

Karen Frost, Early Years and Childcare Manager – 01344 354024
karen.frost@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Doc. Ref

G:\New Alluse\Executive\Schools Forum\43) 280110\Proposed Early Years Single Funding Formula

EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION							
ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
Current Funding Arrangements:							
1	Do you agree that where for simplicity, it makes sense for certain costs and associated funding levels for maintained nursery classes to be met by the main school budget or central Council budget, then this continues?						
	Yes	17	5	22	81%	34%	
	No	0	0	0	0%	0%	
	Undecided	5	0	5	19%	8%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
2	Do you agree with the calculation proposed at Appendix C to determine the level of funds in maintained nursery classes to be removed from the existing main school budget and in future included in the Formula?						
	Yes	10	5	15	56%	23%	
	No	3	0	3	11%	5%	
	Undecided	9	0	9	33%	14%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
Establishing current costs:							
3	Do you agree that data from the cost surveys should be used to establish current costs of different types of settings, unless it is considered incomplete or unreliable, in which case other supplementary surveys and data sources should be used?						
	Yes	15	5	20	74%	31%	
	No	5	0	5	19%	8%	
	Undecided	2	0	2	7%	3%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
Conclusions and recommendations on Formula composition							
The Hourly Base Rate:							
4	Do you agree that the proposed elements of the hourly base rate cover the significant cost elements facing the majority of providers?						
	Yes	9	4	13	48%	20%	
	No	9	0	9	33%	14%	
	Undecided	4	1	5	19%	8%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	
5	Do you support the calculation made to establish the average direct staff cost?						
	Yes	7	5	12	44%	19%	
	No	12	0	12	44%	19%	
	Undecided	3	0	3	11%	5%	
	No reply					58%	
				27		64	

EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
6 Do you agree that for long term absences other than for sickness, such as maternity leave, the existing arrangements should be retained for maintained nurseries where the LA holds the funds and meets the costs, with a funding allocation made to PVI providers who would be responsible for paying any cover requirements? Yes No Undecided No reply	18 1 3 0	5 0 0 0	23 1 3 0	85% 4% 11% 0%	36% 2% 5% 58%	27 64	64
7 Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for sickness and other staff absence? Yes No Undecided No reply	15 2 5 0	5 0 0 0	20 2 5 0	74% 7% 19% 0%	31% 3% 8% 58%	27 64	64
8 Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for when settings are staffed below the minimum staff / child ratios that are assumed in the Formula? Yes No Undecided No reply	12 6 4 0	5 0 0 0	17 6 4 0	63% 22% 15% 0%	27% 9% 6% 58%	27 64	64
9 Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers to finance continuous staff training? Yes No Undecided No reply	15 5 2 0	5 0 0 0	20 5 2 0	74% 19% 7% 0%	31% 8% 3% 58%	27 64	64
10 Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for support costs? Yes No Undecided No reply	9 10 3 0	5 0 0 0	14 10 3 0	52% 37% 11% 0%	22% 16% 5% 58%	27 64	64
11 Do you support the proposal to only fund PVI providers for accommodation, with maintained schools continuing to be funded for the accommodation costs of their Early Years provisions through their main school budget? Yes No Undecided No reply	19 1 2 0	5 0 0 0	24 1 2 0	89% 4% 7% 0%	38% 2% 3% 58%	27 64	64

EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
12	Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to PVI providers for accommodation?						
	Yes	4	14		52%		22%
	No	0	10		37%		16%
	Undecided	1	3		11%		5%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
13	Do you support the calculation made to establish a profit element for PVI providers?						
	Yes	3	17		63%		27%
	No	1	6		22%		9%
	Undecided	1	4		15%		6%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
Supplementary payments to the hourly base rate							
Deprivation:							
14	Do you agree that relative deprivation should be measured via the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index?						
	Yes	5	16		59%		25%
	No	0	3		11%		5%
	Undecided	0	8		30%		13%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
15	Do you agree that the deprivation supplement needs to be funded from a deduction to the Hourly Base rate?						
	Yes	5	9		33%		14%
	No	0	8		30%		13%
	Undecided	0	10		37%		16%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
16	Do you agree that the total funds allocated by deprivation measures to providers should be set at around 3% of the total budget, half the proportion of funding received by BFC through deprivation measures from the Government?						
	Yes	4	10		37%		16%
	No	0	6		22%		9%
	Undecided	1	11		41%		17%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	
17	Do you agree that only the 60% most deprived providers should receive deprivation funding?						
	Yes	5	12		44%		19%
	No	0	6		22%		9%
	Undecided	0	9		33%		14%
	No reply						58%
				27		64	

EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
18 Assuming only 60% of providers receive funding for deprivation, do you agree that funding should be further targeted so that the top 10% be funded at 3 times the basic rate (Band 3), the next 25% at 2 times the basic rate (Band 2) and the final 25% at the basic rate (Band1)? Yes No Undecided No reply	1 2 19 0	4 0 1 0	5 2 20 0	19% 7% 74% 0%	8% 3% 31% 58%	27 64	64
Quality of provision: 19 Do you agree that relevant staff qualifications data is the most appropriate measure for quality of provision? Yes No Undecided No reply	4 15 3 0	5 0 0 0	9 15 3 0	33% 56% 11% 0%	14% 23% 5% 58%	27 64	64
20 Do you agree that the proposed bandings and their relative funding proportions are correct? Yes No Undecided No reply	5 10 7 0	5 0 0 0	10 10 7 0	37% 37% 26% 0%	16% 16% 11% 58%	27 64	64
Quality of provision - funding adjustment for maintained sector providers:							
21 Do you agree that to ensure an equitable level of funding between providers, that the direct staff cost element of the Hourly Base rate for maintained sector providers should be reduced by £0.15 to remove double funding? Yes No Undecided No reply	12 3 7 0	4 0 1 0	16 3 8 0	59% 11% 30% 0%	25% 5% 13% 58%	27 64	64
Other items for consideration around provider funding Supplementary payment to providers for Additional Educational Needs:							
22 Do you think the Formula should include an element to fund additional educational needs? Yes No Undecided No reply	13 5 4 0	4 1 0 0	17 6 4 0	63% 22% 15% 0%	27% 9% 6% 58%	27 64	64
23 Do you think that funding should be paid directly to providers for English as An Additional Language where there are more than 5% of children in the setting? Yes No Undecided No reply	13 2 7 0	3 1 1 0	16 3 8 0	59% 11% 30% 0%	25% 5% 13% 58%	27 64	64

EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
24 Do you have any suggestions on a readily available, objective factor that could be used to recognise the costs of additional educational needs? Yes No Undecided No reply	3 13 6 0	2 3 0 0	5 16 6 0	19% 59% 22% 0%	8% 25% 9% 58%	27 64	64
25 Do you agree that the Schools Forum should be requested to set aside contingency funding to support providers admitting children with special educational needs, where agreed with the Council? Yes No Undecided No reply	17 0 5 0	5 0 0 0	22 0 5 0	81% 0% 19% 0%	34% 0% 8% 58%	27 64	64
Sustainability and sufficiency of providers:							
26 Do you agree that additional financial support should be paid to providers where this is necessary for the Council to meet its duty to ensure sufficient places are available? Yes No Undecided No reply	19 0 3 0	5 0 0 0	24 0 3 0	89% 0% 11% 0%	38% 0% 5% 58%	27 64	64
27 Do you agree that additional financial support should be paid to providers where this is necessary for the Council to meet its duty to ensure sufficient places are available? Yes No Undecided No reply	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0% 0% 0% 0%	0% 0% 0% 100%	0 64	64
28 Do you agree that the proposed eligibility criteria should be adopted as the policy? Yes No Undecided No reply	11 1 10 0	5 0 0 0	16 1 10 0	59% 4% 37% 0%	25% 2% 16% 58%	27 64	64
Transitional funding arrangements:							
29 Do you agree that transitional arrangements should be put in place to smooth the financial impact of the Formula? Yes No Undecided No reply	20 1 1 0	5 0 0 0	25 1 1 0	93% 4% 4% 0%	39% 2% 2% 58%	27 64	64

EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
30 Do you agree that the maximum change in the hourly funding rate that a provider should face each year is 3% (either increase or decrease)? Yes No Undecided No reply	15 3 4 	4 1 0 	19 4 4 		70% 15% 15% 		30% 6% 6% 58%
				27		64	
31 Do you agree that where a provider faces a change in funding of no more than 6% that this should be phased in over 2 years? Yes No Undecided No reply	12 6 4 	4 1 0 	16 7 4 		59% 26% 15% 		25% 11% 6% 58%
				27		64	
32 Do you agree that where a provider faces a change in funding of more than 6%, that 3% should be implemented in the first year, with the balance implemented equally over the next 3 years? Yes No Undecided No reply	14 2 6 	3 2 0 	17 4 6 		63% 15% 22% 		27% 6% 9% 58%
				27		64	
33 Do you agree that the transitional funding scheme should last for up to 4 years, with a review after 2 years? Yes No Undecided No reply	14 6 2 	3 2 0 	17 8 2 		63% 30% 7% 		27% 13% 3% 58%
				27		64	
34 Do you agree that to incorporate stability and predictability of funding for providers, those providers within the scheme at April 2010 will have their funding data frozen and receive confirmed hourly funding rates for the whole period they qualify for transition? Yes No Undecided No reply	6 7 9 	5 0 0 	11 7 9 		41% 26% 33% 		17% 11% 14% 58%
				27		64	
35 Do you agree that if any additional costs arise from the transitional arrangements that the Schools Forum be requested to allocated new funds? Yes No Undecided No reply	19 0 3 	5 0 0 	24 0 3 		89% 0% 11% 		38% 0% 5% 58%
				27		64	

EYSFF – OUTCOMES FROM FINANCIAL CONSULTATION

ITEM	TOTALS			Respondents		All providers	
	PVI	Maintained	Total	No.	%	No.	%
Payment arrangements to providers:							
36 Do you agree that payments to providers should continue to be made on the current twice termly basis?							
Yes	22	4	26		96%		41%
No	0	0	0		0%		0%
Undecided	0	1	1		4%		2%
No reply							58%
				27		64	
Frequency that data used for funding purposes should be updated:							
37 Do you agree that where there is a choice on updating data used for funding purposes that this should be done once a year from the January census return?							
Yes	14	4	18		67%		28%
No	6	1	7		26%		11%
Undecided	2	0	2		7%		3%
No reply							58%
				27		64	
Flexibility:							
38 Do you agree with the local definition of flexibility?							
Yes	14	3	17		63%		27%
No	4	0	4		15%		6%
Undecided	4	2	6		22%		9%
No reply							58%
				27		64	
39 Do you agree with the proposed flexibility test that must be met to receive additional funding?							
Yes	11	3	14		52%		22%
No	5	0	5		19%		8%
Undecided	6	2	8		30%		13%
No reply							58%
				27		64	
40 Do you agree with the proposed funding thresholds for settings for additional flexibility of provision, based on weekly hours, once the test has been met?							
Yes	11	3	14		52%		22%
No	5	0	5		19%		8%
Undecided	6	2	8		30%		13%
No reply							58%
				27		64	
41 Do you agree with the proposed hourly supplement rate for flexibility of provision?							
Yes	11	3	14		52%		22%
No	4	0	4		15%		6%
Undecided	7	2	9		33%		14%
No reply							58%
				27		64	
Number of responses:	22	5	27				
	44.90%	33.33%	42.19%				

