

## North Yorkshire Council

### 2026/27 Early Years Funding Consultation – Provider Comments

#### Question 1

#### 2026/27 Early Years Provider Base Funding Rates

- a. Do you agree with the principle-based proposal for the provider base rate funding for eligible 3 & 4-year olds' universal and working parent entitlement for the 2026/27 financial year

Provider Type	Comment
Childminder	Too Low /Not Financial Viable for a small provider ( childminder)
Childminder	I believe 3-4 year old funding needs more of an increase to make private nurseries and school nurseries more sustainable. The big step between babys and 3 years old needs to closer to prevent childcare places being abused and more about making money the the care and enjoyment for the job.
Childminder	I agree with the way of working out deprivation funding but not that the L/A should keep 3% of the funding for the area this seems to be in excess of what would be required to effectively provide the service.
Full Day Care	I do not agree with the deprivation supplement rates. I do not agree that settings with children from more deprived areas need more funding than others, the same level of service is supposed to be offered across the sector. If deprivation supplements are calculated based on postcodes then there should be an more even distribution between the bands (Band A: 54p - Band B: 7p?!)
Sessional Care	I do agree but unfortunately the funding is always way too low to keep businesses going. There will be yet again more Early years settings going under because of the low funding. Our setting is a charity setting and i dont think we will keep going much longer unless the funding amount goes up.
Full Day Care	we are underfunded on 3 and 4 years funding so i dont think its fair any money is retained for that age group.I believe funding rates shouldn't be based on areas of deprivation, as all children deserve the same rate. It should be up to the provider to allocate the funding where it's needed most, depending on individual family circumstances. There is still very limited support and resources to support children with SEND of this age group too, so to take this amount of funding from this group of children which are already underfunded seems unfair and immoral due to the lack of services available.
Schools and Academies	I agree on the grounds that school again receive focused support as we did in the academic year just gone. Otherwise I struggle to understand how we benefit from losing funding.
Childminder	Most children of this age bracket are at school nursery
Childminder	Funding for this age range should be the same as the younger age group. We work just as hard for all ages!!
Schools and Academies	We do agree but for point 2 we would need to see some support for rural schools as we often get forgotten about.

Full Day Care	I do not agree on the postcode defining the deprivation funding rate and this element of the funding payment.
Schools and Academies	It would be useful to know what central services this covers.

- b) Do you agree with the principle-based proposal for the provider base rate funding for all eligible 2-year olds' (disadvantaged two-year-old entitlement and two-year-old children of working parents' entitlement) for the 2026/27 financial year

Provider Type	Comment
Childminder	Too Low Financially Unviable for a Childminder if not full to capacity
Childminder	This payment seems fair
Full Day Care	I do not agree with the deprivation supplement rates. I do not agree that settings with children from more deprived areas need more funding than others, the same level of service is supposed to be offered across the sector. If deprivation supplements are calculated based on postcodes then there should be an more even distribution between the bands (Band A: 54p - Band B: 7p?!)
Sessional Care	Again i think these rates are better but still not as good as they should be.
Full Day Care	I believe funding rates shouldn't be determined by areas of deprivation, as every child should receive the same amount. The provider should have the flexibility to direct the funding where it's most needed, based on individual family circumstances. Additionally, since there is limited SEN support for two-year-olds, funding for this age group should not be withheld. A reduction of funding with the limited resources and lack of funding is immoral and unjustified for children of this age group
Childminder	I agree
Childminder	Using banding of where the child lives, is not always an indication of financial hardship.
Schools and Academies	Not applicable to us
Full Day Care	I do not agree on the postcode defining the deprivation funding rate and this element of the funding payment.
Schools and Academies	This does not apply to us as we only have from 3+years.

- c) Do you agree with the principle-based proposal for the provider base rate funding for eligible children aged 9 months to 2-year-olds for the 2026/27 financial year

Provider Type	Comment
Childminder	Not Viable Financially if not full to maximum numbers - below minimum wage
Childminder	I believe this is to high and the extra put towards 3-4 year olds for the reasons i explained in the 1st question.
Childminder	I wish there was a way that disadvantaged children from 9mths could access funding, as well as working parents.

