



Department  
for Education

# **Consultation on proposed changes to the role of the local authority in early education and childcare**

**Analysis of responses**

**July 2013**

# Contents

Introduction	3
Next steps and Government response	4
Summary of Responses	6
Question (Q) 1	6
Question (Q) 2	7
Question (Q) 3	8
Question (Q) 4	9
Question (Q) 5	9
Question (Q) 6	10
Question (Q) 7	11
Question (Q) 8	11
Question (Q) 9	12
Question (Q) 10	13
Question (Q) 11	13
Question (Q) 12	14
Question (Q) 13a	14
Question (Q) 13b	15
Question (Q) 14	16
Question (Q) 15	16
Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation	17

## Introduction

1. On 29 January 2012 the Department published 'More great childcare', which outlined the Government's plan to improve quality in the early years and to give parents more choice. As part of this plan, the Government intends to reform the role of the local authority to remove duplication and introduce earned autonomy for effective providers. This will free up local authorities to focus on improving ineffective providers and securing higher standards.
2. The consultation on these proposals was launched on 25 March 2013, and closed on 6 May 2013. It covered both funding requirements and conditions set by local authorities and funding mechanisms to be used by the Department. The consultation asked respondents for their views on these proposals. In total there were 547 responses to the consultation. This summary reflects the most substantive views received, those where over 10% of respondents to a question raised an issue.
3. Unless otherwise stated, the percentages reported are based on the number of people responding to each question, rather than the number of people responding to the consultation as a whole. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
4. The consultation adheres to the Consultation Principles issued by the Cabinet Office in July 2012.
5. The breakdown of respondents was as follows:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents</b>
Local authorities	31
Private, voluntary or independent (PVI) providers	29
Other*	18
Childminders	8
Maintained providers	5
National organisations	4
Parents	3
Independent schools	1

\*Within the 'other' category, respondents identified themselves for the most part as officers/employees of local authorities responding personally, some national organisations/charities, members of the public, early years settings, schools or children's centres.

## Next steps and Government response

6. The Government's response to the consultation is set out in 'More affordable childcare'. The Government is grateful for the many responses to the consultation and it has modified some of its proposals to take account of issues identified during the consultation. In summary, next steps will be:

- As a first step, we have published statutory guidance which sets the direction. Specifically it says:
  - Local authorities should offer to fund places for three-and-four-year olds attending any 'satisfactory'/'requires improvement', 'good' or 'outstanding' provider, and two-year-olds attending any 'good' or 'outstanding' provider;
  - Local authorities should not place conditions on 'good' or 'outstanding' providers other than those relating to:
    - Proper use of public funds (the prevention of fraud and error);
    - Ensuring funded places are entirely free of charge to parents;
    - Ensuring parents are able to access places flexibly;
    - Ensuring providers meet the needs of disabled children or those with a special educational need; and,
    - Ensuring providers are keeping children safe.
  - In addition to the above, any conditions local authorities make of providers who are judged as 'satisfactory'/'requires improvement' must relate to addressing concerns raised by Ofsted at inspection.
- At the earliest possible opportunity, we will make regulations to refocus the duty on local authorities to secure information, advice and training for childcare providers. Authorities will be under a duty to secure information, advice and training to meet the needs of providers judged by Ofsted as 'requiring improvement'. Local authorities will continue to have a power to provide information, advice and training for other providers.
- At this time, we will not be making any changes to the regulations governing the early years single funding formulae and centrally retained funding. We would encourage local authorities to continue to look at how their funding formulae could be simplified and how more money can be passed to the front line.
- At the earliest possible opportunity and subject to the will of Parliament we will legislate to:

- Ensure local authorities cannot refuse to offer to fund a place at early education providers of a certain quality as judged by Ofsted if an eligible child wants to take up a place there;
  - Ensure local authorities cannot refuse to offer to fund new providers to deliver early education places when they have passed their initial Ofsted registration visit and prior to their first Ofsted judgement; and,
  - Limit the conditions that local authorities can set on PVI early education providers – in line with the approach set out in the statutory guidance published alongside this document.
- We will also consider whether to make regulations so that, from September 2015, local authorities can only fund early learning places for two-year-olds in settings judged by Ofsted to be 'good' or 'outstanding'. When making this decision we will take into account all available data on the implementation of the early learning for two-year-old programme.

