upon the above recommendations is therefore:

	Current Rate 2022-23 (£/hr)	Proposed Rate 2023-24 (£/hr)
Base rate (3-to-4-year olds)	4.08	4.31
Base rate (2-year olds)	5.50	5.64
Quality supplement	0.10	0.10
Quality supplement TPG/TPECG – Schools only excluding Maintained Nursery Schools	N/A	0.24
Flexibility supplement	0.10	0.10
Deprivation supplement (10% most deprived based on IDACI)	0.25	N/A
Deprivation supplement (11-20% most deprived based on IDACI)	0.15	N/A
Deprivation supplement (20% most deprived based on IDACI)	N/A	0.21

Schools Forum is asked to:

- **Consider feedback from the early years formula consultation;**
- **Consider input received from the EY Consultative Group;**
- **Discuss the LA’s proposals for changes to the 2023-24 early years funding formula.**
- **Make a recommendation for the final 2023-24 early years formula.**

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained within this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name: John Crowley
Telephone no.: 01603 222557
Email: john.crowley@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Appendix A – Comments submitted in survey (verbatim as received)

Q. Please rank the factors in order of importance to you as a provider for 3- and 4-year-old funding.

Base Rate
Quality Supplement
SENIF
Flexibility Supplement
Deprivation Supplement

Comments received:

<p>the base rate doesn't reflect a normal hourly rate, settings are losing out for cost difference. deprivation supplement is based on locality of homes where some are on a higher income but live in this postcode so makes them eligible for EYPP</p>
<p>Base rate is too little for businesses to run on and as we aren't allowed to charge the difference this means more and more people and businesses are closing. I also don't think it's fair that people who have higher education get more we should all get the same. I have a degree and I feel people are punished when they do just as good job as someone with the education.</p>
<p>As a setting we only qualify for base rate and senior funding. Due to our current building we cannot offer more hours for flexibility funding and the highest qualification a staff member holds is level 4 so do not qualify for quality funding. No families qualify for deprivation.</p>
<p>The base rate is important as all ofsted registered providers are governed by the strict rules given - ratios qualifications etc, quality is because each employ highly qualified staff and SENIF is because we have so many more children coming to us who require lots of support in being able to access all tha5 is on Offer to them.</p>
<p>A good base rate could mean most providers will cover their running costs without the need for any of the supplements, or asking parents to cover the cost of resources, outings and consumables etc Quality and flexibility depends on staff qualifications and again needs to be enough to attract and more importantly, retain the higher qualified and experienced practitioner. SEN and deprivation are individual circumstance and location dependant, not all settings will qualify!</p>
<p>Having an increase in the base rate allows all providers to benefit from any changes. DS should be second as research clearly identifies the increase in need for children from areas of high deprivation and the base rate doesn't come close to meeting this need for additional support.</p>
<p>I work long days providing very flexible care around parent's work needs.</p>
<p>The basic rate us to low, this us where the majority of funding comes from. If I had a child with additional needs an extra person might need to be employed or additional resources acquired.</p>
<p>High deprivation and increase in SEN needs which cannot be met without financial support.</p>
<p>I only get base rate + flexibilty. This doesn't match my hourly fee !!!</p>
<p>As a lone worker base rate is considerable under my "private charge" which means I need to show more quality in my training and flexibility and working a 50 week is sometimes unfeasible.</p>
<p>Base rate is vital for the survival of early years settings, Norfolk already receives the lowest amount in the country, no where near what any provider can survive on. There is a huge SEND gap with very little external support/huge waiting lists leaving providers left to pick up the pieces.</p>

Deprivation is done on postcode, not individual circumstances and in my experience the children I have received this additional funding for are not the ones most in need.
Havent had any funded children since summer 2021 so am not up to date with the current funding conditions
The base rate is Important as it helps to provide more of an even keel for settings working in different areas
I don't get deprivation part or have never claimed senif
As a school Nursery in an academy chain we do not have to provide a qualified teacher in our Nursery. However we do. Despite this we never benefit from the quality supplement. We do not benefit from the flexibility supplement as we stick broadly to school hours. A higher base rate benefits our setting the most. I have a lot of experience of how hard it is to offer quality provision to those children with SEN without additional funding and therefore rate it highly.
I worked hard for my qualifications so feel this needs to be paid more for. And for being willing to be flexible to the parents needs. Deprivation payment-I don't feel this extra payments changes the way someone cares for the children.
Base rate determines how many children we can afford to take on as a setting Quality, all/most settings invest (re-invest_ heavily in staff training and differentiate their mission based on staff involved Deprivation as we know, high levels prove for more challenging sessions, which require different/more creative interventions and supports, resources are usually replenished more frequently SENIF, many settings require, but the training should be in place to cope with this Flexibility, times are hard, settings are struggling with staff recruitment and retention, some are only able to offer reduced hours, they shouldn't be punished for this through less monies.
Flexibility and quality are paramount in early years education in order for parents to work. I have rated the base rate as my top ranking as without a decent base rate to build on there is no incentive to offer funding.
The base rate is the highest amount of income of our setting and we are also eligible for flexibility supplement so these two make up the bulk and most reliable part of our income. SENIF and deprivation payments are intermittent and cannot be relied on when forecasting future income and making plans. Not eligible for quality supplement.
I don't think having a level 3,4,5 should affect your money, you can be a good quality provider without these
We always seem to have a high number of sen And the rest following of importance
Base rate is not enough to cover running costs at the moment, this HAS to be increased otherwise MORE settings will close as it is not affordable to remain open! All settings should employ highly trained staff so recompense for this needs to be rewarded. All settings have to be more flexible with hours to ensure working parents can access the childcare hours they need. Aren't ALL areas in Norfolk now providing for children from deprived families????
Don't feel qualification level is best indicator of quality provision at all.
Simply because we are not in an area classed as deprived at present
I only provide early education and childcare for children with complex SEND. In order to do this highly skilled, highly qualified, intensive, paperwork-heavy, very important and sometimes stressful work, I feel that I need to be paid a reasonable rate. Especially when I am only able to look after 2 children at a time, due to their high needs.
We very rarely receive any deprivation supplement, therefore this one is least important to us
Base rate is most important as this gives an idea of our income from funding based on our intake and waiting list. We have seen an increase in the number of children who require additional support through SENIF.

I believe that with a higher base rate initially would be a great help to many providers as not everyone is in a deprived area etc to gain those extra few pence an hour.

At both are settings, staff (supported by charity finances) have invested heavily in personal training, to ensure that the quality of teaching and learning is high at our settings. It would be unfair, for settings that make little investment in staff training, and offer lower standards of quality childcare, able to achieve the same hourly rates, as settings that have made such efforts to raise the standards in their settings. Furthermore, there would be little motivation for business owners/managers to support/, fund and encourage their staff to self develop, if the funding was the same across the board.

Settings that offer a flexible service to families, often find themselves out of pocket at points in the week, running sessions or times, during the sessions that are less profitable but much needed for families. We rely on the additional monies paid with the flexible supplement, to enable us to continue to offer a flexible service to our families. Settings that go above and beyond to support families should be recognised through the flexible supplement.

I think it's unfair for a childminder to get a special rate if a child lives in a certain area. We all do the same job and provide the same thing for any child in our care. It would be wrong to spend more on a child that comes from a deprived area! Just because they live in that area does not mean that are deprived!! The base rate should be more so all children benefit

The base rate, SENIF and deprivation supplement is obviously very important as this ensures we have enough money to remain viable and offer the best possible care for all individual children's needs. Flexibility is important too as sometimes there is five weeks between payments, which at times is really stretching the funds. In our setting the Quality Supplement does not apply.

Childminders are more flexible than most nurseries offering longer hours and care during the holidays

I have rated the SENIF highly because we have such a high number of children coming through with SEN and needing extra interventions and support.

I have rated Quality less highly because although we currently receive this, it is difficult to recruit staff of this level. We do however have lots of talented and experienced Level 3s

The base rate is most important to us followed by the Quality and Flexibility supplement

All need to be sustainable, inline with inflation otherwise the setting will be forced to close.

Base to be increased to support provisions overall with the rising costs.

Families equally will feel the strain of rising costs.

It is highly important for settings to provide SEN children with the best support which can be done through funding.

most of our children do not qualify for any additional funds. The current base rate does not cover our costs and we lose money on every grant session

As childminders the rate base rate paid is usually lower than our hourly chargeable rate.

A the number of children with SEND is increasing it is important this is reflected in funding for those settings who offer an inclusive provision. Equally the area of deprivation will have high levels of SEND even if they are low levels of speech and language delay. The base rate obviously is the foundation of all income. Flexibility is important to all parents but most providers will offer this to remain sustainable. Emphasis is placed on qualifications and therefore expected Quality, this is not always reflected in practice and in my opinion some staff who are lower qualified have excellent practice. and quality are important but

As a setting we would like to see a higher base rate/SENDIF per child. Currently the SENDIF rate doesn't provide enough financial support to enable us to effectively assist the children with their individual needs.

The rural area we are based in means we have very few children who are entitled to the deprivation supplement.

We have a highly qualified staff team so the quality supplement is very important to us. The extra amount per child is often the difference between us being sustainable or having to do extra fundraising.

As we know the funding rate is below costs, it is simply not affordable to have a funding rate that does not rise inline with other inflationary costs such as minimum wage rises (In Essence we just cannot keep absorbing the loses on base rates) inclusive of supplements settings are still barely meeting costs so the base rate is of the utmost importance.

Quality we must acknowledge the recruitment crisis here, We cannot attract workers on the low pay we are able to offer, those that are passionate about progressing and establishing early years as a career have no incentive to stay in the field. In order for us to push for a better qualified and skilled workforce which is needed in this crucial stage of children's development we really must place value on practitioners being of high quality. (I see this as the second biggest threat to the sector, the lack of good quality staff has huge impacts)

SENIF- Children with SEN undoubtedly need extra support this requires out of ratio time, resources and training therefore funding for this is vital

Deprivation supplement- As a setting in an area of deprivation this does have a place and is incredibly useful however often the affects of deprivation are seen through speech and language delays which can be claimed through SENIF. That being said we also see unfortunately a link between deprivation and support for FSP, CIN and CP so again this needs time and resources to support families (Its hard to rank this at number 4 because it is important but you need an answer so i have tried to be as logical as I can be)

Flexibility supplement- to providers this is of the least importance, I understand for the council you need funded hours to be offered in a flexible manner to parents however from a provider prospective parents will access what works and suits for thier families. I do acknowledge that their may be concerns on providers offering funding in an inflexible and supportive way (Which I believe is wrong) however I feel some of this could possibly be addressed through the provider agreement or alternatively if the provider is offering it in such an inflexible and unrealistic way to parents you could do this as a 'penalty' on the base rate. I understand there would be complications here but a suggestion of sorts.

- 1 is a solid income
- 2 in a recognised area of deprivation and children with a variety of SEN Needs
- 3with a need for longer hours
- 4 secures extra income
- 5 struggle to attract higher qualifications due to costs

Base rate should be the same for all providers. Not all practitioners hold a childcare qualification so for those that have this should be acknowledged.

