



Department
for Education



Government
Social Research

Survey of Childcare and Early Years Providers and COVID-19 Wave 3

Technical note

March 2021

Sarah Butt, Victoria Ratti, Sarah Tipping

NatCen Social Research

Contents

Introduction	3
Sample	3
Questionnaire	5
Respondent communication	5
Fieldwork period	6
Response	6
Weighting	8
Weighting for group-based providers	9
Population totals	9
Weighting process	9
Weighting for school-based providers	10
Population totals	10
Weighting process	10
Weighting for childminders	11
Population totals	11
Weighting process	12
Coding and editing	13
Appendix A. Questionnaire	14

Introduction

The Survey of Childcare and Early Years Providers and COVID-19 (SCEYP COVID) was intended to assess the health of the childcare sector following the government's announcement of the temporary closure of childcare settings in March 2020 as a result of the coronavirus pandemic. The study aimed to assess the impact of COVID-19 on early years settings' opening hours, attendance, income and workforce.

SCEYP COVID consisted of a 5-10 minute web survey asked of a nationally representative sample of group-based providers (GBPs), school-based providers (SBPs), and childminders (CMs) in England.

Multiple waves of the study, taking place several months apart, have been fielded in order to track both the shorter and longer term effects of the pandemic and the changing policy context. Each wave is designed to provide a representative, stand-alone snapshot of the early years market at a point in time. It is also possible to track changes over time in the circumstances of individual providers using data from the subset of providers that have taken part in every wave of the study.

This note relates to Wave 3 of the study which took place in November/December 2020.

Wave 1 of the study took place in July 2020. [Read the Survey of childcare and early years providers and Covid-19 \(Coronavirus\): final report.](#)

Wave 2 of the study took place in September/October 2020. [Read the Survey of childcare and early years providers and Covid-19 \(Coronavirus\), wave 2: final report.](#)

Sample

The sample design is the same as that taken on the annual Survey of Childcare and Early Years Providers in England (SCEYP). The sample for the 2020 SCEYP was drawn in February 2020. However, in March 2020 that study was postponed for 12 months in light of the COVID-19 pandemic before the sample could be issued. The SCEYP COVID study contacted a randomly selected sub-sample of providers from the SCEYP 2020 sample, the design of which followed the approach taken for SCEYP 2019.¹ The original SCEYP sample was stratified by provider and area characteristics to ensure good coverage of different providers.

The survey collected data from three distinct provider populations in England:

- GBPs: childcare providers registered with Ofsted and operating in non-domestic premises.

¹ See SCEYP 2019 [Technical Report](#) for further details of the sample design

A sub-sample was drawn from the 2020 SCEYP sample, which was selected from the July 2019 Ofsted register and designed to be representative of all GBPs in England.

- SBPs: nursery provision in schools, including before- and after-school provision and maintained nursery schools;
A sub-sample was drawn from the SCEYP 2020 sample, which was selected from the School Census from January 2019 and designed to be representative of all SBPs in England.
- CMs: Ofsted-registered childminders providing early years care.
A sub-sample was drawn from the 2020 SCEYP sample, which was selected from the July 2019 Ofsted register and designed to be representative of all CMs in England.

Table 1: SCEYP COVID study sample sizes

Provider type	Issued to SCEYP 2020	Issued to SCEYP COVID Wave 1
GBP	15,121	8,000
SBP	5,882	4,000
CM	4,981 + 25,000 ²	8,000

Settings were eligible to take part in the SCEYP COVID study regardless of whether they were currently open or closed. Any setting which was temporarily closed or had closed since March 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic was eligible for the survey. Settings which had closed prior to March 2020 or for reasons unconnected to the pandemic were treated as ineligible.

20,000 providers were selected for the COVID study. The full sample of providers was issued at Wave 3 of the study regardless of whether or not they had taken part at the previous waves.

² SCEYP consists of two related studies: The main SCEYP survey is a 20-minute web-CATI survey. In addition, a short 5-minute financial survey is issued to a top up sample of providers to enable financial estimates to be provided at local level. The GBP and SBP SCEYP COVID samples were drawn from the samples issued for the main SCEYP survey only. To ensure sufficient cases for the COVID study, the CM sample was topped up with 3,019 cases previously sampled for the financial survey. The top up sample was selected from among the 25,000 cases sampled for the financial survey using the same regional proportions as the main survey.

