



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:

Category	Percentage of respondents
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
Total	516	

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 funding 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
Total	511	

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
Total	515	

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.

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

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	525	

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:

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
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:

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
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:

Category	Number of respondents	Percentage of responses
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

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download 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