

Cheshire West & Chester Council



Have Your Say on the Early Years Single Funding Formula and Monthly Payments



Cheshire West
and Chester

Consultation on the Early Years Single Funding Formula and Monthly Payments to Providers

In April 2017, the Department for Education introduced the Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) to allocate funding to local authorities for the universal and extended entitlements for three and four year olds. Although the EYNFF standardised the allocations to local authorities nationally, the formula for then allocating this funding to providers remains a local decision for each local authority, albeit within specific requirements also set by the Department for Education.

In order to implement the new requirements of the EYNFF, Cheshire West and Chester consulted with all providers in January 2017 on making necessary changes to the local funding formula for the new requirements for the 2018-2019 financial year. Since this point, the Local Authority has further reviewed the local funding formula with provider representatives through the Early Years Reference Group. As such, we are consulting with providers ahead of the 2019-2020 financial year on whether further changes to the local funding formula should be made, .

In further changes, the Department for Education's statutory guidance now states that local authorities should pay all providers, particularly childminders, on a monthly basis by September 2018 unless a provider requests and the local authority agree to continue an existing alternative sustainable method of payment.

This survey is to gather your views on the options for the local funding formula and changes to monthly payments for the next financial year.

All answers will be treated as strictly confidential.

Helpful hints for completing this questionnaire

- This questionnaire consists of a number of pages of text (which provide background information) and 14 questions which should take no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete, once you've read the background information.
- Once you have finished please take a minute to check you have answered all the questions.
- Questionnaires should be completed and emailed back no later than 12 October 2018 to Lorna.A.Davies@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk

Thank you in advance for your time.

If there are issues with accessing the survey online you can complete a paper copy and send it to the address at the end of the survey.

Cheshire West and Chester Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF)

The current EYSFF for allocating funding for three and four year old entitlements in the Borough for 2018-2019 is shown in the table below. The formula includes a standard base rate for all providers and a number of supplements payable to eligible settings either as an additional hourly rate or lump sum allowance for the year.

Provider rates	
Base rate per hour	£3.62
Deprivation supplement per hour (% of deprived children / 2 x 1p) e.g. 100% children from deprived postcode 100% / 2 x 1p = £0.50	up to £0.50
Quality supplement per hour- Qualified Teacher & Early Years Teacher) status	£0.25
Quality supplement per hour- Early Years Professional status	£0.15
Rurality lump sum	£3,000
Partial rurality lump sum	£2,000

Requirements for all local authorities

Since April 2017 there have been a number of requirements on how local authorities are able to allocate funding to providers for the three and four year old entitlements through the EYSFF. These requirements are intended to ensure that funding provided by the Government is fairly distributed to providers.

The key points on local authority funding of providers are that local authorities:

- should set a single funding rate (including same base rate and supplements) for both entitlements for three and four year olds (that is, both the universal 15 hours, and the additional 15 hours for working parents)
- should be moving towards a universal base rate for all types of provider in their local three and four year old formula, and should do this by 2019 to 2020
- must use a deprivation supplement in their local three and four year old formula, and any other supplements used must fall within one of the allowable categories
- must not channel more than 10% of their funding for three and four olds through funding supplements
- can continue to use 'lump sums (as well as a differential base rate) to distribute Government funding, including the supplementary funding for Maintained Nursery Schools to enable the protection of their 2016 to 2017 funding rates
- must plan to spend at least 95% of their three and four year old funding from government on the delivery of the government entitlements for three and four year olds

Meeting the requirements in Cheshire West and Chester

- The local authority already operate a universal base rate of funding for all providers and no further reforms are necessary to bring this in line with the requirement for this to be in place for 2019-2020. In 2018-2019, the base rate was £3.62 per pupil hour. The rate for 2019-2020 will be affected by the proposals on funding supplements within this document.
- The total value of supplements used in any authority must not be more than 10% of the total value of planned funding to be passed through to providers. In Cheshire West and Chester, funding supplements currently account for approximately 10% of funding allocated and so could be reduced but not increased.
- The supplementary funding for the maintained nursery school in the Borough will be made available to that school as intended to protect the overall level of funding for the school. The funding is allocated to the Local Authority **separately and in addition** to the 3 and 4 year old funding allocation and therefore does not affect allocations available to other providers. The supplementary funding is available for the duration of the Parliament to allow the school transitional protection to the new single base rate for all providers.
- In 2018-2019, the pass through rate of three and four year old funding through to providers is 97%, within the government requirements of the 5% central spend cap. The pass through rate also includes funding made available through the Early Years Access Fund for additional support for individual children.

