

## Meeting of the Early Years Working Group

**Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2008**  
***(3.00 pm, Training Room 5, Building 2 at NLBP)***

<b><u>Attended</u></b>	Members:	Anthea Abery (Rosh Pinah, Maintained Nursery Class-Faith)
		Christine Read (All Saints N20, Maintained Nursery Class)
		Diana Rose (Kerem House, PVI Independent School)
		John Maxwell (Holly Park, Maintained Nursery Class)
		Julie Paice (Senior Childminding Co-Ordinator, LBB)
		Liz Bartlett (Wingfield, Maintained Children's Centre)
		Pauline Congdon (PVI Sessional)
		Perina Holness (Moss Hall, Maintained Nursery School)
		Sarah Vipond (Middlesex Uni, PVI Full Day Care)
		Sharon Lee (FRS, PVI Setting)
	LA Officers:	Stuart Gray (Principal Inspector, Chair)
		Diane Lewis (Early Years Inspector)
		Carol Beckman (School Funding Manager)
		Zahid Parvez (Business Manager)
		Sheila Abbott (Early Years and Extended Services Manager)
		Claire Gray (School Resources Support Officer)
	Observer Status:	Elizabeth Pearson (Schools Forum member)
		Jodi Gurney (Schools Forum member)
		Lisa Horne (Barnet Pre-School Learning Alliance)
	Clerk:	Claire Gray (School Resources Support Officer)
<b><u>Not Present</u></b>	Members:	Elaine Rosenthal (Playsafe, PVI Sessional)
	LA Officers:	Martin Baker (Acting Director of Children's Service)
		Akos Adu (Research & Management Information)
		Sarosh Malik (School Resources Support Officer)
<b>1. Apologies for Absence</b>		
1.1	None.	
<b>2. Welcome to new members</b>		
2.1	SG welcomed Pauline Congdon to the meeting representing PVI Sessional nursery settings.	
<b>3. Minutes of previous meeting – 30<sup>th</sup> April</b>		
3.1	Amendment to item 6.1 as follows: DL said that extending high quality early years provision, enabling parents to return to work/training and improving outcomes for children is at the heart of this agenda. Revised minutes to be circulated to members.	<b>CG</b>
<b>4. Matters Arising</b>		

4.1	CG to circulate link to DCSF website to enable members to download current free entitlement guidance documents.	<b>CG</b>
<b>5. PVI's cost analysis</b>		
5.1	CB summarised the responses to the PVI survey and cost analysis data received, although very few settings have completed and returned this information. Those PVIs that responded already seem to be organised in a way that enables the full 15 hours to be offered. However, maintained settings still have difficulties particularly involving the practical implementations as a result of the impact on teachers pay and conditions and also the physical restrictions in established nursery facilities.	
<b>6. Costs in Maintained settings</b>		
6.1	As a result of the restrictions of teacher contracts, maintained settings would need to examine the cost impact of using Nursery Nurses/TAs to provide additional cover, but as a result this would affect the staff: pupil ratio.	
6.2	Although the teaching unions are aware of these changes, there seems to be no guidance at present regarding the impact of proposed changes on staff contracts.	
6.3	Analysis of cost survey to date shows that, in general, costs per hour are least in nursery classes in maintained schools, highest in standalone maintained nursery settings and children's centres, and PVIs fall between the two. Any future funding formula will need to reflect the range of costs at the various settings, rather than a 'one size fits all' approach.	
<b>7. Practical implementation issues</b>		
7.1	The DCSF has issued guidance documents, but the information does not include details of how practical implementation issues have been overcome in settings piloting the new arrangements.	
7.2	The practical implementation difficulties being encountered by maintained settings, such as proposals to use part-time staff, shift patterns/rostering and variable holidays cannot be imposed on teaching staff whereas the pay & conditions are set individually in PVIs. HR will need to be involved should pay and conditions be under discussion.	
7.3	CR expressed concern that due to the limited amount of funding available to implement these changes, maintained settings would suffer a reduction in funding as a result of the move to pupil-led rather than place-led funding, whilst at the same time incurring additional costs due to increased offering.	
7.4	Representatives of maintained settings expressed concern that due to the limited funding available, it will be extremely challenging to implement DCSF requirements for full flexibility. Members expressed concern that proposals resulting in loss of planning and preparation time, communication between key workers/staff and parent contact would reduce the quality of delivery.	
7.5	DL proposed that as an interim measure, maintained settings continue to provide 2½ hour sessions, with the additional ½ hour being made up by a second provider, such as PVIs or childminders. JM felt that this would lead to parents moving to settings offering 3 hours free entitlement and/or full day provision. EP suggested that settings offer 3 hours free entitlement in the mornings, afternoons/wraparound care were charged but that this would reduce the number of places available.	

7.6	PH advised that, based on options piloted in other LAs, maintained settings could offer 8.30-11.30am and 12.30- 3.30pm sessions, but this might lead to difficulties at changeover times, in setting up teaching areas and physically accommodating children at lunch/tea-times. It should be noted that this group agreed at a previous meeting that the provision of lunch does constitute part of the 'education' offering.	
7.7	AA asked how the 10% PPA requirement for staff on teaching contracts would be recognised. CB advised that this would be factored into the nursery AWPU that would form the basis of any future funding formula. Any future formula would also need to reflect size of settings, pupil numbers, infrastructure costs and qualifications of staff.	
7.8	It was agreed that a selection of EYWG members would undertake telephone contacts with other LA settings that have piloted the extended offering to find out what practical solutions have been adopted. Information to be submitted to School Funding team by 14/11/08 for incorporation into papers for next EYWG meeting.	<b>DL/ PH/ EP/ JG</b>
7.9	LH proposed that BPSLA staff would carry out a revised survey of PVI costs during their termly visits to settings, as PVIs might be concerned about providing the LA with business cost information. This would enable a larger sample and more robust cost data, and the information obtained could form the basis for LA financial modelling.	<b>BP SLA /CB/ CG</b>
7.10	SG confirmed that two models will be prepared and presented to the next EYWG, Option 1 based on what has been piloted settings in other LAs, Option 2 using costs drawn from LBB/BPSLA survey data. This work needs to be completed so that schools/settings can incorporate information for parents applying for places in September 2009.	

#### **8. Any Other Business**

8.1	None.	
-----	-------	--

#### **Dates of future meetings**

	<p>26 November 2008 (Training Room 5)</p> <p>25 March 2009 (Training Room 2)</p> <p>6 May 2009 (Training Room 5)</p> <p>1 July 2009 (Training Room 5)</p>	
--	---	--