Questionnaire

The web questionnaire collected data on:

- The current status of the childcare provision
- Number of children currently attending settings, and how this differs from what would have been expected pre-COVID-19
- Changes in staffing arrangements and finances as a result of the pandemic

The Wave 3 questionnaire was mostly a repeat of Wave 2 but with some additional questions about additional spending on equipment and resources (e.g. PPE, additional agency staff) as a result of COVID-19 and the impact of the pandemic on the setting's business model.

A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

Respondent communication

The SCEYP COVID study employed a communication strategy that involved multiple communications across different modes and using different motivational messages to maximise impact. Table 2 summarises the respondent communication schedule.

Table 2. SCEYP COVID Wave 3 schedule of respondent communications

Mailing	Sample	Mailing date
Invitation letter	All providers	25 th November
Email nudge	All providers with an email address	1 st December
Reminder letter 1	All providers without an email address	2 nd December
Reminder Text 1	Non-respondents with mobile number	8 th December
Reminder email 1	Non-respondents with email address	9 th December
Reminder Text 2	Non-respondents with mobile number	15 th December
Reminder email 2	Non-respondents with email address	16 th December

Fieldwork period

Fieldwork took place between the 27th November and 20th December 2020.

The first week of fieldwork coincided with the end of the 2nd period of national restrictions (5 Nov – 2 Dec 2020). When the survey was launched it was not known whether or for how long the restrictions would continue. To ensure comparability in the data collected, whether settings answered before or after the end of national restrictions, the questionnaire prompted them to answer with respect to their situation in the last week of November.

Response

In total 292 SBPs, 1,130 GBPs and 1,457 CMs completed the Wave 3 survey.

In addition to settings that took part at Wave 3, the final Wave 3 dataset includes information from 85 providers who took part at Wave 1 or Wave 2 and reported that they had closed permanently due to COVID-19. These settings were not invited to take part again at Wave 3 but the information they provided on operating conditions pre-COVID and reasons for closure was fed forward to Wave 3 to ensure that the Wave 3 data did not underrepresent closures due to COVID-19.

This represents a response rate at Wave 3 of 7.4% for SBPs, 14.7% for GBPs and 20.9% for CMs.³

Of the unproductive cases, 565 providers were classified as ineligible having contacted NatCen to report they were no longer open/offering childcare for reasons unrelated to COVID-19 or having indicated at the start of the survey that this was the case. As is usual with web surveys, nothing is known about the majority of unproductive outcomes. Forty-eight providers contacted NatCen to opt out of completing the study or receiving any further communication about the study, whilst 1,257 accessed the survey but chose not to complete it.⁴ Table 3 shows the number of settings in each group.

³ Response rate = (Productive cases/ ((productive + unproductive cases) – ineligible))*100. For the purposes of calculating the response rate, it assumed that a percentage of unknown cases (other unproductive) are ineligible.

⁴ Some of these will have opted out/been identified as ineligible at a previous wave. If this was the case they were not sent an invitation for subsequent waves.

Table 3. Number of responses to SCEYP COVID-19 Wave 3 survey

	SBPs	GBPs	CMs	All
Completed Wave 3 survey	292	1,130	1,457	2,879
Cases identified at previous wave as permanent closures due to COVID	1	17	67	85
Total productive cases Wave 3	293	1,147	1,524	2,964
Ineligible ⁵	23	118	424	565
Accessed survey but did not continue	196	504	557	1,257
Office refusal	6	12	30	48
Other unproductive	3,482	6,219	5,465	15,166
Total unproductive cases Wave 3	3,707	6,853	6,476	17,036

Of the settings taking part at Wave 3, 1,575 had also taken part at Wave 1 and Wave 2 and form a panel of settings which can be used to explore change over time among individual settings (see Table 4).

It should be noted that the number of providers, especially SBPs, taking part at all three waves is small. SBPs can be analysed longitudinally when combined with other provider types but should not be analysed separately.

⁵ Includes settings that have closed for reasons unrelated to COVID-19 and childminders with no children currently registered.