## Summary of Responses

### Q 1: What would be the impact of requiring local authorities to offer to fund all providers, except those judged 'inadequate', to deliver funded places for three-and four-year-olds?

7. 516 respondents answered this question.

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
Positive impact	115	22
No impact/neutral impact	83	16
Not sure	62	12
Negative impact	256	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>516</b>	

8. Half of respondents said that this proposal would have a negative impact; 43% of these respondents were local authorities. 38% of respondents said that it would have a positive or neutral impact; nearly 60% of these respondents were different types of early years providers.

9. Around a fifth of respondents (over a third of those who felt that the proposal would have a negative impact) felt that local authority support could help providers, especially poorer providers, to improve the quality of their provision. Over 60% of respondents who raised this issue were local authorities.

10. Around another fifth of respondents (about a third of those who felt the proposal would have a negative impact) felt that the Ofsted inspection had limitations. Nearly 60% of these respondents were local authorities. Some respondents mentioned that providers were not inspected frequently enough and that the quality of provision could deteriorate in between inspections. Since this consultation was launched, Ofsted have consulted on reforms to inspection arrangements which would address many of these concerns – with more frequent inspection for weaker providers and taking action against providers who fail to improve.

11. Around another fifth of respondents felt that the quality of provision may deteriorate or that 'satisfactory'/'requires improvement' providers would not be effectively incentivised to improve if they were automatically funded. Around 50% of these respondents were local authorities.

12. 10% of respondents indicated that they were already funded all providers, other than those judged as 'inadequate', to provide three- and four-year-old places, with some adding that they do place additional requirements on 'satisfactory'/'requires improvement' providers to support them to improve the quality of provision.

## Q2: When is the earliest point (after full implementation in September 2014) that we should require that funded places for two-year-olds can only be delivered by providers judged 'good' or 'outstanding' by Ofsted?

13. There were 511 responses to this question:

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
At least 1 year:	166	32
At least 2 years:	62	12
At least 3 years:	37	7
Not sure:	51	10
Other:	195	38
<b>Total</b>	<b>511</b>	

14. 38% of respondents responded 'other' to this question. Of these 43% said immediately (18% of the total number of respondents), but many others did not specify a timeframe or said that the decision should be taken once sufficiency had been reviewed.

15. 32% of respondents said that the change should take place at least one year after the full implementation of the early learning programme for two-year-olds, with some respondents explaining that they felt some time was needed to enable poorer quality providers to improve.

16. 19% of respondents felt that local authority support was important for improving the quality of provision in the sector, especially poorer providers. Nearly 60% of these respondents were local authorities.

17. 14% of respondents reiterated the Government's position that only 'good' or 'outstanding' provision should be used to deliver early learning places for two-year-olds, with many respondents stating that the evidence shows that disadvantaged two-year-olds benefit from early education most if it is delivered in high quality settings. Several local authorities also confirmed that they were already only funding two-year-old places in 'good' and 'outstanding' provision.

18. 10% of respondents felt that parents should be able to access 'satisfactory'/'requires improvement' provision if they wanted to do so, or if there was insufficient good quality provision. However, only two parents raised this as an issue compared with 36 local authorities.

### Q3: What will be the impact of offering to fund new providers to deliver early education places prior to their first Ofsted inspection judgement?

19. 515 respondents answered this question.

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
Positive impact	86	17
No impact/neutral impact	71	14
Not sure	90	17
Negative impact	268	52
<b>Total</b>	<b>515</b>	

20. Just over half of respondents felt that the proposals would have a negative impact. 42% of these respondents were local authorities. 31% of respondents felt the proposal would have a positive or neutral impact.