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

1	Do you agree that where for simplicity, it makes sense for certain costs and associated funding levels for maintained nursery classes to be met by the main school budget or central Council budget, then this continues?	
	St Michaels's Childcare Trust	As long as the same items are included in the PVI formula
2	Do you agree with the calculation proposed at Appendix C to determine the level of funds in maintained nursery classes to be removed from the existing main school budget and in future included in the Formula?	
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	On discussion with colleagues it was felt that this can not allow for the extra workload management have to meet to sustain a voluntary setting in terms of time management and professional costs for company procedures etc. Time given and not charged for - unlike schools with admin officers etc
	South Hill Park Pre-school	It would appear that maintained nursery classes will still benefit from far more funding as a result of being part of the school. I will cover this in Q10
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	No evidence is presented that everything has been included and that maintained nurseries will still receive subsidies from the main school budget. Indeed, schools with an eye on future pupil numbers in the school and with their school budgets behind them, have many opportunities to do a "loss leader" for their nurseries. PVI do not have the financial security to do the same and are therefore disadvantaged
3	Do you agree that data from the cost surveys should be used to establish current costs of different types of settings, unless it is considered incomplete or unreliable, in which case other supplementary surveys and data sources should be used?	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Does the data used provide a true reflection of costs – PVI staff seem to do a fair amount of unpaid work
	Little Acorns Montessori School	This data seems to be incomplete and also items such as rental costs have been grossly underestimated
	Plus Three Nursery Schools –FW	The current proposals do not reflect our current hiring costs. A figure of £10 p/h was quoted yet all 3 of my settings are substantially more than that, one hiring is almost £17 p/h. Settings that set up and clear away each day pay staff costs of additional 33 % per day. The current proposal fails to take this into account. The PVI settings that set up/clear away will be the biggest losers under this proposed formula, yet we have the highest costs, this is wrong! Staff pay rises have also not been taken into account.
	South Hill Park Pre-school	However we have not been told when data has been considered incomplete or unreliable. Data will vary enormously as PVI settings can be very different, but this does not make the data invalid
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	As long as there is a full consideration of reliability and completion for all data
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	Contrary to question 2, there is no list of the data categories included. This indicates a lack of understanding of PVI costs.
	The College Nursery	With the many different ways that settings are run it is a complicated issue and very difficult to make it fair across the board
4		
5	Do you support the calculator pm made to establish the average direct staff cost?	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Staff costs-we supplement our early years funding from main budget to ensure a ratio of 1:9 in the nursery
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Pack away settings have different staffing requirements due to lack of appropriate facilities eg toilets outside of the main hall requiring staff, access and safe cover for outside areas, kitchen access. Have to cover staff costs and hall rental for set up and pack away time for a 2.5 hour session although your model was worked out on 2 x 2.5 hours sessions per day. NB: How about central government initiative costs - this consultation, EYFS-can't be covered in admin costs.
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	In PVI's, staff pay is very much based on what can be afforded from the funding, not on national pay scales. In the interests of fair competition, the staff costs should be reworked based on national pay scales, not what is being paid. With schools taking 4 year olds and probably subsidising them from the main school budget (as a "loss leader") PVI's are forced to take 2 year olds to survive. Staffing levels for this are 1:4 and not 1:8, so staffing ratios are too low in the formula. So we have unfair competitive situation between schools, with their financial might, and PVI's who are forced into to taking 2 year olds to survive but without the funding for the increased staffing levels required.
6		No comments

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

7	Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for sickness and other staff absence?	
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	No evidence is presented to support the assertion is presented for PVI's. Schools with their larger staffs are able to provide short-term cover for sickness without breaking their staffing ratios. PVI's have to pay staff cover to maintain their ratios. So 12 days, based on school data, is probably too low for a PVI
8		No comments
9	Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers to finance continuous staff training?	
	South Hill Park Pre-school	PVI settings would have a high staff training cost than maintained. We have more staff and many of them come into the job completely unqualified. To reach a high quality we support all staff to then reach their full potential
10	Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to providers for support costs?	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Not all facilities available on site e.g. photocopier, printer, pc, internet. Use of these tends to be at home in own time.
	South Hill Park Pre-school	Support costs do not cover enough. Premises costs need to include maintenance when PVI settings own their buildings or are responsible for them. It seems very unfair to provide the same costs to both maintained and PVI for 'running costs' and 'admin' as maintained nurseries would receive much of this from the school - they would not have a separate electricity bill or their own cleaner/caretaker/printing bills/recruitment costs etc etc
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	Support and accommodation costs are based on 30 children. If OFSTED sets a lower level, these PVIs are immediately disadvantaged in the formula. At St Michael's the OFSTEAD limit is 24. We would take more but we are not allowed to. However, in the formula the support and accommodation costs are the same as for a larger setting. The formula must include the regulated number of places in a setting to adjust for the relatively higher overhead costs in a small settings.
	The College Nursery	Maintained should be meet by the main school budget
11		No comments
12	Do you support the calculation made to establish the funding to be allocated to PVI providers for accommodation?	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	BFBC charge high rental and offer no reduction for long term rental compared to figures used as averages. Figures based on maximum size setting might not be full but rental stays the same.
	South Hill Park Pre-school	The accommodation calculation assumes that a setting would be able to just have funded children all in the same session. As much as you would like to you CANNOT ignore our 2 year olds. We may not receive funding for them but without them many of us would not have a business (due to schools taking children into reception at age 4). Therefore BFC would have to find them somewhere to go - I doubt there are enough nursery spaces & these do not suit all parents