Table 4. Number of providers taking part in Waves 1, 2 and 3 of the SCEYP COVID study

	SBPs		GBPs		CMs		All	
	N	% of issued sample	N	% of issued sample	N	% of issued sample	N	% of issued sample
Took part in Wave 1 only	187	4.7	449	5.6	651	8.1	1287	6.4
Took part in Wave 2 only	256	6.4	504	6.3	366	4.6	1126	5.6
Took part in Wave 3 only	100	2.5	208	2.6	145	1.8	453	2.3
Took part in 2 waves	218	5.5	720	9.0	829	10.4	1767	8.8
Took part in all 3 waves	76	1.9	505	6.3	994	12.4	1575	7.9
No participation	3163	79.1	5614	70.2	5015	62.7	13792	69.0

Weighting

Two sets of weights were produced for Wave 3.

First, **cross-sectional weighting** was used to ensure that the final achieved samples at Wave 3 were representative of early years and childcare providers in England. Survey weights were designed separately for the three provider types to correct for unequal selection probabilities and non-response bias. Grossing weights were created in order to ensure that the weighted achieved samples gross up to the population of early years and childcare providers in England.

Second, **longitudinal weights** were produced to ensure that the smaller panel of providers that had taken part at Waves 1, 2 and 3 - and which can be used to track changes in individual providers over time – was also representative of early years and childcare providers in England. As with the cross-sectional weights, weights were designed separately for the three provider types to correct for unequal selection probabilities and non-response bias. Grossing weights were created in order to ensure that the weighted achieved samples gross up to the population of early years and childcare providers in England.

Weighting for group-based providers

Population totals

The achieved sample of group-based providers was weighted to be representative of all active group-based childcare providers in England that were eligible for the study. The sampling frame did not allow for the exclusion of all ineligible institutions prior to sampling, therefore the eligible population size and profile needed to be estimated using information about institutions found to be ineligible. Any setting which was temporarily closed or had closed since March 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic was eligible for the survey. Settings which had closed prior to March 2020 or for reasons unconnected to the pandemic were treated as ineligible. The total eligible population was estimated at 21,640 establishments – 90%⁶ of the sample frame.

Weighting process

Design weights

Design weights were first calculated to correct for unequal selection probabilities arising from the fact that establishments in North East were oversampled to enable more robust comparisons between regions.

Calibration weighting

Calibration weighting was used to remove the (measurable) bias introduced through non-response to the survey and align the profile of the achieved sample to the profile of the eligible population defined by: region, register type, ownership type, and deprivation band based on Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI).

Longitudinal weights

A logistic regression model was used to model non-response behaviour at Wave 3 of the settings that had previously responded to both Waves 1 and 2. A binary outcome variable was used to indicate whether or not a group-based provider that had taken part in both Wave 1 and 2 went on to complete Wave 3. The independent variables used to predict this outcome included a range of area-level and provider characteristics taken from the sampling frame and the Wave 2 interview.

The regression was run using a combination of forced variables and a stepwise procedure. The characteristics that were used in the Wave 1 weighting (region, register type, ownership type, and deprivation band based on IDACI, all taken from the sampling frame) were forced into the model to ensure the longitudinal weights

⁶ Following data cleaning, 24,055 cases were included in the modelling of the eligible population.

recovered the original population profile on these measures. In addition, the stepwise procedure included any additional characteristics that were significantly related to response behaviour. For the group-based providers only one additional variable was significant: whether the provider expected to cater for those under the age of two years when they reopened.

For each provider, the model generates the predicted probability that the provider would take part in Wave 3, given their provider and area characteristics. A set of weights were derived as the inverse of these predicted probabilities. These model-based weights correct for non-response bias between Wave 2 and Wave 3. The model-based weights were combined with the longitudinal weights from Wave 2 to create a Wave 3 longitudinal weight that accounts for initial sample selection, differences in non-response behaviour at Waves 1 and 2, and differences in non-response behaviour at Wave 3.

Weighting for school-based providers

Population totals

To create a sampling frame of school-based providers the Schools' Census database from January 2019 was used, enhanced with further information from a Get Information About Schools extract. Any setting which was temporarily closed or had closed since March 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic was eligible for the survey. Settings which had closed prior to March 2020 or for reasons unconnected to the pandemic were treated as ineligible. The total eligible population was estimated at 8,696 – 94.3% of the initial sample frame⁷.

