



Department  
for Education

# **Consultation on early years pupil premium and funding for 2-year- olds**

**Government consultation response**

**October 2014**

# Contents

Introduction	3
Summary of responses received and the government's response	4
Main findings from the consultation	4
Next steps	7
Question analysis	9
Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation	18

## Introduction

The Government consultation on *Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) and funding for two-year-olds* was published on 25 June 2014. It sought views on the extension of the pupil premium into the early years, in order to better support the early education of disadvantaged three- and four-year-olds. It asked questions on the mechanics of extending the premium, including checking eligibility; holding providers accountable for the use of the funding; and examples of good practice in supporting disadvantaged children.

It also asked for views on managing the first year of participation funding for the early education entitlement for two-year-olds in 2015-16.

In total 461 individuals or organisations responded to the consultation. It was an online consultation, and the majority of responses were received either through the consultation website (55%) or by email (36%). 9 per cent of responses were received by post.

Respondents identified themselves from a range of backgrounds. These are set out in Table 1.

**Table 1: Responses to question “What best describes you as a respondent?”**

<b>Respondent type</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of overall number of responses</b>
Local authorities:	120	26%
Other:	66	14%
Private/voluntary provider full	64	14%
Nurseries, including school	47	10%
Childcare or early years	33	7%
Childminder:	27	6%
Maintained nursery schools:	25	5%
Primary schools:	25	5%
Representative bodies:	22	5%
Children’s Centres:	20	4%
Parent/carer:	9	2%
Independent nursery schools:	3	1%

## **Summary of responses received and the government's response**

The majority of respondents to the consultation welcomed the proposals to introduce an EYPP, and agreed with the timetable for introducing participation funding. The potential challenges in implementing these changes – and in particular making sure the the EYPP has the greatest possible impact on outcomes for disadvantaged children – were acknowledged by a number of the respondents.

### **Main findings from the consultation**

We are pleased that the response to the consultation was very supportive of the government's proposal to extend the pupil premium into the early years. Respondents agreed with the case made in the consultation document that all children can benefit from access to early education, and that disadvantaged children will benefit in particular from additional resources in order to achieve outcomes on a par with their peers. Some respondents noted the approach to allocating the EYPP means that it will be targeted on children that most need it, regardless of whether or not they live in a disadvantaged area. Some early years providers felt that it would enable them to support children from disadvantaged backgrounds better, by taking specific action to help them.

#### **Eligibility for the EYPP**

A number of groups made the case to extend eligibility for the EYPP to more groups of children. We think that it is important to keep consistency between the EYPP and the school-age pupil premium – this will help to make it clear and simple for parents, schools and providers. Keeping the eligible group focused means that we can get maximum value from the funding available.

Both local authorities and providers highlighted the potential administrative burden associated with determining those children that are eligible for the premium. We are conscious that we want to minimise this as much as possible. The government will, therefore, bring forward an amendment to the Small Business, Enterprise and Employment Bill to enable local authorities to use the existing Eligibility Checking Service to check children's eligibility for the EYPP. To support providers to encourage parents to identify as eligible for the premium, we will produce guidance and case studies of good practice.

#### **Supporting providers to use the EYPP, and holding them to account for effective use**

Respondents strongly agreed with the proposal that providers have freedom to decide how to make use of the funding, citing in particular that providers are best placed to understand the particular needs of the disadvantaged children that they work with. They

were clear that this needs to be accompanied by a clear and effective accountability system, as well as guidance for providers on how to make best use of the EYPP in supporting disadvantaged children.

We will identify and share good practice with providers to help inform their planning on how to make the most effective use of EYPP and how to demonstrate impact. We want to ensure that providers have access to support to enable them to effectively identify the needs of disadvantaged children in their setting and draw on the available research and evidence to plan how to meet them and demonstrate impact. During the first year of the EYPP, Ofsted will look for evidence that providers understand and are planning to meet the needs of disadvantaged children.

To help providers access relevant research and practice, we are working with organisations that bring together the evidence on what works in supporting better outcomes for children. From February 2015, the Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning toolkit will be expanded to cover the early years. The toolkit currently provides a summary of educational research to help teachers and schools decide how to use their resources to improve the attainment of disadvantaged children. The expanded toolkit will include research on approaches to improving children's outcomes in the early years and support the effective deployment of resources and staff. In addition to resources that provide access to research, the Early Intervention Foundation Guidebook provides an online library of programmes that can be delivered locally to improve child outcomes including positive early child development.

