



# THE UNIQUE AND ADDED VALUE OF BIRMINGHAM'S MAINTAINED NURSERY SCHOOLS

MAY 2019



## PREPARED BY

Prof Chris Pascal  
Prof Tony Bertram

*Centre for Research in Early  
Childhood (CREC)*

## IN COLLABORATION WITH

Heads of the 27 Birmingham  
Maintained Nursery Schools



## **Acknowledgement**

The Centre for Research in Early Childhood (CREC) would like to thank the Birmingham Maintained Nursery Schools, and their staff, for the time and support they gave in the production of this report.



# Contents

<b>1. Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Evidence Base</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. The True Value of Birmingham MNS</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. Final Remarks</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Child and Family Funding and Costing Case Studies</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Birmingham Nursery Schools Reach and Access Data</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Cost and Funding Assumptions</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Glossary to Acronyms</b>	<b>50</b>



# The Unique and Added Value of Birmingham's Maintained Nursery Schools

## 1. Executive Summary

### Background

1.1 The unique and specialised nature of Local Authority Maintained Nursery Schools (MNS) is emphasised in a recent DfE Report (Paull and Popov, 2019), which as a publicly funded service, are: more likely to be located in disadvantaged areas; have a higher number of children in receipt of the Early Years Pupil Premium; have a significantly higher proportion of children with special educational needs; and offer a greater range and frequency of additional and specialist services than other early years providers. Despite these exceptional demands, OFSTED consistently rates MNS higher than other form of early years provision with the majority being judged good or outstanding (Paull and Popov, 2019). The 2019 DfE Report also sets out some key challenges for MNS in the current climate; there is concern that MNS will not be viable without the supplementary funding they currently receive.

1.2 Birmingham is the Local Authority with the largest number of MNS (27) in the country and to date has maintained its commitment to sustaining them, helped by the Government's recent transitional funding. Yet Birmingham MNS remain under severe pressure due to budget cuts and the impact of wider austerity measures which have reduced wider services for families and young children within and beyond schools (Pascal, Bertram and Cramp, 2019). The focus of this paper therefore is to illuminate the outstanding quality, effectiveness and value for money of Birmingham MNS in delivering child and family outcomes for the most disadvantaged groups in the city in order to inform the decisions of politicians and policy members in Birmingham and also nationally.

1.3 The evidence in this funding and costing paper has been prepared collaboratively by the 27 Birmingham Maintained Nursery Schools (MNS) and analysed by the Centre for Research in Early Childhood (CREC). Through a rigorous cost analysis of a representative sample of nine detailed case studies of vulnerable children and families, it makes explicit and visible the true and added-value of MNS as a unique, cost effective, public service.

### What is the complexity of child and family needs addressed by MNS?

1.4 Birmingham is a large, urban city serving a plural, diverse and young population, and the case study evidence reveals that its MNS are responding to a wide and complex range of needs of their children and families. These complex needs go far beyond the child's learning and development and include wider family needs for help with basic life requirements such as housing, food, safety, debt management and drug and substance abuse and the differential impact of austerity on the poorest in society.

1.5. Addressing these complex needs through early intervention is vital for the health and well being of the children and the case studies vividly reveal that since the reduction in Children's



Centres services, the Nursery School is now the service where these complex child and family needs are often identified, addressed and multi-agency responses coordinated and delivered.

### **What is the range of services offered and accessed by children and families?**

1.6 Given the wide range of needs presented by young children and families in Birmingham the case studies clearly demonstrate that the MNS are offering a wide range of multi-agency and multi-professional support and services, either on site themselves or through partnership with other agencies and professionals. This work is testimony to the high level of multi-sector and multi-professional partnership working which the Nursery Schools lead in the sector and the increasing responsibilities the Nursery Schools are taking on as other support services diminish.

### **What are the benefits of the services accessed for children and families?**

1.7 Enhanced learning and development outcomes for children who attend MNS, particularly those with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEN/D) and socio-economic disadvantage, are well documented in the case studies. The children also importantly benefited from the Nursery School working more holistically and ensuring that their basic needs were being met, including food, clothes, housing, safety and refuge from threatening and violent home environments.

1.8 This study also indicates the positive benefits for parents and the wider family with regard to health and well being. Starkly and remarkably, and in the absence of other services, in some cases severe and life threatening life conditions are also mitigated through the Nursery's action, such as lack of food, provision of housing, removal from domestic violence, treatment for drug and substance abuse and protection from human trafficking.

### **What is the true value of Birmingham MNS?**

1.9 The costing evidence demonstrates unequivocally the true value of Birmingham's MNS and their added value, particularly for those children and families who are identified as most in need or vulnerable. The added value for these 4,613 city children ranges from 19% to a staggering 445% when compared to the actual funding provided for services delivered. The most added value is identified in Nursery School services delivered to children on a Child Protection Plan (445%), where funding provided only meets 18% of the actual cost. For a child with SEND, regardless of the severity, funding never meets more than 44% of the actual costs, the shortfall covered by MNS.

1.10 The evidence reveals that Birmingham's MNS are currently contributing **over £11.5 million annually** through the additional non-funded services they provide to these most vulnerable children and families. This contribution is made through partnership working, cost efficiencies, unpaid hours, foregone wages, practitioner goodwill and professional generosity and reflects the true public service value of MNS to the city. In reality the actual figure is likely to be even higher but we have offset the supplementary funding (£4.5 million annually) provided to MNS from DfE via the local authority to reflect the additional costs and regulatory requirements and responsibilities associated with schools (as opposed to other early years providers who since 2017 have received the same hourly funding rate as MSN through the Early Years single funding formula).



### **What do the case studies reveal about access, inclusion and service sustainability in Birmingham MNS?**

1.11 The funding provided for the significant number of children with complex needs attending Birmingham's MNS is considerably less than the actual cost of the services delivered to these children and their families. These services are critical in ensuring access to early intervention and securing the developmental progress, safety and well being of vulnerable children, not only during the Foundation years but beyond into Primary School. Costing the additional professional work is very difficult as it is a hidden subsidy, with Nursery School staff often doing this work in their own time and in addition to their formal duties. This hidden but vital work is not acknowledged in costing and funding comparisons.

### **Final Remarks**

1.12 The Government has not yet confirmed if the supplementary funding for MNS will be continued after 2019/20 which means MNS are under threat from significantly reduced staffing, reduced services and potential closures. The loss of the transitional funding is equivalent to a 31% cut in MNS funding (Lucy Powell, statement to HoC, 31st January 2019). This would mean that the valuable and effective work in early help and intervention for these vulnerable children and families, which Birmingham MNS currently provide at minimal costs to the City, will disappear and these children and families will likely suffer hardship, exclusion and long term diminished outcomes as a result. It is imperative to acknowledge the current '**hidden**', **£11.5+ million contribution per year of Birmingham MNS** which, if lost, will cost the city, and these children, dearly.

1.13 It should also be noted that this is an immediate, quantifiable additionality to public service, and should be considered along with the significant longer term additionality that MNS provide in terms of reduced need for expensive interventions and support as the child grows up (Sneha et al, 2016).

1.14 There are currently 392 council-run MNS across the country. If we apply these conservative added value calculations collectively, and account for the entirety of the national supplementary funding allocation, MNS are currently contributing an additional service worth somewhere in the region of **£175 million of public service annually** to the most vulnerable children and families in the country.

1.15 This report sets out a clear case for continued and adequate funding for Birmingham's MNS to ensure the vital and valuable work they carry out on behalf of the city for its most vulnerable children and families in the early years is fully recognised and sustained. The same case applies to all MNS nationally. To lose such a wide ranging, cost effective and vitally needed service from our mainstream school system would be a travesty.



## 2. Introduction

2.1 The unique and specialised nature of Maintained Nursery Schools is emphasised in a recent DfE Report (Paull and Popov, 2019, p8) carried out by Frontier Economics which states that:

*Maintained Nursery Schools (MNS) were set up more than a century ago to provide early education and childcare to disadvantaged children in the most deprived areas of England. Although MNS are early education providers, they are legally constituted as schools. Like maintained schools, they have a head teacher, governing body, delegated budget and at least one teacher with qualified teacher status (QTS), but they differ from schools in having a dedicated head teacher who is an Early Years specialist.*

The report points out that MNS are exceptional in the high quality and range of their Early Years provision and in their location, reach and capacity in addressing the complex needs of the children they serve. For example, MNS are more more likely to be located in disadvantaged areas (43% compared to 15% other provider types), have a higher number of children in receipt of Early Years Pupil Premium (15% compared to 12% in nursery classes and significantly lower proportions in other provider types: 6% in voluntary providers, 3% in private providers and 1% in childminders). They have a significantly higher proportion of children with special educational needs than other early years providers (14% of compared to 10% in nursery classes, 9% in voluntary providers and 4% in private providers). Additionally, MNS offer a greater range and quantity of additional and specialist services than other early years providers. Despite these exceptional demands, OFSTED consistently rates MNS higher than other form of early years provision (Paull and Popov, 2019). This DfE report also acknowledges that in addition to extra staffing costs the distinctive character of MNS means that they inevitably have a higher delivery cost than other forms of early years provision.

2.2 The additional resource requirements and responsibilities which MNS have (as set out in 2.1) come with a burden of cost, a fact which was recognised by DfE when they introduced the single funding formula in 2017. Supplementary funding (variously and interchangeably referred to in different official documents as 'transitional' funding or 'protection' funding) was introduced to help offset the loss of income from reduced hourly rates. In 2019/20 The government has committed £57.281m supplementary funding to England's MNS of which £4.51m has been allocated to Birmingham's MNS. *"This funding is provided in order to enable local authorities to protect their 2016 to 2017 funding rates for MNS (that is, the rates that existed before the EYNFF) and the Government expects it to be used in this way."* (Department for Education 2018).

2.3 The series of robust analyses of the nature and cost effectiveness of MNS undertaken by Frontier Economics for the government makes clear the wider contribution of MNS through their offer of wider integrated services such as family support, health and social care (Paull and Popov, 2019; Paull and Xu, 2019; Blainey and Paull, 2017). Other longitudinal studies have revealed that public investment in high quality early education and care with integrated services is repaid several times over through cost savings for later remediation, educational underachievement, criminality, family breakdown and social division (Sneha et al, 2016). The economic return to the public purse from this social/human investment is significantly greater than investments in physical infrastructure, an argument made strongly by Nobel prize economist, James Heckman,



in his ground-breaking work (Sneha et al, 2016) and for disadvantaged children can deliver a 13% per child, per year return on investment through better outcomes in education, health, social behaviours and employment. In short, MNS unequivocally provide excellent value for money.

2.4 The DfE Report (Paull and Popov, 2019) also sets out some key challenges for MNS in the current climate. They acknowledge that funding for MNS is currently undergoing major changes and there is concern that MNS will not be viable without the supplementary funding they currently receive. Although there have been some initiatives to improve the financial position of MNS, including the use of federated structures and finding additional income streams, such as becoming Teaching Schools, many MNS face challenges around the introduction of 30 hours free childcare, their relationships with a diminished network of Children's Centres and the increasing demands on their provision for children with SEN/D. It is clear that the future of MNS is severely under question in a climate of reduced public spending and austerity policies.