In the area which we cover we do not qualify for quality or flexibility supplement and majority of our funding is made up of the base rate

Base rate most important to our school - followed by SEN to allow inclusion within our setting

In our setting we rarely apply for the last three supplements,

The base rate is important to us as it's our largest source of income and deprivation is low in our area meaning we are unable to get much additional funding for our Nursery. We still have to adhere to the ratios with our staffing regardless of the types of children we have in our setting therefore outgoing costs are high as a maintained Nursery School. We also have additional costs that private settings do not have e.g. headteacher, teacher on site etc. Having said this it does ensure that we offer high quality education for our children. We do have several children with special needs each

year that require additional support when they attend. We offer places to children with profound complex needs who are unable access early education in most other settings.

1. Base Rate - is universal availability to all
2. SENIF - is very important to help fund needs of SEN
3. Deprivation - not relevant in our are, but important
4. Flexibility - not relevant to us, but useful for parents
5. Quality - least useful

It is the only way to drive up standards for the children by paying the staff more to improve their knowledge

Quality and Flexibility not relevant to us.

most of our children are base rate only we need this figure to be our priority for income figures

2 and 3 are things that we, as a nursery, put in place to better serve our children and parents. 4 is essential to have some weighting so those children can get targeted support in the form of specific resources.

However 5 we often find that those children have no additional needs to their peers. I appreciate this is not always the case, and perhaps the area where we operate, but this is certainly our finding.

It is important that children who have additional needs or who come from deprived/vulnerable families receive additional funds to allow additional support

The more money per hour per child benefits all children and that's where the most mney needs to be

All providers are entitled to a fair base rate with those in a deprived area receiving more to cover additional needs. Quality supplement is unfair to be given to a level 6 as I feel those practitioners with level 3 and several years practical experience are as good and sometimes better but penalised by the system.

We are eligible for the first three, and these make up the majority of our 3-4 year old income. We are now experiencing higher than ever levels of SEN with many needing an additional member of staff for support. The SENIF does not cover the cost but helps.

Base Rate to enable continuing funding. Deprivation as we are located within a deprived area a high proportion of our children qualify for the funding across both weightings (77% at present). SENIF, just under 50% of our children have additional needs.

Base rate is the most important to me to ensure that I am getting a fair rate followed by the quality supplement to encourage childcare practitioners to gain qualifications.

Senif was next to help practitioners provide for children with additional needs.

The base rate affects every setting, this is the most financially impactful aspect of the funding. Quality and flexibility penalises settings that are unable to offer extended hours or those that have high quality staff that choose or are unable to undertake additional qualifications

base rate is important to us as this is what we get for our children. In mu area, which is more affluent, deprivation isn't a big issue. good qulaity provision should be rewarded.

I

The current base rate is low so by increasing this and then adding the supplements the rate will be higher. For those unable to achieve the flexibility supplement or quality supplement then the base rate is such that it is a worthwhile rate.

Base rate is important to me as that's the main income for me. Senif and derivation will both require additional support. People who put the effort in to gain higher qualifications should then be able to earn more.

We support several children who are living in deprived areas and children with SEND who need higher support than the typical child within a provision. Many of the children have disabilities and/or complex health needs that require a higher staffing ratio.

The majority of our nursery places are funded on base rate with no other considerations, so that is our most important factor

We don't have 3-5
SENIF is important to us as a setting as we have a lot of speech issues since covid. We are also in a deprived area
Quality is low on the list as I do not feel this is important. We do not have many children on deprivation supplement so have placed this lower on the list. Flexibility is important to us as it increases the base rate final figure for funded children in our care.
we provide childcare in a very deprived area with lots of SEND children who need additional support to reach their full potential
Base rate is because it is for all children and quality is important as it quality of teaching.
due to high numbers of children registered and enquiries for funding entitlement the current hourly rate is detrimental to business. our fee paying parents are subsidising the short fall but as numbers of funded children increase we have less fee paying parents and this is causing a financial issue that cannot continue.
due to rising numbers of SEN children requiring higher intervention the rate for this is placed as 2nd - we need this funding to provide additional staff but they will also fall within base rate category - a rise in SENIF is important due to additional staffing wage rises
I have placed quality supplement lower as all staff have qualifications and staff work towards gaining higher, but retention is harder due to low wages overall - quality supplement is a bonus but not a necessity if increases can be applied elsewhere
Base rate is the largest proportion; we want to provide quality staff to support the children and we want to be as flexible as we can to support our parents.
To ensure we offer all children the best start and opportunities in life
The base rate impacts more children and families and is therefore a greater proportion of our income. We invest in well-qualified staff so the Quality supplement is important and we offer long hours across the week.
The needs of our children are significant and this has the most impact on our sustainability. The current funding does not cover the cost associated with the level of need.
Base rate must increase then reward for quality and flexibility then the other options
Quality to support quality provision over and above Flexible to support the loss providing extended hours for working parents SENIF reduce ratio to provide quality care to children who need it most Deprivation I don't feel this is required as you can claim additional funding through SENIF
As a school Nursery, we have greater need for base rate and SENIF. The majority of our income is through funded children and so the base rate is important to us.
1 - most important 5- Least important. The base rate is very important as this is the main focus on the funding of all children. SENIF funding is also important as this additional money means we can by additional resources to support our children to continue to develop and prevent and further development gap. Deprivation money we use to support those children who may not be able to access specific resources we can use this money to support these children. It is important to ensure that staff are working with the children are qualified and safe to do so. I don't think we offer flexibility supplement
1- if the base rate 3-4 years stays as it is how can providers to stay open, if overhead costs continue to increase! 2/3 Its a case of allowing providers receive the flexibility and quality supplements or add the to the base rate as I think everyone now strives to meet the criteria where and when they can. 4-/5 both as equally important as 2-3 for any child/provison whom requires extra financial support .
The base rate is fundamental to trying to run a sustainable business. Deprivation is based on postcode, you are assuming families in these area require extra funding which is not true of all families. Perhaps a similar calculation to the EYPP award would be a much more realistic approach.

1. Base rate needs to cover all fixed costs, wages, building rent and utilities, sufficient equipment and resources, statutory training, insurance etc.
2. Quality supplement supports both structural and process quality by recognising higher level training and qualifications and promotes early years education as being of high and equal value to education of other age groups. Our manager is a degree holder and our setting supports students up to degree level.
3. Our Preschool continues to provide support for children with additional needs including speech and language and ASD and complex health needs.
4. Early Years is about education but also about childcare and parents and families need support to access and maintain work, including wrap around care.
5. Preschool is not in an area of deprivation.

Q. Which of the following options would you prefer?

Maintain the current criteria.

Remove the criteria 11-20% most deprived.

Combine the current criteria to those living in the 0-20% most deprived parts of the county.

Comments received:

with so many families financially struggling we are "fixing that gap" more.

Those in most need should get the highest supplement.

It is vital that where a child needs extra support funding is available to provide it
 ie more staff needed, different resources needed etc

As long as this change increases the 10% funding level. The current rate doesn't come close to recognising the increased level of need in the areas of high deprivation.

I'm happy with the current criteria

Cost of living is getting higher and more people will be living in poverty soon if not already. Our bills are going up, but I don't feel it is right to increase the hourly rate I charge at this difficult time.

Relatively recent changes to the criteria for deprivation have raised some postcodes to higher categories. However, the deprivation levels have not changed and are still a barrier.

I do not really

Understand the question

Unfortunately postcode is not a reliable factor in determining actual deprivation since the sale of social housing to private buyers and I don't agree with any of the current criteria but forced to choose.

Think it would be fairer

Deprived areas require additional funding to help close the attainment gap

I don't get this part of the payment

We receive a very small amount of deprivation supplement. However, I think it is important to offer the best provision for the children who need us the most i.e. children from areas of deprivation.

I don't like the deprivation payment. It's just a bonus for the childcarer-the children gain no benefit as the childminder would not treat them differently

we work (rurally) next door to a deprived boundary, therefore we get lots of interest in the 2 year funded children but not the deprivation supplement

Unsure

I am assuming it will be easier to manage if all one rate. It seems a strange supplement. I have parents who live in brand new houses that they are buying that are eligible and parents who are struggling in small rural pockets of social housing but because there are also lots of wealthy older people living in same postcode our children don't qualify.

Everyone should receive the same level of education

We are in a deprived area and this money can really help enhance there environment

This setting is in a very rural village, with many one parent families and families out of work however our postcode does not allow parents a deprivation payment. However, we do have one child that lives 15 miles away that travels to us and we do have the payment for this child. His parents both work and have a comfortable income - This does NOT MAKE SENSE!!!

As we are an independent school this isnt really relevant

Settings working in the most deprived areas have extra work to do to help the children catch up and to support their families. They deserve a higher rate of pay.

These would be fully funded children and they should be covered under our universal offer to ensure all children make progress

We are not directly based in a deprived area however we do have families where deprivation is apparent. Widening the area and the requirements to will help to identify this. Not every deprived family lives in a deprived postcode area.

this would enable a fairer rate for all who live in a deprived area

The current system is not appropriate in our area and does not reflect the needs of our community. We are always aware that their are many families living under financial hardship in our local area. However, as they have not been identified through the current system (because their postcode is not recognised) the children/ setting does not get the much needed financial support and recognition needed.

I think it is important that all children living in a deprived area are supported regardless of the percentage.

Don't effect me, so leave as it is

I have no real views on this as we don't receive it

We currently do not see a need to change this.

To ensure the ones the just miss the percentage are still covered.

The current criteria is not fair as it is given to all parents living in a certain post code. Some of these parents do not need any financial help whereas others, who are in need are living in a post code that does not qualify

It is a researched fact that young children who live in an area of deprivation are more at risk of developmental delay. It also demonstrates if a child attends a early years provision it can improve later life chances providing it is of high quality. With the experiences many young children have recently had being born just before the pandemic or during this increases the chances of delay for those who live in areas of identified deprivation.

We feel the funding should be directed to where it is most needed.

This would cover more children in the deprived parts of the county.

Over half of our children receive deprivation supplement, there is a link between this and extra time and resources needed to support these families. I think the deprivation supplements are really important and key and i feel the current criteria is correct however unfortunately it is just that the rates are still to low to truly cover what has to go into supporting these childrens and families. Deprivation supplements would be less key if other services which have been stripped back such as Health visitors, children centres etc could support the families without the setting needing to take the lead here.

Our electricity bill has gone up by over £500 per month minimum wage will again increase significantly in April. In areas of deprivation where the majority of children are funded it means

settings have zero control

Over managing their costs v income because this is dictated to us by the rate provided. There is absolutely no way many settings will survive the coming year on the current funding rate and this is going to hit those in areas of deprivation the hardest. The deprivation supplement whilst not a lot is definitely something that need to be considered carefully.

To ensure a level playing field

Make for the simpler to understand who will qualify for the supplement

Covers all deprived areas and treated the same

We would prefer to maintain the current criteria as we understand the challenges that other settings face regarding children that come from a deprived area and the need for additional funding for that. The base rate continues to need to reflect the cost to fund early education in a maintained Nursery School.

So it is an even amount to all deprived areas

The most money goes to the most disadvantaged

it seems a fair system at the minute

The deprivation payment scheme works well as it is

The demographic of postcodes is changing, particularly with the cost of living issues faced at present. Not all families in 0-10% face deprivation and some families in 11-20% have more deprivation than 0-10%.

