

## Appendix 3: Full-time funded places proposed changes: Data Report

### Summary and key messages

All children are eligible from the term after they turn three for 15 hours per week free early education entitlement (EEE) during term-time, or the equivalent total spread out across every week of the year. Birmingham council has historically funded a number of additional hours for children who meet specific criteria. These criteria were changed in summer 2016. This report looks at the data from the first term following those changes. International evidence suggests that there is no additional benefit for children in attending early years settings for more than 15 hours per week, though for vulnerable children attending for 15 hours for a longer period – i.e. starting at two years old, can have a positive impact. In the context of reducing budgets, research evidence and the current low take-up of targeted two year olds places, this report can be used to inform consultation on removing the funding for full-time places for three and four year olds altogether.

A total of 1,440 children received funding for a full-time place (nearly always 30 hours per week) under a range of criteria, some having more than one criterion applied.

The proportion of children accessing a full-time funded place varies enormously across the city wards and areas of deprivation, meaning that there is no consistency across the city and quite likely a lack of equity for children in similar situations in different areas. Removing the funding for full-time places will enable consistency and equity across the city.

Most children – 80% - with a full-time funded place were accessing it in a primary or nursery school whereas only 57% of all children accessing all EEE places were doing so in schools. This means that the impact of withdrawing the funding will be greater for those children who access their EEE in the schools. After the change to the criteria in 2016, schools are now funding more children full-time from their school budgets than before hand – an increase of 34%. It is possible that some schools will continue to do this, or even to extend it if the council removes all funding, but it is not possible to predict this, especially since schools' funding changes mean many may have smaller budgets.

There are currently 12 criteria under which the council funds full-time places, and these have been grouped into five broad categories for this report.

**Children in first stages of language development:** Children in this group are mostly (90%) in the schools sector and removing funding would affect approximately 500 children.

**Children with disabilities:** Around 300 children accessed a full time place on the basis of their disability.

**Children where there are safeguarding issues:** Children with safeguarding issues are often the city's most vulnerable children and removing full-time places could be significant. Whilst 305 children were funded under these criteria, not all of them – 211 – were on a plan for vulnerable children of one kind or another:

Child protection plan or child in need plan	65
Looked after child plan	39
Family support plan through early help/fCAF	107

**Children already receiving a full-time place**

If settings continued to provide funded full-time places at the same proportions of those funded in the autumn term, 880 children could be in a funded full-time place at the end of the summer term 2017 and not be old enough to move into reception classes. If the funding for full-time places then ceases, these children would have their places reduced to part-time places in the autumn term.

**Parental vulnerabilities**

A total of 221 children were funded for full-time places based on the additional vulnerabilities they face as a result of their parents' situations. 132 had parents with disabilities or illnesses, 19 had a parent in prison, 46 lived in families experiencing domestic violence or drug/alcohol abuse and 24 lived in families with no recourse to public funds.

# Data report

## Introduction

This report examines the children in Birmingham who were funded by the council for a full-time Early Education Entitlement (EEE) place in Autumn term 2016 - the most recent term for which the data is available. A full-time place is usually 30 hours per week but in a very small number of cases it is between 15 hours (the nationally funded rate) and 30 hours.

The council revised the criteria for funding full-time places during 2016, in consultation with providers and parents. The criteria only apply to three and four year olds, though the data shows that there were small numbers of two year olds funded; these have been excluded from the analysis.

## Full-time places and types of setting

In autumn term 2016 1,465 children (9.4% of all funded places, or 8.3% of all eligible children) were funded full-time, a decrease from 14.9% in the summer term, before the criteria changed. The majority (79.6%) of those funded full-time take up their place in a maintained setting – a nursery school or class. This picture differs substantially from part-time places, as shown below.