Weighting process

Design weights

Design weights were calculated to correct for disproportionate sampling of different types of schools.

Calibration weighting

Calibration weighting was used to remove the (measurable) bias introduced through non-response to the survey and align the profile of achieved sample to the profile of the eligible population on the following variables: school type (main stratum), region, type of establishment, quintile of number of places registered.

Longitudinal weights

⁷ Following data cleaning, 9,224 cases were included in the modelling of the eligible population.

There were too few school-based providers that had responded to all three waves to permit them to be analysed separately (there were 76 in total). However, a set of weights were generated for these providers that were solely designed to feed into the combined sample weight, thereby allowing the school-based providers to be included in any analysis of the combined sample of providers.

A logistic regression model was used to model non-response behaviour of providers that had responded to both Waves 1 and 2, then went on to take part at Wave 3. A binary outcome variable was used to indicate whether or not a provider that had taken part in Waves 1 and 2 and went on to complete Wave 3. The small sample size meant the independent variables used to predict this outcome were restricted to a small number of area-level and provider characteristics taken from the sampling frame.

The characteristics that were used in the Wave 1 weighting for school-based providers (namely, school type, region, type of establishment, and quintile of number of places registered) were entered into the model to ensure the longitudinal weights recovered the population profile on these measures. The small sample size meant some of the categories for region, establishment type, and number of school places were collapsed; hence some regions were grouped, foundation schools were combined with community schools, and the variable recording the number of registered places contained only two categories (<235, and 235+).

For each provider, the model generates the predicted probability that the provider would take part in Wave 3, given their provider and area characteristics. A set of weights were derived as the inverse of these predicted probabilities. These model-based weights correct for non-response bias between Wave 2 and Wave 3. The model-based weights were combined with the longitudinal weights from Wave 2 to create a final longitudinal weight that accounted for initial sample selection, differences in non-response behaviour at Waves 1 and 2, and differences in non-response behaviour at Wave 3.

Weighting for childminders

Population totals

The childminders' data was weighted to be representative of the eligible population of childminders in England as of July 2019. Any setting which was temporarily closed or had closed since March 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic was eligible for the survey. Settings which had closed prior to March 2020 or for reasons unconnected to the pandemic were treated as ineligible. Following the approach taken for the main SCEYP study, responding childminders were weighted to the profile of population excluding cases with zero registered places in the sample frame. The total eligible population was 36,980.

Weighting process

Design weights

Design weights were first calculated to correct for unequal selection probabilities arising from the oversampling of smaller regions.

Calibration weights

Calibration weighting was used to remove measurable bias introduced through non-response to the survey and to align the profile of achieved sample to the profile of the population. The population targets used for calibration weighting included: region, whether on all three registers (Early Years Register, Compulsory Childcare Register and Voluntary Childcare Register), registration year, and deprivation band based on IDACI.

Longitudinal weights

A logistic regression model was used to model non-response behaviour at Wave 3 by the childminders who had taken part in both Wave 1 and 2. A binary outcome variable was used to indicate whether or not a childminder that had taken part in Waves 1 and 2 went on to complete Wave 3. The independent variables used to predict response included a range of area-level and provider characteristics taken from the sampling frame and Wave 2 interview.

The regression was run using a combination of forced variables and a stepwise procedure. The characteristics that were used in the Wave 1 weighting (namely, region, whether on all three registers (Early Years Register, Compulsory Childcare Register and Voluntary Childcare Register), registration year, and deprivation band based on IDACI) were forced into the model to ensure the longitudinal weights recovered the population profile on these measures. In addition, the stepwise procedure included any additional characteristics that were significantly related to response behaviour amongst childminders. Only one additional variable was included in the model: the proportion of income that was covered by fees paid by the parent.

For each provider, the model generates the predicted probability that the provider would take part in Wave 3, given their provider and area characteristics. A set of weights were derived as the inverse of these predicted probabilities. These model-based weights correct for non-response bias between Wave 2 and Wave 3. The model-based weights were then combined with the longitudinal Wave 2 weights to create a final longitudinal weight that accounted for initial sample selection, differences in non-response behaviour at Waves 1 and 2, and differences in non-response behaviour at Wave 3.