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

13	Do you support the calculation made to establish a profit element for PVI providers?	
	Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-school	Its hard to know if all of the above will work until its in practice. We hope that it will cover our costs
	Braken Bears Day Nursery	The funding required for accommodation in the PVI sector should be at least double this calculation to cover the cost
	Building Blocks Pre-school	How has this been calculated - no information provided
	Little Acorn Montessori School	Maintained sector gets more money for staff where only 2 are required for 26 children and PVI given less but have to fund more staff and encourage graduate entry? Does not add up. The amount of money given to PVI's is being cut radically, we have to pay to give money to the maintained sector - not £3.60 to £3.40 but in real terms £3.80 to £3.40!!!
	Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	When minimum staff/child ratios were discussed have you calculated the fact that groups such as ourselves run at a 1:6 ratio to take into account 2 year old children – and therefore am I correct in understanding that the 25 pence per hour covers this? With regard to accommodation - your figures only cover for 3 hours per day = £5700 my groups accommodation is in excess of £11500 per annum as we are open for 6 hours maybe I have not understood correctly
	Newbold School	While this works all right for our setting I know several providers were upset that their large accommodation costs would not be covered by this new calculation
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	Costs are erratic and likely to increase considerably- will there be appropriate measure for PVI's? Staff costs cannot allow for the mixed age ranges PVI's have to meet to sustain and potential debt from fee's charged. Although a separate issue, may affect sustaining some PVI's in the future. We could not sustain on grant funded places alone, especially with the erratic transition to nursery currently.
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	My understanding of the single funded formula was to offer a 'more level playing field' between PVI and maintained sector, from current proposals this is clearly not the case eg will the PVI sector receive fruit for the children? We were initially informed that once the single funded formula was introduced that non of us would be worse off and some of us would be better off, this is clearly not the case with my settings loosing 7.14% 7.14% and 1.64% respectively. We are barely able to sustain on the current funding, cuts will inheritably mean reducing outcomes for children due to our inability to afford all 'the extras' we like to provide our children
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	The principle of putting as much as possible into the base funding is sound - as long as the base data is accurate
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	Profit: As charities, PVI's are not allowed to make profits by the Charity Commission. The Trustees are required to reinvest in the facility whilst ensuring their liabilities and risks are covered by holding adequate reserves. The level of reserves has to be justified to the Charity Commission. The biggest liability is closure and redundancy costs. I suspect that many PVI's do not hold sufficient reserves for this, eg one terms salary plus statutory redundancy costs. In addition this liability is salary related so increases each year. So the "profit" element has to be sufficient to establish the reserves required to cover liabilities and then increased in line with the salary element each year.
	The College Nursery	Those PVI that have charity status cannot make a profit
	Wasps	Nurseries in maintained schools have the back of the school budget. Size of the setting should allow the registered ofsted number not element based on 30 children
14	Do you agree that relative deprivation should be measured via the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index?	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Pockets of people in housing association properties now incorporated in all new builds so deprivation more spread around
15	No comments	
16	Do you agree that the total funds allocated by deprivation measures to providers should be set at around 3% of the total budget, half the proportion of funding received by BFC through deprivation measures from the Government?	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Where is the "other half" and what is it used for?
17	No comments	

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

18	Assuming only 60% of providers receive funding for deprivation, do you agree that funding should be further targeted so that the top 10% be funded at 3 times the basic rate (Band 3), the next 25% at 2 times the basic rate (Band 2) and the final 25% at the basic rate (Band1)?	
	Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-school	Deprivation should be based on a child's postcode and not on the provider's postcode
	Birch Hill Pre-school	Where a setting is established in a new build area including low cost housing how can deprivation accurately be established on postcode
	Chavey Down Pre-school	Due to my rent being the highest in the borough to lose money because of not being in a deprived area seems slightly unfair
	Harmans Water Playgroup	Yes, but there is deprivation in other areas and if this is to be done it needs to be done fairly - percentage is vague
	Holly Spring Pre-school	Many deprived families are not living in deprived areas don't know how accurate this is
	Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	As discussed at the meeting I do agree that deprivation should not be measured by the post code of the setting - but by the postcodes of the children attending the setting.
	Newbold School	I'm not sure what to make of this really. If I had seen a nursery in a deprived area I might understand better what the extra funding goes towards.
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	Deprivation should be measured on the postcode/family income of the child and not the setting
	South Hill Park Pre-school	BFC need to be sure that the deprivation money is used to benefit those that are deprived eg extra staff/training/resources. In some ways it would be better if the deprivation funding was completely separate. We would be visited by someone who could help us put in place measures that would really help and then receive the money for this.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	As long as the calculation does not seriously penalise or threaten the sustainability of any settings then the deprivation formula makes democratic sense
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	Deprivation costs should be based on the address of the child, not that of the PVI setting as there are pockets of low cost housing. Deprivation ratios are 1:6 not 1:8 so the formula needs to be corrected.
	The College Nursery	I agree that something needs to be done to support children in the most need. Is the 60% locally or nationally?
	Wasps	Deprived areas are not only in certain postcode areas but low cost housing is a requirement to all new build houses therefore these areas need to be considered to. If the ratios are 1:6 in these areas this needs to be monitored to ensure the funding is used for this purpose
19		No comments
20	Do you agree that the proposed bandings and their relative funding proportions are correct?	
	Braken Bears Day Nursery	This whole section is biased towards school ie maintained sector. This does not look at the PVI sector in terms of overall quality who may have high levels of NVQ3 but not have level 4
	Chavey Down Pre-school	Level 3 I feel is a major achievement and to have to tell staff that is not high enough for us to receive more money will be a very sore point
	Harmans Water Playgroup	I think it ensures groups are striving for the best BUT it is a no win situation for PVI, on our income we will struggle to employ/keep & train a QTS once we pay for them to be educated, they will then move on, our money will be lowered & we have to start over again, on less money.
	Holly Spring Pre-school	I see that in theory this is good but impossible for PVI to maintain. It costs to train, to employ & then don't stay in PVI sector. Impossible, cost us a lot of money for little/no gain. But I can see it is beneficial to child in theory. Is there anything for an outstanding group, this would insure excellent provision
	Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	Staff qualifications does not reflect the quality of the provision. We have just received outstanding overall from ofstead and we do not employ a degree qualified person. Quality should be measured by ofstead judgements not by qualifications.
	Newbold School	I have qualified and unqualified staff. Frequently the unqualified staff are more able than the qualified. As more and more staff become qualified it may even out.
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	Maintained sector has pay scales to attract graduates; 1:13 ratio with increase % of staff highly qualified. PVI's have many staff to enable various ratio requirements - increasing % figures qualification data should allow for how many staff have NVQ 2/3 - not just leaders as in PVI's leaders are involved with many management duties nursery leaders do not have to undertake eg staff management/contracts/CRB's/references etc therefore qualified staff is key to quality 1:1 with children
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	Quality should also be measured on ofsted outcomes
	South Hill Park Pre-school	The highest 'quality' (& therefore highest payment) will be given to a setting where there is a qualified teacher and one level 3. A ratio of 1:13 is NOT quality, it is outrageous. To have a range of staff who are qualified to level 2/3 and at least one person working towards a foundation degree or similar represents a far higher quality level. Qualified teachers may have done a minimal amount of 'Early years' study within their degrees.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	Although I agree that qualifications are an important part of a skilled work force there is no guarantee that this translates into a quality service delivery - it is a component. This sector is (PVI) predominately staffed by committed people with practical skills