Provider Type Autumn Term 2016	Number of children Funded FT	% of all FT children	Number of children Funded PT	% of all PT children	All EEE children	% of all children
Childminder	1	0.07%	108	0.73%	109	0.67%
Day Nursery/pre-school playgroup/independent school nursery	298	20.34%	6653	44.82%	6951	42.62%
Nursery Class	592	40.41%	6606	44.50%	7198	44.14%
Nursery School	544	37.13%	1477	9.95%	2021	12.39%
Special school	30	2.05%	0	0.00%	30	0.18%
Grand Total	1465	100.00%	14844	100.00%	16,309	100.00%

*Table One: Take up of places by setting type and funded hours*

## Wards

Data for children accessing a funded full-time place in the primary and nursery schools are only available at a school level, with no information collected on individual children, so analysis of full-time funded places by area has been conducted in two parts. For all children accessing their full-time place in a special school or a PVI setting the data has been analysed by the child's postcode, but for those children accessing their place in a primary or nursery school, the data has been analysed on the postcode of the school. As most children access a school close to home, this should provide a good indication of the areas where full-time places are predominantly accessed.

This analysis by ward shows enormous variation in the proportion of children being funded for full time places in different parts of the city. The data shown in Appendix One includes four separate key items:

- proportion and number of children living in the ward who have funded full time places
- proportion of children taking up EEE who have a funded full time place
- overall take-up of EEE

The analysis shows that in some wards the proportion of children with full time places is unusually high whilst the overall take-up is lower than average. Specifically, Ladywood, Sparkbrook, and Bordesley Green fall into this category. This suggests that the take-up of full-time places may be preventing take-up of the statutory requirement by other children in these wards. Conversely, there are wards where overall take-up of EEE is very high and the proportion of children having full time places is also high – Tyburn, Washwood Heath, Weoley, Aston and Erdington. This suggests that there are sufficient places in these wards to meet the current full-time needs.

Overall, the data suggests that there is not a consistent approach in different areas of the city to allocation of full-time places. This conclusion is supported by the data from schools, which show that some schools provide full-time places to all or nearly all of their children and others provide no funded full-time places.

### **Non-council funded places**

Table One only shows those children who have a full-time place funded by the council. Some schools also offer full-time places for children funded from school budgets. In autumn term 2016, these school-funded places accounted for 62% of all full-time places in schools. These additional full-time places take the total proportion of all EEE-funded children having a full-time place to 15.6% and represent an increase in school-funded places from 731 in the summer term to 979 in the autumn term, an increase of 34%. This will have mitigated the impact of the change in criteria for full-time funded places in areas around those schools which are funding full-time places from their school budgets. No conclusions can be drawn about the future of school-funded places should the council cease to fund any full-time places, as schools now also face changes to their own budgets as part of the government's changes to the schools funding formula.

Full data on school-funded places can be found in Appendix Two. Schools in five wards provide a large number of places, taking the total proportion of children funded full-time in these wards to well above average; these wards are:

- Kingstanding
- Quinton
- South Yardley
- Northfield
- Stechford and Yardley North.

### **Full-time places by criteria awarded**

Table Two shows the proportion of children accessing a full-time place under each of the criteria for funding. In both the PVI and maintained sectors some settings have recorded a child as meeting more than one criteria, with a total of 169 children being recorded as meeting more than one criteria for full-time funding. Therefore, the proportions of children in each category total more than 100%. As the numbers of children in most categories are low, analysis by ward has not been possible.

The three main criteria under which children have been funded full-time are:

- Children with diagnosed disabilities who have (or are in the process of getting) an education, health and care plan and/or are in receipt of Disability Living Allowance. Or children who have been referred to or by a child development centre or equivalent specialist education agency.
- Children who are in the first stages of language development.
- Child was funded for a full time place in the Summer 2016 term

Whilst there will be no long term impact of withdrawing funding from the last of these, there is likely to be a significant impact on children with disabilities and those in the first stages of language development. The total number of children funded within these two criteria is 763.

The data shows differences between the PVI and maintained sector in a number of the criteria. These differences are explored in the sections below. For full details, please see Appendix Three.