Things are tight at the present time for all families and those families within the current 11-20% are probably now in the same position as the families were who were in the 10% this time last year.

Payments for deprived areas should be fair

A higher percentage of our children fall into the 10% weighting therefore maintaining the the current criteria option would be more beneficial to the school to support the children.

Parents choose our setting because it is within their budget to do so regardless of their postcode

I think it should be equal for the 20% as there may not be a lot of difference between someone in the 9% area and the 11% area.

The current system seems to work. we want those families and children to continue to be identified.

more fair

Children are either in a deprived area or they are not hence wanting to combine

children in the 10% often need more support than children in the 11-20%

it simplifies it

a number of families fall within the above criteria - broadening this to combined will offer a fairer calculation

would be simpler to understand for everyone

To ensure this is available to a wider group

The deprivation in our community is escalating as such the deprivation funding is not indicative of need.

If a child needs additional support you can claim through SENIF

Postcode is just assuming!

It is easier to have one rate.

I feel that if children are in the top 20% then they should all receive the same amount per hour, as they are all in a deprived area. This allows more to be provided to support these children.

We have had children in receipt of this funding and staff have questioned why? During home visits, sharing of photos, consultations, families share with Key Practitioner. This has reflected healthy living conditions e.g. holidays, new cars etc whilst the lower 0-10% were always seen to be struggling e.g. cleanliness, books, clothes, food, nappies etc The rate should increase for them or their should be further insights into the 11-20% family backgrounds.

A deprivation payment should be based on each families circumstances the same as EYPP & 2 year funding. Postcode allocation is a blanket approach and misses families in need in other postcode areas which are looked on positively rather than negatively.

Even in our area where we don't meet eligibility according to IDACI ,we still have families who we support-warm coats, new cooker, signposting/debt management, using donations or general fundraising.

We individualise EYPP often using to support the child's learning and development opportunities outside preschool when a family's income is low. Proposal if no extra cost- combine current criteria.

Q. Which of the following options would you prefer? (Quality supplement)

Maintain the current criteria.

Remove the supplement from the formula.

Change the current criteria.

Comments received:

drop the criteria to level 5, more staff are able to qualify at this level and provide a high standard of care

settings should see financial benefit of having good quality staffing.

Change this to level 4 or above or completely remove it. This supplement, I feel, tells staff that their qualification means nothing unless they're level 6 or above. Level 3 and 4 work just as hard as level 6.

We employ a EYPP and yet struggle to pay her worth she could easily work in a school environment and get paid £9.00 more per hour. We were all encouraged to do degrees and yet funding is so poor we could actually work in an unqualified profession and get paid more,

I think a Childminder qualified to level 6 or above should recieve an additional supplement

As a maintained setting we do not receive this funding. Which is not fair funding. If the LA can demonstrate this supplement has increased the quality of provision it should stay, if there is no evidence it has impacted on the quality of provisions it should be removed and the money used to increase the base rate.

I have a degree, QTS and post-grad. Very happy that i provide excellent quality in my childcare.

Some practitioners spend lot of money to get better qualified to support the children and families we look after. This deserves to be recognised.

We should all be supporting high quality childcare/provision.

I have a city and guilds in childcare, this is not recognised, so therefore I dont get the extra

Quality childcare should be recognised

I would like to see settings with a qualified teacher receive this supplement as well. If not, I would vote for removing it.

Those that have studied and have a deeper understanding should receive a higher payment.

Quality YES we all want to be better and this is a great incentive

Remove flexibility

Our highest qualification of staff is Level 5 which use to be the criteria to receive the supplement.

ALL setting should have highly qualified team members (When I did my EY degree it was going to become necessary that all settings had this qualification!)

Does not equate to quality. Whole criteria is too subjective. Would make more sense to go with Ofsted grades if you are doing this - which would also be a bad idea.

I work hard and I am committed to developing my professional knowledge and skills, in order to provide a better service for children and their families. I would like to be rewarded for this, above settings who choose to provide the basics.

Employing staff with a level 3 is hard enough let alone anyone with a level 6. We would not be in a position to employ a level 6 practitioner let alone be able to pay them.

Our level 3 staff are highly qualified and provide excellent care. We have also noticed level 2 practitioners are put off going for their level 3 because of the conditions of training(online) and requirements. We feel this supplement is wasted as not many settings have Level 6 practitioners and this money could be used to support settings in other ways.

As a charity over the years we have invested heavily, both financially and professionally through personal/ setting development. To enable us to raise the standard of Early Years education for our children and their families. It is only right that we should receive this supplement. This money is used to ensure that staff can be paid (as much as is possible considering we work in a notoriously poorly paid industry) an hourly rate that reflects the level of commitment that they have trained too, and subsequently the efforts they have gone too, to raise the standard of quality education for the children attending the setting.

Removing the quality supplement would a) demotivate owners/managers of settings and practitioners to setting and self development. Encouraging a 'why should I bother' mindset which will in turn, inevitably lower the standards of Early Years education over time. We need to be continuing to invest our commitment across the county to raising standards b) It is grossly unfair to create a level playing field by removing this supplement.

I think the criteria should include practitioners who have gone on to complete an Early Years Foundation Degree (Level 5)

I think it's too difficult to recruit at Level 6 and many of our current Level 3 are very experienced and talented. They provide excellent quality which is not recognised by the supplement

Early Years staff should have their qualification acknowledged, inline with school teacher status, to help maintain their roles.

With the current level of funding and rising costs settings can not afford to pay staff to train for a higher qualification and staff do not earn enough to pay themselves. Even if they are qualified, level 6 or above, settings can not afford to pay them any more than staff who have a level 3, There is no incentive to work hard and train for a higher qualification.

In my professional opinion this is the least important supplement. Early Years providers should aspire to have highly qualified staff to benefit the childrens learning not just for additional supplements

As a setting we can not afford to lose 10p per funded hour per child, If this was to be reduced or removed then the base rate will need to be increased.

This encourages a more highly qualified workforce.

We have a recruitment crisis on our hands, we are losing staff to either schools or supermarkets for less pressure and more pay.

We MUST do something to attract higher quality staff and be able to pay them. Again this supplement whilst not wanting be rude but just honest doesn't help much but it's still something. As a sector we have to do better. Our children deserve better. The standard of staff coming out of college with level threes are incredibly poor.

It only applies to one staff member and therefore we need to value those settings placing priority on training staff rather than a token staff member to get the funding.

Regardless of how high your qualification common sense tells you the more staff to child ratio benefits the children especially coming out of Covid times and in areas of deprivation one teacher to one practitioner cannot deal with a group of children who all have their own unique needs

Getting the Quality supplement acknowledges the qualification as not all practitioners hold a childcare qualification

I'm level 4 trained but the qualification is not recognised in quality supplement
Increase Base rate for all settings
I think the difference between a level 3 and a level 5 is huge. And not many childcare settings have a level 6 in situ. Not is there an incentive on the pay scale to complete the level 6. So the criteria for Quality Supplement should be level 5 and above.
If our quality supplement comes through our maintained Nursery grant then we would need to continue to receive the grant in order to run a sustainable Nursery. We have highly educated staff that work within our Nursery which helps us to provide outstanding early education.
Does not affect our setting, but if 48% use it, they must need it
again its a far figure
This is a supplement based on our decision to staff for this with extra resources, so seems fair.
The money used for this could be used more efficiently in other areas.
The arguement that it enables a higher wage to be paid to higher qaulified staff isn't reflected in the value of the supplement as it isn't enough to pay the wage that those staff can earn in the school sector. The more money on the front line for every child will benefit more children
A level 3 qualified person with several years of practical experience is a capable as level 6 and sometimes better qualified/experienced
It shows recognition for those who support their staff with CPD and believe in having a team of highly skilled and qualified practitioners.
To enable the funding to be used in other areas to support the children,
There are many settings offering high quality provision with practitioners ONLY with a L3 qualification. They are being discriminated against because they've chosen not/unable to study a degree qualification yet still offering high quality care. The base rate is the most important part of the funding to contribute to settings maintaining a sustainable business
I don't think that children attending settings with qualified teacher status practitioners necessarily get a better experience. There tend to be less practitioners and some are not specifically EY trained. If they are maintained settings, they sometimes have to work to school criteria rather than EY.
Those who have gained additional qualifications should be able to earn more.
Level 4,5,6
This currently works for our setting.
In nursery lower the criteria from a level 6 to level 3, why should this be different to a childminder
It shouldn't matter what higher qualification you have with regard to looking after children so should not be supplemented
All qualified staff, even level 2 should be recognised, not just level 3 and above
so we meet the criteria.
We wish to maintain high quality, experienced staff and retain the staff we have, not have to downgrade roles or devalue staff
I am level 5 qualified but this is not recognised at present.
To be able to ensure children are receiving an experience they can learn from and thrive
It is an incentive to invest in better staff qualifications which ultimately benefits the children.
It would be more logical to associate this with the ofsted rating/quality of the setting as a whole or perhaps looking at the percentage of staff at Level 3 or above.
Reward the practitioners that have a level 3 or above
Quality control from LA to ensure children are receiving quality care
Our setting maintains quality of provision as rated by Ofsted despite not having enhanced staff qualifications at level 6
We increased the ratio in one of our rooms, which is led by qualified teachers, however we do not receive any quality funding. The Head of the Nursery is a qualified Teacher, who is also the Early Years Lead and Assistant Head but we still do not receive any quality funding.

I feel that the currently system worked well. I think it encourages setting to ensure they are meeting the correct criteria to be able to receive additional money per hour.

We have been so lucky to receive the extra funding for this criteria. If it were to be removed then the extra supplement cost shouldbe added to the base rate.

It allows us to employ higher qualified staff to ensure we are able to consistently provide outstanding Early Years education.

1. Staffing ratios and group sizes affect the quality of provision. Our preschool can have up to 12 children mixed age range 2-4 yrs comfortably in the room.
2. Having Level 6 promotes a professional well qualified service equivalent to other educational provision. Attracts higher level workforce or would if pay was higher.
3. Retains staff, promotes ethos of ambition.

3. Higher qualifications support quality.

Q. Which of the following options would you prefer? (Flexibility supplement)

Maintain the current criteria.

Remove the supplement from the formula.

Change the current criteria.

Comments received:

This supplement penalises settings that cannot open for 7.5 hours a day.

Any setting offering at least 9am till 5pm or any variation of that will get the supplement, It may encourage or support longer opening hours and better flexibility/choice to parents.

There are a number of setting that due to restrictions on premises and cost for additional staffing required to offer flexible hours are unable to access this funding. Remove and add the base rate.

I would rather that the flexibility supplement was added on to the base rate for all 2-4 year olds

I work for longer hours than many nurseries and offer parents care around the hours they need to do their jobs.

We work long unsociable hours and this should be recognised

The LA should be promoting support for working parents and encouraging providers to offer this where feasible.

It appears to work as is

We are unable to benefit form this. However, I don't have strong feelings on it.

Those willing to stay open longer hours and being flexible so it helps parents should receive extra money

We are able to claim flexibility supplement at the moment as our numbers just allow us to do this. As a small rural setting our numbers fluctuate quite a bit so we often have 2 adults in with 2 children for an hour so it's a case of how long we can sustain this offset against how much we are gaining from that increase over our total number of funded hours.