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

	St Michael's Childcare Trust	The qualification element must be weighted by the hours worked by the individual staff, not average of all PVI staff. Many lower qualified staff only work a few hours whereas the high qualified staff work full time. The average qualification level is therefore higher than has been allowed for.
	The College Nursery	There's no account of experience and a qualification doesn't guarantee quality
	Wasps	Need to base it on full time equivalent not number of staff. Also take into account the hours staff work. PVI settings should be funded the same so they can employ staff on the same grades this improving the quality of the PVI workforce. As schools are now taking 4 yr olds, settings forced to take 2 year olds therefore ratios lower so staff costs higher.
21	Do you agree that to ensure an equitable level of funding between providers, that the direct staff cost element of the Hourly Base rate for maintained sector providers should be reduced by £0.15 to remove double funding?	
	Harmans Water Playgroup	It should be down to the parent to decide childcare arrangements, schools don't provide full day care at this age, parents needing to get back to work etc. We are meant to be doing what is best for the parent & child THIS IS NOT
	Holly Spring Pre-school	This is wrong we are doing what is best for parent/child, giving flexibility. We are meant to be working together to provide wrap around care.
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	The "double funding" reduction for maintained providers should be more as they have many opportunities to cross subsidise from their main school budget and better financial security.
22	Do you think the Formula should include an element to fund additional educational needs?	
	College Town Infant	Additional Ed needs should be needs led
	The College Nursery	Per child with additional needs
23	Do you think that funding should be paid directly to providers for English as An Additional Language where there are more than 5% of children in the setting?	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Threshold should be higher ie 8% of a 52 place setting ie 4 pupils
	The College Nursery	Keep it the same as now
24	Do you have any suggestions on a readily available, objective factor that could be used to recognise the costs of additional educational needs?	
	College Town Infant	Sen Register
	Meadow Vale Primary	Agree with a central fund- difficult as not many enter nursery with a statement
	Building Blocks Pre-school	As and when needed
	The College Nursery	"Every child matters" each child needs are so different
25	Do you agree that the Schools Forum should be requested to set aside contingency funding to support providers admitting children with special educational needs, where agreed with the Council?	
	Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-school	I thought the local authority provided extra funding for additional needs. I am not sure it should be part of the funding formula.
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Not all settings have EAL or SEN children in attendance whereas some settings have a lot (depends on area)
	Harmans Water Playgroup	I have reservations that will be successful at present we receive no or very little help in this area, this needs to be seriously looked at, as groups will be more reluctant not to take these children, as the costs will be too high. It take staff time & dedication typing reports and attending reviews etc as well as the actual care. Have really strong feelings on this subject, something needs to be done
	Holly Spring Pre-school	At the moment it is hard to receive funding for SEN. Staff put in a lot of hard work & it should be rewarded accordingly
	Little Acorn Montessori School	This funding has been dealt with separately historically and should remain that way otherwise this money could disappear into the larger budget
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	At this early stage of care it can take time to identify and have acknowledged concerns about SEN. This can affect the costs of our care as we 'manage' the situation in the interim period. We have in the past sustained the cost of extra support ourselves to ensure quality of care for the child. How can this be best supported?
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	I feel strongly that SEN funding should remain separate per child individual need and not per setting in the formula
	South Hill Park Pre-school	Again I feel this should be separate from the rest of the funding. Somebody could visit settings to determine how best we could help children will EAL or SEN. This may be additional staff training, resources etc. In this way the money is always spent on the purpose intended.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	Special needs must be kept separate from the formula to ensure that each need is independently assessed and appropriately supported
	The College Nursery	This could help with extra support for the staff and not necessarily on going
	Wasps	Hard to collect data so better to allocate on a needs basis as now.