<b>Criteria for funding</b>	<b>Proportion of all FT children</b>	<b>Proportion PVI FT children</b>	<b>Proportion LA FT children</b>
Children with a child protection plan, or who are subject to a section 47 child protection investigation or a section 17 children in need plan	4.5%	7.7%	3.7%
Children in local authority care	2.7%	3.7%	2.5%
Children identified as in need of early help through a family common assessment framework (fCAF) and have in place a family support plan	7.4%	9.4%	6.9%
Children with diagnosed disabilities who have (or are in the process of getting) an education, health and care plan and/or are in receipt of Disability Living Allowance. Or children who have been referred to or by a child development centre or equivalent specialist education agency	20.3%	25.4%	18.9%
Children from families where their physical accommodation places the child at risk of harm	1.7%	0.0%	2.2%
Children whose parents/carers need support as a result of their physical disability, learning disability, mental health problem or illness	9.2%	11.0%	8.7%
Children with parents/carers in prison	1.3%	0.7%	1.5%
Children from families experiencing domestic violence or drug/alcohol abuse	3.2%	4.7%	2.8%
Children who are in the first stages of language development	32.2%	15.7%	36.5%
Children from families with no recourse to public funds	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%
Children in exceptional circumstances around a safeguarding/vulnerable situation need	4.8%	1.0%	5.8%
Child was funded for a full time place in the Summer 2016 term	22.5%	43.8%	16.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>111.5%</b>	<b>124.7%</b>	<b>108.1%</b>

*Table Two: Proportion of all FT funded places by criteria*

## **Safeguarding criteria**

There are five criteria which encompass safeguarding:

1. Children with a child protection plan, or who are subject to a section 47 child protection investigation or a section 17 children in need plan (65 children)
2. Children in local authority care (39 children)
3. Children identified as in need of early help through a family common assessment framework (fCAF) and have in place a family support plan (107 children)
4. Children from families where their physical accommodation places the child at risk of harm (25 children)
5. Children in exceptional circumstances around a safeguarding/vulnerable situation need (69 children)

Overall, 305 children were funded under these criteria, with 69% of them – 211 children – on a plan for vulnerable children of one kind or another.

A higher proportion of children in PVI's accessed full-time places on the basis of a local authority care order, a child protection plan, child in need plan or a family support plan as part of Early Help. Conversely, a larger proportion of children in the maintained sector accessed full-time places on the basis of their physical accommodation placing them at risk of harm or exceptional circumstances around a safeguarding/vulnerable situation.

## **Parental vulnerabilities**

There are four criteria which are covered in this area:

- Children whose parents/carers need support as a result of their physical disability, learning disability, mental health problem or illness (132 children)
- Children with parents/carers in prison (19 children)
- Children from families experiencing domestic violence or drug/alcohol abuse (46 children)
- Children from families with no recourse to public funds (24 children).

A total of 221 children were funded for full-time places based on the additional vulnerabilities they face as a result of their parents' situations.

A larger proportion of children in the PVI sector were funded for full-time places on the basis of their parents having disabilities or illnesses or experiencing domestic violence or drug/alcohol abuse.

## **Children in the first stages of language development**

As mentioned above, this is the largest groups of full-time funded places, with 464 children funded under this criterion. In the maintained sector, over a third (36.5%) of those funded full-time met this criteria, compared with less than 16% in the PVI sector. In total, 417 of the children funded under this criterion are in schools.

## **Children funded full-time in the previous term**

324 children were funded full-time on the basis of this criterion. In the PVI sector, this was the case for 43.8% of children in the autumn term, compared with only 16.9% in the maintained sector. This difference is largely attributable to schools being far more likely than PVI's to take a new cohort of children in each September, rather than having rolling admissions.

Whilst the consultation on changes to full-time places is ongoing, settings have been advised not to allocate new full-time places, which should prevent the impact of removing the funding less significant. However, if all settings continued to provide funded full-time places at the same proportions of those funded in the autumn term, 880 children could be in a funded full-time place at the end of the summer term 2017 and not be old enough to move into reception classes. If the funding for full-time places then ceases, these children would have their places reduced to part-time places in the autumn term.

### **Children with disabilities**

This is the third largest group of full-time funded children, with 292 children funded under this criterion. In the PVI sector, over a quarter of those funded full-time met this criteria, compared with less than 20% in the maintained sector.

### **Deprivation**

A supplement is paid to the settings for each child who lives in areas of deprivation in the city. The measure of deprivation used is the IDACI (Income deprivation affecting children index) profile, where the 0-5% band is the most deprived 5% areas of England, chosen because it is the only national index of deprivation which focuses directly on children. Over half of all children under five (56.6%) in Birmingham live in the qualifying deprived areas - the most deprived 20% in the country. Children living in these areas are more likely to meet one of the criteria for a full time place. Therefore, we would expect there to be some correlation between the wards with the highest levels of deprivation and those with the highest take up of full time places.