Currently working families are entitled to claim 30 hours funded. Why do settings have to be open 37.5 to be able to access the extra 'flexibility' funding? It would make more sense to have this awarded at 30 hours of opening.

Seems unfair on those that cannot do this

currently you have to be open 2 days for 7 hours, that doesn't seem very flexible for parents

I work long hours to meet the needs of families and I appreciate being compensated for this, over and above what school based settings provide.

Add more on to the base rate for everyone

We work hard at both settings, to ensure we offer quality flexible childcare, to support our working and non working families. Often, by opening later into the day or opening earlier in the morning than other settings. The costs to our setting in staff wages are higher as a result, and many of the hours we are open at either end of the day are less profitable, and run at a loss. It is only right and fair that settings who go above and beyond to support families with flexible childcare, should be better financially supported. Than settings that choose the simple profitable route of 9am-3pm to help offset the loss of income.

A lot of nurseries and preschools put restrictions on when people can use the funding - they charge for lunch times and the start and end of the day. Flexibility should also be based on providers willing to provide funding for a whole day!

Childminders more flexible

We don't currently claim this but we have recently extended our hours to include breakfast and teatime clubs so we are interested in looking in to it

Maintain the criteria but this requires an increase in hourly rate.

We pride ourselves in continuity of care, all our staff work full time and every child is looked after by the same Key Person whenever they attend. This is very important. To offer flexible hours would result in staff working on a rota and this would not fit our ethos of the child first and secure nurturing relationships.

I don't think it is necessary, just increase the base rate.

I'm not sure how to change the criteria but fundamentally we should be supporting working parents

Would seem a fairer system for those settings who are unable to open for longer periods to receive the money allocated for this supplement within their base rate.

We are unable to reach the flexibility supplement as we run in a community village hall and are restricted in the hours and days we can open.

I think I would rather see this money be used towards qualification levels. I feel parents have choices and can choose a setting that meets their needs and this doesn't need to form part of the criteria. I understand some settings will

Try to 'play the system' here but I think educating parents on how they can access funding will Give them an indication of the best provider for them. I know some of the bigger chains apply their funding in really unfair ways to parents however if parents were educated on how they can claim they would consider their providers more possibly.

Equally

Some providers hands may be tied and can only operate certain hours because of building constraints etc and shouldn't be penalised for this.

It still does not help some of our working parents who need a much longer day, we know of a single parent whose shift starts at 6am in the morning till 6pm 3 days a week

Due to being in a rented village hall we can not operate longer hours so unable to claim this supplement

Increase Base rate for all settings

As a Nursery school and daycare setting which we provide extended care from 8am until 5pm and we are finding that more and more families are looking for extended hours and a more flexible way to use their funding which fits in with their work. The flexibility supplement helps us in providing such provision for our families which we would be unable to offer without it. There are very little settings in our area that offer extended, flexible hours.

Hourly rate should be universal

again for system

This is a supplement based on our decision to staff for this with extra resources, so seems fair.

it is important to allow parents to have flexibility when they are looking for childcare

Settings that can open for longer will be doing so already as it's financially viable to do so to offer parents the flexibility they need. Settings that can't open longer are penalised. The more money on the front line benefits every child.
It is offered but parents do not need to access it. Most daynurseries have opening times to meet this criteria
To enable the funding to be used in other areas to support the children,
Settings that are unable to offer longer days because it is not viable are being penalised and unable to access this additional rate
Difficult to verify opening hours and although may offer longer hours, they may not be taken.
This works very well for the families who attend our setting.
We are a school based provider, the max hours we can offer are 6.75 per day so this supplement is out of our grasp
we choose to only offer funded hours during the school day 9-3 due to losing so much off the hourly rate we charge to what we receive from funding hours
N/A
Having a supplement for opening longer during the session to give parents flexibility in care is important, a supplement to benefit this helps with maintaining our preschool
the hours need to be longer, as a normal working day is longer than 7.5 hours
yes because we do receive it.
we have a high number of working families who rely on the flexibility of using 7.5 and above hours per day - the flexibility supplement helps towards our financial sustainability to offer this
To be able to provide very flexible cover for our working parents in the current climate
To give parents more flexibility which suits their childcare needs
Enables us to be flexible across the week.
Increase the flexibility part
Provide only if a separate session is offered.
We do not meet the flexibility criteria and therefore would be happy with the removal, if it increased our base rate.
It is important to be able to offer as much as possible to support parents. I feel the current criteria works well.
See above
It supports us to open 8 - 6 pm, Monday to Friday to support working families
Parents and families need childcare that is flexible and responsive to working parents extended and wrap around care needs.

Q. Which of the following options would you prefer?

Answer Choice		Maintain the current rate	Decrease the current rate	Increase the hourly rate
1	£1.13: Low and Emerging - Need Average is below 3	56	7	68
2	£1.50: Low and Emerging Need - Average is between 3 and 4	49	4	76
3	£6.50: Complex and Medical Need - Average is 4 or more	67	5	60

Comments received:

to enable staff to employ dedicated staff the cost will need to be met

The needs of the children are paramount and the SENIF funding is appallingly low to help support these children. Some children need consistent adult support and £1.50 per hour is appalling to support these children

Many children have complex needs within our setting, they join us in sept and yet we are expected to fund them until the panel meets in Oct and decide how much money we are awarded to support the children. We have no early years support teacher who visits and advises us and yet we are expected to be health visitors, speech therapists and occupational therapists within our normal everyday duties at nursery. We are also never given any help towards staff costs for meetings, paperwork, telephone calls.

Supplements need to better reflect the additional staffing and resources that a SEN child may need. Settings need to have enough finances to attract and retain the specialist practitioners needed for this important role

The SEND rate for a child who is waiting for an EHCP, for us, is on average £100 per term, this is so low it offers almost no impact on the actual costs of providing the specialist provision these children require.

As a maintained setting we have enrolled a number of children with additional needs who have been asked to leave their PVI provision. If this money is redirected and added to the base rate the settings who support children with additional needs will be additionally penalised, while the settings who do not provide places for children with additional needs will see an increase in their base rate. To reduce the number of children who are moving into reception with additional needs the LA has to invest in early years.

I haven't had experience of this area.

To allow someone to be employed on 1 - 1 basis.

For pupils with complex needs a higher adult ratio is required and the current rate does not facilitate this.

The hourly fee would nowhere near cover the cost of a SEN child. As a childminder I can't afford to take them on because they need more time which means you'd have to have far less children

Having

Not been ever in reception if this I feel

I can not answer this fairly

Providing support for children with SEND, additional resources, time for additional paperwork and meetings is costly. Children with SEND are already being failed through huge waiting lists for support and lack of provision willing to help it needs to be funded properly.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to manage children with SEN within the setting. More financial support would allow settings to fund staffing to increase ratio of staff

I have never had the funding so can't really comment but it seems very complicated!

I find this hard to comment on or decide on! I think the two lower bands are very low payments, not allowing for much alteration to provision. Overall I think the payments should be on a sliding scale but maybe not quite so heavily weighted towards the top payment. A more even spread perhaps?

I don't know about this

Not aware of the above. We have lots of children awaiting for EHCPs but none are currently awarded EYPP.

We have applied for SENIF over past few years. The Low and Emerging Need has been used for training and resources. It is better than nothing but it isn't a great deal of money so am happy for that to remain the same if the complex and medical needs could be increased to go further towards the cost of employing staff. It only covers 2/3 of hourly NMW. This means that settings are having to subsidise the cost of supporting children with complex needs, often without the much-needed support of other professionals.

If a child has any level of SEN they will need that additional person to help them. All people offering this extra support need the same wage, so payments need to be more similar.

Seems a sensible and proportionate way of doing it. Need in this area is growing if anything so I would ideally increase the amounts, but that would then have to come from elsewhere.

The amount of funding based on complex needs does not equate to a one to one childcare practitioner who earns even minimum wages.

Because it's way too low, for instance if you need to enhance ratio or provide equipment, this rate of funding does not cover this

Most low and emerging needs of 3 and below can be met with good practice and capable staff. Children with needs of between 3 and 4, need more interventions, 1:1 and small group support, which means more staff. Children with complex and medical needs require 1:1 support and time spent on paperwork, family support and meetings. When £6.50 is added to a meagre Base rate, it does not equate to a single wage.

Children in band 3&4 need extra help, but without enough funding they do not get as much help as they need. If a group of 4 children in band 3&4 needed help, we would only receive £6 on the current rate and this is not enough to fund an extra member of staff for an hour.

We have so many children at present with low and emerging needs. With no baby groups, health visitor groups, speech and language, drop in centres, toddler groups etc we are getting children who have never been seen before in any setting, never met a health visitor, no 2 year checks completed before they come to us. All of this is contributing to the amount of support these children need on joining our setting. The current SEND funding we receive does not cover the time spent in helping and supporting these children and their families.

I think extra is needed for below 3 year olds as many two year olds come in needing more support

We only make a claim, if the needs of a child are so great that in order to support the child to attend the setting we a) require an additional staff member to work with the child, to enable them to make suitable progress and or to help keep them (and/or the other children) safe from harm and b) we do not have the funds in our bank account to cover the cost.

It is vital for children and families with SEND (and only fair and reasonable) that there is additional funding made available to support these children should it be required, to enable them to access quality childcare alongside their peers.

Early years providers are usually the ones who deal with the emerging needs and push to get the help the child needs. We initially deal with more of these type of children. So should be paid more to acknowledge this.

It is important that the rates coincide with increases relating the resources required to care for the children and practitioners wages who are caring for the children.

Don't claim so haven't a clue

Even with SENIF we are finding it difficult to meet the needs of the increasing number of children with SEN needs. We need enhanced staff ratios but the funding is not enough to cover them which means we have to use our own reserves which is not sustainable.

The rates need to increase inline with inflation, and to recognise the work and training that staff do to enable the funding for each child.

Increase average of 3 or below slightly to reflect that there are still needs to be supported which would benefit from slightly more funding.

The current rate does not provide the finances required to employ a member of staff to look after the child. Some have severe emotional/behavioural problems, others have medical needs which require constant monitoring and checks, which a key person with 7 other children in their care cannot safely provide.

This lower level of need is in my experience nearly always around delay in speech and language development. This level of need should be supported within the provision by qualified staff and training opportunities. If consideration is being given to the quality supplement perhaps these should be considered in unison, one or the other

For children who fall into the 3 and above, often need staff working with them for the majority of their time at the setting, often on a 1-1 basis. This will take a member of staff away from the other children who are still requiring the care and attention from that member as they are within staff ratio.

We do not have any children with SEN and I do not know enough about the rates paid i.e. if they are enough. But any increase would benefit children with SEN.

To be frank it shouldn't come from the same pot. SEN response in Norfolk are poor across the board. We fail SEN children and this is part of the reason.

I cannot emphasise this point enough it should absolutely not be a providers responsibility to deliver a sen place at their own cost. This is a cost that should be solely placed on the government as it is there responsibility to provide Ada quote and suitable SEN places for children. A struggling private setting should not have to operate at a loss to provide a SEN place for a child. We are not a school Or a LA we are businesses and as such that burden is not our responsibility to bear. We absolutely should willingly provide places and do all that we can to accommodate for children but we cannot be expected to run at a loss for this that is an absolutely run and unfair expectation

To put on a private business and I do not believe any other business are placed in such a position. Because of this you see children turned away and then it is a few providers that end up beating the brunt because we do so with our hearts not our minds then you end up

With several

Children and an unsustainable business. It's wholly wrong for everyone involved.