Review of Funding Supplements

In 2019-2020, local authorities will continue to have the ability to use funding supplements in their local funding formula in addition to the universal base rate. Supplements are amounts of funding which are given in addition to the base rate to reflect local needs or policy objectives.

Local authorities must continue to use a deprivation supplement with other permitted supplements being discretionary. As such we are seeking views on retaining, reducing or removing the discretionary supplements currently in use for 2019-2020.

Over the following sections, information is provided on how each supplement is used and how many providers receive funding through this mechanism. We have also indicated how much funding would be made available through the base rate from removing any supplement. There will inevitably be winners and losers from any change to the current funding formula and therefore transitional arrangements to move towards a different formula can also be considered.

The following table shows the number of providers, by type, delivering three and four year entitlements in the summer term 2018 and the number and percentage receiving each of the funding supplements.

	TOTAL	PVI	MNU	Childminder
Number of providers for three & four year olds	272	156	43	73
Number receiving deprivation supplement	155	116	34	5
Number receiving QTS supplement	97	56	40	1
Number receiving EYP supplement	29	29	0	0
Number receiving partial rurality supplement	9	5	4	0
Number receiving rurality supplement	29	24	5	0

	% of providers	% PVI	% MNU	% Childminder
Receiving deprivation supplement	57%	74%	79%	7%
Receiving QTS supplement	36%	36%	93%	1%
Receiving EYP supplement	11%	19%	0%	0%
Receiving partial rurality supplement	3%	3%	9%	0%
Receiving rurality supplement	11%	15%	12%	0%

Description of Funding Supplements

1. Deprivation

The use of this supplement remains a mandatory requirement therefore needs to be retained. 57% of providers are in receipt of this supplement, therefore clearly the impact of any change in the mechanism used to allocate funding for deprivation would create turbulence for a large number of providers.

Currently this funding is measured based on the child's postcode ensuring that providers on the border of an area of deprivation receive funding for those children from a deprived area attending with them. If it was based on the provider postcode some providers with no children from a deprived area attending their setting might still receive this supplement whilst providers outside of the area of deprivation might have many children attending from an area of deprivation yet not receive this supplement.

The amount is based on the percentage (%) of children attending the setting from a deprived postcode and ranges from 0.005p (half a pence) to 50p (fifty pence). For childminders it is based on the number of children attending from a deprived postcode and ranges from 10p to 30p.

2. Rurality/sparsity

This is an optional supplement used to support providers serving rural/sparse communities where populations may not make a provision sustainable.

This supplement currently supports 38 providers (14%) in the Borough and would have a significant impact on these providers if removed.

The current method of calculation uses DEFRA's classification of Rural and Predominantly Rural which is based on the postcode area of the provider. However, we are aware that this classification method on its own does not recognise the sufficiency need of the setting or its sustainability. Currently 35 of these providers (92%) deliver in an area with low or no other provision and 17 providers (45%) have low occupancy levels. Applying an additional criteria would ensure that this supplement only goes to support settings that would otherwise not be sustainable in some areas where they are one of the only providers delivering to families.

3. Quality

This is an optional supplement which can be used to support workforce qualifications and system leadership only.

Currently there are two quality supplements payable to providers with staff leading practice with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) paid at 25p, staff leading practice with Early Years Professional Status (EYPS) paid at 15p. This supplement recognises the additional costs of employing qualified staff.

QTS and EYPS are measured by certification and a declaration from the provider that that person is in the room with the children for at least 15 hours a week leading practice. The impact of qualified staff on the progress of children in a setting cannot currently be accurately measured because returns of this data are not consistent and are not received from all providers.

47% of providers in receipt of one or more of the supplements. The amount of funding targeted through this supplement equates to approximately 16p that may otherwise be applied through the universal base rate.

The amount of funding currently allocated through the base rate and through supplements is shown in the table below for the 2017-2018 academic year.