2.5 Birmingham is the Local Authority with the largest number of Maintained Nursery Schools (27) in the country and to date has maintained its commitment to sustaining them, helped by the Government's recent transitional funding. The independent research outlined above has shown that MNS provide the highest quality early education, meeting higher standards and employing the most qualified staff within the sector, yet Birmingham MNS remain under severe pressure due to budget cuts and the impact of wider austerity measures which have reduced services for families and young children. The cutbacks to Children's Centres have particularly impacted on the pressures MNS are now facing to meet the needs of their vulnerable children and families and which are portrayed vividly in the illuminative case studies later within this report. As a recent Ofsted report (25.9.2018) on one Birmingham Nursery School commented:

*Since the closure of the local Children's Centre, the school has become the 'go to place' when parents are struggling with a range of issues. Leaders and staff are skilled at signposting families to appropriate help.*

2.6 In summary, it is evident that Birmingham MNS provide a qualitatively different set of integrated services than other early years providers in the City. They consistently and uniquely deliver higher quality early education to the less advantaged and children with special educational needs and disabilities than any other part of the school and early years system in the city. Their expertise also provides a range of professional development and quality improvement services for the early years sector more widely. Currently, 98% of MNS nationally are rated good or outstanding by OfSTED but in Birmingham remarkably this rises to 100%. Such independent assessments provide clear evidence that each Birmingham MNS provides the highest quality early education and care which is inclusive and universally available to all children in their locality, in addition to a wide range of other support and services. Given the continued threat to the sustainability of Birmingham MNS, the focus of this paper is to illuminate the outstanding quality, effectiveness and value for money of Birmingham MNS in delivering child and family outcomes for the most disadvantaged groups in the city. It is hoped that this evidence will inform the decisions of politicians and policy makers in Birmingham and also nationally.

2.7 The evidence in this funding and costing paper has been prepared collaboratively by the 27 Birmingham Maintained Nursery Schools (MNS) and analysed by the Centre for Research in Early Childhood (CREC). Its purpose is to make explicit and visible the true value of MNS using actual funding and costing figures relating to the work they do with some of the most vulnerable





children in the city of Birmingham. It should be noted that this study does not include the added value of the professional development and quality improvement work that they do in addition to delivering these child and family services.

### **3. Evidence Base**

3.1 This paper provides a detailed breakdown of the actual funding provided to MNS for services for children and families with various levels of need or vulnerability and the documented costs of the range of services actually provided to these children and families by Birmingham MNS over 2018/2019. It then sets out the gap between the funding provided and the costs of services provided, thereby highlighting the high value for money the MNS deliver to the City. It also provides qualitative evidence on the complex nature of the families needs, the pattern of services accessed through the MNS and the benefits of these services for the children and families, with a final reflection on access, inclusion and sustainability of these vital MNS services.

3.2 The evidence is drawn from a series of nine real life, actual funding and costing case studies which authentically represent the range and types of need that Birmingham MNS are currently responding to. They have been carefully chosen using clearly defined criteria including: type of need; level of need; type of family. In this way, they offer a detailed and comprehensive exemplification of the range of children and families that Birmingham MNS are currently supporting. These child and family case studies are summarised in Appendix 1 and include:

Case Study 1: A child with higher level SEN/D

Case Study 2: A child with moderate level SEN/D

Case Study 3: A child with lower level SEN/D

Case Study 4: A newly arrived child

Case Study 5: A child in the early stages of learning English (ESAE)

Case Study 6: A child with English as an additional language (EAL)

Case Study 7: A child from a low income family (Eligible for EYPP)

Case Study 8: A child on a Child Protection Plan

Case Study 9: A child eligible for Two Year Old Grant Funding

3.3 The Nursery Schools provided detailed figures of the funding they received from the local authority to provide services to support each of the case study children and families. They then set out the services they actually delivered to the child and family and the costs for providing these additional services (see Appendix 3 for cost and funding assumptions). Analysis of these data reveals the funding gap between services funded and services provided in each case. The costs and funding for the nine case study children were then scaled up according to the numbers of children with each of these levels of need in the 27 Maintained Nursery Schools in Birmingham (see Table in Appendix 2) to give a sense of the true value offered by the Nursery Schools when the needs of these children are considered.

## **4. The True Value of Birmingham MNS**

### **4.1 What is the complexity of child and family needs addressed by MNS?**



4.1.1 Birmingham is a large city serving an extremely diverse and young population. The children and families in the city have a wide and complex range of needs which the City's MNS are responding to. The broad categories of need covered in the nine case studies include children with high, moderate and low SEN/D (special education needs/disability), newly arrived children, children at EASE (early stage of learning English), children with EAL (English as an additional language), children in poverty/low income families (in receipt of Early Years Pupil Premium) and children under a child protection order. It should be noted that these categories do not address the entire and individualised range of needs that families in the city present and which are also evident in the case studies. It should also be noted that the level of severity of need in each of these categories varies from high to low, but all levels require an additional response from the MNS over and beyond the provision of a universal early education/childcare place. These complex needs go far beyond the child's learning and development and include wider family needs for help with basic life needs such as housing, food, safety, debt management and drug and substance abuse.

4.1.2 To respond appropriately to these complex needs requires the MNS to deploy their resourcing and professional expertise efficiently and as fully as they are able within the current constrained funding climate. It is also evident from the case studies that these categories of need are not self delineating, with many children and families presenting with a number of these needs, further adding to the complexity of response required.

4.1.3 For example, in case study 3 the child has SEN/D and the mother mental health problems:

*L's mother suffered from post-natal depression after the birth of her second child and required a significant amount of emotional support..... L is delayed in all areas of his learning and development but has no medical diagnosis.*

Case study 4 describes a newly arrived child with limited English, under a Child Protection order and with a mother who has severe mental health issues:

*A is a 2 year old child who arrived in the country with his mum in 2016 from Nigeria. Mum was a victim of sexual exploitation both in Nigeria and when she arrived in Birmingham, the consequence of this was mum contracted HIV. A and mum had limited English. A was subject to a Child Protection Plan due to A being vulnerable and the family being homeless...A presented as very withdrawn and emotional which had a negative effect on his behaviour...A's behaviour was very challenging when he first started at the setting, he would lash out at both adults and children. Mum had no access to public funds and was being fully supported financially through social care. The family were quite isolated and mum suffered with mental health. (CS4)*

Case study 6 reveals a child with speech and language delay and living in a large family unit with recorded instances of domestic violence:



*During A's initial home visit parents raised concerns about her speech and language and her use of words. A uses some identifiable words in English, parents described these as words that she had learnt through 'You Tube' videos...The Community Paediatrician had reported back that it was too early to assess A for autism however she has been discharged with severe language delay. The Health Visitor also stated that they had concerns A did not receive sufficient face to face interaction at home and had a lot of screen time... two year old progress check showed her speech was not clear and she was still babbling....These conversations also brought into light the concerns of both school and the health team that A was still eating baby food out of jars.....During A's first term within the setting a disclosure of domestic violence was made. (CS6)*

Case studies 6, 7 and 8 reveal that families and children present at Nursery School with even their basic needs for food, clothes, safety and housing being unmet by any other service:

*N is 3 years of age...has been on a Child Protection plan since he was 2 years old...N is developmentally behind his peers and has poor social and emotional development, he needs constant reassurance, nurture sessions and guidance from the educational psychologist. N also has poor speech and language.....The family needs lots of support with N's attendance including home visits, picking up from home and distribution of daily bus passes. N is also not collected on time, usually being collected between 5:30 and 6pm. N is not adequately dressed and usually hungry so we provide uniform, shoes, coats, breakfast, snacks, lunch and tea. N's family does not ever contribute school fund or towards events such as school trips so the school subsidises this. The school also provides books for home which are not returned. There are concerns about heavy drug use and poor attendance of the children...(CS8)*

4.1.4 Addressing these complex needs through early intervention is vital for the well being of the children and the case studies reveal that often the Nursery School is the service where these complex child and family needs are identified, addressed and multi-agency responses coordinated and delivered.

## **4.2 What is the range of services offered and accessed by children and families?**

4.2.1 As stated earlier, it is now well acknowledged that MNS provide a wide range of services and support to children and families above and beyond an early education and childcare place. The data also reveals that MNS enable access to their services and meet the needs of the most vulnerable children more effectively than other forms of early years provision, especially for children with SEN/D or children with Child Protection orders.

4.2.2 Given the wide range of needs presented by young children and families in Birmingham the MNS are clearly offering a diverse range of multi-agency support and services, either on site themselves or through partnership with other agencies and professionals. These include SEN/D assessment, Team Around the Child (TAC) Meetings, Educational Plan (EP) meetings, dedicated SENCo support, physiotherapy, nurture groups, forest school, specialist and cultural sensitive



language and communication support, drugs workers and debt management, all delivered through ongoing and close liaison with Educational Psychologists, Health Visitors, Speech and Language Support, Community Paediatricians, Occupational Health Services, Family Support, Children's Centres, Primary Schools, Police, Social Care, Housing, Food Banks and local councillors.

4.2.3 For example, in case study 1 the Nursery School coordinated their services with community clinical teams, hospitals, other day nurseries and a range of other professionals to provide a comprehensive package of support to a 3 year old with global developmental delay, mild myopathy and dysphagia. Case study 3 reveals this multi-professional working:

*SENCo and Assistant SENCo's have liaised with other professionals. This included the school Educational Psychologist, Community Paediatrician, Occupational Therapy and Speech and Language Therapy. The Nursery School provided the Community Paediatrician with a supporting letter in January 2019, prior to his appointment in clinic.(CS3)*

Case study 4 reveals the long standing and extensive range of support for a newly arrived mother and child arranged by the Nursery School that was required to ensure the child and mother were both safe and the child was developing normally. Case studies 5 and 6 illustrate the wide and skilfully deployed range of specialist communication and language support given by Nursery School staff to children who are at an early stage of their English development or where English is an additional language. As case study 6 illustrates:

*Small group interventions are not developmentally appropriate for A. Therefore, all areas of her learning and development are supported through bespoke one to one support. Activities set for A's targets are provided daily through 1-1 support from her Inclusion Support worker. Alongside this staff all use Makaton symbols to support A build up her vocabulary. The school uses weekly Makaton signs and Makaton signs and symbols are used for daily activities and routines. We have also use 'now and next' boards and visual time tables to help A understand routines. Using rhymes of the week and story focuses has helped A to develop a better understanding of the use of language and its comprehension. There have also been changes made in the learning environment such as clearer labelling and challenges set out for A to ask questions and seek new ways of language acquisition.(CS6)*

Case studies 4, 7 and 8 reflect the high level of support given for families living on low income with meeting the child's most basic needs for food, clothes and housing. Case study 7 reflects this wider support offered:

*C was given a uniform and school bag at the start of the school year. C often did not have nappies or wipes so we used Nursery School stock. We provide breakfast and food throughout the session. C attended breakfast club for free and stayed for a lunch. Sometimes mum came to us when she had no money for gas or electric. Mum needed*



*a lot of support to help C toilet train. C had to see our Speech and Language Therapist which meant he also needed a support plan for a speech delay. C attended Forest School sessions, nurture group and speech and language intervention groups. We supported mum with her communication with the Primary School her older children attend and liaised with housing about poor living conditions. (CS7)*

Case study 4 also records the range and extent of the support needed and provided for a vulnerable child and family:

*The recorded child chronology for A between the period of September 2016 and July 2018 includes a wide range of support. A accessed the Nursery School provision which was initially funded via social care in September 2016 and a referral to a Family Support Worker was made by the Designated Lead for Safeguarding (DSL) at the Nursery School in December 2016. A letter was written by DSL at the Nursery School to the local councillor for housing support in December 2016. There were 26 meetings with DSL from the Nursery and mum between the period of September 2016 and July 2018. There were 4 Child Protection meetings, 4 meetings with mum, DSL and social worker between the period of September 2016 and March 2017. 8 further meetings occurred with mum, DSL and the family support worker between the period of March 2017 and July 2018. In September 2016 an individualised settling in period was arranged for A, whereby A had 1:1 support for a period of 3 weeks for the first 30 minutes of the day. SENCo and DSL have liaised with professionals involved including social care, family support and the health visiting team via telephone and email. There was an initial behaviour plan meeting in December 2016 to support A's emotional well being and a written plan by the settings SENCo was made. 5 further meetings occurred between DSL and A's parent between December 2016 and July 2018. Mum was referred for support through the local children's centre to access the 'Freedom Programme' which supports women who have experienced domestic abuse. The Nursery School continued to liaise with professionals to enable Mum to access workshops to support A's learning and development. A referral back to social care was made by DSL due to dad being seen with mum and previous concerns around mums and A'S vulnerability and mum being exploited. A referral was also made to the food bank by DSL and access to food vouchers arranged. (CS4)*

4.2.4 This range of services offered and accessed by Nursery School children and families is testimony to the high level of multi-sector and multi-professional partnership working which the Nursery Schools lead in the sector and the increasing responsibilities the Nursery Schools are taking on as other support services diminish.

### **4.3 What are the benefits of the services accessed for children and families?**

4.3.1 The enhanced long term outcomes for children who attend MNS, particularly those with SEN/D and social disadvantage, are well documented in research, as set out earlier. This study reflects this evidence and also indicates the positive benefits for parents and the wider family health and well being.



4.3.2 For the children in this study we can identify strong benefits from accessing the specialist and holistic support that the Nursery Schools offer, especially for these children with complex and multiple needs. These benefits include early identification of children with SEN/D, inclusion for children with SEN/D in mainstream settings, enhanced physical coordination and mobility, improved behaviour and child well being, enhanced levels of development in all areas of learning but especially social and emotional development and language development, all of which has worked to close the gap in achievement for these children. Children also benefited from the Nursery School ensuring their basic needs were being met, including food, clothes, housing, safety and refuge from threatening and violent home environments.

4.3.3 For the parents and wider family we can also identify clear benefits which go well beyond the normal expectations of an early educational place by enhancing the quality of family life, supporting parents into training and employment, improving the child's home learning environment, increasing parenting skills and enhancing family wellbeing. These benefits include social and emotional support and counselling for parents, respite for family from care responsibilities, increased social inclusion and reduction in isolation, access to parenting support and information. Starkly and remarkably, in the absence of other services, in some cases severe and life threatening life conditions were also mitigated through the Nursery's action, such as lack of food, provision of housing, removal from domestic violence, treatment for drug and substance abuse and protection from human trafficking.

4.3.4 Examples of the wider range of benefits to children of attending Nursery School are revealed in case study 8:

*A full-time place means that N has the opportunity to narrow his attainment gap and work towards age-related targets. N accesses breakfast, snacks, lunch and tea every weekday. N is seen every weekday and so is safe. N has appropriate clothing so is warm and dry. (CS8)*

Case study 4 and 6 also indicate these wider benefits:

*The support given to A improved his emotional development and ensured the gap between him and his peers closed by the time he left the setting. A made rapid progress in all areas of learning, with the support given A's behaviour improved dramatically, he began to build trusting relationships with both children and key staff. (CS4)*

*A is now using words within context, prior to this she was repeating what she had heard. Parents are working hard at home by limiting the use of technology and screen time. They have also worked hard alongside nursery to support A with her eating who is now eating a wider range of solid food. The Inclusion Support worker and teacher input have supported A to develop her spoken and understanding of English. This is reflected within the three teacher assessments carried out since September and also A's wellbeing and interactions. A has made significant progress within her time at the setting. On entry A was assessed at working within band 1 (0-11months) in*



*Communication and Language, at spring time this has significantly increased and A is now beginning to work at age appropriate levels (22-36months). (CS6)*

4.3.5 Examples of benefits to parents and family members are revealed in case study 4 and 6:

*Mum’s confidence in her own parenting improved with supporting the behaviour plan and accessing parent workshops. The professional relationship with mum supported her to access the help she needed to improve A’s and her own life chances. Mum was able to access basic needs such as food while in desperate circumstances during a period in which social care had stopped supporting. Mum also began to recognise that she had been exploited for many years and began to work with other professionals round her awareness for domestic abuse and human trafficking. (CS4)*

*After the disclosure of Domestic Violence the school has been a place where mum is happy to share and ask for help. Teachers have called in women’s support groups to help mum think about upskilling herself which mum has now decided to do next academic year to help her children in the future. Teacher and nursery officers have been made available to translate to mum when needed. The family have accessed services as needed and suggested they have attended appointments and are working with the nursery and other linked professionals to help A develop. (CS6)*

**4.4 What is the difference between funding provided and funding ‘found’ for services accessed by children and families in MNS?**

4.4.1 The cost and funding data from the 9 case studies detailed in Appendix 1 has been collated into the table below showing:

- A. The actual cost of the services delivered by the MNS;
- B. The funding provided for these services;
- C. The unfunded cost of services, met by MNS
- D. The % added value of in-kind services provided by MNS in relation to the actual funding received).

**Table 1: The Added Value of Birmingham’s MNS services**

Case study	A. Actual cost of MNS services (£ per year)	B. Funding provided for MNS services (£ per year)	% costs (A) met by funds (B)	C. Additional cost met by MNS (£ per year)	% costs (A) met by MNS (C) ie not funded	Value added % of MNS offer in relation to actual funding received (C/A*100)
1. A child with higher level SEN/D	12,597.00	5,333.30	42%	7,263.70	58%	136%
2. A child with moderate level SEN/D	11,039.00	4,725.30	43%	6,313.70	57%	134%
3. A child with lower level SEN/D	5,567.00	2,445.30	44%	3,121.70	56%	128%
4. A newly arrived child	6,621.05	5,575.05	84%	1,046.00	16%	19%



5. A child in the early stages of learning English	4,666.68	2,737.52	59%	1,929.16	41%	70%
6. A child with English as an additional Language	6,348.00	4,724.92	74%	1,623.08	26%	34%
7. A child from a low-income family (eligible for EYPP)	7,856.50	2,747.40	35%	5,109.10	65%	186%
8. A child on a Child Protection Plan	13,336.10	2,445.30	18%	10,890.80	82%	445%
9. A child eligible for Two-Year-Old Grant Funding	7,457.50	2,986.80	40%	4,470.70	60%	150%

4.4.2 The costing evidence revealed in Table 1 demonstrates unequivocally the true value of Birmingham’s MNS and their added value, particularly for those children who are identified as most in need or vulnerable. The added value provided by MNS to these children ranges from 19% to a staggering 445%, with the most added value being delivered to children on a Child Protection Plan (445%), children from low income families (150-186%) and children with all levels of SEN/D (128%;134%;136%).

4.4.3 These figures reflect the extensive range of additional services being provided by the MNS which are not currently being fully funded but being delivered through cost efficiency, unpaid hours, foregone wages, practitioner goodwill and professional generosity. It should be noted that these costings do not include the professional training and quality improvement work also carried out by the MNS for the sector with no additional funding.

4.4.4 The evidence presented in section 1.1 indicates that other forms of early years provision in the city do not offer the same range and quality of services to these vulnerable children which emphasises the vital and cost efficient contribution of the MNS, particularly at a time when other services to these children and families have been cut. It reveals how the MNS in the city have responded to shoulder public responsibilities towards these children and families.

#### 4.5 What is the added value to the city by all 27 Birmingham MNS?

4.5.1 Actual figures of the number of Birmingham children attending the 27 Birmingham MNS who fall under each of the at risk categories explored in the case studies is set out in Appendix 2 and summarised in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Birmingham Nursery Schools Reach and Access Data**

	Children with higher level SEN/D	Children with moderate level SEN/D	Children with lower level SEN/D	Newly arrived children	Children in ESAE	Children with EAL	Low income children (Eligible for EYPP)	Children subject to a CP Plan	Two year old grant funded children
Total number of children in BMNS	166	183	313	33	751	1316	863	44	944





4.5.2 These data reveal that the 27 BMNS are currently providing access to additional services for large numbers (4,613) of Birmingham's young children with SEN/D, children in need of specialist language support and children living in low income households.

4.5.3 We have calculated the total contribution or added value of the Birmingham MNS over the year 2018/2019 by taking the total numbers of children in the identified 'at risk' groups who currently attend Birmingham MNS as set out in Table 2 and multiplying this by the cost saving figures for each group as set out in Table 1. These data are set out in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Total Contribution or Added Value of BMNS**

	Total number in BMNS in 2018/19	Unfunded Contribution per child (£ per year)	Total unfunded contribution (£ per year)
Children with higher level SEN/D	166	7,263.70	1,205,774.20
Children with moderate level SEN/D	183	6,313.70	1,155,407.10
Children with lower level SEN/D	313	3,121.70	977,092.10
Newly arrived children	33	1,046.00	34,518.00
Children in ESAE	751	1,929.16	1,448,799.16
Children with EAL	1316	1,623.08	2,135,973.28
Low income children (Eligible for EYPP)	863	5,109.10	4,409,153.30
Children subject to a CP Plan	44	10,890.80	479,195.20
Two year old grant funded children	944	4,470.70	4,220,340.80
<b>Total Cost Saving (£ per year)</b>	<b>4,613</b>		<b>16,066,253.14</b>

4.5.4 These calculations indicate that Birmingham's MNS are currently contributing **over £16 million per year** through the additional non-funded services they provide to 4,613 of the most vulnerable children and families in the city. This contribution is made through cost efficiencies, unpaid hours, practitioner goodwill and professional generosity reflects the true public service value of MNS to the city.