21. A fifth of respondents felt that new provision may not be of a high enough quality to warrant guaranteed funding (nearly a third of those who felt the proposal would have a negative impact). Over half of these respondents were local authorities.

22. 14% of respondents felt that local authorities could support new providers to achieve a successful first inspection (nearly a fifth of those who felt the proposal would have a negative impact). 62% of these respondents were local authorities, only 10% of these respondents were providers.

23. 11% of respondents felt that there was a risk that where new a provider received an 'inadequate' rating in their first Ofsted inspection and local authorities subsequently stopped funding places in that setting, the children would be disrupted in the move to another provider.

#### **Q4: What would be the impact of limiting the conditions local authorities can set on providers solely to those outlined in paragraph 4.4?**

24. 506 respondents answered this question.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>
Positive impact	112	22
No impact/neutral impact	46	9
Not sure	71	14
Negative impact	277	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>506</b>	

25. Over half of respondents felt that the proposal would have a negative impact; nearly half of whom were local authorities. Nearly a third of respondents felt that the proposal would have a positive or neutral impact, 70% of whom were providers.

26. Around a third of respondents (over half of those who felt that the proposal would have a negative impact) felt that local authority support could help providers, especially poorer providers, to improve the quality of their provision. Over half of respondents who raised this issue were local authorities.

27. 14% of respondents (just over a fifth of those who felt the proposal would have a negative impact) felt that the quality of poorer provision may deteriorate if local authorities were not able to insist on poorer providers taking steps to improve their quality in order to deliver funded early education places. 68% of these respondents were local authorities.

28. 12% of respondents (nearly a fifth of those who felt the proposal would have a negative impact) felt that providers were not inspected frequently enough by Ofsted. 66% of these respondents were local authorities.

#### **Q5: What other conditions, if any, should local authorities be able to place on early education providers to deliver funded places?**

29. 251 respondents answered this question. Many respondents made more than one suggestion; these suggestions are grouped into the most common areas below:

Area	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
Participation in quality improvement activities	122	49
Participation in training	107	43
Safeguarding	51	20
Willingness to be supported by their local authority	50	20
Level of qualifications	37	15
Inclusion/special educational needs (SEN)	36	14

## Q6: Do you agree with the proposed list of reduced training requirements set out in Appendix 1?

30. 525 respondents answered this question.

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
Yes	89	17
No	382	73
Not sure	54	10
Total	<b>525</b>	

31. 73% of respondents disagreed with this proposal, 36% of whom were local authorities. Of the 17% who agreed 69% were providers.

32. Around a quarter of respondents (nearly a third of those who felt that the proposal would have a negative impact) felt that local authority support could help providers, especially poorer providers, to improve the quality of their provision. 50% of respondents who raised this issue were local authorities.

33. Just over a fifth of respondents (nearly a quarter of those who felt that the proposal would have a negative impact) felt that the proposal would make it more difficult for providers to access affordable training and advice. 43% of respondents who raised this issue were local authorities.

34. 10% of respondents felt that the quality of training not provided by local authorities was varied. Nearly 50% of these respondents were local authorities; whereas only seven providers raised this issue.

## Q7: What would be the impact of reducing the prescribed training requirements on providers/local authorities as set out in Appendix 1?

35. 525 respondents answered this question.

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
Positive impact	49	9
No impact/neutral impact	34	6
Not sure	37	7
Negative impact	405	77
Total	525	

36. 77% of respondents felt that the proposal would have a negative impact, nearly 40% of who were local authorities. Of the 16% of respondents who felt that the proposal would have a positive or neutral impact, nearly three-quarters were providers.

37. 24% of respondents felt that poorer providers would not have the support needed to improve. Over 50% of these respondents were local authorities.

38. A fifth of respondents felt that the proposal would make it more difficult for providers to access affordable training and advice. Over 50% of these respondents were local authorities.

39. 17% of respondents (a fifth of those who felt that the proposal would have a negative impact) felt that the quality of training not provided by local authorities was varied. 55% of these respondents were local authorities.

## Q8: Would these changes have a greater impact on some areas of information, advice and training provision over others? If so, which?

40. 489 respondents answered this question

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
Yes	312	64
No	57	12
Not sure	120	25
Total	489	

41. 64% of respondents thought the proposals would have a greater impact on some areas of information, advice and training than others. 39% of these respondents were local authorities. Of the 12% of respondents who disagreed 63% were providers.

42. 11% of respondents thought that the proposals would have a greater impact on safeguarding training. 60% of these respondents were local authorities; whereas only nine providers raised this issue.

43. No other area was mentioned by more than 10% of respondents. Respondents mentioned a number of areas including continuing professional development, financial planning, and SEN.

## **Q9: Do you support the proposal for a single flat rate within a local authority for two-year-old early education?**

44. There were 499 responses to this question:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>
Yes	299	60
No	115	23
Not Sure	85	17
Total	499	

45. 60% of respondents agreed with the proposal, 23% disagreed and 17% were unsure

46. The majority of respondents felt that the proposal would make funding more transparent, although it was added that the rate should be sufficient to make the position fairer between settings. The targeted nature of the entitlement lessened the need for more than one base rate although there was some concern that this might not be the case when the 40% eligibility came in.

47. A significant minority of responses suggested there should be flexibility to reflect the additional costs associated with children with complex needs and / or SEN.

48. A smaller number of respondents felt that the proposal would make delivery harder for the maintained sector. A small number of comments made the point that provider costs varied considerably between different types/sizes of providers (and geographic areas) and that this should be taken account of.

## Q10: Do you support the proposal to limit the number of base rates and bands for three- and four-year-old early education?

49. There were 486 responses to this question:

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
Yes	299	62
Not sure	105	22
No	82	17
Total	486	

50. 62% of respondents agreed with the proposal, 17% disagreed and 22% were unsure.

51. The majority of respondents felt that the proposal would be simpler and fairer for all providers than the current system.

52. For those who disagreed, the main concern was the impact the proposal might have on those providers with higher costs, such as maintained nursery schools.

## Q11: What are your views on the limits proposed for three- and four-year-old early education (a maximum of three base rates and no more than two bands)?

53. There were 328 responses to this question:

54. The great majority of responses (approximately 75%) were in favour of the proposal, with the overwhelming majority citing the fact that it would make things simpler and fairer. There were a small number of respondents that said that the proposal did not go far enough and that there should only be one or two base rates.

55. There were concerns that reducing the number of base rates and bands would impact negatively on the maintained sector. There were also concerns that it would be harder to take account of rural factors. There were a small number of responses that said that there should be four base rates (for PVI, maintained nursery schools, nursery classes in primary schools and childminders).

56. A small number of comments suggested that decisions on the number of base rates/bands would be best made by local authorities, rather than central government, given their local knowledge and ability to take into account, quality, deprivation and type of setting.

## Q12: What are your views on removing, for three- and four-year-olds, all supplements (and factors) other than for deprivation?

57. There were 357 responses to this question:

58. The responses to this question were mixed, with a range of responses from outright agreement, agreement with caveats to outright disagreement – as well as a number of responses from those who were unsure as to the implications. However, those who disagreed held the small majority of the responses.

59. Those that agreed with the proposal cited the fact that it would simplify the process.

60. A number of respondents (approx. 35%) were worried that removing a ‘quality’ supplement would remove the incentive for settings to up-skill their staff. However, a small number of respondents made the point that, if the removal of supplements led to an increase in the general hourly base rate paid out, settings would be able to use this additional money for staff training/recruitment of qualified staff.

61. The second most reported concern was that there was a risk that the proposal would be inequitable in rural areas – due to the higher costs in these areas.

62. Other issues raised included: the concern that the national criteria for assessing ‘deprivation’ would be too blunt and some would miss out; and that this might impact negatively on SEN. (To note: the consultation did not contain a proposal to establish national criteria for deprivation.)

63. Some respondents said that the Department should set the base rate and not let the local school forum decide as in some areas the school forum had frozen base rates for a number of years.

## Q13a: Do you support the changes proposed for early years centrally retained DSG spending?

64. There were 445 responses to this question:

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
Yes	100	22
No	196	44
Not Sure	149	33
Total	445	

65. 22% of respondents agreed with the proposal, 44% disagreed with the proposal and 33% were unsure.

66. There was no consistent reason given among those who supported the proposal. There were a few responses along the lines that setting caps would stop local authorities from retaining centrally too much funding.

67. A large number of respondents felt that the local authority should be able to retain funding for training purposes. There was a concern that providers buying support on an individual basis would lose the economies of scale available in the current system. There was a fear that, as a result, providers would not be able to afford to purchase training support.

68. It was also considered by some that Ofsted would not be able to fill the gap regarding advice relating to child outcomes and that the service provided by Ofsted was too variable.

69. Local authority discretion to make decisions on centrally retained funding was seen as key by a number of respondents. These were mainly from, but not limited to, local authorities.

70. Finally, there were few concerns that local authorities that currently retain less than 10% would expand this to meet this level if it was seen as a Department standard.

### **Q13b: Can the definition be improved?**

71. There were 377 responses to this question:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>
Yes	191	51
No	23	6
Not Sure	163	43
Total	377	

72. 51% of respondents said yes, 6% said no, and 43% were unsure.

73. There was little in the way of suggestions as to how the definition could have been improved. A number of respondents said that the definition would benefit from being tighter and more specific as to what the funds could or could not be retained for.

74. There were a number of references to the inclusion of training as being important (see Q13a)

**Q14: Do you think that a 10% limit on early years DSG central spend is appropriate? If not, please explain why and include any comments on the impact that this would have in comparison to a 15% or 20% limit.**

75. There were 388 responses to this question:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>
Yes	128	33
No	101	26
Not Sure	159	41
Total	388	

76. 33% of respondents agreed with the 10% limit, 26% disagreed, and 41% were unsure.

77. There were a very high number of unsure responses to this question - this is probably due to the technical nature of the question. There were also a lot of comments (mainly from providers) that 'without knowing what local authorities spend centrally retained money on, it is impossible to know the effect of putting a limit on it'.

78. A lot of those disagreeing with the limit emphasised the importance of local authority flexibility to make decisions on what to retain and what to use it for.

79. Overall, 10% seemed to be seen, generally, as a reasonable level with most respondents indicating that local authorities shouldn't retain much more than this. Although a small number of local authorities said that 15% would be more reasonable as a maximum limit.

**Q15: Please use this space to add any comments you would like to make.**

80. Most responses to this question re-iterated points made under earlier questions.

## **Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation**

4Children

Abracadabra Preschool Academy

All Saints Pre-School

Alyth Kindergarten

Apple tree day care nursery

Aughton Early Years Centre

Babcock LDP, Devon

Bacton Under Fives

Barnaby Bright Nursery

Barnardo's

Bedford Borough Council

Bellinge Community Pre-school

Bemerton Children's Centre

Birmingham City Council

Blackpool Council

Blofield Day Nursery

Bolton Council

Bournemouth Borough Council

Bracknell Forest Council

Bradford Metropolitan District Council

Bradford Under Fives Association

Bramble Hedge Pre-School

Brighton and Hove City Council

Bristol City Council

British Humanist Association

Broadway Infant School

Bromley Mencap

Bath and North East Somerset Council

Buckinghamshire County Council

Bucknell Pre-school

Burnwood nursery school

Busy Bee Day Nursery

Busy Bees (Marshalswick)Ltd

Buttercups Nursery

Butterwick preschool

Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Caterpillar Day Nursery Ltd  
Caterpillar Daycare and Hollins Day Care  
Central Bedfordshire Council  
Cherrytrees Montessori  
Cheshire West and Chester Early Years Team  
Child Dynamix  
Childcare on domestic  
Children's centre Stockport Borough Council  
Child's Play Pre-school  
Chipperfield Preschool  
City of York Council  
Clevedon Montessori Nursery  
Communityworks  
Coppetts Wood Primary School and Children's Centre  
Cornwall Council  
Coton Green Pre School Nursery  
Council of the Isles of Scilly  
Coventry City Council  
Crick Pre-School  
Cumbria County Council  
Debenham roundabout pre-school  
Derby City Council  
Derbyshire County Council  
Devon County Council  
Dicky Birds Nurseries  
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council  
Dorset County Council  
Ducketts Preschool  
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council  
Durham County Council  
East Sussex County Council  
Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) Local Authority Network  
Edmonton Baptist Church Preschool  
Elland Under 5s Community Playgroup  
Ellergreen Nursery School and Childcare Centre  
Entrust

Essex County Council  
Eton nursery  
Family and Childcare Trust  
Family Care  
Finchley Reform Synagogue Kindergarten  
Fladbury First School  
FRS Kindergarten  
Full day care  
Gainsborough Pre-school  
Gateshead Council  
Grange Tiny Hands Pre-school  
Hampshire County Council  
Happy Hands Montessori  
Herefordshire Council  
Hertford Selections Children's Centre  
Hertfordshire County Council  
Highwood nursery  
Holbrook & District Pre-School Playgroup  
Homelands Primary School  
Horfield welly pre-school  
Howard Street Nursery School  
Hull City Council  
ISI (Independent inspectorate, approved for the inspection of the EYFS)  
Jack in the Box  
Kent County Council  
Kiddiwinks Child Care Ltd  
Kidz Kabin Pembroke Studios  
Kinderland Day Nursery  
Kirklees Council  
Kirstys childminding service  
Knebworth pre-school  
Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council  
Ladybirds Nursery  
Lancashire County Council  
Lancashire Schools Forum/ Lancashire Early Years Consultative Group  
Lark Hill Nursery School  
Latchford Wasps Nursery  
Lawnswood Childcare Ltd

Leavesden Children's Centre  
Leeds City Council  
Leicestershire County Council  
Lincolnshire County Council  
Lisa's Childcare  
Little Bears Pre-school  
Little Caterpillars Childminding  
Little Ducklings Childminding and Shobdon Arches Preschool  
Little Hands Nurseries  
Little Jogs Day Nursery  
Little Ladybirds  
Little Leos Nursery  
Little Nightingales  
Little People Nursery  
Little Rascals (Aldridge)  
Little Rascals (Leeds)  
Liverpool Primary Headteachers Association  
London & South East Regional Quality Improvement Network  
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham  
London Borough of Barnet  
London Borough of Brent  
London Borough of Bromley  
London Borough of Camden  
London Borough of Ealing  
London Borough of Hackney  
London Borough of Haringey  
London Borough of Harrow  
London Borough of Havering  
London Borough of Hillingdon  
London Borough of Hounslow  
London Borough of Islington  
London Borough of Newham  
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames  
London Borough of Southwark  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
London Borough of Wandsworth  
London Councils  
London Early Years Foundation

Luton Borough Council  
Madeley Nursery School  
Magic Nurseries  
Manchester City Council  
Margaret McMillan Nursery School and Children's Centre  
Margaret McMillan Nursery School  
Margaret McMillan Parents Group  
Mel's Childcare  
Merton Poppits Playgroup  
Middlesbrough Council  
Milford Playgroup  
Mill Lane Pre-School Association  
Milton Keynes Council  
Montessori Schools Association  
Mount Wise Community Primary School  
Nagila Pre-School  
National Association of Headteachers  
National Association of Family Information Services  
National Children's Bureau  
National Day Nurseries Association  
National Union of Teachers  
Network Nurseries Ltd  
New Road Nursery  
Newcastle City Council  
North East Mitcham Community Association  
North Lincolnshire Council  
North Somerset Council  
North Somerset Council CYPS Early Years  
Northamptonshire County Council  
Northfield St Nicholas Primary School  
Northumberland County Council  
Nottingham City Council  
Nottinghamshire County Council  
OFSTED  
Oldham Childminder Network  
Oldham Council  
Out of School Alliance  
Oxfordshire County Council

Pals Pre-school  
Paperchain Pre-school and Little Stars Pre-school  
Paws  
Peterborough City Council  
Plymouth City Council  
Plymouth Safeguarding Children's Board  
Poole Borough Council  
Poulton Children's Centre  
Pre-school Learning Alliance  
Professional Association for Childcare and Early Years  
Pye Nest Nursery  
Rainbow kindergarten  
Rainbow Teddies Pre-school  
Red Balloon (Bawtry) Limited  
Red Squirrels Nursery  
Registered Accredited Childminder  
Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council  
Rosemary Early Years Centre  
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
Royal Borough of Greenwich  
Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames  
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  
Rutland County Council  
Salford City Council  
Sally Annas Day Nursery  
Sandcastles Children's Nursery  
Sandwell Early Years & Childcare Unit  
Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council  
Scalchemy Training and Development  
Sheffield City Council  
Skylarks  
Slough Borough Council  
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council  
Somerset County Council  
Somerset Road Pre-school  
South Gloucestershire Council  
South Street Nursery School  
Southampton City Council

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council  
St Anne's Children's Centre.  
St Joseph's Pre-school Playgroup  
St Jude's Church Pre-School  
St Michael's Family Centre  
St Paul's Community Development Trust  
St Pauls Nursery School & Children's Centre  
St Paul's Pre-School  
St. Andrew's pre school  
St. Bonaventure's Early Years  
St. Phillips Pre-school  
St.James Church School Nursery  
St.Oswald's pre-school  
Staffordshire County Council  
Stanmore College  
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council  
Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
Stramongate nursery  
Suffolk County Council  
Sunderland City Council  
Sunny Brow Nursery School  
Sunny Days Pre-school (Malmesbury) CIC  
Sure Start Newcastle East Children's Centres  
Sure Start West Riverside  
Surrey County Council  
Surrey Early Years and Childcare Service  
Suzanne's Childcare  
Swindon Borough Council  
Sydling Springs PreSchool  
TACTYC, the Association for the Professional Development of Early Years Educators  
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council  
Telford and Wrekin Council  
The Ark Chid Okeford  
The Aspect Group of Prospect  
The Beehive Nursery  
The Co-operative Childcare  
The de Lacey Montessori School  
The Fawns Preschool

The Little School  
The Local Government Association  
The National Deaf Children's Society  
The Rise Trust  
Thomas Boughey Nursery School  
Thorley Pre-School  
Thurlby PreSchool  
Tibberton Early Years Nursery  
Toad Hall Pre-School  
Tod C.E School  
Tri-borough – London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster City Council.  
Tuffkid  
UNISON  
Unison Norfolk County Branch  
University Day Nursery  
University of Huddersfield  
Upwood small to tall  
Victoria Park Nursery School & Children's Centre  
Voice (Union for Education Professionals)  
Wakefield Council  
Walsall Childrens Services Serco  
Warrington Borough Council  
Warwickshire County Council  
West Berkshire Council  
West Sussex County Council  
Westfield Nursery School  
Wigan Council  
Willaston Pre-school  
Wiltshire Council  
Winterton Playgroup  
Witham Nursery  
Woodland Corner  
Woodland Grange Primary School  
Woodthorpe After School Club  
Worcestershire County Council



Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2013

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v2.0. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2)

email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

About this publication:

enquiries [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus)

download [www.gov.uk/government/consultations](http://www.gov.uk/government/consultations)

Reference: DFE-00445-2013



Follow us on Twitter:  
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:  
[facebook.com/educationgovuk](https://facebook.com/educationgovuk)