The table also shows how much could be added to the base rate if the funding currently allocated through the supplement was instead distributed to all providers through the base rate (i.e. if the supplement was removed)

	Total 2017/2018 Academic Year	Increase to per hour Base Rate if not paid as supplement	Current Funded rate	Effect on eligible provider of removing supplement
Number of three and four year old hours funded	4,038,073			
Value of payments through the Universal Base Rate	£14,521,481			
Value of payments through the Deprivation Supplement	£535,593	£0.13	Varies by provider	Mandatory so can't be removed but can be reduced
Value of payments through the Quality Supplement (QTS)	£539,061	£0.13	£0.25	-£0.12
Value of payments through the Quality Supplement (EYP)	£101,515	£0.03	£0.15	-£0.12
Value of payments through the Rurality Supplement	£33,000	£0.01	£3,000	-£3,000
Value of payments through the Partial Rurality Supplement	£62,000	£0.02	£2,000	-£2,000

Other local authorities

The move to more specific and restricted local funding formulas under a national system has better enabled comparisons with other local authorities. We are aware from provider representatives that neighbouring authorities have been able to issue funding rates earlier than in Cheshire West and Chester and also to confirm rates for future years. These authorities have operated a simpler formula than has been operating in Cheshire West and Chester with less use of discretionary supplements. They will not have needed to review the affordability and compliance with the new requirements in the same way as we have in the Borough recently and simplicity and certainty of funding rates therefore is also a consideration in this consultation.

The funding formulae for 2017-2018 financial year for our neighbouring authorities and statistical neighbours are shown below.

Local Authority	Description	Unit Value PVI £	Unit Value Nursery School £	Unit Value Nursery Class £	Unit Type
Cheshire West and Chester	Base rate	3.58	3.58	3.58	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.15	0.05	0.24	PerHour
	Quality - QTS	0.25	0.25	0.25	PerHour
	Quality - EYPS	0.15			PerHour
	Rurality	3000		3000	LumpSum
	Partial rurality	2000		2000	LumpSum
Central Bedfordshire	Base Rate	4.05	3.7	3.7	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.4	0.4	0.4	PerHour
	Quality	0.2			PerHour
Cheshire East	Base Rate	3.88	3.88	3.88	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.09	0.33	0.16	PerHour
	Rural/Sparsity Factor	0.07		0.07	PerHour
East Riding of Yorkshire	Base Rate	3.87	3.87	3.87	PerHour
	Deprivation	620	300	300	PerChild
Nottinghamshire	Base Rate	4.17		4.07	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.05		0.05	PerHour
Staffordshire	Base Rate	3.85	3.85	3.85	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.3		0.3	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.2		0.2	PerHour
Stockport	Base Rate (extended hours)	4.3	4.3	4.3	PerHour
	Base Rate Funding	4.58	0	4.58	PerHour
	Base Rate Funding	4.17	6.58	4.17	PerHour
	Deprivation supplement	0.31	0.31	0.31	PerHour
Warrington	Base Rate	4.00	4.3	4.28	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.02	0.02	0.02	PerHour
Warwickshire	Base Rate	3.77	3.77	3.77	PerHour
	Deprivation	1.14	1.14	1.14	PerHour
Worcestershire	Base Rate	4.14	4.14	4.14	PerHour
	Deprivation	1.00	1.00	1.00	
York	Base Rate	4	4	4	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.4	0.4	0.4	PerHour
Halton	Base Rate	4.72	4.72	4.72	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.08	0.08	0.08	PerHour
	Quality - QTS	734.56	734.56	734.56	LumpSum
Wirral	Base Rate	3.6	5	3.6	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.04		0.04	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.12		0.12	PerHour
	Deprivation	0.19	0.23	0.19	PerHour
	Quality EYP/EYT/QTS/CE	0.13	0.16	0.13	PerHour
	Flexibility within school day	0.15	0.18	0.15	PerHour
	Flexibility Outside school day	0.15	0.18	0.15	PerHour

Monthly Payments

The Department for Education's Statutory Guidance states; A4.13 Local authorities should pay all providers, particularly childminders, monthly and are expected to do so from September 2018. If a provider requests and the local authority agree an existing alternative sustainable method of payment may continue,

Cheshire West and Chester Council did not implement monthly payments from September 2018. We instead set our intentions to consult with providers and consider the impact of changes to the payment system.

It is worth noting that the amount you receive is based on your claim, so all payments systems will payout the same total amount of funding across the claim period, it is only the frequency of claims and payments that will differ.

Any change in system will have to be assessed for its impact on childcare providers, the early years team tasked with processing the claims, our payments and ICT departments and the hub software provider. We do not wish to increase the administrative burden on yourselves and us through additional hub tasks. We have no additional resource available to cover an increase in administration workload.

A recent national survey of councils by childcare works (the body tasked with supporting the implementation of 30 hours) showed that 75% of councils had not moved to monthly payments and that following consultation with providers had decided not to make the change.

Unlike other Local Authorities, we pay our providers 70% of your estimated activity upfront each term, 30% at the end of term. This is better than monthly because you receive the majority of the funding upfront so you have more flexibility to manage cashflow. It is worth noting that during the summer claim period for providers offering funded hours term time only the monthly payment would be 25% as no payment would be claimed or made for the month of August.

We can advise that any change to our payment method will apply to all settings and we will not be able to agree to provider requests to continue with the existing arrangement as it is not possible to run two different payment methods on the hub.

The following of examples of % breakdown, number of claims and actual payments which would be received for a day nursery on the following four payment processes. Budget monitoring could be difficult for monthly adjusted payments as the amount each month could differ. The current funding system requires a claim or an adjustment for each payment made even if you have no children to claim for or no adjustments this means that for monthly payments you would need, as a minimum, to submit a claim each month to very strict deadlines.

Spring term	Months	Current payment (70-30%)	Adjusted Monthly payment	Current payment with (80-20%)	Monthly payment with final adjustment
	January	70%	33% adjusted to actuals	80%	33%
	February	0	33% adjusted to actuals	0	33%
	March	30% adjusted to actuals	33% adjusted to actuals	20% adjusted to actuals	33% adjusted to actuals
Claims		2	3	2	3

Summer term	Months	Current payment (70-30%)	Adjusted Monthly payment	Current payment with (80-20%)	Monthly payment with final adjustment
	April	70%	20% adjusted to actuals	80%	20%
	May	0%	20% adjusted to actuals	0%	20%
	June	0%	20% adjusted to actuals	0%	20%
	July	30% adjusted to actuals	20% adjusted to actuals	20% adjusted to actuals	20%
	August	0%	20% adjusted to actuals	0%	20% adjusted to actuals
Claims		2	5	2	5

Autumn term	Months	Current payment (70-30%)	Adjusted Monthly payment	Current payment with (80-20%)	Monthly payment with final adjustment
	September	70%	25% adjusted to actuals	80%	25%
	October	0%	25% adjusted to actuals	0%	25%
	November	30% adjusted to actuals	25% adjusted to actuals	20% adjusted to actuals	25%
	December	0%	25% adjusted to actuals	0%	25% adjusted to actuals
Claims		2	4	2	4

	Current payment (70-30%)	Adjusted Monthly payment	Current payment with (80-20%)	Monthly payment with final adjustment
Yearly Total claims	6	12	6	12

Funding paid at 70% upfront and 30% balance towards the end of period/term

Autumn 2017	Dates	Total Claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
Initial claim	10/07/2017	£8,530.04		
Initial Payment	week commencing 04/09/2017		£5,971.03	70% total claim
Adjustment claim	13/11/2017	£9,445.64		plus 640.92 adj
Final payment	week commencing 11/12/2017		£3,474.61	30% claim amount +/- adjustments
Spring 2018	Dates/Claim	Total Claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
Initial claim	11/12/2017	£19,365.87		
Interim Payment	week commencing 08/01/2018		£13,556.11	70% total claim
Adjustment claim	19/02/2018	£18,669.27		minus 487.62 adj
Final payment	week commencing 19/03/2018		£5,113.16	30% claim amount +/- adjustments
Summer 2018	Dates/Claim	Total Claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
Initial claim	19/03/2018	£23,885.69		
Interim Payment	week commencing 16/04/2018		£16,719.98	70% claim amount
Adjustment claim	11/06/2018	£23,885.69		
Final payment	week commencing 09/07/2018		£7,165.71	30% claim amount +/- adjustments