Where one to one is required this should be covered fully.

I have said maintain current rate for the others because again you are asking us to choose between a rock and a hard place. I don't feel this is a fair question to place on providers ultimately you need to change the system you can't take from one pot and add to another this just shifts the problems it doesn't solve it.

Really all the rates need to go up across the board.

I'm sure you're aware of all of this but this survey is ultimately like being asked if we would rather die by drowning or by fire.....

We appreciate budgets are tight

What we receive at present does not cover minimum wage to support children with SEN

If children with SEN are to be given the opportunity to attend mainstream nursery/childminder provision, the setting must be properly funded to allow adequate supervision and support.

Some children with a lower emerging need sometimes requires more resources to help them to thrive.

For the low emerging needs some additional support can be provided through normal ratios however for those that have complex needs that do not have an EHCP is place yet often require 1:1 support

I would not want other areas of unding to loose funding and it is a reasonable amount

the money received for the lower bands in inadequate for providing provision

the rates could do with being higher to help with teachers and equipment needed for the child. everything gone up massively in price

Not applicable to us at present so unfair to comment.

Complex needs require more support and therefore would need additional funding.

Children under 3 already receive a better hourly rate so this enhancement in rate helps meet their needs. The pool of children for this is relatively small.

The needs of children is increasing and the interventions needed require more staff time out of ratio.

A higher rate for low and emerging 3/4 year olds will help meet this out of ratio staff cost.

Those with complex and medical needs, require the most staff intervention - typically 1:1 (even though we can't call it that) and this enhancement plus the base rate is only enough to meet the staff hourly cost. There is no spare for non contact time, report writing, meetings etc.

Resources to help children development are more and more expensive to buy, every child has a different need, so a different resource is need for each child, plus the one to one time needed for SEN children, decrease the possible attendance, and earning are lower. Not ideal for the times we are all going through.

The need for SENIF is increasing year on year, nurseries are struggling to accommodate SEND child and are losing money, as there is no funding for 2year olds whose parents pay for the child to attend, but the child may have severe needs, which takes up a member of staff. The whole county needs more SEND nurseries to help levitate the strain on mainstream nurseries.

To be able to provide the targeted support that is essential for children with SEN to make good progress we quite often need to enhance our ratios. There is also the cost of specific resources, additional staff time required for writing support plans, meetings with parents, creating visual aids etc. With wage increases these costs are higher than ever.

The current system works well, don't change it.

If you have a child that attends 6 hours a week and qualifies for the £1.13 rate - realistically what is a setting able to do with £6.78 a week or even £27.12 for 4 weeks. How much of an impact will that have on the child? As with most things it is the business that has to suck up the cost/time/staffing and provide additional measures and support for the children in our care. The time it takes in reality to observe/gather evidence/complete an application is financially more costly to the business in staff hours than providing the support for the child without applying for the funding.

There is a need for Sen support within early years settings. By raising the rate it will allow for more children to be supported to achieve their potential.

I don't have any SEN places so hard to know if that's enough or not.

Rates to low to support children needing extra staff. rates do not cover extra wages

We are a setting that prioritise places for children with a very high SEND levels. The majority of the children require an increase in staffing support to maintain their health, safety and provide them with the opportunities to attend an early education setting that can support their complex needs.

The two low and emerging needs need to be brought in line with one another as provision for these children is quite similar

so much needs to be provided to help this children and their development. lack of finances shouldn't stop this from happening

Due to speech being an issue in the current cohorts and speech being left for Early years to be responsible for we need extra funding to allow for these interventions

Children on higher level support often require adult support for a large majority of the day. The payment received helps but does not reflect the hourly rate paid to staff members for this care. As a charity run preschool we have to do lots of fundraising to make up the shortfall. Children on level 3/4 can often require a majority of time to care for them and help with their needs throughout the session and should be brought up in line with level 4/5 in my opinion

costs have risen, so the funding does not cover the amount of cost needed to give the child extra support

2 year old needs SENIF to support them with difficult children to give parents a relief.

post pandemic we are experiencing a higher number of children with additional needs, these may be fairly high initially and decrease as support is in place and development improves / and or needs are more complex ongoing. this impacts all areas within each room and additional staffing is required longer term to ensure consistency in supporting higher interventions - again this comes down to the financial impact on sustainability

We did have a child with complex needs who needed full time support but the supplement does not meet the cost of having an extra member of staff so needs to be increased

None of the current rates reflect the true cost to the provider

The current level of funding does not cover anywhere near the costs of supporting children.

The children banded 3-4 require additional support which is not covered in the funding.

Average below 3 - the SEN need is lower, so we are able to manage with the staff we have.

Average between 3 & 4 - Our experience shows that these children's needs are more complex and we have a greater financial need, i.e more staff

Average is 4 or more - more financial demand, perhaps 1 to 1 needed, currently the hourly rate combined with the base rate will cover this expense.

When supporting children it is important to be able to provide resources and support to parents for the child as well as supporting the child in the setting. We feel working with the parents well will promote to positive partnership and supporting the development of the child. If the money was increased more could be provided for the child which would hopefully prevent their development gap from increasing.

Sometimes we also find parents are unsure how to support their child, so this money would also be used to support them.

Rows 1-2 - Any child who has low and emerging needs at the starting point of their early years journey, I think the rate should match for both rows, as the support required can be more or less dependent on the child not their age rate. Row 3 - No change due to the struggles children face and the support required to look after their care and educational needs.

The time taken to apply for £1.13/£1.15 per hour cancels out the extra amount for a staff to work with a child!!

Unless there is an increase in overall funding from Gov into the DSG then it is better to maintain the existing rate for consistency and sustainability.

The banding and application is easily understood and works.

Q. From April 2021, SENIF was extended to 2-year-old children. This is financed by reducing the 2-year-old base rate paid to providers. Which of the following would you prefer?

The continuation of top slicing the allocation to fund additional support for funded 2-year-olds with SEN.

To enable an increase in the 2-year-old base rate consider removing the ability to apply for SEN funding (SENIF) for funded 2-year-olds which would mean each child is funded at the same rate irrelevant of need.

Comments received:

More and more 2 year olds are coming through with additional needs, why should they be penalised by not allowing us to claim funding to support their needs.

There is a lot of work/staff/time involved when providing care for a child with additional needs and yet any money received just helps towards the wages if the time a member of staff is spent with a child.

The funds should be allocated appropriate to each child's needs

This goes a small way in acknowledging that these children require a significant amount of additional support.

Again, i have no experience with this, but feel it is only fair to give extra support to those who need it.

Very few 2 year olds are identified that young.

Increased funding would enable EY provision to plan more effectively and meet needs quicker.

I dont agree with 2 year funding, it should not be given to parents who are not working!
I currently recieve SENIF for a 2 year old and it has been invaluable, allowing higher staff ratios and replacing favourite resources which have become damaged. I would not have been able to continue supporting this particular child without the additional support.
Sen funding should not be restricted by age
We do not have 2 year olds in our setting.
Again, unaware
The system appears too complex and should be clearer for settins
We have been able to apply for SENIF for funded 2-year olds which has meant we were able to support children with very low levels of communication and getting them onto the SALT waiting list much earlier.
When a child begins preschool at age 2 they are not entitled to increased funding immediately. We have to welcome them in to the setting, assess and work with them for a period of time before we can begin the process of gathering evidence of their needs. Meaning they are potentially 3 before a claim can be made. So a higher base rate would enable better use of money from the offset.
Being able to apply for SENIF for 2 year olds is really important in meeting children's sometimes very high needs. Without this funding, families would not be able to access vital early education and childcare for their children with SEND.
Ratios are lower for 2 year olds and therefore there is more posibility for small group work
All children aged 2 should have access to 2 year funding at the same rate. Children aged 2 with SEND, generally speaking, are able (with varying degrees of support from the setting) to access and benefit from Early Years education aged two with the universal provision. This 2nd year in the child's preschool life, enables staff to fully understand the child's learning and development needs, whilst focussing on nurture and PSE development. As the child progresses aged 3-4 the learning gaps become grater and more significant, and the child's need can be better identified, the child is physically more mobile and active, and this is then, the time to ensure that if additional funding is required to support the child to access their Early Years entitlement, funds are available.
This is a difficult question to answer as it important for both reasons,
We rely on SENIF for 2 year olds with a high level of need
An overall increase will enable settings to better support the 2-year-olds
As this age group have 1 key Person for 4 children, the funding does not cover the cost.
If the base rate was increased this would offer internal opportunity within providers to use the money accordingly. Consideration needs to be given to whether there is a genuine developmental delay or just 2 year old behaviour, perhaps requesting evidence from professionals to clarify actual delay.
As a setting we currently feel that the 2 year funding rate is fair, It is vital to continue to provide SENIF for 2 years as without this some children in this age bracket will not be able to access settings.
Often Two year old children need extra support with or without SEN but those with extra need will need extra funding.
Again I can't answer this option. Neither is acceptable. Norfolk need to reassess how SEN childrens needs are met. The burden should not be placed on providers to finance SEN places.
All of these things add to a sector already on its knees you are asking us to provide places we cannot afford with no support.
In our position we have our fair share of SEN pupils we manage our budget to accommodate needs of all children

We have found we have to absorb much of the initial early stage costs of supporting children with SEN, or with possible SEN which would be better channelled into the basic rate, particularly for two year olds.

We would prefer a higher base rate for our 2 year olds as this would enable additional support to be put in place within normal ratios and then as needs are identified SENIF funding could be applied for when they are 3.

A higher 2-year-old rate would benefit more settings and allows time to assess if a child is in need of SENIF or needs progression through natural development

consistency of funding

most two year olds wont be assessed for SENif till nearly three or over anyway as their needs havnt shown much at age 2

not all children need the additional funding. additional support should be allocated based on need

For those children who need additional support, not having a pool of funding to use could exclude them from accessing their hours

If a two years old is developing at normal rate, there is no need of extra more complex recourses .

Neither of those options are ideal

The current system works well, don't change it.

The base rate is the most impactful to businesses being able to remain viable for parents to access us

Additional funding would benefit for more severe sen cases.

We support several children aged 2 that present with signs of a disability however these children are not diagnosed with a disability until later on in their education however they still require a high level of support before their official diagnosis. If support is enabled at the earliest point, we are able to start the child off on the best foundations for their learning.

We do not take 2 year olds so this has no effect on us

its fair

This was a good addition to the funding and don't see why it needs to change.

all children regardless of age should be able to be offered SEN funding

Wasting money on children that do not need it

A number of 2yrs do not meet criteria for SENIF but do require additional support - even if only through first term, a higher number of 2-3 yrs have behaviours which require additional support - therefore an equal rate across this age band would enable all needs to be met within receipt of higher base rate

neither choices are fair to settings; two years olds with needs may need the same support as a 3 or 4 year old with SEN needs. Settings may refuse to take SEN children if no funding??

Enabling SENIF 2 years old to have the additional support they need

those with complex needs require further support - which costs money.

Base rate should rise regardless with the current cost of living, SENIF should be an additional support cost, especially as children's development has taken a hit due to covid-19 and various cutbacks across the industry resulting in early years staff dealing with the developmental footfall.

The level of need is high for all 2 year olds- our 2 year old room is a smaller space with lower numbers of children which means that in most cases SEND needs can be met- it would be necessary to continue to have access to exceptional needs funding to enable inclusion for children with complex need irrespective of funding.

Every child has a different need.

I would also like to be able to claim funding for 'paying' children who are banded 4 and above

Historically and currently, our experience shows that the 2 year old children who have SEN needs are not 2 year funded.

If a child has a recognised need for SEND then I feel they should be able to apply for the additional funding because the sooner support and intervention can begin the development gap should stop growing

The base rate £5.50 for 2 year olds is hugely better than the base rate for 3-4 year olds. Our current private rate £5.35 for 2 year olds. We do support parents who need to go to work whilst competing with local providers but our rate does not meet overhead costs. Top slicing supports both the provision and a child with SEN.

2 year funded children and their families require a lot of both managers and practitioners time. A lot of the families have issues that have not been dealt with appropriately before they arrive at our door. We spend a lot of time building the families trust and work with them to ensure better outcomes for both them and their child, this equates to more than the hourly rate before education even starts!!

Our practitioners identify additional needs in 2 year olds and some extra funding has enabled us to provide appropriate levels of support.

Schools Forum

Item No. 4d

Report title:	Notional SEN
Date of meeting:	27 January 2023

Executive summary

The DfE have issued new operational guidance and LA's are expected to take account of this and actively review the size of their notional SEN allocations for the 2023-24 financial year.

A paper setting out the context for this, nationally and locally, was discussed at the November Schools Forum meeting and it was agreed to carry gather information from schools via a survey to gauge the way that Notional SEN funding is allocated within individual schools. This approach was proposed as Norfolk's percentage allocation is relatively low within the range nationally set out in the guidance. Our intention was to use the survey results to inform our approach for FY 2023/24 and beyond.

Schools Forum are asked to:

- Review the responses received to the LA's notional SEN survey;
- Provide a view on direction of travel for the notional SEN calculation within schools' budget shares, i.e. whether we should move to a higher rate to be closer to the national average range
- Note the requirement for the LA, within the context of the DfE Safety Valve programme, to actively align to national guidance which supports further our reduction on in year spend within the High Needs Block
- Note the LA view that, given the low response rate to the survey and activity already planned for the coming financial year with schools as part of Local 1st Inclusion (including DfE Safety Valve), we could retain current Notional SEN rate for FY 2023/24 with a view to increase incrementally over the next 3 years, starting FY 2024/25.

1. Context

The DfE have issued operational guidance on notional SEN values for the first time, for the financial year 2023-24. LAs are now expected to review the size of their notional SEN allocations following engagement with schools and Schools Forum.

The DfE have provided national data on notional SEN, with 78% of authorities allocating between 5% and 15% of their Schools Block funding as notional SEN. In Norfolk, this percentage is approximately 7% currently. Across all authorities, the average is 11.3% which is a significant difference.

Therefore, there is a need to review whether Norfolk’s notional SEN budget should be brought into line with the national average. An engagement survey was issued in November for mainstream schools to gather information on current use of notional SEN budgets.

2. Notional SEN formula

The DfE expect the calculation of the notional SEN budget to include¹:

- a small part of the basic entitlement funding;
- a larger part of deprivation funding, reflecting the higher prevalence of lower-level SEN amongst disadvantaged pupils, and
- the majority or whole of the low prior attainment factor funding, as this is the best proxy we currently have for pupils with low-cost, high-incidence SEN

Other elements of the funding formula may also be used.

3. Norfolk’s Current Notional SEN Budget

Norfolk’s current notional SEN budget is £38.4m, representing just under 7% of Schools Block funding within the funding formula.

Norfolk uses basic entitlement funding, IDACI deprivation data, low prior attainment and part of schools’ lump sums to calculate notional SEN funding.

The table below summaries Norfolk’s 2022-23 notional SEN budget:

Factor	Total Value of Notional SEN 2022-23
Total BPPE	£6,956,139
Primary IDACI	£5,416,738
Secondary IDACI	£5,618,191
Primary LPA	£8,881,823
Secondary LPA	£8,477,347
Total Lump Sum	£3,065,186
Total Notional SEN 2022/23	£38,415,425
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula	£559,594,607
Notional SEN as a % of SB funding	6.86%

¹ Para 13, [The notional SEN budget for mainstream schools: operational guidance - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/101421/SEN_budget_guidance.pdf)

The proportion of factors currently used to calculate notional SEN in Norfolk are as follows:

Factor	Factor Unit Values	Notional SEN within factor	% of factor relating to Notional SEN
BPPE (Primary)	£3,217.00	£64.60	2.01%
BPPE (KS3)	£4,536.00	£64.60	1.42%
BPPE (KS4)	£5,112.00	£64.60	1.26%
IDACI Pri band F	£220.00	£212.18	96.45%
IDACI Pri band E	£270.00	£254.62	94.30%
IDACI Pri band D	£420.00	£277.34	66.03%
IDACI Pri band C	£460.00	£277.34	60.29%
IDACI Pri band B	£490.00	£277.34	56.60%
IDACI Pri band A	£640.00	£277.34	43.33%
IDACI Sec band F	£320.00	£307.66	96.14%
IDACI Sec band E	£425.00	£413.75	97.35%
IDACI Sec band D	£595.00	£423.42	71.16%
IDACI Sec band C	£650.00	£423.42	65.14%
IDACI Sec band B	£700.00	£423.42	60.49%
IDACI Sec band A	£890.00	£423.42	47.58%
Primary LPA	£1,130.00	£512.12	45.32%
Secondary LPA	£1,710.00	£774.97	45.32%
Pri Lump Sum	£121,300.00	£7,617.26	6.28%
Sec Lump Sum	£121,300.00	£7,617.26	6.28%

Based on what is allowed to be included within the notional SEN the Norfolk formula meets requirements. However, compared to the DfE's expected methodology Norfolk's use of Low Prior Attainment (LPA) factor funding is low at 45.32%, and the proportions of other factors should also be reviewed.

4. Engagement Survey

The LA carried out a engagement survey of mainstream schools from 25th November to 16th December to inform discussion at Schools Forum in January 2023. The purpose of the consultation survey was to raise awareness of the difference between Norfolk's level of notional SEN funding and the national average, to gain insights into schools' current use of notional SEN funding and to align any changes with the implementation of the 'Safety Valve' programme of work within our new SEND improvement programme, Local 1st Inclusion.

5. Survey Responses

The LA received 10 complete responses from mainstream schools, and 31 partial responses.

One of the complete responses was from a Multi Academy Trust, therefore the 10 complete responses represented a total of 12 primary schools/academies and 1 secondary academy, and an overall total of 3,807 pupils.

The 31 partial responses provided no useable information.

The responses received from the 10 completed responses were as follows (Q1-4 were for school/trust information for analysis of responses only):

Q5. What is the % of your budget allocated as Notional SEND within your budget share?

Responses: All responses received stated between 2.5% and 7.5%.

Q6. Please calculate and provide the current % spend within your existing budget that would fit within the definition of Notional SEND (used to make provision for children and young people with SEND as part of the setting's local offer including those with high needs, therefore supporting the first £6k of an individual's provision)

OR

**If your school has submitted a costed provision map through the INDES / IPSEF to the Inclusion and SEND Team, you can choose to provide your school name rather than resubmit this information?
(We will only use the school name to extract the information we hold and will not use it in the analysis of the data return)**

Responses based on current % spend: The answers submitted were 8.1%, 9.8% and 11.9% for the 3 schools that provided this. One school also stated 'see notional spend submitted' but no information was found to have been submitted except in Q5 to which their answer was 5.5%.

Responses based on school name: 6 schools submitted their names (4 at one trust) and the costed provision maps worked out to 4.7%, 10.1%, 10.1%, 11.9%, 14.2% and 22.5%.

A further 3 schools did not answer this question.

Q7. Please indicate the recent direction of travel within your school's budget over the last 5 years for spend that would fit within the definition of Notional SEND:

- **Increasing %**
- **Decreasing %**
- **Stable percentage**

Responses:

Increasing % - 8 responses including a MAT and therefore 11 schools were represented.

Decreasing % chosen by 1 school.

Stable % chosen by 1 school.

Q8. Should Norfolk adopt the DfE recommended approach (below) to the identification of notional SEND budget per school, even if the overall amount for Norfolk does not change?

- **A small part of the basic entitlement funding;**
- **A larger part of deprivation funding, reflecting the higher prevalence of lower-level SEN amongst disadvantaged pupils, and**
- **The majority or whole of the low prior attainment factor funding, as the best proxy for pupils with low-cost, high-incidence SEN**

Yes or No. Please state the rationale for your response.

Responses:

'Yes' from 9 schools.

'No' from the MAT representing 4 schools.

Appendix A provides the transcript of comments stating rationale for answers to question 8.

Q9. If you have anything else you would like to add about any of the proposed changes to the Notional SEND Formula 2023-24, please provide comments in the box below.

Appendix A provides a transcript of additional comments submitted by schools/trusts.

6. Conclusion/Recommendation

Although there was only a limited number of responses to the survey, all responses that provided information on current notional SEN spend were higher than the LA currently allocates through the local formula.

The schools that responded indicated that they receive between 2.5% and 7.5% of their budget as notional SEN but spend between 4.7% and 22.5%.

80% of responses (for 85% of schools represented) indicated that the level of spend on notional SEN has increased over the last five years.

90% of responses (for 69% of schools represented) agreed that Norfolk should adopt the DfE recommended approach to the identification of notional SEND budget per school, even if the overall amount for Norfolk does not change.

Within the report to November Schools Forum we set out the following important note regarding Notional SEN funding:

Whilst it is true that a change in the ratio of Schools Block funding assigned for notional SEN funding does not change any individual schools' budget allocation, it will have implications for our work regarding 'top up' funding and access to other LA SEND services. The LA needs to ensure that requests for additional support are considered in the context of how schools use their delegated funding, and we need to determine if the Norfolk wide rate of 7% notional SEN is reflected at individual school level in terms of spend.

Schools Forum are asked to:

- Review the responses received to the LA's notional SEN survey;
- Provide a view on direction of travel for the notional SEN calculation within schools' budget shares, i.e. whether we should move to a higher rate to be closer to the national average range
- Note the requirement for the LA, within the context of the DfE Safety Valve programme, to actively align to national guidance which supports further our reduction on in year spend within the High Needs Block
- Note the LA view that, given the low response rate to the survey and activity already planned for the coming financial year with schools as part of Local 1st Inclusion (including DfE Safety Valve), we could retain current Notional SEN rate for FY 2023/24 with a view to increase incrementally over the next 3 years, starting FY2024/25.

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained within this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name: Michael Bateman
Telephone no.: 01603 307572
Email: michael.bateman@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Appendix A – Notional SEN Survey, comments for questions 8/9

Comments verbatim as submitted through the survey, including if there appear to be errors in understanding of the factual data provided.