Respondents felt strongly that peer-to-peer support by early years providers, and providers working together in quality improvement networks, would support good use of the EYPP. The department already supports sector-led improvement, for example the network of teaching school alliances provides an opportunity for schools and private, voluntary and independent providers (PVI) to learn from each other and share resources. Through Teaching Schools we are already testing the development of local hubs of early years practice bringing together all types of early years providers and will look to build on the learning from this in the future. To identify good practice specifically relevant to the EYPP, we will launch a call for evidence in November 2014 asking providers to share effective approaches to identifying and meeting the needs of disadvantaged children. Details of the call for evidence will be announced soon.

Respondents were supportive of the proposal that the main accountability mechanism for the use of the EYPP be through Ofsted inspection. Ofsted have agreed to update their inspection frameworks to set out that effective use and impact of the EYPP will be assessed under the leadership and management judgement. To make this judgement, Ofsted will want to see evidence that a provider has considered how best to invest EYPP funding, how they expect to determine if the money improves a child's outcomes over the short and/or long term and any evidence available on impact already achieved. They will update the provider self-evaluation framework to include questions on the approach that

providers are taking to using the EYPP – in particular, how they are making use of the money, which children they are targeting the money on, and how children’s outcomes are improving under the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) – and will ask questions on these areas during inspection. Where a provider is not able to supply this evidence their inspection judgement for the leadership and management judgement may be lowered, and inspectors will make recommendations on how the provider can improve.

### **Virtual School Heads**

A small but significant group of respondents noted the important role that Virtual School Heads play in supporting the use of the school age pupil premium for looked after children, and recommended that they have the same role for the Early Years Pupil Premium. Virtual School Heads should be responsible for managing the allocation of the EYPP for looked after children. For this group of children, funding will not be allocated directly to providers, but instead will be held by the Virtual School Head for the local authority, who will distribute it to providers.

### **Implementation of Early Years Pupil Premium**

In order to ensure that the whole system is ready for the introduction of the EYPP in April 2015, the Government will implement it from January 2015 in a representative group of local authorities. This will give us the opportunity to ensure that systems for funding and for checking eligibility are working smoothly ahead of the introduction of the EYPP in April 2015. The early implementers will also provide examples of how providers are using the EYPP to improve outcomes for disadvantaged children.

We will produce short guidance for local authorities on how to implement the EYPP later this year.

### **Participation funding**

The consultation also asked two questions about our proposed approach to implementing participation funding for the early education entitlement for two-year-olds. The majority of respondents agreed with our proposed approach, to use additional data collection in 2015-16 to allow for in-year adjustment of budgets. We will implement the proposals as set out in the consultation document.

A small number of respondents queried whether the autumn was the best time for this data collection. We appreciate that respondents are concerned that take-up rates are relatively low at the start of autumn term, and will review when in the autumn term would be appropriate to take the second count to give the most accurate picture. We will do the check in autumn so that the additional data collection for both two-year-old participation funding and the EYPP can take place at the same time, in order to minimise any burden on local authorities.

## Next steps

### Early Years Pupil Premium

- We will implement an EYPP in April 2015 as proposed in the consultation document. We will amend the School and Early Years Finance Regulations to set a national hourly rate for the EYPP which local authorities must pay to providers.
- Local authorities will be allocated initial funding for 2015-16 as per the allocations published alongside the consultation document. These have been published again alongside this response. We will conduct a mandatory mid-year survey in the autumn to check take-up of the EYPP, and make adjustments to allocations in light of that.
- Government to bring forward an amendment to the Small Business, Enterprise and Employment Bill to enable the Eligibility Checking Service to be used for the EYPP.
- Early implementation of EYPP from January 2015 in a representative group of local authorities.
- Government to publish guidance to local authorities on administering the funding and eligibility checking of the EYPP later in 2014.
- Ofsted to update their inspection frameworks to set out that effective use and impact of the EYPP will be assessed under the leadership and management judgement.
- We will retain the mandatory deprivation supplement in the Early Years Single Funding Formula. We encourage local authorities to consider using their deprivation supplement to increase the local rate of Early Years Pupil Premium.
- We will extend the current Study of Early Education and Development (SEED) research to include an assessment of the impact of EYPP on the quality of early years settings included in the study. An interim report will be available in summer 2016.
- We will conduct a survey of providers part way through the financial year to see how providers are spending their EYPP and to identify early evidence of impact.