Funding claimed and paid on monthly adjusted basis (amounts adjusted each month)

Autumn 2017	Dates/Claim	Total Claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
September claim	07/08/2017	£8,530.04		
Payment	week commencing 4/09/2017		£2,132.51	25% claim amount
October claim	04/09/2017	£9,445.64		
Payment	week commencing 02/10/2017		£2,361.41	25% claim amount
November claim	09/10/2017	£9,445.64		
Payment	week commencing 06/11/2017		£2,361.41	25% claim amount + adjustment
December claim	06/11/2017	£9,445.64		plus 228.9 adj
Payment	week commencing 04/12/17		£2,590.31	25% claim amount + adjustment
Spring 2018	Dates/Claim	Total Claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
January claim	04/12/2017	£19,365.87		
Payment	week commencing 01/01/18		£6,390.74	33% claim amount
February claim	08/01/2018	£19,365.87		
Payment	week commencing 05/02/2018		£6,390.74	33% claim amount
March claim	05/02/2018	£18,669.27		minus 459.76 adj
Payment	05/03/2018		£5,887.79	34% claim amount +/- adjustment
Summer 2018	Dates/Claim	Total Claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
April claim	05/03/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment	week commencing 02/04/2018		£4,777.14	20% claim amount
May claim	09/04/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment	week commencing 07/05/2018		£4,777.14	20% claim amount
June claim	07/05/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment	week commencing 04/06/2018		£4,777.14	20% claim amount
July claim	04/06/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment due	week commencing 02/07/2018		£4,777.14	20% claim amount
August claim	09/07/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment due	week commencing 06/08/2018		£4,777.14	20% claim amount +/- adjustment

Funding paid at 80% upfront and 20% balance towards the end of term

Autumn 2017	Dates/Claim	Total claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
Initial claim	10/07/2017	£8,530.04		
Interim Payment	week commencing 04/09/2017		£6,824.03	80% claim amount
Adjustment claim	13/11/2017	£9,445.64		plus 732.48 adj
Final payment	week commencing 11/12/2017		£2,621.61	20% claim amount +/- adjustments
Spring 2018	Dates/Claim		Amount Paid	% of claim paid
Initial claim	11/12/2017	£19,365.87		
Interim Payment	week commencing 08/01/2018		£15,492.70	80% claim amount
Adjustment claim	19/02/2018	£18,669.27		minus 557.28 adj
Final payment	week commencing 19/03/2018		£3,176.57	20% claim amount +/- adjustments
Summer 2018	Dates/Claim		Amount Paid	% of claim paid
Initial claim	19/03/2018	£23,885.69		
Interim Payment	week commencing 16/04/2018		£19,108.55	80% claim amount
Adjustment claim	11/06/2018	£23,885.69		
Final payment	week commencing 09/07/2018		£4,777.14	20% claim amount +/- adjustments

Funding claimed and paid on a monthly basis adjusted in the last month of the period.

Autumn 2017	Dates/Claim	Total claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
September claim	07/08/2017	£8,530.04		
Payment due	week commencing 4/09/2017		£2,132.51	25% of claim amount
October claim	04/09/2017	£9,445.64		
Payment due	week commencing 02/10/2017		£2,132.51	25% of claim amount
November claim	09/10/2017	£9,445.64		
Payment due	week commencing 06/11/2017		£2,132.51	25% of claim amount
December claim	06/11/2017	£9,445.64		plus 686.7 adj
Payment due	week commencing 04/12/17		£3,048.11	25% of claim amount +/- adjustment
Spring 2018	Dates/Claim		Amount Paid	% of claim paid
January claim	04/12/2017	£19,365.87		
Payment due	week commencing 01/01/18		£6,390.74	33% of claim amount
February claim	08/01/2018	£19,365.87		
Payment due	week commencing 05/02/2018		£6,390.74	33% of claim amount
March claim	05/02/2018	£18,669.27		minus 459.76 adj
Payment due	05/03/2018		£5,887.79	34% of claim amount +/- adjustments
Summer 2018	Dates/Claim	Total claim	Amount Paid	% of claim paid
April claim	05/03/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment due	week commencing 02/04/2018		£4,777.14	20% of claim amount
May claim	09/04/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment due	week commencing 07/05/2018		£4,777.14	20% of claim amount
June claim	07/05/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment due	week commencing 04/06/2018		£4,777.14	20% of claim amount
July claim	04/06/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment due	week commencing 02/07/2018		£4,777.14	20% of claim amount
August claim	09/07/2018	£23,885.69		
Payment due	week commencing 06/08/2018		£4,777.14	20% of claim amount +/- adjustments

Consultation Questions

Question 1

What type of provider are you?