Q8, in favour of DfE recommended approach (answered 'Yes'):

“Schools should be provided with funding to cover the level of need they have and shouldn't have to prove that they are spending £6000 per child in order to apply for top up funding (element 3) in order to cover the basics that should be covered by element 2”

“It takes into account location and deprivation.”

“Regarding point 2 above, this would support meeting the needs in school.”

“We are seeing an increase in children who are both SEND and disadvantaged, and it is hard to raise attainment for this group of children.”

“We are overspending on our SEND Notional each year. We have numerous interventions that we need to put in place but decisions are being made due to costs rather than need and this is not acceptable.”

Q8, against DfE recommended approach (answered 'No'):

“School budgets are already stretched. Whilst we would welcome additional funding for SEND, moving existing money within the schools budgets would have a detrimental impact on non-SEND pupils”

Q9, any additional comments:

“Expecting schools to spend the first £6000 is unreasonable when you only send us £11866 in notional send for the entire school.”

“Notional £6k does not tie in with actual identified SEND within the school so even if the formula changes the level of SEND will not.”

“Whilst I appreciate there must be a notional formula, it is hugely beneficial to have the opportunity to discuss the school context with an advisor from County.”

“We are concerned that the impact of increasing the % of gap allocated to notional SEN combined with the 1.5% delegated to the high needs block would have a significant impact on the provision that schools would be able to provide as their core, universal offer to all pupils. We believe that SEND needs to be appropriately funded by central government rather than a redistribution of an already overstretched budget.”

Norfolk Schools Forum

Minutes of Meeting held on Wednesday 16 November 2022 at Easton College
09:00 – 12:30 hours

Present:

Lisa Barton (sub)
Steven Dewing (Sub)
Lacey Douglass
Mike Grimble, Avenue Junior School
Glyn Hambling, Unity Education Trust
David Hicks
Adrian Lincoln (sub)
Howard Nelson, Diocese of Norwich
Peter Pazitka, SJB CMAT
Joanne Philpott, City of Norwich School
Sarah Porter, The Heart Education Trust
Rachel Quick, The Wherry School
Sarah Shirras, St Williams Primary
Joanna Tuttle, Aylsham High School
Martin White, (Chair) Nebula Federation
Rebecca Wicks, The Clare School
Vicky Warnes
Martin Brock
Marilyn Edgeley
Dawn Filtness
Sam Fletcher

Jo-anne Lamb

Apologies:

Adrian Ball, Diocese of Ely Multi Academy
Michael Bateman

John Crowley

Martin Colbourne, City College
Bob Groome
Carol Jacques
Clare Jones, Boudica Schools Trust
Nicki Rider
Chris Snudden

David Shaw, Creative Education Trust
Sara Tough

Representing

16 – 19 Representative
Academies
Early Years Representative
Primary Maintained Governors
Alternative Provision
Academies
National Education Union
Diocesan Board of Education
Academies
Academies
Academies
Special School Academy
Primary Maintained Schools
Secondary Maintained Schools
Primary Maintained Governors
Maintained Special Schools
National Education Union
Accountant (Schools, SEND & EY)
Admin Officer
Finance Business Partner
Interim Assistant Director,
Education Strategy &
Infrastructure
Senior Advisor – Early Years
Learning

Academies
Assistant Director, SEND Strategic
Improvement & Early Effectiveness
Assistant Director, Learning &
Achievement
16 – 19 Representative
National Education Union
Maintained Nursery School
Academies
Head of High Needs SEND
Director of Learning &
Inclusion
Academies
Executive Director Childrens
Services

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair highlighted that this was the last meeting before Chris Snudden retires. He wished to thank her for her support for schools and the schools Forum.

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising

An error was noted on page 4 of the minutes and agreed to be correct: 20225/26 replaced by 2025/26.

The minutes were agreed as a true record.

Appointment of Vice Chair

It was noted that Sarah Porter, as notified to Members via email, had withdrawn her nomination for vice-chair for personal reasons since the last meeting and, therefore, Glyn Hambling had accepted appointment to the role.

School Catering Contract

Officers had sought both legal and procurement advice – timing not ideal, down to staffing.

No need to procure however with volatile markets and considering costs it was thought not appropriate to enter another 3-year contract at this stage, and so Officers pursued an extension to the current contract for one year with inflationary increases only. Norse have agreed an extension and the cost will be an inflationary cost. This is a NCC Member's decision which will be undertaken asap. NCC have written to schools this week. Schools can contact James Stanford with any concerns. Officers confirmed costs will be made clear once the NCC Member decision has been concluded.

Safety Valve Executive Board

The Chair of Schools Forum made the decision regarding who will represent the Forum on the Board and confirmed the names via email to all Members since the last meeting:

Lacey Douglass
Glyn Hambling
Sarah Porter
Rachel Quick
Jo Tuttle
Martin White

The first planned meeting will be January 2023. There will be Terms of Reference and will include replacements if people are unable to attend meetings. It was agreed that the same number of people representing Forum should attend each meeting.

Central Schools Services Block

The Chair said that information had been requested and a meeting with primary maintained representatives did not happen.

Item 4b in minutes – Fair Funding Consultation

Concerns from Norfolk Governors Network (NGN) about communications around the Fair Funding Consultation – too little communication with governors.

Officers said a presentation was supposed to have been placed earlier on the Governors hub; they acknowledged that the timing had not been quick enough. Officers confirmed that they will work closer with NGN in the future.

3. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)

a) Schools Block (including consultation outcomes and Schools Block transfer decision)

Officers reported that 37 responses had been received to the Fair Funding Consultation.

The options mirror the National Funding Formula factors and values.

General comments and views from Forum Members

MW – Comments show a disconnect and people not understanding

If you don't know where the comments come from will not understand the context

MG - Small number of schools responding so still not an accurate view of how people feel

Quick turnaround of consultation

They still think HN Block LA issue – don't think the message came across

We have to go for 1.5 % if we are going to support the Safety Valve Programme

SS – 61 did not complete response so didn't they understand it – interesting to analyse why this was

Officer response – clearly because they did not complete, we could not use.

SD – Problem of understanding - so complicated – our governors did not respond as did not understand

HN - You will submit a disapplication for 1.5 %

All our schools in deficit so hard to say yes to 1.5 %

JP – I sensed a general sense of fatigue from the comments

Think people are bothered but see survey as utterly meaningless

SS – Concerns around finance, staffing retention

Not enough information on Safety Valve and its benefits

GH – Question put to me if 1.5 % agreed and Safety Valve not successful what then?

Need to think carefully how we consult – and brief schools carefully

Consultation has to be meaningful

Officer response – Need to look at next stages of delivering Safety Valve programme

– looking at January meeting with information in advance to consider

GH – Lots of understanding from people involved in conversations but this did not happen before consultation

Officers confirmed governors will be included in conversations

Officers confirmed Early Years sector will be involved in conversations

JP – In terms of the disconnect when schools are applying for element 3 funding you have got a very historical message there

SP – none of us actually know what our budgets will be for SEND in the Spring term

– absolutely no clarity at all – the issue for us as a Trust is we would be taking this

1% from the core budgets will be the non-SEND children that will be losing that funding and the money coming back in will be earmarked for SEND children – so not inclusive

MW – We should register our thoughts from last year that the reason we are in this difficult position is because of the funding of the HNB and its underfunding.

Important to emphasise.

GH – Think about what it will do – difficult because we need outcomes
 MW – I do not have total confidence of buying in of everybody
 RQ – Big issue around schools feeling not able to meet needs of children
 Concerns of rapid removal of funding for private sector – not realistic
 Safety Valve not telling us the speed things are going to be done
 Officer response – I get that it is about the confidence and understanding of the plan
 MW – Forum would be very interested to see the communication plan
 SD – Suffolk funded lower but not putting this pressure on schools
 MG – We are maintaining the deficit – Safety Valve can reduce it

Vote on continuation of the movement of 0.5% from Schools Block to the High Needs Block for 2023-24.

For: 14
 Against: 0
 Abstain: 2

Members views upon the specific question of support, or otherwise, for the disapplication request by the LA for the additional 1% block transfer:

Sarah Porter – I can't support the 1% at the moment just because of current financial situation. Everybody is facing a black hole and they don't know how big that black hole is going to be and don't know what the situation is going to be.

Howard Nelson – Can't support the 1% for similar reasons – the government have to look at this situation differently otherwise we will be here in another 4 years having a similar conversation.

Rebecca Wicks – From a special school point of view we need money, but I am not supportive because of the effect it is going to have on every other child.

Rachel Quick – I concur - we haven't got capacity at this point in time - we can't take children so need the money to support children in schools`.

Steven Dewing – Don't support

Lacey Douglass – Not for me to support or not support -I feel pressure everyone under.

Mike Grimble – Whole system needs to be worked out, if we say no, we are not supporting the whole system – I understand individual school views. My concerns not seeing any benefit coming through. Got to succeed. Have to support the safety valve. Have to support 1%.

Sarah Shirras – Reluctantly support – has to be some outcomes. System engagement is vital.

Jo Tuttle – Same as Mike and Sarah.

Joanne Philpott – I agree – want to see what benefits there will be – whole system has to work not just about building more schools. From baseline upwards through to assessment, screening, support, further education, the whole system is broken and has to be fixed. Sacrifice of 1% I will go with that.

David Hicks – Can't support.

Adrian Lincoln – From union point of view suspect we have to remain neutral.

Vicky Warnes – Yes agree neutral have to support all our members.

Lisa Barton – Can't support anything that takes money away from the front line.

Glyn Hambling – I will support the option in principle as trying to mend the system.

Needs to be further accountability from this group in a years' time against that project

and against the outcomes. Reluctant to impact on finances any further but we have to stop the rot.

Peter Pazitka – Wanted to see the benefit of extra transfers but the loss of immediate income - can't support the 1%.

Martin White – We have slipped into this position over many years. Want to support plan, believe the plan has a chance of putting things right particularly if the government actually produce some funding to help us with the ongoing deficit – communication not good but I support the extra 1% at this time but that would not be my view ongoing year on year without seeing some impact of the plan after the first year

Funding Cap:

Martin Brock went through the options in the paper.

Comments:

A discussion followed with a mixture of preferences for adjusting MFG for those schools effected or sticking with a 'hard cap' because that was the purpose of having a capping system. No conclusion on any particular option was reached, though no member was in favour of option 4.

Officers were asked what would happen if no recommendation for a particular option was received and they advised that with no clear recommendation they would recommend the status quo to NCC's Cabinet as there is no clear mandate to make a change from the National Funding Formula.

Schools Forum did not make a recommendation

Changes to Scheme for Financing Schools

Martin Brock went through the options in the paper.

Comments:

SS – BMP does not do anything for development work

Third paragraph quite arbitrary – schools make a valid reason and then LA does not agree with it

MW – Takes out bureaucracy in process

MG – Surprised at schools that did not feel happy with 8%

Maintained School Members were asked to approve the proposed changes.

MW – illogical that you could have money clawed back that would make a deficit in year 3 worse

MG – only one minor clawback in previous years

Analysis of Balance

For: Unanimous

School Building Maintenance holding account

For: Unanimous

3b. De-delegation/CSS Block

Decision 1a - Should staff cost budgets for the primary sector be de-delegated? (To be agreed by maintained primary representatives).

Yes

Decision 1b – Should staff cost budgets for the secondary sector be de-delegated? (To be agreed by the maintained secondary representative).

Agreed to de-delegate for ‘Special Circumstances’ only

Decision 2 – To agree de-delegation of a contingency at an indicative rate of £8.46 per-pupil for 2023/24 from maintained schools’ budgets, for a budget of £277k (to be agreed by all maintained school representatives).

Comments on Decision 2

MW - Why are we being asked to do this?

Schools are supported by lead officer

Deficit must have been huge before any actions put in place by headteacher

Officer response – we appreciate amount per pupil significant but there has been a lot of work put in to reduce costs

SS – not fair on other schools

MW – when was delegation removed?

Action – I will find out (SF)

MG – looking at diminishing amount of maintained schools having to stump up money - this system will be disastrous

MW – delegated budgets should have been removed

Decision: No

Decision 3a – Should Free School Meals eligibility be de-delegated for the primary sector (maintained)? (To be agreed by maintained primary representatives).

Yes

Decision 3b – Should Free School Meal eligibility be de-delegated for the secondary sector (maintained)? (To be agreed by the maintained secondary representative).

Yes

Decision 4 – Should £150k for two full time adviser posts be de-delegated at an estimated rate of £4.58 per-pupil? (Maintained schools’ representatives only).

No

Comments:

SS - To be asked to vote without information we have requested for is disrespectful

MW – Should be a buy in system. Should be paid for in a different way

Decision 5a - The maintained special school representative is asked to decide on the buyback of services for all maintained special schools in the 2023-24 financial year.

Yes

Decision 5b - The academy special school representative is asked to decide on the buyback of services for academy special schools in the 2023-24 financial year.

No

Decision 6 - The maintained nursery school representative is asked to decide on the buyback of services for maintained nursery schools in the 2023-24 financial year.

Nursery representative was not present therefore a decision will be sought after this meeting

Decision 7a – To approve a £1.101m centrally retained fund for pre-16 growth in 2023-24 (vote for all Schools Forum members)

JP – Gap in information on some sections of growth plans

Action: these are published in January – will go back to Isabel Horner for more information that we can share (SF)

For: unanimous

Decision 7b – To approve the pre-16 growth fund criteria as detailed in section 1.7 of this paper (vote for all Schools Forum members)

Schools Forum are required to approve the retention of Central School Services Block items (vote by all members)

For: Unanimous

Decision 8a – To approve the level of Admissions funding (£487,011).

For: Unanimous

Decision 8b – To approve the level of funding for Schools Forum (£30,000).

For: Unanimous

Decision 8c – To approve the level of funding for Fees to Independent Schools for pupil without SEN (£100,000).

Forum Members asked for further information regarding how these funds would be used and it was agreed that Officers would provide further information for a decision in January

Bring back in January for a decision

Decision 8d – To approve the level of contribution towards the Director of Learning & Inclusion central budgets - Early Intervention and Achievement (£119,700).

Following a query, Officers confirmed that the heading should have been changed for this decision to reflect that there will not be a Director from January but there will be leadership roles from across Norfolk's schools sector that will require funding. Forum Members asked for further information regarding how these funds would be used and it was agreed that Officers would provide further information for a decision in January

Bring back in January for a decision

Decision 8e – To approve the level of Termination of Employment Costs (£64,994).
For: Unanimous

Decision 9 – Schools Forum (all members) to approve funding for responsibilities held for all schools from Central School Services Block, including Teachers' Pay Grant and Teachers' Pension Employer Contribution Grant for centrally employed staff (£2,566,546).

Forum Members asked for further information regarding how these funds would be used and it was agreed that Officers would provide further information for a decision in January

Bring back in January for a decision

3c. Notional SEN

Martin Brock presented this paper.

Comments on from Forum Members regarding proposed survey:

SS – Feels very complicated

Some schools looking at this think they will get more money

JT – Does not seem to run in parallel with the Safety Valve Programme – having to justify a higher level of SEN funding in the first place

SD – Complexity of this - don't think will get useful information – moving money around on a piece of paper or sounds like another cut.

JP – Feels like evidence gathering not a consultation

MW – Could be a benefit if schools were suggesting they are spending hardly any money

SP – Feels like another barrier for claiming SEN. Pot to spend on other children getting less and less

MW – Schools will see through this

SP – Making it harder to be inclusive

MW – Come back to Forum in January – could provide us with useful information – if we could sell it as an information gathering exercise may be of benefit that may be useful in communications with DfE. Would not want to see this as way of increasing the notional SEN.

Officers said they would note the feedback and amend the engagement paper and survey accordingly and then make sure information was available in January to support a decision.

3d Early Years Block 2023 – 24 Funding Formula Update

Jo-anne Lamb presented this paper.

The survey has now closed and there were 261 responses – 148 completed. Officers will analyse the responses and bring back to Forum in January. A consultative group is being set up and will meet on 30 November.

4. MyOracle

John Baldwin presented this item covering feedback received, action taken to date and action planned.

A group of Forum representatives met with Sam Fletcher and John a few weeks ago to discuss the issues schools have with the system. The Chair said this was useful.

Officers decided to hold a meeting and gather views from other schools around what the current concerns are.

Officers had agreed to look at:

- operational implementation
- improve engagement in communications – John Baldwin completed a report yesterday
- look at from strategic implementation aspect and how NCC dealt with the process

Sam Fletcher will discuss the conclusions with Sara Tough

John Baldwin said his report was not finished in time to circulate prior to this meeting but can be made available.

John Baldwin said he did have concerns about the process to implement the new pay awards into the new system.

GH – I share your concerns to pay moving forward.

Clarity about understanding FAQ essential

JT – can't emphasise enough how important to get pay awards right – should have been tested months ago

MW – Forum will want a report back in January to how the process went

JT – If you know there is going to be an issue we need to know

John Baldwin – We will know early in December if there are significant problems.

Won't know if system has picked up smaller amounts of money. There will be a manual activity post run and we need to put out clear information about this.

A new pay slip will be available soon that will be easier to understand.

JT-Can you bring payroll forward to Friday?

John Baldwin – people will be able to access their payslips Thursday night/Friday

SS – System needs to put mistakes right not schools.

5. Future Plan

Agreed next meeting will be at Easton College and future meetings would be face to face.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting is on 27 January 2023 – it was agreed that this be held in room JB031, Jubilee Building, Easton College.

7. AOB

None

draft

Schools Forum

Item No. 6

Report title:	Schools Forum Membership
Date of meeting:	27 January 2023

Executive summary

The local authority is required to review the membership of Schools Forum on a regular basis in line with updated pupil numbers. The representation for mainstream schools remains broadly proportionate based on the October 2022 census data. This paper is for information only and no changes are required to membership at this time.

Schools Forum Structure

The membership of Schools Forum needs to reflect the proportion of pupil numbers in the different school sectors as per the Schools Forums (England) regulations 2012.

Although there has been a small increase in the proportion of academy pupils since the structure of Schools Forum was last reviewed in January 2022 the representation for mainstream schools remains broadly proportionate based on the latest split of maintained and academy pupil numbers and number of mainstream schools members.

Minimum Requirements

Schools members – Must be at least 2/3rd of Schools Forum membership

Where the local authority maintains the following type of schools they should each be represented on the Schools Forum:

- Primary Schools
- Secondary Schools
- Special Schools
- Nursery Schools
- PRUs

For each group above the representation can be made up or Headteachers (or their representative) and/or Governors.

There must also be representation (if such exists in the local authority area) for:

- Mainstream academies including free schools, UTCs, and Studio Schools
- Special academies including free schools
- Alternative Provision academies including free schools

Academy representation is not restricted to principals, senior staff or governors.

Primary schools, secondary schools and academies must be broadly proportionately represented on schools forum, based on the total number of pupils registered at them.

Non-school members – Must be no more than 1/3rd of Schools Forum membership

- 1 16-19 representative
- 1 Early Years PVI representative

Before considering other groups, the local authority must consider diocesan representation.

Any relevant person may represent these non-school groups.

Current Representation

School members – 15 members

- 1 Primary maintained Headteachers
- 2 Primary maintained Governors
- 1 Secondary maintained school representative
- 7 Academy representatives
- 1 Special School Headteacher
- 1 Nursery School Headteacher or Governor
- 1 Special School Academy representative
- 1 AP Academy representative

Non School members – Up to 6 members

- 1 16-19 representative
- 1 Early Years PVI representative
- 1 C of E Diocesan Rep
- 1 Roman Catholic Rep (currently vacant)
- 1 National Education Union Primary Rep
- 1 National Education Union Secondary Rep

Therefore, as required, at least two-thirds of Schools Forum members are schools/academy members.

Check of mainstream schools' representation based on pupil numbers from October 2022 census:

Primary Maintained	30,949	= 28.66%
Secondary Maintained	1,144	= 1.06%
Primary and Secondary Academies	75,896	= 70.28%

Total 107,989

Schools Forum currently has a total of 11 school members for maintained primary schools, maintained secondary schools and mainstream academies.

The latest mainstream pupil numbers from the October 2022 Census give the following proportions for representation (out of 11 mainstream school members):

3.15 primary representatives (currently Schools Forum has 3 representatives, so this is broadly proportionate)

0.12 secondary representatives (there must be at least 1 representative so current membership is correct)

7.73 academy representatives (currently Schools Forum has 7 mainstream academy representatives so this is still broadly proportionate but may need to be reviewed in future years if the proportion of pupils in mainstream academies increases further).

Schools Forum is asked to note the information provided.

SCHOOLS FORUM FORWARD PLAN

I – Information

D- Decision

	Autumn Term			Spring Term			Summer Term	
30/9/22 (Friday)	September (Face-to-face, Easton College)		27/01/23 (Friday)	January (Face-to-face, Easton College)		17/05/23 (Wed)	May (Face-to-face, Easton College)	
09:00 – 12:00	DSG Management Plan Update and Safety Valve Programme	D	09:00 – 12:00	Election of Chair/Vice Chair	D	09:00 – 12:00	Dedicated Schools Grant 2022/23 Outturn	I
	Provisional DSG Allocations for 2023-24 and Fair Funding Consultation for Mainstream Schools' Formula	D		Review Membership	I		Annual Audit Report (Norfolk Audit Service)	I
	Early Years Funding Consultation	D		Proposed Schools Budget including central costs	D		DSG Safety Valve (standing item)	I
	Central Schools Services Block: info on LA services	I		Pupil variations 2023-24	I			
				DSG Safety Valve update and additional 1% transfer vote	D			
				Early Years Consultation	D			
				Notional SEN	I			
16/11/22 (Wed)	November (Face-to-face, Easton College)		15/03/23 (Wed)	March (Face-to-face, Easton College)		07/07/23 (Friday)	July (Face-to-face, Easton College)	
09:00 – 13:00	Early Years Block 2023-24 Funding Formula Update	I	09:00 – 12:00	Agree next year's plan	D	09:00 – 12:00	Updates on Scheme for Financing Schools (Financial Regulations)	D
	Schools Block (inc. consultation outcomes and Schools Block transfer)	D		Final pupil variations (only if changed from January)	I		DSG Safety Valve (standing item)	I
	De-delegation/CSS Block	D		DSG Safety Valve (standing item)	I			
	Notional SENDSG Safety Valve (standing item)	D						
		I						

draft