

Early Childhood Education Funding Review Consultation online survey

This content is a raw download of the online survey used during the Ministerial Advisory Group ECE Funding Review consultation.

ECE Funding Review survey

Tēnā koe,

A Ministerial Advisory Group (MAG) has been set up by the New Zealand Government. It will provide advice and recommendations to re-shape the Early Childhood Education (ECE) funding system to deliver more for children, families, the sector and the economy.

Consultation is open on options for change to early childhood education (ECE) funding in New Zealand.

We think the ECE funding system could do more to:

- support children's development and help them learn, in turn leading to success in education and better life outcomes and
- help parents and caregivers to work, to help families to thrive and
- support a strong economy by helping people caring for children to work.

Based on our work so far, we've identified seven areas where we believe change could make a difference. We've identified a range of possible options in each of these areas, but this doesn't mean we are going to recommend change in all these areas.

This is your chance to see what type of change is being considered, tell us how this would affect you and whether you support the possible changes.

For more details on the proposals please read the discussion document [here](#)

Consultation closes on 6 August, we will review the feedback and consider it alongside research, modelling, survey results, and advice from government agencies. We will use this information to develop our final recommendations to government by the end of the year.

We are committed to developing practical recommendations that deliver more from ECE for children, families, the sector, and the wider community.

We look forward to hearing your views.

In this survey

The survey will take about 20 minutes and contains questions about the ECE Funding Review consultation document.

Privacy statement



New Zealand Government
Te Kāwanatanga o Aotearoa

Collecting personal information

We are not seeking personal information, though we realise that such information may be provided in feedback submissions. Any personal information which is collected will be anonymized and all reports will use aggregated information.

Your responses, once downloaded from SurveyMonkey - will be held in secure Ministry of Education systems and will only be able to be accessed by staff associated with the review. This information will not be used for any auditing purposes.

Publishing submissions

We may publish a summary of the feedback we receive from this consultation. This will include aggregated information only. This will not include your personal information, even if you voluntarily provide that information to us. We will only publish your submission with your permission.

Privacy notice

This privacy notice applies to personal and other information collected as part of this consultation. Our privacy policy is governed by the Privacy Act 2020.

We will keep your personal information secure if you voluntarily provide that information. Any personal information supplied will only be used for the purpose for which it was provided or permitted by the Privacy Act 2020. Your personal information will not be disclosed to any third party except where necessary for the provision of services, or as authorised or required by law.

If you want to check personal information that we hold, or request the correction of that information when required, please write to:

The Privacy Officer
Ministry of Education
PO Box 1666
Wellington 6140
or email privacy@education.govt.nz

Relevant legislation

Your submission may be subject to the Official Information Act 1982, the Privacy Act 2020, and the Public Records Act 2005. These laws cover how we handle, manage and share protected personal information given in confidence. We will never release an individual's personal information or contact details without their permission.

ECE Funding Review survey

Participation information

*** Do you consent to participate in this survey?**

Participation is voluntary, and your responses will be kept confidential. You can withdraw at any time before submitting your responses.

☐ Yes

☐ No

What is your ethnicity or ethnicities? (Tick all that apply)

☐ European/Pākehā/NZ European

☐ Māori

☐ Pacific peoples

☐ Asian

☐ Prefer not to say

Other (please specify)

Are you answering these survey questions from any of the following perspectives?

Please select all that apply.

☐ As a parent, caregiver, or whānau

☐ As a **qualified** early learning teacher or kaiako or educator

☐ As an **unqualified** early learning teacher or kaiako or educator

☐ As an early learning service owner or manager

☐ Other worker at an early learning service

☐ Member of the public

☐ Prefer not to say

☐ Other (please specify):

What type of early learning service are you associated with? Please select all that apply.

☐ Education & Care service

☐ Home-based ECE service

☐ Kindergarten

☐ Kōhanga Reo

☐ Playcentre

☐ Playgroup

☐ Hospital-based ECE service

☐ None

☐ Prefer not to say

Other (please specify)

Do you belong to an early learning service, organisation, or association and would like your responses to be identifiable internally to the MAG and MoE as being submitted on behalf of your organisation? **If yes, please provide your details below.**

Where do you live?

- ☐ Northland Region
- ☐ Auckland Region
- ☐ Waikato Region
- ☐ Bay of Plenty Region
- ☐ Gisborne Region
- ☐ Hawke's Bay Region
- ☐ Taranaki Region
- ☐ Manawatū -Whanganui Region
- ☐ Wellington Region
- ☐ Otago Region
- ☐ Canterbury Region
- ☐ Tasman-Nelson Region
- ☐ Marlborough Region
- ☐ West Coast Region
- ☐ Southland Region
- ☐ Prefer not to say
- ☐ Other (please specify)

ECE Funding Review survey

Improve targeted funding to services

* The questions on the following page relate to improving targeted funding to services. If you would like to skip these questions and move on to the next proposed area for change, click 'continue without answering' below:

- ☐ Continue without answering
- ☐ Answer questions related to combining funding streams

ECE Funding Review survey

1. Improve targeted funding to services:

Combine similar targeted funding streams

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose Oppose Neutral Support Strongly support

Option 1a:

combine equity funding A, B and TFFD to create a new equity funding stream

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 1b:

combine isolation-based funding into one equity funding stream (Equity D and ATIS)

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for combining funding streams (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see regarding combining similar funding streams?