Coding and editing

The SCEYP COVID survey did not contain any open-ended questions requiring coding. Responses to one question (Qmanage) including an “Other (please specify)” code were coded into the existing code frame by researchers at NatCen.

Data have not been cleaned further but have been left as reported to be used at the discretion of the analyst. Internally inconsistent responses (e.g. providers saying they are open on 0 days but for 1 or more hours, providers reporting a number of fulltime + part time staff higher than the total number of staff) have been left as reported. Responses to the questions on weekly fees have not been trimmed for outliers.

Appendix A. Questionnaire

P15414 Childcare and Early Years and COVID-19 Wave 3 - Web Survey

Version : V1

Date: 06/11/2020

Logos

Include logos from left to right:

DFE: <W:\P15414\4. Documents\Wave 1\Logos\DfE 2955 CMYK.jpg>

Frontier Economics: <W:\P15414\4. Documents\Wave 1\Logos\frontier economics logo.jpg>

NatCen: <W:\P15414\4. Documents\Wave 1\Logos\NatCen MasterLogo.png>

URL

survey.natcen.ac.uk/EYWave3

Website

www.natcen.ac.uk/childcaresurvey

Privacy notice

http://natcen.ac.uk/taking-part/studies-in-field/survey-of-childcare-and-early-years-providers/privacy-notice/?_ga=2.130455817.709265723.1592307717-317425858.1591697807

OUTCOME CODES

0 = Accessed, not complete

110 = Complete

410 = Office refusal

780 = Ineligible

PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTIONS

All questions to have hidden DK (-8) and REF (-9) codes unless otherwise specified.

Please generate timestamps at the locations indicated in the spec

All questions are single code unless otherwise specified using G_Multi instructions below.

All instructions for CAWI respondents to display in *italics*.

G_Single_II1 "Singlecode instructions 1"

_WEB: "Please select one option only"

G_Multi_II1 "Multicode instructions 1"

_WEB: "Please select all that apply"

G_Estimate_II1 "Estimate instructions 1"

_WEB: "Please provide a number for each. An estimate is fine if you're not sure of the exact number"

G_Estimate_II2 "Estimate instructions 2"

_WEB: " Please give an amount per week. An estimate is fine if you're not sure of the exact amount"

Sample Variables

Provtype

1 = SBP

2 = GBP

3 = CM.

Provider_name

Address1

Feedforward variables

Qdaysbefp

Qhoursbefp

Wave

A. INTRODUCTION

{ASK ALL}

CAWI Landing page

 Survey of Childcare and Early Years Providers and COVID-19

Thank you for your interest in this important research for the Department for Education.

To access the survey please enter your unique access code and click 'NEXT'.

TS1 : [SET TIME STAMP HERE]

{ASK ALL}

CAWI Intro

Welcome to this Survey of Childcare and Early Years Providers and COVID-19 Wave 3.

This is the third wave of the Survey of Childcare and Early Years Providers and COVID-19. You may have taken part in an earlier wave of the survey in July or September/October. We are very keen to hear from you again. If you did not take part in waves 1 or 2, now is your chance to have your say. The survey should take around 10 minutes to complete.

You will be asked questions about how your setting operated in November 2020, when the new national restrictions started. You will also be asked about how your setting was operating before the government announced closure of early years provision to all but children of critical workers and vulnerable children in March 2020 (referred to here as "Before COVID-19").

{TEXTFILL IF ProvType = GBP "If your setting is part of a chain, please only answer about provision run by your branch"}

Please complete the survey even if your setting is now closed.

All the answers you give will be anonymised and treated in strict confidence. No individuals or settings will be able to be identified.

If you need to pause the questionnaire, you can simply click 'STOP' and log back in later using the same link you used to get here. You may need to wait 10 minutes before you can re-enter the survey. Please note that if someone else from your provision logs into the survey, they will be able to see the answers that you have provided.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, or have difficulties completing the survey online, please email childcaresurvey@natcen.ac.uk or call 0800 652 4572.

More information, including a link to the privacy notice, is also available on the project website: www.natcen.ac.uk/childcaresurvey .

Click 'NEXT' to continue.

TS2: [SET TIME STAMP HERE]

B. DELIVERY MODELS

{ASK IF ProvType = GBP AND Wave=0}

Qmanage

What type of group, organisation or individual owns or manages {Textfill: "Provider_name"}?