Overall, 11% of children living in the most deprived areas were funded full-time, compared with 8.3% overall. This picture varies enormously by ward, however, as shown in Appendix Three, with some wards having a larger proportion of children funded full-time overall than those living in the most deprived areas. Please see Appendix Three for full data.

A much larger proportion of children living in the most deprived areas received full-time funding, compared to the ward overall in six wards:

Aston  
Brandwood  
Edgbaston

Tyburn  
Ladywood  
South Yardley.

On the other hand, a much smaller proportion of children living in the most deprived areas received full-time funding, compared to the ward overall in nine wards:

Bordesley Green  
Erdington  
Longbridge  
Northfield  
Oscott

Quinton  
Selly Oak  
Sheldon  
Sutton Trinity.

This suggests that whilst there is an overall correlation between high deprivation levels and high full time funded places, this masks a reverse correlation in some wards. Although there is only data on the address for the setting for children in the maintained sector, data is available for both the setting and the child's home postcode in the PVI sector.

**Appendix One: Analysis by Ward**

<b>Ward</b>	<b>% EEE children funded FT</b>	<b>% all children with a funded FT place</b>	<b>Overall take-up of EEE</b>	<b>Number children with a funded full-time place</b>
Acocks Green	5.6%	4.9%	86.8%	22
Aston	25.7%	24.2%	94.2%	163
Bartley Green	8.3%	7.2%	87.1%	28
Billesley	6.6%	5.3%	80.6%	23
Bordesley Green	12.6%	10.5%	83.3%	91
Bournville	0.0%	0.0%	91.6%	0
Brandwood	9.8%	9.4%	95.7%	37
Edgbaston	10.9%	8.8%	80.6%	24
Erdington	26.1%	24.6%	94.6%	85
Hall Green	0.7%	0.6%	80.2%	2
Handsworth Wood	0.0%	0.0%	85.0%	0
Harborne	0.0%	0.0%	85.0%	0
Hodge Hill	7.2%	6.5%	90.3%	35
Kings Norton	8.0%	7.1%	88.5%	27
Kingstanding	9.5%	9.1%	95.6%	43
Ladywood	15.4%	13.1%	85.3%	41
Longbridge	10.0%	9.0%	89.9%	32
Lozells and East Handsworth	2.8%	2.6%	94.3%	17
Moseley and Kings Heath	3.1%	2.9%	92.4%	9
Nechells	10.9%	9.7%	89.0%	71
Northfield	5.0%	4.3%	85.6%	17
Oscott	6.5%	5.4%	82.9%	21
Perry Barr	1.0%	0.8%	85.4%	3
Quinton	3.8%	3.1%	81.3%	13
Selly Oak	8.6%	7.1%	82.9%	15
Shard End	5.0%	4.2%	83.1%	21
Sheldon	11.3%	10.0%	88.1%	31
Soho	8.9%	7.6%	85.7%	48
South Yardley	8.8%	7.7%	88.1%	46
Sparkbrook	26.4%	23.3%	88.4%	150
Springfield	1.9%	1.6%	87.7%	11
Stechford and Yardley North	6.1%	5.7%	92.6%	26
Stockland Green	3.2%	2.6%	83.3%	11
Sutton Four Oaks	0.4%	0.3%	91.8%	1
Sutton New Hall	0.9%	1.0%	105.0%	2
Sutton Trinity	4.6%	4.2%	90.4%	13
Sutton Vesey	3.6%	3.7%	101.6%	9
Tyburn	17.9%	16.5%	92.0%	62
Washwood Heath	20.6%	18.6%	90.5%	147
Weoley	16.9%	16.6%	98.3%	68
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>88.6%</b>	<b>1465</b>