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

26		No comments
27		No comments
28	Do you agree that the proposed eligibility criteria should be adopted as the policy?	
	Building blocks pre-school	How quickly can additional financial support be provided when so much information is required
	South Hill Park Pre-school	My fear is that poor quality settings will be 'rewarded'. The council need to ensure that settings are not kept open 'artificially' if the real reason for them not having enough children is that parents do not think they are good enough.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	Financial support should only be made available once normal assessments have been exhausted
29		No comments
30		No comments
31		No comments
32	Do you agree that where a provider faces a change in funding of more than 6%, that 3% should be implemented in the first year, with the balance implemented equally over the next 3 years?	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Too Long
33	Do you agree that the transitional funding scheme should last for up to 4 years, with a review after 2 years?	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Too Long
34		No comments
35	Do you agree that if any additional costs arise from the transitional arrangements that the Schools Forum be requested to allocated new funds?	
	Building Blocks Pre-school	It seems that council run/sure start type settings have gained the most whereas the PVI's which already struggle to cover costs will lose money. We feel unsupported and unwanted.
	Little Acorn Montessori School	There should be an annual review as government change could be radical changes
	Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	If your proposal hourly funding for my nursery decreases as proposed it will mean staff redundancies
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	When this formula comes in, potentially PVI all need to purchase new database systems to accommodate hourly rate rather than a sessional rate and also to be able to offer more flexible care
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	Providers need to make reasonable assumptions as part of their planning - this however cannot be unrealistic and be fully protected against the general and 'unknown' challenges facing the economy in the next few years
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	The 3% step is large. It is the difference between profit and loss for some PVI's. To have it imposed year on year until the formula value is reached will be a disaster. Schools with their school budgets behind them will have no problem. The funding reduction could result in redundancy costs and will drive PVI's out of business. PVIs with small reserves will not be able to absorb the change. It takes time to adjust staffing or attract additional children.
	The College Nursery	From where?
36	Do you agree that payments to providers should continue to be made on the current twice termly basis?	
	South Hill Park Pre-school	This works well for us.

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

37	Do you agree that where there is a choice on updating data used for funding purposes that this should be done once a year from the January census return?	
	Sandy Lane Primary	Recalculation Jan & April & Sept
	Bracken Bears Day Nursery	The number of children in the nursery changes termly-the calculation of the data should be termly. If data was gathered at the beginning of the year only this would be at a period of low occupancy which would affect the cash flow for a whole year. January is the period when children leave to go to school
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Argument for this is unclear as changes occur from term to term
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	Data should be collected termly and changes made termly, however, would increase admin
	South Hill Park Pre-school	Changes may occur during the year, eg staff reaching a higher level of qualification, and this should be reflected termly
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	January is not allowing a reliable barometer. Some form of annual averaging should be considered. Perhaps mean, mode reflection at head count day each term
	The College Nursery	The child population at PVI nurseries changes constantly, for us week by week so a termly update would be better. The same as the funding
	Wasps	This should be more regular
38	Do you agree with the local definition of flexibility?	
	The College Nursery	This is how we operate now and have done for many years. Some PVIs are limited by external factors and may only be able to meet some of the criteria will they be recognized. We offer flexibility to all children (2-5 yrs) are we considered inflexible where a GF child chooses only to attend the set hours, but over 2.5 days or different times to sessional hours?
39		No comments
40		No comments
41	Do you agree with the proposed hourly supplement rate for flexibility of provision?	
	Meadow Vale Primary	Has no intention of changing its current practice ie 12.5 hours
	Building Blocks Pre-school	Settings in community halls may have difficulty providing the level of flexibility required to get any additional payment and it may not be sustainable to provide that flexibility. We will struggle to provide 15 at all.
	Harmans Water Playgroup	But for some groups it is not easy to increase hours
	Little Acorn Montessori School	Smaller groups in hired halls will be penalised under this system whilst the maintained sector benefits - unfair as there is often little choice as to hours of opening and number of children in settling etc.
	Owlsmoor Pre-school	The 'leeway' may be difficult to sustain unless funding allows for an hour either side - staffing and maintaining such flexibility may otherwise prove costly
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	For settings based on community halls, we are unable to extend our hours due to the hall being used in the afternoon by other users. It is unfair that we are penalised because of this
	South Hill Park Pre-school	It is difficult to agree with the proposed hourly rate supplement rate at this stage as we do not have our own calculations regarding the cost to the setting.
	Stepping Stones Playgroup	The flexibility concept is fine in principle. With no boundaries to work to it is possible that full flexibility will not be able to be met at a management price/cost. Each setting will face different challenges and limitations so flexibility will have different meanings to each setting.

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

	Additional comments	
	Plus Three Nursery Schools - FW	The PVI sector should be extremely concerned of their future in Bracknell Forest, should this proposal be adopted. Other local authorities appear to have achieved a much fairer outcome for both the maintained and PVI sector. As part of the PVI sector in Bracknell Forest I currently feel very threatened, unwanted and unloved. Thankyou to the government who have now delayed the single funded formula until April 2011 which now allows the PVI time to make our decisions and take any actions necessary
	St Michael's Childcare Trust	The formula: from my days at university, the maxim of my research professor has served me well in my later career: "If it looks wrong, it is wrong. If it looks right, it is still probably wrong!" Looking at Appendix I, "the anticipated proposed changes", if the formula is correct, I would expect to see an equal number of setting which gain or lose from the formula, indicating that the average impact is correct. To have 14 maintained schools receiving an increase in funding and none a decrease looks wrong. To have only 9 PVI's having an increase but 40 having a decrease also looks even more wrong. With maintained receiving an additional £58,520 but the PVI's having £50,533 of funding removed is the wrong answer.
		The formula may be correct but it is populated with parameters that are probably cause of the imbalance between maintained and PVI's. In other words, the costs of PVI's are being under estimated and the maintained sector over estimated. When challenged at the meeting over this, BFBC staffs defence was "this is what the formula produced and the formula is right". Well if it looks wrong it is wrong. Unless of course there is an obvious reason why the funding balance has been wrong in the past but no such reason was offered at the meeting. Within the formula, there are many opportunities eg in support and accommodation costs, where a small change from maintained to PVI would address the imbalance. With Limited reserves, PVI's are at risk of being put out of business by BFBC unless this imbalance is addressed.
		Recommendations - I recommend that having addressed the other issues with the formula that this consultation has identified: 1: The parameters in the formula are adjusted until there are no net movement of funds between the maintained and PVI sectors. 2: That within each sector, there are as many winners as losers. We will then have confidence that the funding formula and the continued provision of Early Years Education will be successful.

