

**Early Years Funding Formula Consultation
North Northamptonshire Council's Draft Response**

Question 1:	Do you agree with our proposal to update the underlying data in the additional needs factor in the EYNFF?
Answer:	Yes. It needs to be updated as it doesn't reflect the current situation.
Question 2:	Do you agree with our proposal to move to using the free school meals headline measure?
Answer:	Yes. This change is welcomed as it could potentially increase our funding.
Question 3:	Do you agree with our proposal to update the way in which the Disability Living Allowance data is used?
Answer:	Yes as the current data is 6 years out of date.
Question 4:	Do you agree with our proposal to update the underlying data used in the area cost adjustment in the EYNFF, in particular the rateable values data and the GLM data, when available?
Answer:	Yes. However this will impact NNC as it is based on ACA adjustment as the rateable value is lower in the North Northamptonshire than Northamptonshire currently.
Question 5:	Do you agree with our proposed amendments to the proxy measure for premises related costs in the EYNFF, including introducing schools rateable values data?
Answer:	Yes as the current data is so out of date and as the current property values have gone up so the rateable value should go up.
Question 6:	Do you agree with our proposed approach to mainstreaming the early years element of the teachers' pay and pensions grants?
Answer:	No as there is a high risk that the funding is not used for what it is intended for.
Question 7:	Do you agree with our proposal to update the operational guide to encourage local authorities to take account of additional pressures that some providers might face using the existing quality supplement?
Answer:	No. The whole operational guide needs to be revisited not just the existing quality supplement. The statutory duties for the local authorities needs to be updated Early education and childcare - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)
Question 8:	Do you agree with our proposal to update the underlying data in the area cost adjustment in the 2-year-old formula?
Answer:	Yes as the current dataset is very out of date.
Question 9:	Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a proxy for premises related costs into the 2-year-old formula?
Answer:	Yes as it will align it with 3 & 4 year old funding which then opens up the providers with the potential of offering more disadvantaged 2 year old places.
Question 10:	Do you agree with our proposed approach to protections in the EYNFF for 2023-24?



Answer:	Yes the protection should reflect the current cost of living increases as well as the impact of Covid.
Question 11:	Do you agree with our proposed approach to protections in the 2- year-old formula for 2023-24?
Answer:	Yes the protection should reflect the cost of living increase as well as the impact of Covid especially babies born during the pandemic as they are the disadvantaged 2 year olds.
Question 12:	Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a minimum hourly funding rate and a cap on the hourly funding rate for MNS supplementary funding?
Answer:	Yes.
Question 13:	Do you agree with our proposed approach to rolling the teachers' pay and pensions grants into MNS supplementary funding?
Answer:	No. We think this would adversely impact our MNS in real terms.
Question 14:	Do you have any comments about the potential impact, both positive and negative, of our proposals on individuals on the basis of their protected characteristics? Where any negative impacts have been identified, do you know how these might be mitigated?
Answer:	<p>Positive impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 yo funding aligning with 3 & 4 yo funding providing capacity to deliver additional 2 yo disadvantages places across the sector• Changes to updating the dataset will reflect the current situation which will be beneficial to the LA <p>Negative impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rolling the teachers' pay and pensions grants into MNS supplementary funding and then capping it risks reducing funds available for the children it was originally intended for• Update the operational guide to encourage local authorities to take account of additional pressures that some providers might face using the existing quality supplement. This will only identify the pressures on the sector without any additional funding for quality supplement to the LA
Question 15:	Are there any other comments that you would like to make about our proposed reforms?
Answer:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We are concerned the proposed reforms do not reflect the impact as a result of the pandemic i.e. Covid babies are now our 2 yo and there is a greater draw on our SENIF funding which cannot cope with the volume of children presenting emerging needs. This will have a knock-on effect on attainment and the High Needs Funding when children start mainstream school.• The increasing cost of living inflation has a knock-on effect on the sector in terms of running cost and whether they continue to be viable or not. This could potentially create a sufficiency issue as settings as forced to close.



North
Northamptonshire
Council