</I>If your setting is part of a chain, *please only answer about provision run by the branch that is based at* {Textfill: "Address1"}.</I>

G_Single_II1

1. A private (for profit) company (including employer-run childcare for employees)
 2. A voluntary or community group or charity (including church(es) or religious group(s))
 3. A local authority
 4. Other
-

{ASK ALL}

QStatus

What is the current status of your early years childcare provision?

G_Single_II1

1. Open (this may be different days/hours from before COVID-19)
2. Temporarily closed and not offering any childcare provision at the moment
3. Permanently closed and will no longer be offering childcare provision

NO DK

NO REF

{ASK IF QStatus = 2 or 3}

Qclosed

When did {TEXTFILL IF ProvType = GBP “your setting” IF ProvType = SBP “your nursery” IF ProvType = CM “you”} close?

G_Single_II1

1. Before the start of the COVID-19 closure in March 2020
2. After the COVID-19 closure but for reasons unrelated to the pandemic
3. After the COVID-19 closure as a result of the pandemic

NO DK

NO REF

{ASK IF Qclosed = 1 OR 2}

IneligThanks

We are only looking for settings that are open, or that have closed due to COVID-19, and therefore you are not eligible to take part in this survey. Thank you very much for taking the time to contribute. If you have any questions you can visit

www.natcen.ac.uk/childcaresurvey or email childcaresurvey@natcen.ac.uk

Press ‘Next’ to end the survey.

NCOOutcome = 780

PAGE START

{ASK IF (Qstatus=1 OR Qclosed=3) AND Wave=0}

Qdaysbef

Before COVID-19, how many days per week were you open in a typical week?

0...7

{ASK IF QStatus=1}

Qdaysnow

{Textfill if Wave=0 “And how” if Wave>0 “How”} many days per week were you open in a typical week in November 2020?

0...7

PAGE END

PAGE START

{ASK IF (Qstatus=1 OR Qclosed=3) AND Wave=0}

Qhoursbef

Before COVID-19, how many hours were you open on a typical day?

By this we mean the total number of hours of childcare you offer throughout the day 1...24

{ASK IF QStatus=1}

Qhoursnow

{Textfill if Wave=0 "And how" if Wave>0 "How"} many hours were you open on a typical day in November 2020?

By this we mean the total number of hours of childcare you offer throughout the day 1...24

PAGE END

CALCULATE DV: Qreducedv=0.

If wave=0 and ((Qdaysnow<Qdaysbef) OR (Qhoursnow<Qhoursbef)) Qreducedv=1,
If wave>0 and Qstatus=1 and ((Qdaysnow<Qdaysbef) or (Qhoursnow<Qhoursbef)) qreducedv=1.

{ASK IF Qreducedv =1}

QWhyReduced

Which, if any, of these reasons, explain why you are now operating at reduced opening hours compared with the period before COVID-19?

G_Multi_II1

1. Lack of staff available to work
2. Lack of staff willing to work
3. Lack of demand from parents for the hours
4. Not financially sustainable to open for more hours
5. Cannot adhere to COVID-19 related infection and prevention control measures if open for more hours
6. Other reason

Not Applicable

Additional option hidden with DK and prefer not to Answer

{ASK IF Qclosed=3}

QWhyClosed

Which, if any, of these reasons led to the closure of your setting?

G_Multi_II1

1. Lack of demand from parents
2. Lack of staff available or willing to work

3. Increased costs of adhering to COVID-19-related infection and prevention control measures
 4. No longer financially sustainable to open
 5. Cannot adhere to COVID-19-related infection and prevention control measures
 6. Other reason
-

C. ATTENDANCE

{ASK IF (Qstatus=1 OR Qclosed=3) and wave<2}

Qexpectage [GRID QUESTION: ONE PAGE]

In the absence of the COVID-19 restrictions, how many children would you have been expecting to attend your setting in a typical week during the 2020 autumn term?

Please give a number for each of the following age groups. If you would have not expected to have any children in an age group, please input 0

G_Estimate_ II1

GRID ROWS

1. QexpectU2age	Under age two	0...999
2. Qexpect2age	Age two	0...999
3. Qexpect34age	Three and four year old pre-school children	0...999
4. Qexpectschage	School-aged children aged 4 or over	0...999

{ASK IF QStatus =1}

Qattendage [GRID QUESTION: ONE PAGE]

How many children *actually* attended your setting in a typical week in November 2020? If it varied week by week, please think back to the week beginning 23rd November.