## Participation Funding for two-year-olds

- In 2015-16 initial funding for the two-year-old programme will be allocated to local authorities in June 2015 using the January 2015 census data. To make sure local authorities are accurately funded as the take-up of the entitlement increases over the year, we will use a mid-year second data count in the autumn term to adjust funding in-year to reflect any significant increases in take-up of the entitlement. The additional data collection is not intended to provide real time funding, but rather allow the department to make an in-year adjustment to reflect major increases in participation rates in the first year.
- Local authorities are expected to submit the additional data on a voluntary basis to avoid unnecessary burden. The initial 2015-16 funding allocation will remain the same if local authorities choose not to submit an autumn count.
- In 2016-17 funding will be allocated on the same basis as for the three- and four-year-old entitlement, based on the January 2016 census. However, we will keep under review whether a second data count is needed in 2016-17 to adjust funding in year two if take-up levels do not stabilise in the first year.

As we cannot confirm initial allocations for 2015-16 until June, to assist local authorities plan their budgets, we are publishing local authorities 2015-16 per child hourly rates for two-year-olds with this response.



## Question analysis

### Question 1

**Do you agree that children from low income families; children in care; or children adopted from care should be eligible for the EYPP?**

	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	314	70%
Agree	109	24%
Neither agree or disagree	13	3%
Disagree	7	2%
Strongly disagree	6	1%

There were 449 responses to this question. Respondents were overwhelmingly supportive of the principle of introducing an Early Years Pupil Premium. 94% of those answering this question either agreed or strongly agreed, and only 3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. In their written responses, some respondents noted the benefits of investment in early education, and emphasised that all children should be able to access early education to support their development. Some respondents noted that disadvantaged children will benefit disproportionately from additional support.

Some respondents suggested that other groups of children should be automatically eligible for the EYPP too, including children with an Education, Health and Care Plan (4.2% of respondents); children of serving military personnel (2.2% of respondents); and children that meet the criteria for the early education entitlement for two-year-olds (1.1% of respondents).

A number of private and voluntary providers highlighted concerns that the EYPP would need to be ringfenced, otherwise it would not be passed on to them.

### Question 2

**Do you agree that providers should ask parents for their National Insurance Number and date of birth, so that local authorities should check eligibility for the EYPP using the Eligibility Checking Service?**

	Total	Percent
Yes	320	75%
Not sure	63	15%
No	45	11%

There were 428 responses to this question. Respondents generally agreed with the proposals for checking eligibility – 75% of respondents agreed and only 11% disagreed.

A substantial number of respondents highlighted that eligibility checking could potentially be burdensome for providers and/or for local authorities. They also noted that some parents would be reluctant to identify themselves as eligible.

Respondents raised a number of questions about when eligibility checks should first be carried out, and then how often they should be repeated. These questions are addressed in an accompanying Q&A document. We will publish guidance for local authorities later this year.

One of the things highlighted by the consultation is that different local areas have adopted different mechanisms for checking eligibility for the two-year-old entitlement, and they want to take a similar approach for the Early Years Pupil Premium. We want local areas to adopt the most accurate and efficient way of identifying eligible children in their area. Some of these are described in the accompanying boxes.

#### **Rochdale**

All parents wishing to access a Government funded place complete a parental declaration. The form, which is a combined request for the two-year-olds entitlement, asks for the parent's National Insurance number and date of birth. The local authority plans to use this form to assess eligibility for the EYPP, thus avoiding the need for a separate request to the local authority to check eligibility for the EYPP on the parents' part. This system means that parents will only be required to complete one form and supply their personal information once, thus avoiding the risk that parents might be deterred by more form filling if they wish to confirm that their child is entitled to the EYPP for their child.

#### **Merton**

Parents have access to an online facility which is hosted on the local authority's website and allows parents to request confirmation of whether they are eligible for a Government funded place. The online facility allows them to enter their personal details into an online eligibility checker. The checker will then tell them if they meet one of the economic criteria for eligibility and provide them with a unique reference number which they use to claim a free place for their child. Once parents have chosen a provider who has a place available for their child, they will give them their reference number. The provider will then request confirmation that the parent is eligible using the same online checker. The online facility could be upgraded to allow parents to check eligibility for the EYPP.