Please select 1 of the types of provider (from the drop down list) below, if you select other please enter a provider type in the box below.

Type
Please select from the list below:
Other:

Question 2

What funding supplements do you currently receive?

Please select all supplements you currently receive from the drop down list below

Supplement
Please select from the list below:

Question 3

Please tick 1 of the statements below which you feel matches your views on the use of each supplement in the EYSFF.

Supplement	The supplement should be retained	The supplement should be removed
Rurality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality – Qualified teacher status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality – Early years professional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 4

Please tick 1 of the statements below which you feel matches your views on the value of each supplement in the EYSFF.

Supplement	The amount of the supplement should remain unchanged	The supplement should be reduced in value	The supplement should be increased in value
Deprivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rurality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality – Qualified teacher status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality – Early years professional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 5

Please tick 1 of the statements below which you feel matches your views on the criteria/ eligibility of each supplement in the EYSFF.

Supplement	The current eligibility criteria should be retained	The current eligibility criteria should be changed
Deprivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rurality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality – Qualified teacher status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality – Early years professional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 6

If you have responded that the rurality supplement criteria should be reviewed in question 4.

Do you agree an additional criteria should be added so this supplement is only paid in areas where provision is sparse?

Please tick 1 of the statements below which matches your views on the use of this supplement.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 7

If you have responded that the quality supplement criteria should be reviewed in question 4.

Do you agree the amounts paid for Qualified Staff should only be paid to providers who submit child progress/tracking data and that (once we have the data available to measure this) it should be linked to children’s progress?

Please tick 1 of the statements below which matches your views on the use of this supplement.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 8

Please tick 1 of the statements below which you feel matches your views on payment methods

Keep the current method of 6 claims a years with 70% upfront and 30% adjusted to actuals at the end.	Change to monthly of 12 claims a year with possible varying amounts month by month to account for monthly adjustments.	Change to monthly method with 9 payments a year being based on estimates and 3 claims a year (the last month of each period) these payments would be based on actuals.	Keep the current method of 6 claims a year but increase the upfront payment to 80% and the final adjusted payment to 20%.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 9

Do you agree publishing consistently in advance the dates for claims and payments would be helpful?

Please tick 1 of the statements below which matches your views on publishing dates.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 10

If payments were made during the first week of each claim period (i.e. week commencing 1 Sept, 2 January, 1 April), instead of the first week of term, would this be helpful?

Please tick 1 of the statements below which matches your views on changing payment dates.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 11

Would you agree to delay changes to the payment method until systems could be put in place that would minimise the resource impact of the change?

Please tick 1 of the statements below which matches your views on delaying implementation of monthly payments.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 12

How would a change in payment mechanism affect the amount of time you spend on administration?

Please tick 1 of the statements below which matches your views on administration time.

Really decrease admin time	Decrease admin time	No Affect	Increase admin time	Really increase admin time
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 13

Would a change in payment mechanism improve your settings financial stability/planning?

Please tick 1 of the statements below which matches your views on financial stability/planning.

Really easy financial stability/planning	Easier financial stability/planning	No Affect	More difficult financial stability/planning	Really difficult financial stability/planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 14

**Are there other affects a change to the payment mechanism would have on your setting?
(please provide details):**

Please use this section to include any further comments or suggestions relating to any of the aspects listed above or anything else relating to the changes to funding for three and four year olds

**Thank you very much for taking part in this consultation.
Please return this questionnaire, by Friday 12 October 2018.**

Lorna.a.davies@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk

Lorna Davies, Commissioning People, 4th Floor, HQ, 58 Nicholas Street, Chester, CH1 2NP