Full Day Care	I do not agree with the deprivation supplement rates. I do not agree that settings with children from more deprived areas need more funding than others, the same level of service is supposed to be offered across the sector. If deprivation supplements are calculated based on postcodes then there should be an more even distribution between the bands (Band A: 54p - Band B: 7p?!)
Schools and Academies	Our setting only takes 3-4 year olds so don't have a comment either way on this element
Full Day Care	I believe funding rates shouldn't be determined by areas of deprivation, as every child should receive the same amount. The provider should have the flexibility to direct the funding where it's most needed, based on individual family circumstances. Additionally, since there is even less SEN support for under 2's, funding for this age group should not be withheld. Under 2's have the least amount of services available to them and the services they do have such as health visitors are beyond stretched and what they provide has decreased over time. There is unacceptable levels of support for children of this age group and their families. Early years providers are having to do more and more to fill this gap to support children's health and well being needs and parenting guidance and support.
Childminder	I agree
Childminder	The funding rate should be the same across all ages. It would then stop settings from turning down 3-4 yr olds as the rate is alot lower.
Schools and Academies	Not applicable to us
Full Day Care	I do not agree on the postcode defining the deprivation funding rate and this element of the funding payment.
Schools and Academies	This is not relevant to us as we only have 3+ years in our setting.

## Question 2

Do you have any further comments relating to the local authority proposals for early years funding for 2026/27?

Provider Type	Comment
Childminder	Sadly, the 3/4 year old funding still is not enough.
Childminder	No
Childminder	I feel very strongly about the funding rates being so far apart from 9mth -2 to 3-4 yrs old. You are making it about money and not the care and passion for the job.
Full Day Care	Not part of the 2026-2027 proposals but it would be very helpful if the number of funded weeks per term aligned with number of weeks in the academic term.
Childminder	I feel that funding rates should be across the board rather than different hourly rates for different ages. It's extremely hard to manage a business where one year youre getting over 26k for example to then drop to potentially 20k or less. How is that sustainable for childminders, especially those working on their own, like myself. I can go from earning near on £30 p/h one day to just £18 the next and thats before tax.

Full Day Care	If the LA continue to retain 3% of the allocated funding rates I would like to see more support and training delivered to settings free of charge like previously. Termly consultancy visits and safeguarding audits etc... I have noted that more training is being brought back free of charge through NYES which is positive to see, it is essential to be able to access training to be able to build a strong and dedicated Early Years workforce. More face-face training is needed, I got so much out of networking meetings and in-person training events when I started in Early years which you cannot replicate with online training.
Childminder	The 3-4 year old rate is still massively underfunded!!!! I am now trying to move children on to school nursery when they get to 3. It is completely unsustainable.
Full Day Care	As a setting every year we are one of the lowest paid areas for funding for children and this continues to amaze us and raises questions of how and why? We still have to provide the same high levels of care and education for all children. The confusion of why we are paid so low is something that we feel is morally wrong and an unfair disadvantage to all our children and their families.
Childminder	The rate should be an average for childminders. The difference for under 3's to 3-4years is too much, the rate drops significantly, many childminders are only taking under 3's for this reason.
Sessional Care	No
Childminder	The funding for 3 year olds is less than most settings charge privately. At present this is off set for me by younger children however those children who are currently 2 more than 50% of my cohort will all turn 3 and my income will drop substantially. This will cause problems for myself and I may have to get a second job to support my family until I get another cohort of children aged 9m
Childminder	I think the responsibility given by the child care provider does not reflect in the hourly rate
Childminder	No
Schools and Academies	None
Schools and Academies	We do not agree with the proposal to stop after headcount claims for private and school based settings! We take children from 2yrs upwards. By implementing this change it will stop a lot of parents being able to use their hours at our setting. Perhaps you need to change your headcount and census dates to later in the terms so this won't have such a massive impact on our settings. We would urge you to not implement this change as it is detrimental to preschools that only take children from the age of 2.
Childminder	Please look at supporting the smaller privately owned businesses with some of the 3 percent retained. I do feel the government is providing huge support to nurseries in preschool and our precious settings do offer such a fantastic education and opportunity to all Early Years Children.
Full Day Care	The funding retention for centrally managed service provisions, SENIF, EYPP and DAF are all necessary and understood and the direct benefit and best use of the funding can be seen. However, the deprivation supplement - postcode based, does not seem to reflect children's need and the best use of funding.