Please give a number for each of the following age groups. If no children in an age group attended, please input 0.

Please note, this should be the number of children that actually attended, rather than any places that parents are paying for, but children are not attending

GRID ROWS

1. QattendU2age	Under age two	0...999
2. Qattend2age	Age two	0...999
3. Qattend34age	Three and four year old pre-school children	0...999
4. Qattendschage	School-aged children aged 4 or over	0...999

D. FINANCIAL HEALTH

{ASK IF QSTATUS=1 i.e. ALL OPEN SETTINGS}

QADDCOSTS [GRID QUESTION: ONE PAGE]

Roughly, how much **more** are you spending **each week** on the following items as a result of the pandemic?

This might be spending on new items you would not previously have needed or increased spending on items as a result of the pandemic.

Please give a figure to the nearest whole pound.

If you are are not spending more money now compared with before the pandemic please put £0.

1. QCostsPPE	PPE	£0 ... 9,999,999
2. QcostsClean	Cleaning products or services	£0 ... 9,999,999
3. Qcostssfaff	Agency / supply staff to cover staff absences	£0 ... 9,999,999
4. Qcostsheat	Heating (as a result of increased ventilation)	£0 ... 9,999,999
5. QcostsOth	Other costs related to the pandemic	£0 ... 9,999,999

{ASK IF QSTATUS=1 i.e. ALL OPEN SETTINGS}

QBusmodell

Have you **increased** any of the following aspects of provision because of the pandemic:

Please select all that apply

- hourly pay rate for permanent staff.
- hours for permanent staff to cover other staff absences
- Use of agency / supply staff.
- Fees paid by parents.
- Additional charges paid by parents.
- The choice / flexibility in hours that parents can use.
- None of the above [EXCLUSIVE]

{ASK IF QSTATUS=1 i.e. ALL OPEN SETTINGS}

QBusmodelID

And have you **decreased** any of the following aspects of provision because of the pandemic:

Please select all that apply

- hourly pay rate for permanent staff.
- Use of agency / supply staff.
- Fees paid by parents.
- Additional charges paid by parents.
- The choice / flexibility in hours that parents can use.
- None of the above [EXCLUSIVE]

{ASK IF (Qstatus=1 OR Qclosed=3) AND Wave=0}

Qpropincome

Before COVID-19, roughly what proportion of your total income typically came from parent-paid fees?

0...100%

{ASK IF (Qstatus = 1 OR Qclosed =3) and wave<2}

Qfeesbef

In the absence of the COVID-19 restrictions, roughly how much income would you have been expecting to receive from parent-paid fees for a typical week during the 2020 autumn term?

G_Estimate_II2

Please give a figure to the nearest whole pound

£ 0...200,000

{ASK IF QStatus = 1}

Qfeesnow

How much income will you have received from parent-paid fees for a typical week in November 2020. If it varied week by week please think back to the week beginning 23rd November?

<i> This should include any fees paid by parents whether or not their children are currently attending childcare. That is including any retention fees charged <i>

G_Estimate_II2

Please give a figure to the nearest whole pound

£ 0...200,000

{ASK IF QStatus =1 AND (Provtype = GBP OR CM)}

QContinue

Based on what you know about the current situation and upcoming developments, are you reasonably confident that it would be financially sustainable to continue to run your childcare provision:

G_Single_II1

1. For another year or longer
 2. At least until July 2021
 3. At least until Easter 2021
 4. Only until the end of January 2021
-

E. Workforce

{ASK IF (Qstatus = 1 OR Qclosed =3) AND (ProvType= GBP or SBP) AND Wave=0}

Qstaffbef

Before COVID, excluding apprentices how many paid staff were involved in the delivery of your provision at this setting.

<i> Please only include the senior manager(s) and people working with the children, not specialist staff such as accountants. </i>

Variable name	Working hours		Number of paid staff
Qstaffbefft	Working full-time (30 hours or more a week)		0...300
QStaffbefpt	Working part-time (less than 30 hours a week)		0...300

{ASK IF QStatus =1 AND (ProvType = GBP or SBP)}

Qstaffnow [GRID QUESTION: ONE PAGE]

In November 2020, excluding apprentices, how many of your paid staff were...