### Question 3

**Do you agree that if transitional arrangements are necessary for a short time then a paper-check system is the best way of determining eligibility?**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly agree	71	17%
Agree	181	43%
Neither agree or disagree	104	25%
Disagree	36	9%
Strongly disagree	25	6%

There were 417 responses to this question. Respondents were broadly supportive of a paper check system as the best way of determining eligibility if transitional arrangements are necessary. Nonetheless, their responses were clear that this would be a sub-optimal outcome.

### Question 4

**Do you support an October 2015 census count in order to make an in year adjustment to EYPP allocations?**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	290	69%
Not sure	83	20%
No	45	11%

There were 418 responses to this question. A majority of respondents agreed with the proposals for an additional census count in October 2015 to assess take up of the EYPP, and to adjust funding if necessary. Some respondents noted that this would help to ensure that funding went to the right children. A small number of respondents highlighted that take up of the early education entitlement is relatively low in the autumn.

## Question 5

**Do you agree that providers should determine how to use the Early Years Pupil Premium to support their disadvantaged children?**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly agree	206	48%
Agree	168	39%
Neither agree or disagree	24	6%
Disagree	21	5%
Strongly disagree	11	3%

There were 431 responses to this question. Respondents strongly agreed with the proposal that responsibility for making best use of the EYPP for supporting disadvantaged children should sit with early years providers – 87% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed, compared with 7% that disagreed or strongly disagreed. Respondents emphasised that providers know children’s individual needs best.

Some respondents (3.5%) noted the important role that Ofsted would play in holding providers to account for their use of the EYPP. Other respondents (16.7%) noted that providers would find it helpful to have guidance about good practice in using the premium. A number of respondents highlighted that local authorities have a role to play, as champions of disadvantaged children, in providing appropriate support to providers.

## Question 6

**Do you think that in the longer term there should be a more explicit expectation that providers receiving the EYPP should be a part of proven quality improvement arrangements?**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly agree	145	34%
Agree	176	41%
Neither agree or disagree	54	13%
Disagree	39	9%
Strongly disagree	12	3%

There were 426 responses to this question. The majority of respondents agreed with the idea that, in the longer term, providers should be part of proven quality improvement arrangements. Many respondents highlighted the benefits of particular quality assurance schemes – although some noted that these schemes are unmoderated. Some respondents noted potential benefits from a single, national assurance scheme; others, however, felt that it is better to have more flexibility for providers to choose the right arrangements for them.

A proportion of respondents (5.4%) noted that there could potentially be a role for local authorities in mediating and signposting providers to appropriate quality assurance. A significant number stated that they thought that Ofsted quality assurance arrangements are sufficient.

## Question 7

**Do you agree that we should retain a mandatory deprivation supplement in addition to the EYPP?**

	Total	Percent
Yes	276	67%
Not sure	97	23%
No	41	10%

There were 414 responses to this question. The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal to maintain a mandatory deprivation supplement in the Early Years Single Funding Formula. There were a number of thoughtful responses on both sides of the question, highlighting the benefits of an approach targeted on individual children rather than on a geographical area; but also the broader challenges faced by providers working in disadvantaged areas.

## Question 8

**Do you agree that the Department for Education should ask Ofsted to consider these arrangements in its inspection framework?**

	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	141	33%
Agree	202	47%
Neither agree or disagree	53	12%

	Total	Percent
Disagree	26	6%
Strongly disagree	9	2%

There were 431 responses to this question. 80% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed. 12% neither agreed nor disagreed. 8% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The department have discussed this response with Ofsted, who have agreed to update their inspection frameworks to set out that effective use and impact of the EYPP will be assessed under the leadership and management judgement.

## Question 9

**What data and evidence do you think providers could use to demonstrate the impact of the EYPP?**

There were 241 responses to this question, offering useful suggestions on how providers could demonstrate impact. The majority of responses focussed on tracking child attainment and many suggested using existing assessments to do this such as EYFS learning journeys and the two-year-old progress check. The new baseline assessment at age four was also proposed as a useful data set. Many respondents suggested that gathering parental views would be an important aspect of understanding impact.