O
Funding by provider under the proposed Formula (2008-09 data)

Provider	Osfted URN	Provider Type	Actual 2008-09			Total cash funding from the proposed Formula				Change + more / - less	% comparison cash			Indicative hourly rates			Change + more / - less	
			Participation (hours)	Funding from BFC		Hourly Base Rate	Supplements		Total Funding for the year		Increase	Decrease	No change	Hourly Base Rate	Supplements			Total Funding for the hour
				For the year	By the hour		Deprivation	Quality							Deprivation	Quality		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	P	Q	R	S	
Fox Hill Primary	109805	Maintained	5,700	£18,810	£3.30	£16,815	£1,140	£1,425	£19,380	£570	3.03%			£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	109807	Maintained	15,200	£50,160	£3.30	£44,840	£3,040	£3,800	£51,680	£1,520	3.03%			£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Wildmoor Primary	109812	Maintained	9,500	£31,350	£3.30	£28,025	£0	£2,375	£30,400	£-950		-3.03%		£2.95	£0.00	£0.25	£3.20	£-0.10
College Town Infant and Nursery	109828	Maintained	20,900	£68,970	£3.30	£61,655	£2,090	£5,225	£68,970	£0			0.00%	£2.95	£0.10	£0.25	£3.30	£0.00
Owlsmoor Primary	109870	Maintained	17,100	£56,430	£3.30	£50,445	£1,710	£4,275	£56,430	£0			0.00%	£2.95	£0.10	£0.25	£3.30	£0.00
New Scotland Hill Primary	109883	Maintained	13,300	£43,890	£3.30	£39,235	£0	£3,325	£42,560	£-1,330		-3.03%		£2.95	£0.00	£0.25	£3.20	£-0.10
Birch Hill Primary	109893	Maintained	23,750	£78,375	£3.30	£70,063	£4,750	£5,938	£80,750	£2,375	3.03%			£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Crown Hill Primary and Nursery	109922	Maintained	21,375	£70,538	£3.30	£63,056	£4,275	£5,344	£72,675	£2,138	3.03%			£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Wooden Wood Primary	109928	Maintained	22,325	£73,673	£3.30	£65,859	£4,465	£5,581	£75,905	£2,233	3.03%			£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Wildridings Primary	109941	Maintained	24,700	£81,510	£3.30	£72,865	£4,940	£11,115	£88,920	£7,410	9.09%			£2.95	£0.20	£0.45	£3.60	£0.30
Meadow Vale Primary	109942	Maintained	24,225	£79,943	£3.30	£71,464	£4,845	£6,056	£82,365	£2,423	3.03%			£2.95	£0.20	£0.25	£3.40	£0.10
Newbold School	110141	PVI	7,725	£28,274	£3.66	£26,659	£773	£1,931	£29,363	£1,089	3.85%			£3.45	£0.10	£0.25	£3.80	£0.14
Squirrels Day Nursery	119242	PVI	10,398	£38,055	£3.66	£35,882	£1,040	£0	£36,922	£-1,133		-2.98%		£3.45	£0.10	£0.00	£3.55	£-0.11
Cherry Town Nursery	119248	PVI	6,775	£24,796	£3.66	£23,381	£0	£1,355	£24,736	£-61		-0.25%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01
Owlsmoor Pre-School	119250	PVI	16,770	£61,378	£3.66	£57,873	£1,677	£0	£59,550	£-1,828		-2.98%		£3.45	£0.10	£0.00	£3.55	£-0.11
The Old School Day Nursery	119251	PVI	13,868	£50,755	£3.66	£47,857	£0	£2,774	£50,630	£-125		-0.25%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01
Teddies Nurseries	119252	PVI	11,590	£42,419	£3.66	£39,997	£1,159	£0	£41,156	£-1,263		-2.98%		£3.45	£0.10	£0.00	£3.55	£-0.11
PAWS Nursery	119256	PVI	18,180	£66,539	£3.66	£62,739	£0	£0	£62,739	£-3,800		-5.71%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
RMA - Lakeside Nursery	119258	PVI	14,712	£53,848	£3.66	£50,773	£0	£2,942	£53,715	£-132		-0.25%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01
Sandhurst Nursery School	119260	PVI	23,670	£86,632	£3.66	£81,685	£0	£0	£81,685	£-4,947		-5.71%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
WASPS Pre-School	119261	PVI	19,805	£72,486	£3.66	£68,347	£0	£0	£68,347	£-4,139		-5.71%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-School	119262	PVI	13,238	£48,449	£3.66	£45,683	£0	£3,309	£48,992	£543	1.12%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.25	£3.70	£0.04
Carousel Nursery School	119268	PVI	4,960	£18,154	£3.66	£17,117	£0	£1,240	£18,357	£203	1.12%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.25	£3.70	£0.04
Garth Under 5's Nursery	119269	PVI	6,363	£23,287	£3.66	£21,957	£1,273	£0	£23,229	£-57		-0.25%		£3.45	£0.20	£0.00	£3.65	£-0.01
The Ark Pre-School	119271	PVI	4,975	£18,208	£3.66	£17,169	£0	£1,244	£18,412	£204	1.12%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.25	£3.70	£0.04
The College Nursery	119277	PVI	13,160	£48,166	£3.66	£45,415	£2,632	£3,290	£51,337	£3,172	6.58%			£3.45	£0.20	£0.25	£3.90	£0.24
College Town Montessori Nursery Ltd	119278	PVI	14,490	£53,033	£3.66	£50,005	£0	£3,623	£53,627	£594	1.12%			£3.45	£0.00	£0.25	£3.70	£0.04
Building Blocks Pre-School	119286	PVI	8,880	£32,501	£3.66	£30,645	£0	£1,776	£32,421	£-80		-0.25%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01
Little Acorns Montessori School	119290	PVI	10,770	£39,418	£3.66	£37,167	£0	£0	£37,167	£-2,251		-5.71%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
St Michael's Childcare Trust	119299	PVI	17,695	£64,764	£3.66	£61,065	£3,539	£0	£64,604	£-159		-0.25%		£3.45	£0.20	£0.00	£3.65	£-0.01
South Hill Park Pre-School	119301	PVI	19,770	£72,358	£3.66	£68,226	£3,954	£3,954	£76,134	£3,776	5.22%			£3.45	£0.20	£0.20	£3.85	£0.19
Ascot Baptist Church Pre-School	119302	PVI	7,053	£25,812	£3.66	£24,338	£0	£0	£24,338	£-1,474		-5.71%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.00	£3.45	£-0.21
Crowthorne Village Pre-School	119317	PVI	8,720	£31,915	£3.66	£30,093	£0	£1,744	£31,837	£-78		-0.25%		£3.45	£0.00	£0.20	£3.65	£-0.01