4.5.6 It is acknowledged that supplementary funding (worth £4.5 million annually) is provided to Birmingham MNS from DfE via the local authority to reflect the additional costs and regulatory requirements and responsibilities associated with schools (as opposed to other early years providers who since 2017 have received the same hourly funding rate as MSN through the Early Years single funding formula). Although this funding is not directed at specific children and is intended to benefit all children who attend a MNS or are supported by a MNS through sector improvement work, we have conservatively chosen to offset that income stream against the identified non-funded contribution. Even when this is done it can be seen that Birmingham's MNS are currently contributing **over £11.5 million per year to support the most vulnerable children.**

#### **4.6 What do the case studies reveal about access, inclusion and service sustainability in Birmingham MNS?**



4.6.1 Reflecting on the funding and costing evidence presented in the 9 case studies, and the issues faced by MNS headteachers and governors in sustaining these vital services which are accessed by some of Birmingham's most vulnerable children and families, the MNS headteachers highlighted a number of urgent issues:

1. The funding provided for children with complex needs attending Birmingham's MNS in significant numbers is considerably less than the actual cost of the services delivered to these children and their families which are critical in ensuring their developmental progress, safety and well being, not only during the Foundation years but beyond into Primary School. As case study 2 reveals:

*J attends nursery for 30 hours per week. However, ISEY (Inclusion Support for Early Years) funding is only available for 7.5 hours per week, which covers only three quarters of the two hours per day of targeted intervention that J receives. Without this support, J would not make the progress in his learning and development required to narrow the gap between him and his peers. The amount of information and evidence gathering required to submit a successful request for EHC (Education, Health and Care) assessment means that a significant amount of school budget share has been spent on paperwork, with minimal financial support from ISEY funding. If this request is successful, the Primary School that he attends will receive his CRISP funding, despite having had no input into the EHC assessment process. In fact, the Nursery School has been subsidising the cost of this work for an average of £89 per week, which equates to £3,382 over the academic year. In light of ever tightening budgets, this resourcing is unsustainable. (CS2)*

2. Costing the additional and challenging professional work carried out by Nursery School staff to support vulnerable children and families is very difficult. It is a hidden subsidy as staff often do this work in their own time and in addition to their contracted duties. This work is vital to the children's development and wellbeing and their safety but is not acknowledged in costing and funding comparisons. This is well stated in case study 4:

*It's easy to cost the work carried out around supporting A's developmental needs but the work carried out to ensure his emotional wellbeing was protected and to keep him safe is very difficult to break down. The role of the Designated Lead for Safeguarding (DSL) is carried out as an additional duty by a senior member of staff, this is not a standalone role within Nursery School setting as funding does not permit this. The hours of work that are involved to support very vulnerable children and families is not measurable in funding allocated to each child yet it is a responsibility. There is no extra funding to support this work yet it is an expectation within all statutory policy to safeguard children. In order to ensure A makes progress, we first have to consider their experiences and family circumstances, without carrying out this work A's life chances would be limited.(CS4)*

3. The administrative costs in enabling the multi-professional partnerships required to meet children and families complex needs are often not fully recognised but are significant, as exemplified in case study 1:



*Furthermore, the amount of administrative work, liaison and communication that is involved in co-ordinating this provision is even more costly (£131) than the direct support A receives (£100). This means that the paperwork the Nursery School has completed in order to ensure that A's needs are met within a multidisciplinary and family centred manner, is a greater expense to school services than paying the inclusion staff that support her.(CS1)*

4. The time required to gather sufficient evidence for justifying additional funding for a child with special needs means that MNS are spending considerable resource in collecting this evidence but getting no funding benefit for doing so, as revealed in case study 3:

*However, the time scale required to gather sufficient assessment data to evidence the level of need that would warrant an EHC assessment (three cycles of assessment) is extremely difficult to gather, even when a child attends a provision for a total of four terms. This is particularly difficult when, as in L's case, he is the first child in the family and his mother has other no children as a point of reference regarding child development. Often we, as Early Years educators, are the first to raise concerns regarding a child's development. This must, wherever possible, be conducted in a timely and sensitive manner. Thus, discussing a referral to external agencies, gaining parental consent to do so and gathering sufficient information to complete a thorough referral can take longer than we would like. As a result, L will have only completed his Social, Communication and Interaction Pathway (SCAIP) assessment at the end of the summer term, shortly before he begins Primary School. As such, he will have an academic years' worth of input from the Communication and Autism Team (CAT). As L will not be undergoing EHC assessment during this academic year, he is not eligible for ISEY funding. Neither does he receive Disability Learning Allowance, and as such is not entitled to Disability Allowance Funding. Therefore, the Nursery School does not receive any additional funding to provide L with the support that he requires, which is above the Universal Offer and remit of a mainstream Nursery School provision.(CS3)*

## 5. Final Remarks

5.1 The Government has not yet confirmed if the supplementary funding for MNS will be continued after 2019/20 which means MNS are under threat from significantly reduced staffing, reduced services and potential closures. The loss of the transitional funding is equivalent to a 31% cut in MNS funding (Lucy Powell, statement to HoC, 31st January 2019). This would mean that the valuable and effective work in early help and intervention for these vulnerable children and families which Birmingham MNS currently provide at minimal costs to the city will disappear and these children and families will suffer hardship, exclusion and long term diminished outcomes. It is imperative to acknowledge the current 'hidden, **£11.5 million contribution per year of Birmingham MNS** which, if lost, will cost the city, and these children, dearly. As Lucy Powell, MP stated,



*The maintained nursery sector is increasingly accommodating children with complex, life affecting conditions, who would usually have their needs met in a specialist setting with specialist resources. The private sector cannot meet these types of need.*

5.2 There are currently 392 MNS across the country. If we apply these added value calculations collectively, MNS are currently contributing an additional worth of more than **£175 million of public service annually** to the most vulnerable children and families in the country.

5.3 This report sets out a clear case for continued and adequate funding for Birmingham's MNS to ensure the vital and valuable work they carry out on behalf of the city for its most vulnerable children and families in the early years is fully recognised and sustained. To lose such a wide ranging, cost effective and vitally needed service from our mainstream school system would be a travesty.



## References

Blainey, S and Paull, G. (2017) *Study of Early Education and Development (SEED): The cost and funding of early education*, DfE Research Report 552

Department for Education (2018) *Early Years Entitlements: Local Authority funding of providers: Operational Guidance 2019 - 2020*

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/758271/EYNFF Operational Guide - 2019-20 Final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/758271/EYNFF_Operational_Guide_-_2019-20_Final.pdf) (accessed 08/05/2019)

Pascal, C., Bertram T. And Cramp A. (2019) *The impact of austerity on vulnerable young children and families in Birmingham*, Paper delivered at BECERA conference, Birmingham, February 2019.

Paull, G. and Popov, D. (2019) *The role and contribution of Maintained Nursery Schools in the early years sector in England*, DfE Research Report 895

Paull G. and Xu X. (2019) *Early years providers cost study 2018 Research report February 2019*, DfE Research Report 984

Sneha E., Hojman A. , García J.L., and Heckman J. (2016) *Early Childhood Education*. in Moffitt, Robert (ed.), *Means-Tested Transfer Programs in the United States II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.



## **Appendix 1: Child and Family Funding and Costing Case Studies**

Case Study 1: A child with higher level SEN/D

Case Study 2: A child with moderate level SEN/D

Case Study 3: A child with lower level SEN/D

Case Study 4: A newly arrived child

Case Study 5: A child in the early stages of learning English (ESAE)

Case Study 6: A child with English as an additional language (EAL)

Case Study 7: A child from a low income family (Eligible for EYPP)

Case Study 8: A child on a Child Protection Plan

Case Study 9: A child eligible for Two Year Old Grant Funding



## **Case Study 1: A child with higher level SEN/D**

### **1. Family Type and Circumstances**

A is three years old and is an only child who lives at home with her parents. Her paternal grandparents live nearby. The family live a significant distance from the school and the Nursery School attended is not their nearest Nursery School, but parents felt that this Nursery would best suit A's needs. A has a medical diagnosis of global developmental delay, mild myopathy and dysphagia. She has profound and multiple learning difficulties. A had an EDAP assessment when she was one year old. She has attended Conductive Education since she was 13 months old and currently attends sessions twice per week. There are several medical professionals involved in her health care. However, when she started at the Nursery School in September, there were no Educational Services involved with A. She was known to the Early Support Service, but was not allocated an Educational Support worker during the summer term of 2018 because she was due to start at the Nursery School in September 2018.

### **2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family**

A had an extended, bespoke settling in period. This included A's mother remaining in the nursery environment to play alongside her whilst providing emotional reassurance. SENCo and Assistant SENCos have liaised with professionals. This included the school Educational Plan (EP), who completed a Home Visit during July 2018, prior to A starting the Nursery School. The SENCo liaised with the previous Community Day Nursery Clinical Co-ordinator to arrange for A's care to be transferred from that Community Day Nursery to the Nursery School Community Day Nursery. The Assistant SENCo supported A's mother in attending DRC stay and play with her. This then built a relationship that meant an Educational, Health and Care (EHC) needs assessment and referrals to support services were discussed as early as possible. An initial Educational Support and SEN Support Plan meeting occurred in October. The Team Around the Child (TAC) meeting took place 4.10.18. An EHCAR (Educational, Health and Care Assessment Request) was submitted and a CRISP (Criteria for Special Provision) assessment was completed in October 2018.

A was referred to the Educational Psychologist Service, Occupational Therapy, Health Visitors and PDSS. ISEY (Inclusion Support for Early Years) funding application submitted October 2018. Funding was agreed and accessed from January 2019. The Nursery School contacted the Community Physiotherapy team to obtain a copy of her updated Physiotherapy Plan and advice. Staff received training in supporting A with her walking frame from the Community Physiotherapy team. A receives one to one support during key times of the day, such as mealtimes. A is also dependent upon adults to meet all of her care needs. Small group interventions are not developmentally appropriate for A. Therefore, all areas of her learning and development are supported through bespoke one to one support. Activities to target A's Physiotherapy programme targets are provided daily. She has a key worker, rather than a key group, so that she receives a developmentally appropriate group time. This is on a 1:3 ratio, rather than a 1:13 ratio.

### **3. Benefits of Services Accessed for Child and Family Members**



The Nursery School provision provided A's parent with much-needed respite. Although they have family nearby, A's parents had not left A in their care, due to their separation anxiety. The DRC groups provided A's parents with an opportunity to attend an appropriate stay and play session, where they could discuss A's needs with an educational professional. This reduced their isolation. Parents were informed of the Education, Health and Care (EHC) assessment pathway and the Nursery School explained that an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) would need to be in place in order for A to attend a Special School that could meet A's needs.

A using her walker at nursery developed her tolerance of this mobility tool; previously, A had become extremely distressed when her parents tried to get her to use this at home. So much so, that they eventually gave up on this. A is now receiving support from education support services (Educational Psychology Service and PDSS) that will continue to support her throughout her school life. A is making progress in all areas of her learning and development. The level of this progress would not have been achieved without the daily intervention she receives at the Nursery School.

#### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service Accessed	Cost per hour	Hours per week	Cost per week
Nursery School staff time with parents	£21	4	£84
Communication/liaison with professionals	£21	1	£21
Referrals submitted to support services	£21	0.5	£10.50
Funding applications and assessments	£38	0.5	£19
One to one inclusion support	£17	10	£170
Small group intervention teaching	N/A	N/A	N/A
			<b>£304.50</b>

Please note: the timings above are approximate average.

Costing is dependent upon in the grade of the staff member.

EHCP specific work (one off pieces of work)	Cost per hour	Total Hours	Total Cost
Preparation for TAC meeting and EHCAR submission	£21	10	£362
	£38	4	
EHC assessment	£21	6	£202
	£38	2	
Annual review of EHCP (July 2019)	£21	4	£236
	£38	4	
Educational Psychologist (traded service)	£130	8 (total)	£1040
			<b>£1840</b>

Costing for service accessed	£304.50
EHCP specific work (£1040 across 38 weeks to calculate average)	£27 per week
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>£331.50</b>





**Overall costing incurred for 2018/19 academic year (£331.50 x 38 weeks): £12,597.00**

### 5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family

Funding stream	Hourly rate	Hours per week	Total funding per week
ISEY	£8	7.5	£60
EEE	£4.29	15	£64.35

Please note- as A was not under ES caseload and did not have an ES and SEN Support Plan, Nursery School was unable to apply for ISEY funding to begin until the spring term (January 2019)

Funding stream	One off payment	Weeks per year	Total funding per week
DAF	£615	38	£16

EEE funding	£64.35
ISEY	£60
DAF	£16
<b>Total Funding per week</b>	<b>£140.35</b>

**Overall funding received for 2018/19 academic year (£140.35 x 38 weeks): £5,333.30**

### 6. Difference Between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' for Services Accessed by Family

Costing per week	Funding per week	Funding 'Found' for Services
£331.50	£140.35	<b>£191.15 per week</b>

**This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of £191.15 x 38 weeks: £7,263.70**

**Unfunded proportion of costs: 58%**  
**Added Value by Nursery School: 136%**

### 7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability

In order to support A's development on a daily basis, thus ensuring her sustained progress and fulfil her potential, the first-hand one to one support that A requires must take place. However, the funding that the Nursery School receives for A per week (£140.35) does not cover the amount the school spends on this provision per week (£331.50). Furthermore, the amount of administrative work, liaison and communication that is involved in co-ordinating this provision is even more costly (£161.50) than the direct support A receives (£170). This means that the paperwork that the Nursery School has completed in order to ensure that A's needs are met within a multidisciplinary and family centred manner, is a greater expense to school services than paying the inclusion staff that support her.



The funding provided for A's provision is only one 42% of the overall costing. Therefore, the school has 'found' 58% of the funding required to meet A's needs effectively. Although one might think to prioritise A's direct support over paperwork, without an Education, Health and Care Plan, A will be unable to access an appropriate Special School. Nor will said school be able to effectively co-ordinate her complex education, health and care needs throughout her education and later in her adult life.



## Case Study 2: A child with moderate level SEN/D

### 1. Family Type and Circumstances

J is three years old and is an only child who lives with his mother, who is adopted. J was previously a child in care and was adopted when he was 9 months old. J’s mother works full time and accesses 30 hours of funding for J’s full time place. J has a significant delay in all areas of his learning and development but has no medical diagnosis. He had a GDAP (phonology) assessment when he was 2 years and 3 months old. He is under the Community Paediatrician and is on the waiting list for Speech and Language Therapy. J started attending the Nursery under three provision in April 2018.

### 2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family

SENCo and Assistant SENCos have liaised with professionals. This included the school Educational Psychologist, Health Visitor, Community Paediatrician and Speech and Language Therapist. Initial Educational Support and SEN Support Plan meeting in November. Team Around the Child (TAC) meeting date set for 11.4.19. J was referred to the Educational Psychologist Service in October 2018. An ISEY (Inclusion Support for Early Years) funding application submitted October 2018. Funding was agreed and accessed from January 2019. J attends small group targeted interventions that focus upon communication, nurture, physical development and cognitive skills. J currently shows no awareness of his bladder or bowel movements and is not toilet trained. He has his nappy changed by a member of staff as often as is required. J has a key worker, rather than a key group, so that he receives a developmentally appropriate group time. This is on a 1:3 ratio, rather than a 1:13 ratio.

### 3. Benefits of Services Accessed for Child and Family Members

Our nursery provision provided J’s parent with an inclusive education. J previously attending a private day nursery, where his mother felt was unequipped to support his learning and development. Our concerns regarding J’s learning and development were discussed over an appropriate length of time, in a sensitive manner. The inclusion team have supported J’s mother’s emotional needs, alongside his educational needs. J’s mother was informed of the Education, Health and Care (EHC) assessment pathway and the Nursery School explained that an EHC Plan would provide a co-ordinated approach to supporting J’s educational, health and care needs throughout his schooling and that if J’s mother felt that a mainstream setting was not supporting his educational needs effectively, she could request a change of provision or type of school.

J is now receiving support from the school Educational Psychologist. The Nursery School will continue to support J’s mother through the EHC assessment process. J is making progress in all areas of his learning and development. The level of this progress would not have been achieved without the daily intervention he receives at the Nursery School.

### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service Accessed	Cost per hour	Hours per week	Cost per week
Nursery School staff time with parents	£21	2	£42
Communication/liaison with professionals	£21	1	£21



Referrals submitted to support services	£21	0.5	£10.50
Funding applications and assessments	£38	0.5	£19
One to one inclusion support	N/A	N/A	N/A
Small group intervention teaching	£17	10	£170
			<b>£262.50</b>

Please note: the timings above are approximate average.  
Costing is dependent upon in the grade of the staff member.

<b>EHCP specific work (one off pieces of work)</b>	<b>Cost per hour</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Preparation for TAC meeting and EHCAR submission	£21 £38	10 4	£362
EHC assessment	£21 £38	6 2	£202
Educational Psychologist (traded service)	£130	4 (total)	£520
			<b>£1084</b>

Costing for service accessed	£262.50
EHCP specific work (£1084 across 38 weeks to calculate average)	£28 per week
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>£290.50</b>

**Overall costing incurred for 2018/19 academic year (£290.50 x 38 weeks): £11,039.00**

#### 5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family

<b>Funding stream</b>	<b>Hourly rate</b>	<b>Hours per week</b>	<b>Total funding per week</b>
ISEY	£8	7.5	<b>£60</b>
EEE	£4.29	15	<b>£64.35</b>
			<b>£124.35</b>

**Overall funding received for 2018/19 academic year (£124.35 x 38 weeks): £4725.30**

#### 6. Difference Between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' for Services Accessed by Family

<b>Costing per week</b>	<b>Funding per week</b>	<b>Funding 'Found' for Services</b>
£290.50	£124.35	<b>£166.15 per week</b>

**This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of £166.15 x 38 weeks: £6313.70**

**Unfunded proportion of costs: 57%**  
**Added Value by Nursery School: 134%**



## **7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability**

J attends nursery for 30 hours per week. However, ISEY (Inclusion Support for Early Years) funding is only available for 7.5 hours per week, which covers only three quarters of the two hours per day of targeted intervention that J receives. Without this support, J would not make the progress in his learning and development required to narrow the gap between him and his peers.

The amount of information and evidence gathering required to submit a successful request for EHC assessment means that a significant amount of school budget share has been spent on paperwork, with minimal financial support from ISEY funding. If this request is successful, the Primary School that he attends will receive his CRISP funding, despite having had no input into the EHC assessment process. In fact, the Nursery School has been subsidising the cost of this work for an average of £89 per week, which equates to £3382 over the academic year. In light of ever tightening budgets, this resourcing is unsustainable.



## Case Study 3: A child with lower Level SEN/D

### 1. Family Type and Circumstances

L lives with his mother and one year old sister. His mother is 5 months pregnant. L’s mother suffered from post-natal depression after the birth of her second child and required a significant amount of emotional support. She is now being supported by a Home Start volunteer. L’s father is an active parent, but does not reside within the family home. L’s mother travels a significant distance on the bus for him to attend this particular Nursery School because she feels that it can best meet L’s needs. He started attending the Nursery under threes provision in April 2018. He is under the Community Paediatrician and has been referred to Speech and Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Health Visitor and Educational Psychologist service. L is delayed in all areas of his learning and development but has no medical diagnosis.

### 2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family

SENCo and Assistant SENCos have liaised with professionals. This included the school Educational Psychologist, Community Paediatrician, Occupational Therapy and Speech and Language Therapy. The Nursery School provided the Community Paediatrician with a supporting letter in January 2019, prior to his appointment in clinic. He is due to undergo a Social, Communication and Interaction Pathway (SCAIP) assessment in July 2019. An initial Educational Support and SEN Support Plan meeting took place in November 2018. L was referred to the Educational Psychology Service in December 2018 and Occupational Therapy in January 2019. L attends small group targeted interventions that focus upon communication, nurture, physical development and cognitive skills.

### 3. Benefits of Services Accessed for Child and Family Members

Our nursery provision provided L’s parent with an inclusive education. Our concerns regarding L’s learning and development were discussed over an appropriate length of time, in a sensitive manner. The inclusion team have supported L’s mother’s emotional needs, alongside his educational needs. L’s mother has been informed of the role of the school Educational Psychologist. Although he does not require an Education, Health and Care Plan at this point, he requires a higher level of support than his peers. This may become challenging once he begins Primary School. However, L will be known to the Educational Psychologist Service and the support that he is currently receiving from our school Educational Psychologist will be ‘handed over’ by our school Educational Psychologist and the case file will be transferred onto the caseload of his Primary Schools’ allocated Educational Psychologist. L is making progress in all areas of his learning and development. The level of this progress would not have been achieved without the daily intervention he receives at the Nursery School.

### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service Accessed	Cost per hour	Hours per week	Cost per week
Nursery School staff time with parents	£21	1	£21
Communication/liaison with professionals	£21	1	£21
Referrals submitted to support services	£21	0.5	£10.50
Funding applications and assessments	£38	0.5	£19



One to one inclusion support	N/A	N/A	N/A
Small group intervention teaching	£17	4	£68
Educational Psychologist (traded service)	£130	2 (total)	£7
			<b>£146.50</b>

Please note: the timings above are approximate average.  
Costing is dependent upon in the grade of the staff member.

**Overall costing incurred for 2018/19 academic year (£146.50 x 38 weeks): £5,567.00**

### 5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family

Funding stream	Hourly rate	Hours per week	Total funding per week
EEE	£4.29	15	<b>£64.35</b>

L is not eligible for ISEY funding, as we are unsure of whether he will require an EHC assessment. See section 7.

**Overall funding received for 2018/19 academic year (£64.35 x 38 weeks): £2445.30**

### 6. Difference Between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' for Services Accessed by Family

Costing per week	Funding per week	Funding 'Found' for Services
£146.50	£64.35 (EEE)	<b>£82.15 per week</b>

**This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of (£82.15 x 38 weeks): £3121.70**

**Unfunded proportion of costs: 56%**  
**Added Value by Nursery School: 128%**

### 7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability

Under the previous criteria for Full Time places, L would have been eligible for a full time place. He is now only eligible to 15 hours. As such, L is disadvantaged further because he is unable to access a full time education that he would have previously received. This additional time would have doubled the amount of targeted intervention support he would have received and accelerated his progress further. L does not currently meet the threshold for an Education, Health and Care (EHC) assessment. However, the time scale required to gather sufficient assessment data to evidence the level of need that would warrant an EHC assessment (three cycles of assessment) is extremely difficult to gather, even when a child attends a provision for a total of four terms. This is particularly difficult when, as in L's case, he is the first child in the family and his mother has other no children as a point of reference regarding child development. Often, we as Early Years educators are the first to raise concerns regarding a child's development. This must, wherever possible, be conducted in a timely and sensitive manner. Thus, discussing a referral to external agencies, gaining parental consent to do so and gathering



sufficient information to complete a thorough referral can take longer than we would like. As a result, L will have only completed his Social, Communication and Interaction Pathway (SCAIP) assessment at the end of the summer term, shortly before he begins Primary School. As such, he will have an academic years' worth of input from the Communication and Autism Team (CAT). As L will not be undergoing EHC assessment during this academic year, he is not eligible for ISEY funding. Neither does he receive Disability Learning Allowance, and as such is not entitled to Disability Allowance Funding. Therefore, the Nursery School does not receive any additional funding to provide L with the support that he requires, which is above the Universal Offer and remit of a mainstream Nursery School provision.





## **Case Study 4: A Newly Arrived Child**

### **1. Family Type and Circumstances**

A is a 2 year old child who arrived in the country with his mum in 2016 from Nigeria. Mum was a victim of sexual exploitation both in Nigeria and when she arrived in Birmingham, the consequence of this was mum contracted HIV. A and mum had limited English. A was subject to a Child Protection Plan due to A being vulnerable and the family being homeless. A currently had no contact with his father due to him being conceived in an abusive relationship with the father being the perpetrator of exploitation back in Nigeria. A presented as very withdrawn and emotional which had a negative effect on his behaviour. Mum did not engage with professionals when starting at the nursery setting, it took time and care to build a relationship. A's behaviour was very challenging when he first started the setting, he would lash out at both adults and children. He was supported via the setting's SENCO and key person, he was referred to the Educational Psychologist (EP) and a behaviour plan was put in place. Mum had no access to public funds and was being fully supported financially through social care. The family were quite isolated and mum suffered with mental health. A was not entitled to 2 year funding as mum had no access to public funds, nursery provision was initially paid for through social care in September 2016 until A was able to access universal 3 year funding in September 2017.

### **2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family**

The recorded child chronology for A between the period of September 2016 and July 2018 includes a wide range of support. A accessed the Nursery School provision which was initially funded via social care in September 2016 and a referral to a Family Support Worker was made by the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) at the Nursery School in December 2016. A letter was written by the DSL at the Nursery School to the local councillor for housing support in December 2016. There were 26 meetings with the DSL from the Nursery and mum between the period of September 2016 and July 2018. There were 4 Child Protection meetings, 4 meetings with mum, the DSL and social worker between the period of September 2016 and March 2017. 8 further meetings occurred with mum, the DSL and the family support worker between the period of March 2017 and July 2018. In September 2016 an individualised settling in period was arranged for A, whereby A had 1:1 support for a period of 3 weeks for the first 30 minutes of the day. SENCO and the DSL have liaised with professionals involved including social care, family support and the health visiting team via telephone and email. There was an initial behaviour plan meeting in December 2016 to support A's emotional well being and a written plan by the settings SENCO was made. 5 further meetings occurred between the DSL and A's parent between December 2016 and July 2018. Mum was referred for support through the local children's centre to access the 'Freedom Programme' which supports women who have experienced domestic abuse. The Nursery School continued to liaise with professionals to enable Mum to access workshops to support A's learning and development. A referral back to social care was made by the DSL due to dad being seen with mum and previous concerns around mums and A'S vulnerability and mum being exploited. A referral was also made to the food bank by the DSL and access to food vouchers arranged.

### **3. Benefits of the Services Accessed for Child and Family Members**

Our nursery provision provided A and his mum with much needed help. The support given to A improved his emotional development and ensured the gap between him and his peers closed by



the time he left the setting. A made rapid progress in all areas of learning, with the support given A's behaviour improved dramatically, he began to build trusting relationships with both children and key staff. The Behaviour Plan closed by the time A reached 3yr old provision in September 2017.

Mum's confidence in her own parenting improved with supporting the behaviour plan and accessing parent workshops. The professional relationship between mum and staff supported mum to access the help she needed to improve A's and her own life chances. Mum was able to access basic needs such as food while in desperate circumstances during a period in which social care had stopped supporting. Mum also began to recognise that she had been exploited for many years and began to work with other professionals round awareness for domestic abuse and trafficking.

Multi agency working was key to the success of improving the family circumstances. The family were eventually given a permanent address and mum gained access to public funds with the support of the family support worker and social worker.

#### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service accessed	Cost per hour	Hours in total	Total cost
Meeting times with mum/ DSL	Grade 4-£28	13	£198
Communication/liasing with professionals	Grade 4-£28	5	£140
Referrals to other agencies	Grade 4-£28	4	£112
Professional meetings	Grade 4-£28	12	£336
Plan Meeting-SENCO	£38	5	£190
Writing of Plans-SENCO	£38	2.5	£70

**Overall Costing incurred for the period between September 2016 till July 2018: £1,046.00**

#### 5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family

Funding Stream	Per Hour	Per 15hr Entitled	Per Term	Per Academic Year
Social Care funding equivalent to 2yr Funding Sept 2016-July 2017	£5.24	£78.60	£1021.80	X 3 terms £3,065.4
EEE 3yr Funding Sept 2017-July 2018.	£4.29	£64.35	£836.55	X 3 terms £2509.65

Please note: the timings above are approximate average. Costing is dependent on the grade of the staff member. There was no funding provided by services accessed by the family to support the needs identified.



**Overall income gained through EEE funding between the period of September 2016 to July 2018: £5,575.05**

**6. Difference between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' For Services Accessed by Family**

The DSL roll is an additional responsibility of senior staff in Nursery Schools, there is currently no funding provided for the work involved in safeguarding nor for children that have arrived in the country. Yet statutory responsibility enforces school setting to carry out such work.

**This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of £1,046.00**

**Unfunded proportion of costs: 16%**

**Added Value by Nursery School: 19%**

**7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability**

It's easy to cost the work carried out around supporting A's developmental needs but the work carried out to ensure his emotion wellbeing was protected and to keep him safe is very difficult to break down. The role of the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) is carried out as an additional duty by a senior member of staff, this is not a standalone role within Nursery School Setting as funding does not permit this. The hours of work that are involved to support very vulnerable children and families is not measurable in funding allocated to each child yet it is a responsibility. There is no extra funding to support this work yet it is an expectation within all statutory policy to safeguard children.

In order to ensure A makes progress, we first have to consider their experiences and family circumstances, without carrying out this work A's life chances would be limited.



## **Case Study 5: A Child in the Early Stages of Learning English (ESAE)**

### **1. Family Type and Circumstances**

Child S is 46 months old; he has two younger siblings and lives in flat with his parents and close to the Nursery School. One of the siblings, who is two years old, also attends the nursery. The family's housing is poor and they are in the process of bidding for local authority housing. The children's health has been very poor during the winter due to the housing conditions. Child S's attendance was a concern due to this however, the school has supported the family by referring them to the health visiting team. Child S speaks and understands her home language (Bengali), however his English is at an early stage of development. The parents speak Bengali at home. Father has some conversational English and Mother speaks Bengali only with limited understanding of English. Child S started attending the Nursery School in September 2017 with no English.

### **2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family**

The Nursery School mainly serves a population of Asian families (Pakistani and Bangladeshi). The majority of children attending have English as an Additional Language (EAL). The family have accessed two and three-year-old funding for Child S to attend Nursery. The nursery school has supported Child S's development of English through a wide range of approaches. To support Child S in his early stages of English his key person has used the Wellcomm Language Screening Tool which has provided next steps to support his language acquisition. These targets are implemented through group time planning and individual support given throughout continuous provision. Weekly letters and sounds activities based around environmental, instrumental body percussion and voice sounds supported this early stage of Child S's English during adult led small group activities. Many members of staff have had Makaton training. Makaton signing is used for daily routines and activities. New Makaton signs are introduced weekly and Child S uses these to support his newly learned English. Visual Timetables alongside verbal prompts are used to support Child S's understanding of the daily routine. Members of staff have been trained in Early Language Development and strategies learned are utilised daily such as extending language and showing an interest in what is being said to provide encouragement, commenting on child S's actions through parallel talk, modelling correct language structures in English, recasting his attempts at spoken English and using real life objects and contexts to support learning new vocabulary. Providing resources which reflect Child S's culture and identity such as books, posters and role play equipment. Members of staff use lots of repetition through delivery of a wide variety of stories and songs in order to scaffold learning for Child S. Rhymes of the week are shared with parents to continue school learning at home. Visual supports and props are used to bring words to life and support Child S's understanding of stories and rhymes. Members of staff allow time for Child S to respond to their questions and conversations. Members of staff use self-talk and put words to their actions to model good English. Using more open questions to encourage Child S to practise his growing English. One member of staff is able to translate for the family to ensure that school messages are understood and that the family are fully included in school life. All members of staff have been trained in Peer Massage and this has supported Child S's as his confidence has grown. The story used to develop peer massage has also provided Child S with opportunities to develop language and repeat phrases.

### **3. Benefits of the Services Accessed for Child and Family Members**



Child S has attended nursery since September 2017. Child S was in the silent phase until June 2018 when he started using gestures and single words. At this time Child S became more confident and started to play with other children and initiate activities with them. Child S's vocabulary has developed and he is now talking in 3-4 four-word sentences consistently. Child S's assessments show that the attainment gap has closed as in Communication and Language he is now working at age related expectations for Listening and Attention and Understanding and emerging at age expected for Speaking. Child's well-being and involvement scales have also increased. Child S's developing English has also supported his younger siblings understanding and use of English as he knows many single words and can speak in 2-3 word sentences. The family are very pleased with Child S progress in spoken English and with the wide variety of activities that he is able to partake in.

Child S will be transitioning to Reception Class in September 2019 and the support he has received at the Nursery school has ensured that he will be working at a level comparable to the majority of his peers.

#### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service Accessed Autumn Term 2018	Cost per hour	Hours per week	Cost per week	Cost per term
Nursery School staff time with parents meetings	£36	0.4 6 (over the Autumn 2018)	£90	£216 ( total for 6 hrs)
Communication/liaison with professionals	£38 and £36	3 (over the Autumn 2018)	£7.60 £7.20	£114 ( total for 3 hrs) £108(total for 3 hrs)
Wellcomm training and implementation	£38 and £36	2(one off)	£5.27 £5	£76( total for 2 hrs) £72( total for 2 hrs)
Preparations applications and assessments	£38	2(one off)	£5.27	£76( total for 2 hrs)
Child S: group intervention teaching and 1-2-1 support plus paper work	£36	1	£36	£540
Child S– peer to peer massage x6 External agency	£41.60	1	£41.60	£249.60
Child S– peer to peer massage	£36	0.5	£18	£270
			<b>£269.94</b>	<b>£1,721.96</b>

Please note: the timings above are approximate average.  
Costing is dependent upon in the grade of the staff member.



**Overall costings for 2018/2019 academic year: £4,666.68**

**5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family**

Funding stream	Yearly rate	Hours per week	Total funding per week
EYPP	£292.22	15	£7.69
EEE	£2445.30	15	£64.35

<b>Total Funding per week</b>	<b>£72.04</b>
-------------------------------	---------------

**Overall funding received for 2018/19 academic year (£72.04 x 38 weeks): £2,737.52**

**6. Difference Between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' for Services Accessed by Family**

Costing from September - Dec 2018	Costing per week over the Autumn term	EYPP Funding for the term started September 2018 for the Autumn term	EEE Funding for the term started September 2018	Funding 'Found' for Services
£1,721.96	£269.94	£115.35	<u>£965.25</u>	<u>£641.36</u>

**This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of £1,929.16**

**Unfunded proportion of costs: 41%**

**Added Value by Nursery School: 70%**

NB: This figure takes in account of only including the costings for the external agency in Autumn term only.

**7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability**

In order to support Child S's language development on a daily basis, to ensure progress and enable him to fulfil his potential, he will need to continue with the interventions provided. However, the funding that the Nursery School receives for Child S per week (£72.04 ) does not cover the amount the school spent on this provision over the Autumn term (the difference being £42.75 per week). If this level of support continues for another two terms the school faces an additional cost of £983.41. Child S will need to have continued support and encouragement to develop his spoken English and to widen his vocabulary, in order to prepare S for the transition to his Reception class with a good level of the English language.



## **Case Study 6: A child with English as an Additional Language (EAL)**

### **1. Family Type and Circumstances**

A is three years old; she has a younger sibling and shares her home with her parents and extended family. Her paternal grandparents live within the property along with paternal aunts. The family live a distance from the school and the Nursery attended is not their nearest Nursery School, but parents felt that our provision could support A better with her needs. A's father speaks fluent English along with A's paternal aunts. Mum and grandparents have very limited English both understanding and conversational. A speaks and understands her home language as this is spoken by family members. During A's initial home visit parents raised concerns about her speech and language and her use of words. A uses some identifiable words in English, parents described these as words that she had learnt through 'You Tube' videos. The child's Health Visitor was also contacted by A's teacher and SENCO to find out if they had any further information regarding A. The Health visitor explained that A had been referred to the Community Paediatrician by her GP before the age of two as the family and GP had concerns with A's use of language. The Community Paediatrician had reported back that it was too early to assess A for autism however she has been discharged with severe language delay. The Health Visitor also stated that they had concerns A did not receive sufficient face to face interaction at home and had a lot of screen time. The Health Visitor also referred A to the Speech and Language team during her two year old progress check as her speech was not clear and she was still babbling. Speech and Language have issued A with three targets and awaiting another appointment. These conversations also brought into light the concerns of both school and the health team that A was still eating baby food out of jars. Health stated that they had informed parents about weaning. The teacher and the SENCO met with the parents and offered further weaning support, helping parents to explore different ways of encouraging A to eat solid food. A review was carried out by the SENCO within the setting with input from the teachers and parents as to A's areas of development in September 2018 and a 'My SEN and Early Support Plan' was put in place. During A's first term within the setting a disclosure of domestic violence was made. This resulted in a number of staff working together alongside social services, health and other professionals.

### **2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family**

An extended period of time was created for the settling in the child. A's mother remained in the nursery environment to play alongside her and help settle her into nursery. SENCO, Head Teacher, Teacher and Nursery Officer have liaised with professionals, such as Health Visitors, Speech and Language Therapists, CDC, social services and also including the schools Educational Psychologist, who completed Visits during the October 2018. ISEY (Inclusion Support for Early Years) funding application was submitted and approved in October 2018. Small group interventions are not developmentally appropriate for A. Therefore, all areas of her learning and development are supported through bespoke one to one support. Activities set for A's targets are provided daily through 1-1 support from her Inclusion support worker. Alongside this staff all use Makaton symbols to support A build up her vocabulary. The school uses weekly Makaton signs and Makaton signs and symbols are used for daily activities and routines. We have also use now and next boards and visual time tables to help A understand routines. Using rhymes of the week and story focuses has helped A to develop a better understanding of the use of language and its comprehension. There have also been changes made in the learning environment such as clearer labelling and challenges set out for A to ask questions and seek new ways of language acquisition.



A also has a key worker who, supports A with the development of her EAL through language rich games, conversations for A to develop an understanding of words within English. During the first few months A would just echo what was being said, however through these group and 1-1 interventions A is now showing a greater understanding of what is being said and asked through her responses. A is now able to sit for short periods of time within focus group sessions and will often answer questions directed at her in clear English.

### 3. Benefits of Services Accessed for Child and Family Members

Our nursery provision provided A's parent with much-needed support. Although they live with extended family, A's parents had not left A in their care, due their personal choice. Both parents have met with the teachers and SENCo and are now good at asking for support as they need it. After the disclosure of Domestic Violence the school has been a place where mum is happy to share and ask for help. Teachers have called in women's support groups to help mum think about upskilling herself which mum has now decided to do next academic year to help her children in the future. Teacher and nursery officers have been made available to translate to mum when needed. The family have accessed services as needed and suggested they have attended appointments and are working with the nursery and other linked professionals to help A develop.

A is now using words within context, prior to this she was repeating what she had heard. Parents are working hard at home by limiting the use of technology and screen time. They have also worked hard alongside nursery to support A with her eating who is now a wider range of solid food. The Inclusion support worker and teacher input have supported A to develop her spoken and understanding of English. This is reflected within the three teacher assessments carried out since September and also A's wellbeing and interactions. A has made significant progress within her time at the setting. On entry A was assessed at working within band 1 (0-11months) in Communication and Language at spring time this has significantly increased an A is now beginning to work at age appropriate levels (22-36months).

### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service Accessed	Cost per hour	Hours per week	Cost per term	Average cost per week
Nursery School staff time with parents meetings	£21 and £36	6 (over the period)	£126 £216	£22.80
Communication/liasion with professionals/ fact finding	£38	8 (over the period)	£304	£20.26
Referrals submitted to ISEY	£36	2 (one off)	£72	£4.80
Preparations applications and assessments	£36	5(over the period)	£180	£12
Discussions with the Health Vising team	£38	2(one off)	£76	£5
Small group intervention teaching	£38	5	£190	£12.60
Educational Psychologist (traded service)	£130	4 (total)	£520	£34.60
GNS staff time with parents for translation	£36 £38	3 (Over the period)	£114	£9.60
Referrals to CASS/Social Services	£36	4 (one off)	£144	£15.20





	£21	4( one off)	£84	
Additional salary to ISEY worker ( started in October 2018)	£3	7.5	£90	£22.50
			<b>£2,116</b>	<b>£159.36</b>

Please note: the timings above are approximate average.  
Costing is dependent upon in the grade of the staff member.

**Overall costing incurred for 2018/2019 academic year: £6,348.00**

#### 5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family

Funding stream	Hourly rate	Hours per week	Total funding per week
ISEY	£8	7.5	£60(only 7 Weeks)
EEE	£4.29	15	£64.35

Please note- funding only began in October 2018 for ISEY

ISEY	£60 (only 7 weeks)
EEE	£64.35
<b>Total Funding per week</b>	<b>£124.34</b>

**Overall ISEY and EEE funding received for 2018/2019 academic year (£124.34 x 38 weeks): £4,724.92**

#### 6. Difference between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' for Services Accessed by Family

Costing Sept-Dec 2018	Costing per week over the Autumn term	ISEY Funding for the term (7 weeks - funding started at the end of October 2018)	EEE funding over the Autumn term	Funding 'Found' for Services
£2,116	£159.36	£420 ( £60 per week)	<b>£1385.25 over the term</b>	<b>£730.75 over the term</b>

**This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of £1623.08**

**Unfunded proportion of costs: 26%**

**Added Value by Nursery School: 34%**

#### 7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability

In order to support A's development on a daily basis, to ensure progress and enable her to fulfil her potential, the first-hand one to one support that A requires must take place. However, the funding that the Nursery receives for A per week (£124.34) does not cover the amount the school



spends on this provision per week (the difference being £35.02). For the first month of child A being within the setting the school there was no ISSEY funding being accessed. In addition to all of this the amount of administrative work, liaison and communication that is involved in co-ordinating support for A and her family was more costly over the autumn term (£730.75) than the direct support A received. This means that the paperwork that the Nursery has completed in order to ensure that A's needs are met by creating a family centred and multidisciplinary approach has shown a significant greater expense for the schools services in comparison to the cost of the inclusion staff hired to support her. A will need to have support and encouragement to develop her understanding of spoken English as at times A is still using words out of context. In the light of how settings must all work together to safeguard children, there was a lot of time spent chasing professionals earlier on to fact find about child A and her needs. This not only causes the school unnecessary costs but also delays the vital support a child needs. With the constant support of her inclusion support officer (one and half hours a day) and the rest made up by teaching staff and SENCo the school will prioritise A's development. However, the figures for autumn term suggest that it will cost the school further in the future to ensure that A's language develops further.



## Case Study 7: A child from a low income family (Eligible for Early Years Pupil Premium - EYPP)

### 1. Family Type and Circumstances

C is 3 years old and is eligible for 3 year old funding plus Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) as his mum is on a low income. C has 4 older siblings and we had his older sister previously. Mum needs a lot of support and often struggles to manage her finances and needs support with this.

### 2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family

C was given a uniform and school bag at the start of the school year. C often did not have nappies or wipes so we used Nursery School stock. We provide breakfast and food throughout the session. C attended breakfast club for free and stayed for a lunch. Sometimes mum came to us when she had no money for gas or electric. Mum needed a lot of support to help C toilet train. C had to see our Speech and Language therapist which meant he also needed a support plan for a speech delay. C attended Forest School sessions, nurture group and speech and language intervention groups. We supported mum with her communication with the Primary School her older children attend and liaised with housing about poor living conditions.

### 3. Benefits of Services Accessed for Child and Family Members

C had at least 2 meals a day. C's speech and language improved meaning the attainment gap between him and his more affluent peers was narrowed. Mum engaged well with the nursery and primary school which meant the needs of the children could be met.

### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service Accessed	Cost per hour	Hours per week	Cost per week
Nursery School staff time with parents	£21	5	£105
Communication/liaison with professionals	£38	0.5	£19
Referrals submitted to support services	£36	0.5	£18
Funding applications and assessments	N/A	N/A	N/A
One to one inclusion support	£17	0.25	£4.25
Small group intervention teaching	£4.25	2	£8.50
Educational Psychologist (traded service)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Breakfast, snacks and lunch (food and provision)	£2.50	10	£25.00 + £20.00
Additional support	N/A	N/A	£7
			<b>£206.75</b>

Please note: the timings above are approximate average.  
Costing is dependent on the grade of the staff member.

**Overall costing incurred for 2018/19 academic year: £7856.50**



### 5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family

Costing per week	Funding per week	EYPP Funding (0.53 per hour)	Funding 'Found' for Services
£206.75	£64.35	7.95	<b>£134.45 per week</b>

Overall funding received for 2018/2019 academic year: £2,747.40

### 6. Difference Between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' for Services Accessed by Family

This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of £5,109.10

Unfunded proportion of costs: 65%  
Added Value by Nursery School: 186%

### 7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability

C and his family come with additional needs which relate to the support they need to access school and education. This has an impact on the staff time needed to do this. C needed additional support settling and additional home visits. There is also additional time spent supporting family by liaising with other services in meetings and on the telephone.



## Case Study 8: A child on a Child Protection Plan

### 1. Family Type and Circumstances

N is 3 years of age and started with the school at age 2. He has been on a Child Protection plan since he was 2 years old. He has an older sister, also on the plan, who came to the Nursery School and now attends a local primary school. N is developmentally behind his peers and has poor social and emotional development, he needs constant reassurance, nurture sessions and guidance from the educational psychologist. N also has poor speech and language and so works with our Speech and Language Therapist. The family needs lots of support with N's attendance including home visits, picking up from home and distribution of daily bus passes. N is also not collected on time, usually being collected between 5:30 and 6pm. N is not adequately dressed and usually hungry so we provide uniform, shoes, coats, breakfast, snacks, lunch and tea. N's family does not ever contribute school fund or towards events such as school trips so the school subsidised this. The school also provides books for home which were not returned. Concerns about heavy drug use and poor attendance of the children means daily conversations and correspondence with the local primary school the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL), drugs worker, Health visitor and social worker.

### 2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family

Full time place provided for N with breakfast club and afterschool although funding for just 15 hours. If N does not arrive to school and we cannot contact mum, school will home visit with intention to bring N to school. School attendance at Child Protection Conferences and Core Group meetings. SENCo has liaised with professionals. This included the school Educational Psychologist, Health Visitor and Speech and Language Therapist.

N attends small nurture group interventions that focus upon communication, nurture, physical development and cognitive skills. N has a key worker.

### 3. Benefits of Services Accessed for Child and Family Members

A full-time place means that N has the opportunity to narrow his attainment gap and work towards age related targets. N accesses breakfast, snacks, lunch and tea every weekday. N is seen every weekday and so is safe. N has appropriate clothing so is warm and dry.

### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service Accessed	Cost per hour	Hours per week	Cost per week
Nursery School staff time with parents	£21	3	£63
Communication/liaison with professionals	£38	2	£76
Staff time recording on CPOMs, writing reports etc.	£21	1.5	£31.50
Attendance at meetings (averaged across the year)	£38	0.4	£15.20
Referrals submitted to support services	£38	0.25	£9.50



Small nurture group	£4.25	5	£21.25
Breakfast Club, lunch, tea and after school club	N/A	N/A	£52.50
Additional 15 hours education	£5	15	£75
Educational Psychologist (traded service)	£130	2 (total)	£7
			<b>£350.95</b>

Please note: the timings above are approximate average.  
Costing is dependent upon in the grade of the staff member.

**Overall costing incurred for 2018/19 academic year: £13,336.10**

#### 5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family

Funding stream	Hourly rate	Hours per week	Total funding per week
EEE	£4.29	15	£64.35

**Overall funding received for 2018/2019 academic year: £2,445.30**

#### 6. Difference Between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' for Services Accessed by Family

Costing per week	Funding per week	Funding 'Found' for Services
£350.95	£64.35	<b><u>£286.60 per week</u></b>

This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of **£10,890.80** over a year

**Unfunded proportion of costs: 82%**  
**Added Value by Nursery School: 445%**

#### 7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability

N's attendance at a Maintained Nursery School means he is safe and can be monitored closely. He has access to healthy food and drinks and so his nutritional needs are met. N's emotional wellbeing can be monitored and good relationships mean we can support him with this. N has a chance to fulfil his potential and narrow the gap between his attainment and that of his peers living in a more stable environment. The Maintained Nursery School will also work with other professionals to ensure that N does not remain in an unsafe household for a long period of time.



## Case Study 9: A child eligible for 2 year old grant funding

### 1. Family Type and Circumstances

Q is two years old and is entitled to 2 year old grant funding through economic means testing.

### 2. Range of Services Offered and Services Accessed by Family

Q attends the Nursery School for 15 hours early education entitlement. As she is two years old she is on a 1 to 4 staff ratio. She attends one forest school session a week and on this day receives a school dinner. Mum attends workshops with Q and engaged with the school for Q's 2 year check. Q has no additional needs.

### 3. Benefits of Services Accessed for Child and Family Members

Mum sees the benefit in Q attending school and has noted the improvement in her personal, social emotional and communication skills. Q attends well.

### 4. Costing of Services Offered and Accessed by Family

Service Accessed	Cost per hour	Hours per week	Cost per week
Nursery School staff time with parents	£15	1.5	£22.50
Staffing	£11.25	15	£168.75
Breakfast, snacks and lunch (food and provision)	N/A	N/A	£5
			<b>£196.25</b>

Please note: the timings above are approximate average.

Costing is dependent on the grade of the staff member.

**Overall costing incurred for 2018/19 academic year: £7,457.50**

### 5. Amount of Funding Provided for Services Accessed by Family

Funding stream	Hourly rate	Hours per week	Total funding per week
2EEE	£5.24	15	£78.60

N.B. The total funding we receive for a 2 year old place for a year is £2987. 2 year olds have a ratio of 1:4. The funding for 4 2 year olds for a year is £11,947. The lowest amount a Maintained Nursery School in Birmingham can pay for a member of staff is £19,754 – a loss of £7807. Per child this is an additional £1951.75 per year, per 2 year old.

**Overall funding received for 2018/2019 academic year: £2,986.80**

### 6. Difference Between Funding Provided and Funding 'Found' for Services Accessed by Family

Costing per week	Funding per week	Funding 'Found' for Services	
£196.25	£78.60	<b>£117.65 per week</b>	<b>£4470.70 per year</b>



**This means that the Nursery School has funded this work to the amount of £4470.70**

**Unfunded proportion of costs: 60%**  
**Added Value by Nursery School: 150%**

### **7. Reflections on Family Service Access and Sustainability**

Every time a Maintained Nursery School admits a 2 year old on 2 year funding they are having to subsidise the wages of the staff. This is because all Birmingham schools pay the Birmingham living wage and 2 year olds have a 1 to 4 staff ratio. There is no level of staff a Birmingham school can employ that would be covered by the early education funding for 2 year olds. It is beneficial to the child to receive additional early education but the more 2 year olds a Maintained Nursery School gives provision to, the more it has to subsidise.



**Appendix 2: Birmingham Nursery Schools Reach and Access Data**

	Children with higher level SEN/D	Children with moderate level SEN/D	Children with lower level SEN/D	Newly arrived children	Children in ESAE	Children with EAL	Children subject to a CP Plan	Two year old grant funded children	Low income children (eligible for EYPP)
MNS 1	12	13	4	1	6	33	2	38	41
MNS 2	13	4	9	1	1	16	1	42	35
MNS 3	14	5	6	2	1	42	4	29	19
MNS 4	3	5	5	0	10	32	0	0	16
MNS 5	4	13	4	1	13	76	1	34	18
MNS 6	4	11	12	0	1	9	2	22	48
MNS 7	14	13	15	5	20	77	2	48	33
MNS 8	1	6	9	1	16	55	1	27	15
MNS 9	1	5	18	1	31	52	2	21	41
MNS 10	3	11	5	1	9	36	1	39	27
MNS 11	13	7	5	0	0	55	4	56	80
MNS 12	4	5	6	3	4	18	2	15	25
MNS13	9	7	11	0	9	13	5	55	49
MNS 14	11	5	13	3	23	49	5	42	38
MNS 15	1	8	0	1	86	104	0	50	30
MNS 16	4	4	2	0	35	14	1	12	11
MNS 17	11	8	16	0	62	82	1	61	35
MNS 18	6	15	55	0	2	6	0	41	43
MNS 19	6	4	7	2	158	158	2	61	22
MNS 20	5	5	0	2	104	104	2	47	20
MNS 21	5	3	2	3	21	38	0	1	6
MNS 22	3	4	2	1	37	43	1	40	24
MNS 23	4	7	35	0	70	121	1	55	62
MNS 24	2	0	16	0	0	19	1	24	25
MNS 25	4	1	6	0	0	19	0	0	3
MNS 26	5	7	49	5	28	34	3	76	73
MNS 27	4	7	1	0	4	11	0	8	24
<b>TOTAL: 27</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>1316</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>944</b>	<b>863</b>



### Appendix 3: Cost and Funding Assumptions

1. As a basic premise we have added the child's Early Education Entitlement hours in to their amount per head, based upon published rates of:

£5.24 per hour for 2 year old places for 15 hours/week over 38 weeks

£4.29 per hour for 3 year old places for 15 hours/week over 38 weeks

2. All income and costs per child have been calculated for 3 terms (38 weeks). Where a child did not complete a full 3 terms the costs have been extrapolated.

3. Costs for staffing hours have used the following figures: (calculated by taking midpoint of range with 38% on costs with reference to Teachers 2018/19 pay scales and Support staff 2019/20 pay scales)

Grade 2 = £17 per hour

Grade 3 = £21 per hour

DHT = £38 per hour

SENCO = £36 per hour

4. Supplementary funding is not directly linked to individual children and has therefore not been included in the individual case study funding calculations. Its global benefit to the MNS is however acknowledged and where a calculation of contributions has been made this supplementary funding is acknowledged and deducted in its entirety from the subtotal.



## **Appendix 4: Glossary to Acronyms**

CAT: Communication and Autism Team

CDC: Child Development Centre

CIC: Child in Care

CRISP: Criteria for Inclusion and Specialist Provision

DAF: Disability Access Fund

DLA: Disability Living Allowance

DRC: Disability Resource Centre

EDAP: Early Development Assessment Pathway

EEE: Early Education Entitlement

EHC assessment: Education, Health and Care assessment

EHCAR: Education, Health and Care Assessment Request

EHCP: Education, Health and Care Plan

EP: Educational Psychologist

EPS: Educational Psychology Service

ES & SEN Support Plan: Early Support and Special Educational Needs Support Plan

GDAP: Global Development Assessment Pathway

HV: Health Visitor

ISEY: Inclusion Support in the Early Years

OT: Occupational Therapy

PDSS: Physical Difficulty Support Service

SALT: Speech and Language Therapy

SCAIP: Social Communication and Interaction Assessment Pathway

TAC: Team Around the Child