## Question 10

**Do you have any suggestions of other ways to judge whether the EYPP is having the desired impact?**

There were 164 responses to this question, which provided helpful suggestions for how we could assess the impact of the EYPP. The most popular suggestions included were commissioning a longitudinal study; introducing Unique Pupil Numbers to enable development and attainment to be tracked from the early years through school; collecting evidence on the attainment gap between disadvantaged children and their peers; and seeking parental views on child progression.

## Question 11

**Do you have comments on the long-term aspiration of improving data collection so that we can track children through their educational career?**

There were 110 responses to this question. Respondents favoured tracking child attainment through either use of NHS numbers or introduction of Unique Pupil Numbers. The department will explore these options further.

## Question 12

**Do you agree with these proposals for supporting providers and disseminating good practice?**

	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	179	43%
Agree	155	37%
Neither agree or disagree	64	15%
Disagree	15	4%
Strongly disagree	3	1%

There were 416 responses to this question. 80% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed with the proposals to support providers and disseminate good practice.

## Question 13

**Are there particular examples of good practice in supporting disadvantaged children that early years providers should be aware of?**

There were 154 responses to this question. Respondents focussed on the impact that a positive home learning environment can have on children and working with parents to support children's development. Speech and language support was also thought to be an essential part of any support programme for disadvantaged children and respondents specifically referred to Every Child a Talker and Talk Time.

Respondents were also interested in learning from other providers, particularly those rated outstanding by Ofsted. Accessing peer to peer support was noted as an important way to ensure that children benefit from shared expertise and the Teaching Schools infrastructure was recognised as a way in which this could be facilitated.

## Question 14

**How can we best disseminate good practice to all early years providers working with disadvantaged children?**

There were 266 responses to this question. The majority of early years providers responding to this question wanted to access peer to peer support and training. 47.4% of respondents, many of which were local authorities, suggested that local authorities would be well placed to disseminate good practice.

## Question 15

**Do you support the proposal to have two data collections to allocate funding for early learning for two-year-olds in 2015-16?**

	Total	Percent
Yes	272	66%
Not sure	108	26%
No	32	8%

There were 412 responses to this question. The majority of respondents were supportive of the proposal to have two data collections in 2015-16. 66% of respondents agreed with the proposal, 8% disagreed and 26% were unsure.

The respondents felt that the proposal would allow growth in take-up of the two-year-old entitlement to be accounted for in funding allocation.

A small number of respondents noted that the additional data collection should continue beyond 2015-16 until participation levels for the new entitlement stabilises.

## Question 16

**Do you support using the October count as the second participation funding count for 2015-16?**

	Total	Percent
Yes	256	62%
Not sure	113	27%
No	43	10%



There were 412 responses to this question. The majority of responses were in favour of the proposal. 62% of respondents agreed with the proposal, 10% disagreed and 27% were unsure.

Of those that agreed, respondents noted that October would allow time for take-up to have grown following the extended entitlement and would prefer the count to be taken at a later point as possible after the autumn half term as children start after half term points. A small number of respondents that said that the headcount is lowest in the autumn term.

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

4Children

Abacus nursery (SW) LTD

Abbey Nursery School

Achieving for Children

Acorn pre-school

Acorns Nursery

Acorns Playgroup

Alderley Edge School for Girls

Allsorts pre-school

Apples and Honey Nursery

Army Families Federation, The

Aspect Group of Prospect

Auntie Edna's Child Care

BabockLDT

Balsall Heath Children's Centre

Barbados Playgroup Ltd

Barnados

Beaumont Lodge Primary School

Bedworth Heath Nursery School

Benington Nursery

Birmingham City Council

Bizzie Bees

Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council

Blackpool Council

Bluebells Day Nursery

Bobtails

Bolton Council

Booktrust

Boston Nursery School

Brambles Community Pre-School

Brenda's Busy Little Bees

Brigh Horizons Family Solutions  
Bright Horizons  
Bright Sparks  
Bright Stars Children's Day Nursery  
Brighton & Hove City Council  
Bristol City Council  
British Association for Adoption and Fostering  
British Educational Suppliers Association  
Britwell Baptist Preschool  
Brook Early Years  
Buckinghamshire County Council  
Building Blocks Montessori  
Bury Council  
Bushy Leaze Early Years Centre  
Busy Bees  
Calderdale MBC  
Calmore Pre-school Playgroup  
Cambridge Road CP & N School  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Cambridgeshire Early Years Service  
Carmountside Primary Academy  
Catholic Education Service  
Central bedfordshire  
Cherub Nursery  
Cheshire West and Chester Early Years Reference Group  
Childhaven Community Nursery School  
Childminding Matters  
Children services Salford  
Children's Links  
Choice Childcare  
Chris and Debbie Tiny Tots Childminding  
Church Hill Nursery School & Children's Centre  
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council  
City of York Council

Clocktower Childcare Ltd  
Combe Martin Preschool CIC  
Communication Trust, The  
Community Learning  
Coppull Primary School & Children's Centre  
Coventry City Council  
Crawley Green & Wenlock Pre-School  
Croydon Council Early Years working party  
Cumbria County Council  
Darlington Borough Council  
Derbyshire County Council  
Devon County Council  
Directorate Children and Young People  
Doncaster LA  
Dorset County Council  
Durham Local Authority  
Durham Nursery Schools  
Early Childhood Forum  
Early Education  
Early Intervention Foundation  
Early Years and Childcare  
Early Years and Childcare Team  
Early Years Reference Group, Wiltshire Council  
East Riding of Yorkshire Council  
East Sussex County Council  
Eatonbank  
  
Ellenborough and Ewanrigg Infant School  
Enfield LA  
Essex Early Years Partnership Group  
Euxton Pre-School  
Everton Nursery School and Family Centre  
EYDCP, Southampton City Council  
f40 Group of Local Authorities  
Fairfield Nursery School and Children's Centre

Family Action  
Family and Childcare Trust  
Federated nursery schools and children's centres (Stoneygate and Appletree)  
First Steps  
First Steps Day Nursery  
Fledglings Pre-School  
Footprints Learning for Life Ltd  
Funtime Pre-school  
Ganneys Meadow Early Years Centre  
Gateshead Council  
Gilbert Scott Primary School  
GL assessment  
Gloucestershire Adoption Team  
Gloucestershire County Council and Gloucestershire Schools Forum  
Grafton Childcare  
Granville Plus Nursery School  
Growing places @ Oak Meadow  
Gunter Primary  
Hampshire County Council  
Hampshire County Council SfYC  
Happidayz nursery  
Happy Days Nurseries Ltd  
Happy Hoppers Nursery  
Hargrave Park School  
Haringey Council  
HCC The Aviary Nursery  
Healthy Living Centre & Children's Centre  
Hempsall's  
Hendred pre-school  
Hertfordshire County Council  
High Greave Schools Federation  
Hindley Sure Start Nursery School and Children's Centre  
Howard Community Primary School  
Huncote Community Association

Independent Association of Prep Schools  
Institute of Wellbeing  
Independent Schools Association  
Isle of Wight Local Authority  
Islington Council  
Islington Schools Forum  
Jigsaw Montessori Nursery  
Joint response Ambitious about Autism, Scope, Contact a Family, Building Stronger Families, Every Disabled Child Matters, Family and Childcare Trust  
Kent County Council  
Kidz First Nursery  
Kidz ok ltd  
Kim's Childminding Service  
Kingston upon Hull City Council  
Kingsway Preschool  
Kirklees Council  
Knowsley MBC – Early Years Service  
Lancashire County Council  
Lancashire Schools Forum Early Years Blocal working Group  
Lancaster and Morecambe Children's Centres  
Leasowe early years School /centre  
Leicester City Council  
Leicestershire County Council; Early Learning and Childcare Service (0-5 Learning)  
Linaker primary school  
Lincolnshire County Council  
Lindridge CE Primary School  
Little Acorns Kindergarten  
Little Angels Nursery  
Little Oaks Day Nursery  
Little Owls Daycare  
Little People Nursery  
Little springs nursery rugeley  
Local Government Association  
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

London Borough of Barnet  
London Borough of Bexley  
London Borough of Camden  
London Borough of Hackney  
London Borough of Hounslow  
London Borough of Merton  
London Borough of Newham  
London Borough of Redbridge  
London Councils and Association of London Directors of Children's Services (ALDCS)  
London Early Years Foundation (LEYF), The  
London Youth  
Lugley Bugs Childcare  
  