Provider	Ofsted URN	Provider Type	Actual funding rate 2008-09	Indicative funding rate 2008-09 through BFC	Change in funding	Change in funding	Within transitional funding protection scheme?	Transitional adjustment per hour 2010-11	Indicative hourly rate 2010-11	Change from 2008-09	Transitional adjustment per hour 2011-12	Indicative hourly rate 2011-12	Change from 2010-11	Transitional adjustment per hour 2012-2013	Indicative hourly rate 2012-13	Change from 2011-12
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
Harmans Water Primary	130949	Maintained	£3.30	£3.40	£0.10	3.03%	Yes	£0.03	£3.33	0.91%	£0.03	£3.36	0.91%	£0.04	£3.40	1.21%
Sandy Lane Primary	133619	Maintained	£3.30	£3.30	£0.00	0.00%	No									
Great Hollands Primary	134304	Maintained	£3.30	£3.50	£0.20	6.06%	Yes	£0.07	£3.37	2.12%	£0.07	£3.40	2.12%	£0.06	£3.50	1.82%
The Pines Primary and Nursery	134740	Maintained	£3.30	£3.70	£0.40	12.12%	Yes	£0.13	£3.43	3.94%	£0.13	£3.46	3.94%	£0.14	£3.70	4.24%
Binfield Pre-School	159101	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Braken Bears Day Nursery	509756	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
Pines Community Pre-School	509758	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Winkfield Montessori	955614	PVI	£3.66	£3.70	£0.04	1.09%	No									
Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	EY225660	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
The Family Tree Nursery	EY262359	PVI	£3.66	£3.85	£0.19	5.19%	Yes	£0.06	£3.36	1.64%	£0.06	£3.39	1.64%	£0.07	£3.85	1.91%
Teepee Day Nursery	EY263716	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
The Mortarboard Nursery School	EY269662	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Rectory Lane Nursery School	EY292438	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Eagle House School	EY297376	PVI	£3.66	£3.70	£0.04	1.09%	No									
Harmans Water Pre-School	EY312359	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Busy Bees Montessori	EY314825	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Children's House Nursery	EY320968	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Lambrook Haileybury School	EY349670	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Plus Three Nursery - Farley Wood	EY357460	PVI	£3.66	£3.45	-£0.21	-5.74%	Yes	-£0.07	£3.23	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.26	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.45	-1.91%
Plus Three Nursery - Newell Green	EY357469	PVI	£3.66	£3.45	-£0.21	-5.74%	Yes	-£0.07	£3.23	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.26	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.45	-1.91%
Plus Three Nursery - Martins Heron	EY357477	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
Sports Centre Pre-School	EY366001	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
The Oaks Pre-School	EY368053	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Footsteps at St Josephs	EY375203	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Holly Spring Pre-School	EY377858	PVI	£3.66	£3.95	£0.29	7.92%	Yes	£0.10	£3.40	2.73%	£0.10	£3.43	2.73%	£0.09	£3.95	2.46%
Pavillion Pre-School	EY385228	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Dolphin Nursery (Bracknell) Ltd	EY385381	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Meadowbrook Montessori School	EY387762	PVI	£3.66	£3.65	-£0.01	-0.27%	No									
Bramleywood Nursery	EY391711	PVI	£3.66	£3.75	£0.09	2.46%	No									
Birch Hill Pre-School	EY392849	PVI	£3.66	£3.55	-£0.11	-3.01%	Yes	-£0.04	£3.26	-1.09%	-£0.04	£3.29	-1.09%	-£0.03	£3.55	-0.82%
Chavey Down Nursery School	EY393320	PVI	£3.66	£3.45	-£0.21	-5.74%	Yes	-£0.07	£3.23	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.26	-1.91%	-£0.07	£3.45	-1.91%