**Appendix Two: School funding of full-time places**

<b>Ward</b>	<b>No.FT places funded by setting</b>	<b>Total no. EEE funded children</b>	<b>% children funded FT by school</b>	<b>% children funded FT by council</b>	<b>Overall % funded FT</b>
Acocks Green	32	393	8.14%	5.60%	13.74%
Aston	35	638	5.49%	25.71%	31.19%
Bartley Green	28	337	8.31%	8.31%	16.62%
Billesley	17	349	4.87%	6.59%	11.46%
Bordesley Green	-2	721	-0.28%	12.62%	12.34%
Bournville	21	284	7.39%	0.00%	7.39%
Brandwood	2	377	0.53%	9.81%	10.34%
Edgbaston	0	220	0.00%	10.91%	10.91%
Erdington	-59	330	-17.88%	26.06%	8.18%
Hall Green	-1	279	-0.36%	0.72%	0.36%
Handsworth Wood	59	357	16.53%	0.00%	16.53%
Harborne	0	300	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hodge Hill	32	486	6.58%	7.20%	13.79%
Kings Norton	12	339	3.54%	7.96%	11.50%
Kingstanding	73	451	16.19%	9.53%	25.72%
Ladywood	24	267	8.99%	15.36%	24.34%
Longbridge	2	321	0.62%	9.97%	10.59%
Lozells and East Handsworth	11	607	1.81%	2.80%	4.61%
Moseley and Kings Heath	10	292	3.42%	3.08%	6.51%
Nechells	2	652	0.31%	10.89%	11.20%
Northfield	88	338	26.04%	5.03%	31.07%
Oscott	39	325	12.00%	6.46%	18.46%
Perry Barr	1	315	0.32%	0.95%	1.27%
Quinton	67	339	19.76%	3.83%	23.60%
Selly Oak	13	174	7.47%	8.62%	16.09%
Shard End	35	418	8.37%	5.02%	13.40%
Sheldon	-3	274	-1.09%	11.31%	10.22%
Soho	40	539	7.42%	8.91%	16.33%
South Yardley	166	526	31.56%	8.75%	40.30%
Sparkbrook	-8	573	-1.40%	26.35%	24.96%
Springfield	0	591	0.00%	1.86%	1.86%
Stechford and Yardley North	104	426	24.41%	6.10%	30.52%
Stockland Green	0	349	0.00%	3.15%	3.15%
Sutton Four Oaks	0	267	0.00%	0.37%	0.37%
Sutton New Hall	24	212	11.32%	0.94%	12.26%
Sutton Trinity	1	283	0.35%	4.59%	4.95%
Sutton Vesey	2	250	0.80%	3.60%	4.40%
Tyburn	43	347	12.39%	17.87%	30.26%
Washwood Heath	36	720	5.00%	20.56%	25.56%
Weoley	2	403	0.50%	16.87%	17.37%
<b>Total</b>	<b>979</b>	<b>15669</b>	<b>6.25%</b>	<b>9.38%</b>	<b>15.62%</b>

\* The data for Erdington has been supplied inaccurately by one school. The data has not been corrected here, as we cannot ascertain the correct number.

**Appendix Three: Full-time places by criteria**

<b>Criteria for full-time place</b>	<b>PVI number of children</b>	<b>Maintained number of children</b>	<b>Total number of children</b>	<b>Proportion PVI children</b>	<b>Proportion LA children</b>	<b>Proportion of all children</b>
Children with a child protection plan, or who are subject to a section 47 child protection investigation or a section 17 children in need plan	23	42	65	7.7%	3.7%	4.5%
Children in local authority care	11	28	39	3.7%	2.5%	2.7%
Children identified as in need of early help through a family common assessment framework (fCAF) and have in place a family support plan	28	79	107	9.4%	6.9%	7.4%
Children with diagnosed disabilities who have (or are in the process of getting) an education, health and care plan and/or are in receipt of Disability Living Allowance. Or children who have been referred to or by a child development centre or equivalent specialist education agency	76	216	292	25.4%	18.9%	20.3%
Children from families where their physical accommodation places the child at risk of harm	0	25	25	0.0%	2.2%	1.7%
Children whose parents/carers need support as a result of their physical disability, learning disability, mental health problem or illness	33	99	132	11.0%	8.7%	9.2%
Children with parents/carers in prison	2	17	19	0.7%	1.5%	1.3%
Children from families experiencing domestic violence or drug/alcohol abuse	14	32	46	4.7%	2.8%	3.2%
Children who are in the first stages of language development	47	417	464	15.7%	36.5%	32.2%
Children from families with no recourse to public funds	5	19	24	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%
Children in exceptional circumstances around a safeguarding/vulnerable situation need	3	66	69	1.0%	5.8%	4.8%
Child was funded for a full time place in the Summer 2016 term	131	193	324	43.8%	16.9%	22.5%
Total number of criteria-funded children	373	1233	1606	124.7%	108.1%	111.5%
Total number of children funded full-time	299	1141	1440			

**Appendix Four: Analysis by deprivation**

Ward	Number children with a funded full-time place	Number of all children	% all children with a FT place	Number of children with a FT place in 20% most deprived areas	Number of children living in 20% most deprived areas	Proportion of children living in 20% most deprived areas funded full-time	Difference in proportion on funded full-time living in 20% most deprived areas and all children
Acocks Green	22	453	4.9%	16	241	6.6%	1.8%
Aston	164	677	24.2%	165	558	29.6%	5.3%
Bartley Green	28	387	7.2%	28	317	8.8%	1.6%
Billesley	23	433	5.3%	19	260	7.3%	2.0%
Bordesley Green	91	866	10.5%	34	520	6.5%	-4.0%
Bournville	0	310	0.0%	0	72	0.0%	0.0%
Brandwood	37	394	9.4%	40	196	20.4%	11.0%
Edgbaston	24	273	8.8%	21	63	33.3%	24.5%
Erdington	86	349	24.6%	8	179	4.5%	-20.2%
Hall Green	2	348	0.6%	0	25	0.0%	-0.6%
Handsworth Wood	0	420	0.0%	0	173	0.0%	0.0%
Harborne	0	353	0.0%	0	23	0.0%	0.0%
Hodge Hill	35	538	6.5%	19	286	6.6%	0.1%
Kings Norton	27	383	7.0%	16	229	7.0%	-0.1%
Kingstanding	43	472	9.1%	46	436	10.6%	1.4%
Ladywood	41	313	13.1%	37	210	17.6%	4.5%
Longbridge	32	357	9.0%	12	257	4.7%	-4.3%
Lozells and East Handsworth	17	644	2.6%	13	543	2.4%	-0.2%
Moseley and Kings Heath	9	316	2.8%	1	48	2.1%	-0.8%
Nechells	71	733	9.7%	82	674	12.2%	2.5%
Northfield	17	395	4.3%	0	206	0.0%	-4.3%
Oscott	21	392	5.4%	0	62	0.0%	-5.4%
Perry Barr	3	369	0.8%	3	91	3.3%	2.5%
Quinton	13	417	3.1%	0	190	0.0%	-3.1%
Selly Oak	15	210	7.1%	0	15	0.0%	-7.1%
Shard End	21	503	4.2%	21	489	4.3%	0.1%
Sheldon	31	311	10.0%	7	153	4.6%	-5.4%
Soho	48	629	7.6%	49	549	8.9%	1.3%
South Yardley	46	597	7.7%	49	394	12.4%	4.7%
Sparkbrook	151	648	23.3%	143	621	23.0%	-0.3%
Springfield	11	674	1.6%	1	217	0.5%	-1.2%
Stechford and Yardley North	26	460	5.7%	22	257	8.6%	2.9%
Stockland Green	11	419	2.6%	3	225	1.3%	-1.3%
Sutton Four Oaks	1	291	0.3%	0	0	n/a	n/a

Ward	Number children with a funded full-time place	Number of all children	% all children with a FT place	Number of children with a FT place in 20% most deprived areas	Number of children living in 20% most deprived areas	Proportion of children living in 20% most deprived areas funded full-time	Difference in proportion funded full-time living in 20% most deprived areas and all children
Sutton New Hall	2	202	1.0%	0	0	n/a	n/a
Sutton Trinity	13	313	4.2%	0	21	0.0%	-4.2%
Sutton Vesey	9	246	3.7%	0	0	n/a	n/a
Tyburn	62	377	16.4%	62	249	24.9%	8.5%
Washwood Heath	148	796	18.6%	139	697	19.9%	1.3%
Weoley	68	410	16.6%	50	293	17.1%	0.5%
Total	1469	17678	8.3%	1106	10039	11.0%	2.7%