To what extent do you agree that combining equity funding A, B and TFFD into a new equity funding stream would have a positive impact on system complexity and administrative burden?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

ECE Funding Review survey

1. Improve targeted funding to services:

Improve mechanisms for targeted funding streams

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose Oppose Neutral Support Strongly support

Option 1c:

implement the new equity index across socio-economic based funding streams

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 1d:

implement the new isolation index across isolation-based funding streams

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 1e:

introduce a new
funding stream for
additional needs
based on individual
children

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - **please explain your choice** (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 1f:

introduce a base
grant for isolated
services

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - **please explain your choice** (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 1g:

differentiate Equity
C based on level of
immersion, and/or
priority language

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - **please explain your choice** (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - **please explain your choice** (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for improving mechanisms for targeted funding streams (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to improve mechanisms for targeted funding streams:

ECE Funding Review survey

1. Improve targeted funding to services:

Rebalance targeted and universal funding streams

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose Oppose Neutral Support Strongly support

Option 1h:

moderate increase
to targeted funding

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 1i:

significant increase
to targeted funding

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for rebalancing targeted and universal funding streams (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to rebalance targeted and universal funding streams:

Fees assistance for families

* The questions on the following page relate to fees assistance for families. If you would like to skip these questions and move on to the next proposed area for change, click 'continue without answering' below:

- ☐ Continue without answering
- ☐ Answer questions related to fees assistance

2. Fees assistance for families

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose Oppose Neutral Support Strongly support

Option 2a:

reduce the frequency of CCS income and activity assessment from weekly to monthly or quarterly

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 2b:

change eligibility criteria for CCS to provide more base hours for low-income families (for example, increase non-activity tested hours from 9 to 20-30 hours a week)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 2c:

increase the amount of CCS fees assistance some

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

families can claim

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 2d:

change / align
income thresholds
for CCS and
FamilyBoost

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 2e:

integrate fees
assistance for CCS
and FamilyBoost

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for fees assistance for families (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to fees assistance for families:

In your opinion, with the current settings in mind, should the main sources of fees assistance (MSDs Childcare Subsidy and IR's FamilyBoost) be:

- ☐ More tightly targeted to a small group of those most in need
- ☐ More broadly targeted to a wider group of the general population
- ☐ About the same as they are currently

ECE Funding Review survey

Change universal funding settings

* The questions on the following page relate to changing universal funding settings. If you would like to skip these questions and move on to the next proposed area for change, click 'continue without answering' below:

- ☐ Continue without answering
- ☐ Answer questions related to universal funding

ECE Funding Review survey

3. Change universal funding settings:

Funded hour settings

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose

Oppose

Neutral

Support

Strongly support

Option 3a:

increase maximum
funded daily hours
of provision for 20
Hours ECE to eight
per day (from six)

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 3b:

increase maximum
funded daily hours
of provision for all
ECE to eight per
day (from six)

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 3c:

change funded
hours to be based
on children not
child-places

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for universal funding for funded hour settings (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to universal funding settings for funded hours?

ECE Funding Review survey

3. Change universal funding settings:

Home-based care services

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose Oppose Neutral Support Strongly support

Option 3d:

make adjustments
or improvements
within current
funding systems for
home-based ECE

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 3e:

a new funding
system for home-
based ECE to
recognise
differences from
centre-based ECE

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for universal funding settings for home-based care services (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to universal funding settings for home-based care services?

ECE Funding Review survey

Changes to certificated teacher funding bands

* The questions on the following page relate to changes to certificated teacher funding bands. If you would like to skip these questions and move on to the next proposed area for change, click 'continue without answering' below:

- ☐ Continue without answering
- ☐ Answer questions related to support for the ECE workforce

ECE Funding Review survey

4. Changes to certificated teacher funding bands

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose Oppose Neutral Support Strongly support

Option 4a:

adjust the boundaries of the top two funding bands (currently 80-99 percent and 100 percent) so that they sit at 80-95 percent and 96 percent plus, but retain the existing 80-99 percent 100 percent funding rates

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - **please explain your choice** (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 4b:

remove the 100
percent funding
band rate but retain
the other bands

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 4c:

reduce the number
of certificated
teacher funding
bands to two (under
80 percent
certificated
teachers, and 80
percent and above
certificated
teachers)

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 4d:

change the way of
assessing whether a
service has met the
80 percent
threshold

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for changes to certificated teacher funding bands (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to certificated teacher funding bands?