<i> Please only include the senior manager(s) and people working with the children, not specialist staff such as accountants. </i>

*<i>Please make sure each member of staff is included in one box only</i>
If staff numbers varied week by week, please think back to the week beginning 23rd November.*

GRID ROWS

1. Qstaffnowft Working full-time (30 hours or more a week) and not on furlough
0...300

2. Qstaffnowpt Working part-time (less than 30 hours) and not on furlough 0...300

3. Qstaffnowfur On furlough as part of the government's job retention scheme and not currently working 0...300

4. Qstaffnowfurpt On part-time furlough (flexible furlough scheme) 0...300

{ASK IF QStatus =1 AND (ProvType = GBP or SBP)}

Qstaffabsent

Thinking about the last week in November, that is the week beginning 23rd November. Excluding apprentices, how many of your paid staff were absent from work due to COVID?

This may be a confirmed or suspected case, due to self-isolating or caring for dependents for COVID-related reasons. Do not include those staff members who are currently on furlough.

0...300

{ASK IF QStatus =1 AND (ProvType = GBP or SBP)}

Qstaffrisk

How many, if any, of your staff are you aware of as being at higher risk from coronavirus?

The current guidance on who is considered at higher risk from coronavirus can be viewed at <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/people-at-higher-risk/whos-at-higher-risk-from-coronavirus/>

0...300

{ASK IF (Qstaffnowfur = 0 AND Qstaffnowfurpt = 0) OR (Qstaffnowfur = DK/REF AND Qstaffnowfurpt = DK/REF) OR ((ProvType = GBP or SBP) AND Qclosed = 3)}
i.e. if provider has not previously stated they had staff on either full or PT furlough.

Qfurlough

{TEXTFILL IF ProvType = GBP “Has your setting” IF ProvType = SBP “ Has your nursery” IF ProvType = CM “ Have you”} used the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (furloughing) at any point?

1. Yes
2. No

TS3 [SET TIME STAMP HERE]

[COMPUTE NCOUTCOME 110 (FULLY COMPLETE) HERE]

{ASK ALL}

QRecontact

It’s possible that we may want to contact you again to complete another wave of this particular study, helping us to track the impact of coronavirus on the early years sector. The follow-up research would be for the Department for Education and would be carried out by NatCen in the next 12 months.

Would you be willing to be contacted to take part in another short survey on the impact of coronavirus?

G_IfNec_II1: <i> By agreeing to be contacted, you are not committing to taking part. You can make up your mind at the time. </i>

Analysis “Consent to re-contact for follow-up research”

1. Yes - willing to be re-contacted
2. No - not willing to be re-contacted

{ASK IF QRecontact=YES AND ProvType =GBP or SBP}

Qcontactname

In order to make it easier for NatCen to re-contact [TEXTFILL If ProvType = SBP “your nursery” If ProvType =GBP “your setting”] to keep in touch about this research to track the impact of COVID-19 on the early years sector, it would be useful for us to have a named contact.

If you are happy to be the named contact please enter your name in the box below.

Text [1..100]

1. Prefer not to answer

NODK

{ASK IF QRecontact=Yes}

Qcontactem

[Textfill IF ProvType = CM "You have reached the end of the main questions.

It is important that NatCen have the correct contact details for you so that we can keep in touch about this research to track the impact of COVID-19 on the early years sector"].

Can you please provide the best work e-mail address at which to reach you.

Please be assured that your details will only be used for the purpose of contacting you in relation to our research and will not be shared with anybody outside of our research team.

Text [1..100]

1. Prefer not to answer

NODK

{ASK IF Qcontactem<>1}

Qcontacechk

Please confirm your correct email address

TEXT[100]

HARDCHECK: If answer provided does not include @ or full-stop: "Please check and amend. E-mail addresses should contain an @ character and a full stop."

HARDCHECK: IF Qcontactem<> Qcontacechk

"The two email addresses you have entered are not the same. Please check and amend"

{ASK ALL}

TS4: [SET TIME STAMP HERE]

Qthanks

You have reached the end of the survey.

Many thanks for your help with this research. We really appreciate your time and your contribution.