Luton Borough Council  
Mama Bear's Day Nursery Ltd  
Manchester City Council  
Marcham preschool  
Mary Paterson nursery school  
Maxine Houldsworth's Childminding Service  
Mayflower Primary School  
Melcombe Primary School & Children's Centre  
Menorah Primary School  
Merry-go-round Day Nursery  
Montessori Schools Association  
NASUWT  
National Children's Bureau  
National Day Nurseries Association  
National Early Years Trainers and Consultants Organisation (NeyTCO)  
Nettlestead and Watlington Preschool and Out of Schools Club  
New Road Nursery  
Newcastle City Council  
Norfolk County Council  
  
North Somerset Council  
North Tyneside Council

North Yorkshire County Council  
Northamptonshire Childminding Association  
Northamptonshire County Council  
Northfleet Nursery School  
Northumberland County Council  
Northumbria University  
Northwood Hills Nursery

Nottinghamshire County Council  
Nursery School (2-4 years)  
Oakmere Children's Nursery  
The Association for the Professional Development of Early Years Educators  
Old Court Community Pre-School  
Oldham Community Health Services  
Oldham Council  
Once upon A Time Nursery Ltd  
Orchard

Oxfordshire County Council  
Oxfordshire Schools Forum/Oxfordshire Early Years Working Group  
Parkroyal pre-school  
patch day nursery, The  
Peterborough City Council  
Piglets pre-school  
Playgroup Network NE CIC  
Plymouth City Council (Early Years Service)  
Portman Early Childhood Centre, Hub for the North East Locality (Westminster)  
Children's Centres  
Portsmouth City Council

Pre-school Learning Alliance  
Professional Association for Childcare and Early Years  
Rainbow Early Years  
Rhymetime & Woodleys Nurseries  
Rochdale Borough Council  
Rosy Apple Childcare Ltd



Royal National Institute of Blind People  
Sandcastles Children's Nursery  
Sansway House Day Nursery  
Scope  
Seaham Harbour Nursery School  
Sheffield City Council  
Sheffield Hallam University  
Shepton Mallet Community Infants' School & Nursery  
Shiremoor Primary School  
Shobdon Arches Preschool  
Shropshire Council  
Slough Early Years Service  
Soho Children's Centre  
Somerset County Council  
South Darley Pre-school Playgroup  
South West Schools' Federation  
Southampton City Council  
Southwark Council  
Spinney Children's Centre, The  
Spitfires nursery  
St Andrew's C E Primary School  
St Andrews Pre School  
St Helen's Council  
St James Tunbridge Wells  
St. Margaret's Nursery School and Children's Centre  
St. Mark's Pre-school  
Staffordshire County Council  
Startpoint Northam  
Stepping stones preschool  
Stockport County Council  
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council  
Suffolk County Council  
SunnyDays Playgroup  
Surrey Civilian Military Partnership Board, Surrey County Council

Surrey County Council  
Surrey Early Years and Childcare Service  
Swinton Fitzwilliam Primary School  
TACT  
TACTYC, The Association for the Professional Development of Early Years Educators  
Tameside School Governors' Forum  
Tenterfield Nursery and CC  
Three Legged Cross First School  
Threshers Day Nursery  
Tibberton Early Years  
Tiddlywinks  
Tiny Toez  
Topsy Turvy Pre-School  
University of Warwick, The  
Usworth Colliery Nursery School  
Valley Nursery  
Virtual School for Children in Care  
Virtual school for looked After Children in Northamptonshire, The  
Voice the Union  
Wakefield Council  
Walton Oak School  
Wandsworth Borough Council, Early Years and Intervention Service  
Warrington Borough Council  
Warwickshire Schools Library Service  
Well Place Day Nursery  
Wellies  
Werneth Primary Care Centre  
West Berkshire Council  
Westminster City Council  
Westside Day Nursery  
Who Cares? Trust, The  
Wigan Council Early learning and Childcare team  
Windlesham Village Pre-school  
Wirral Schools Forum

Woodcote Pre-School

Woodlands Pre-School

Woolston Community Preschool 1

Worcestershire Association of Governors

Worcestershire County Council



Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2014

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-00627-2014



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



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