Are there any other funding settings/arrangements that could support teacher development and teaching responsibilities that occur outside the classroom?

In your opinion, what would be the advantages or disadvantages of greater flexibility around the staff hour count (consider aspects such as whether non-contact hours for professional development and planning time should count)

ECE Funding Review survey

Government support for a sustainable ECE workforce

* The questions on the following page relate to government support for a sustainable ECE workforce. If you would like to skip these questions and move on to the next proposed area for change, click 'continue without answering' below:

- ☐ Continue without answering
- ☐ Answer questions related to support for the ECE workforce

ECE Funding Review survey

5. Government support for a sustainable ECE workforce

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose

Oppose

Neutral

Support

Strongly support

Option 5a:

return funding for
teacher pay and
progression to pre-
2022 policy settings

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 5b:

create a simplified
version of the
current opt-in
scheme for pay
parity

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 5c:

create a broader
system wide
framework for
teacher pay and
progression that is
consistently applied
across service types

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for government support for a sustainable ECE workforce (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to government support for a sustainable ECE workforce?

What implementation challenges do you think should be considered if changes to government support for a sustainable ECE workforce were to be made?

In your opinion, what would be the advantages and disadvantages of greater flexibility in negotiating salaries and progression (consider aspects such as workforce, service sustainability, quality, and affordability)

If 'Option 5c' (create a broader system wide framework for teacher pay and progression that is consistently applied across service types) progresses, then:

Yes

No

The new framework should be mandatory (instead of 'opt-in')?

☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result):

The new framework should include kindergartens (instead of kindergartens retaining their distinct arrangements)?

☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result):

ECE Funding Review survey

Better information and system transparency

* The questions on the following page relate to better information and system transparency. If you would like to skip these questions and move on to the next proposed area for change, click 'continue without answering' below:

- ☐ Continue without answering
- ☐ Answer questions related to information and transparency

ECE Funding Review survey

6. Better information and system transparency

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose

Oppose

Neutral

Support

Strongly support

Option 6a:

require ECE
providers to publish
their fee schedules
online

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 6b:

introduce a
webpage that
brings together key
ECE information
currently held by
the government

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 6c:

collect better
information about
adult-to-child ratios

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 6d:

collect better
information about
ECE workforce pay

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for better information and system transparency (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to increase information and system transparency?

ECE Funding Review survey

Modernise, simplify, and improve the operation of the ECE funding system

* The questions on the following page relate to modernising, simplifying, and improving the operation of the ECE funding system. If you would like to skip these questions and move on to the next proposed area for change, click 'continue without answering' below:

- ☐ Continue without answering
- ☐ Answer questions related to ECE funding system operations

ECE Funding Review survey

7. Modernise, simplify, and improve the operation of the ECE funding system

To what extent do you support/oppose the following options?

Strongly oppose Oppose Neutral Support Strongly support

Option 7a:

streamline
reporting on
targeted funding

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - **please explain your choice** (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 7b:

provide the option

☐☐☐☐☐

of monthly payment
of funding to ECE
services

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 7c:

simplify
requirements and
processes related to
attendance and
absence (e.g. forms
and verification)

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 7d:

simpler and more
consistent
requirements
regarding the
provision of annual
financial
information by ECE
providers to
government

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Option 7e:

investigate (in
collaboration with
key stakeholders)
the challenges
faced by hospital-
based services

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Do not change this
setting

☐☐☐☐☐

Optional - please explain your choice (including any effects/impacts you expect to result from this option):

Explain any amendments you would make to the options presented above for modernising, simplifying, and improving the operation of the ECE funding system (please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to):

What other changes (not mentioned above) would you like to see to modernise, simplify, and improve the operation of the ECE funding system?

ECE Funding Review survey

Summary

Please rank the following areas for change in order of importance to you (with your highest priority at the top, and the lowest priority at the bottom):

- ☐

Improve targeted funding to services: Combine similar targeted funding streams
- ☐

Improve targeted funding to services: Improve mechanisms for targeted funding streams
- ☐

Improve targeted funding to services: Rebalance universal and targeted funding streams
- ☐

Fees assistance for families
- ☐

Change universal funding settings: funded hour settings
- ☐

Change universal funding settings: funding approach for home-based care services
- ☐

Simplify certificated teacher funding bands
- ☐

Government support for sustainable ECE workforce
- ☐

Better information and system transparency
- ☐

Modernise, simplify, and improve the operation of the ECE funding system

What other changes (not mentioned in the consultation document), would you like to see to the operation of the ECE funding system? Please be clear about which options your suggestions refer to: