

Reforming the Early Years Foundation Stage (the EYFS): Government response to consultation

20 December 2011

Introduction

- i. Children's future attainment, wellbeing, happiness and resilience are profoundly affected by the quality of their experiences during early childhood. Parents are the most important influence, but high quality early education can also make a big difference to children's life chances. Improving the support that children receive in their early years is central to the Government's aims of greater social mobility and reducing the number of children in poverty.
- ii. The Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) framework sets standards for the learning, development and care of children from birth to age five. In the three years since its introduction, it has helped improve outcomes for children. The framework describes what a good provider of early education and childcare should do, the levels of development that most children can be expected to reach by age five, and the requirements against which Ofsted inspects, to ensure high quality. In a diverse sector, the EYFS aims to assure parents of a consistent quality experience for their child. The framework supports an integrated approach to learning and care, with continuity for children for the transition from the foundation years into Year 1 of the National Curriculum.
- iii. The reform of the EYFS is an integral part of the Government's wider vision for families in the foundation years¹, ensuring that through early help and intervention families are supported to give children the very best possible start in life and every opportunity to fulfil their potential. EYFS reform is part of a wider programme of change through: increased flexibilities in the 15 hours free early education entitlement for three and four year olds (with a sharper focus on quality improvement); the introduction of a new entitlement for two year olds (extended to 40 per cent of two year olds by 2014); reform to the network of Sure Start Children's Centres (which will continue to be accessible to all families but offer services focused towards those in greatest need); trialling of parenting classes; and an increase in the number of health visitors supporting families from birth to age five. This overall package of reforms has the potential to transform children's life chances.
- iv. The Government has made clear its intention to maintain a universal EYFS framework for early education and childcare, strengthened and simplified in line with the recommendations of Dame Clare Tickell's independent review. Dame Clare concluded that the EYFS framework has had a positive impact, increasing professionalism and helping to raise standards. Ofsted evidence bears that out. But Dame Clare also identified ways in which the framework could be improved.
- v. On 6 July a revised draft EYFS framework was issued for consultation, taking forward Dame Clare's proposals for reform:
 - reducing paperwork and bureaucracy for professionals;
 - focusing strongly on the three prime areas of learning most essential for children's healthy development and future learning (with four specific areas in which the prime areas are applied);

¹ *Supporting Families in the Foundation Years*, July 2011

- simplifying assessment at age five, including to reduce the early learning goals (ELGs) from 69 to 17; and
 - providing for earlier intervention for those children who need extra help, through the introduction of a progress check when children are age two.
- vi. This document sets out the feedback received in consultation on the Government's proposals, through an online questionnaire and a range of meetings, workshops and events. It also outlines how the Government will now put in place a reformed and strengthened EYFS for September 2012.
- vii. In summary:
- there was **broad support for the Government's approach to reform**. Approval was particularly strong for the focus on the three prime areas of learning, for the safeguarding and welfare requirements, for reductions in paperwork, and the clarity of the new framework;
 - while the case for a slimmed-down set of **statutory** requirements remains strong, many respondents felt there was **a need for supplementary information and practice guidance to support practitioners** in effectively delivering the reformed EYFS. The Government accepts the need for some further materials and we are working closely with sector bodies to ensure appropriate material is separately produced to underpin the new statutory framework. Additional materials planned include: guidance and exemplification for teachers on completing the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile; best practice models for presenting information from the progress check at age two; a chart covering child development from birth to age five (covering both the prime and specific areas); and a summary of the EYFS for parents. We are also considering with our partners in the Early Education and Childcare Co-production group whether we might also jointly produce a shortened version of *Development Matters*;
 - a significant minority of respondents questioned the **emphasis on school readiness**. We understand that there may be some anxiety that the EYFS should be valued as an important phase in its own right, and that there may be a concern about too strong a focus on formal education too soon. The Government considers that this anxiety is unwarranted because school readiness should be understood in a broad sense. It refers to children having the broad range of essential knowledge and skills that provide the right foundation for good future progress, through school and life. Preparation for that transition should not be seen in a narrow way. In their first few years, through exploration and play, children learn to walk and run, to talk and understand, and learn to relate to others, as well as beginning to read and write and use numbers. These are all important elements of 'school readiness' that are reflected in the new Early Learning Goals (ELGs). The EYFS framework accordingly recognises the central importance of play in children's learning. It also recognises that children need to be introduced to formal learning in their foundation years in a way and at a time appropriate to their individual level of development. Doing that well depends on practitioner skill and judgement, for which we want to provide the necessary flexibility and support; and

- Most respondents supported the **proposed measures to simplify assessment at age five** and better alignment with the National Curriculum to ease children's transition to Year 1. Respondents did, however, offer comments on the detail of the draft ELGs and how best to support judgements of children's development against them. We have considered this feedback carefully and propose further simplification of assessment, supported by guidance. We have also made some amendments to the draft ELGs, reflecting consultation feedback and further discussion with subject experts. We have broadened the scope of the mathematics goals and made some clarifications on literacy (both reading and writing). Our proposals are outlined in Section 1 of this document.
- viii. This document further sets out how we propose to move forward on all the key issues for the new framework and to support practitioners to deliver the new simpler, stronger EYFS with confidence. The Government is also reviewing the National Curriculum, alongside EYFS reform, and working to ensure the two are properly aligned.

Next Steps

- ix. A further one month consultation is underway on a revised version of the ELGs and the educational programmes (taking account of feedback from the July-September 2011 consultation), alongside the draft statutory instrument which gives effect to the *EYFS: The Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) (Learning and Development Requirements Order)*. This consultation is required by the Childcare Act 2006. Subject to this exercise, we will finalise the statutory framework and work with the sector on the supporting guidance needed by practitioners to implement the updated framework. We will publish the final framework and associated regulations in Spring 2012, in preparation for their implementation from September. In the meantime, Professor Cathy Nutbrown has been asked to lead a review into early years and childcare qualifications. The call for evidence is open until the 24 January, and a number of regional events are now taking place to gather the views of the sector. An interim report will be published in early March and the final report will be presented in June 2012. More information and a link to the call for evidence can be found at www.education.gov.uk/nutbrownreview.

This document

- x. The remainder of this document explains the feedback we received in response to each question raised in consultation² and sets out a proposed way forward on each issue. It is organised by theme:-
- Learning and development
 - Assessment
 - Safeguarding and welfare
 - Other issues

² As some on-line respondents have selected more than one option for particular questions, total percentages listed under any one question in this document may not always equal 100%. Throughout the document, percentages are expressed as a measure of those answering each question, not as a measure of all respondents.

Consultation methodology

- xi. The online consultation on the revised draft EYFS framework ran from 6 July to 30 September 2011. 2,308 responses were received. To support the online consultation, test out early findings, and ensure that the sector and parents had sufficient opportunity to provide feedback, the Department hosted (directly, or via partners), a series of workshops, events and meetings between July and October 2011. Departmental officials also attended events hosted by sector organisations. The Department publicised the consultation through: direct e-mail to key stakeholders (including those who responded to Dame Clare Tickell's review); features on the Department for Education (DfE) website; sector events; and other websites and sector organisation bulletins.
- xii. Annex A lists the workshops and meetings managed by the DfE and its early years and childcare partners during the consultation period. Annex B lists all organisations that responded to the online consultation apart from those that asked that their response be kept confidential.
- xiii. The organisational breakdown of respondents to the online consultation was as follows:

• Maintained School	457
• Nursery	409
• Local Authority	300
• Pre-School/Playgroup	269
• Early Years Sector Representative	269
• Independent School	135
• Childminder	122
• Parent/Carer	118
• Other ³	36
• Union/Professional Association	30
• Charity	30
• Academic	29
• Consultant	28
• SEN Provision	27
• Play Sector	19
• Children's Centre	18
• Breakfast/Afterschool Club	12

³ Those which fell into the 'other' category included inspectorates, training providers, museums/galleries and those who did not specify a category.

Section 1: Learning and development

Prime and specific areas

1. We consulted on introducing three prime areas and four specific areas of learning and development, as recommended by the Tickell review. The majority of respondents were supportive of the focus on prime areas of learning, agreeing they are of vital importance for children's future learning. Practitioners and parents who attended consultation workshops also welcomed the strengthened focus on these prime areas.

Q2 Do you agree with the proposals that there should be three *prime* areas of learning and development? The three *prime* areas are: personal, social and emotional development; physical development; and communication and language (paragraph 1.3).

There were 2171 responses to this question.

1330 (61%) Yes 390 (18%) No 399 (18%) Partly 52 (3%) Not Sure

Q3 Do you agree with the proposals that there should be four *specific* areas of learning and development? The four *specific* areas are literacy; mathematics; understanding the world; and expressive arts and design.

There were 2141 responses to this question.

1084 (51%) Yes 429 (20%) No 548 (25%) Partly 80 (4%) Not Sure

Q4 Paragraph 1.6 of the draft framework explains how learning in the prime and specific areas should be supported. Is this a clear explanation? If you ticked no, or not sure, please say how this could be clarified.

There were 2071 responses to this question.

1003 (48%) Yes 776 (38%) No 292 (14%) Not Sure

2. Some respondents suggested that the prime and specific areas should be seen as equally important and were concerned that settings might concentrate on the prime areas to the detriment of the specific areas and the division between the two different types of area did not allow children to develop at their own rate. Respondents asked for further information on how the prime areas should be applied to the specific areas.
3. In her review of the EYFS, Dame Clare Tickell noted wide agreement from researchers and practitioners that the three prime areas of learning are central to

all other areas of learning and development. This is why they are the subject of renewed focus in the new EYFS. Dame Clare emphasised that the prime areas were fundamental to children's successful learning in the specific areas. The specific areas cannot be encountered in isolation from communication and language, personal, social, emotional and physical development since children always experience the world through communication, and physical and sensory involvement. This is what is meant by the prime areas being applied in the specific areas. A strong foundation in the prime areas is essential. If this is not securely in place by age five, it holds children back in other areas of learning and development.

4. The new EYFS framework makes clear that practitioners should observe and respond to each child in their care on an ongoing basis. It gives a broad steer that there should be a focus on prime areas for younger children, with gradual building in of support in the specific areas for older age ranges, as children develop, and as appropriate to their individual level of development and progress. This reflects the importance of the prime areas of learning for other areas, but practitioners should of course be flexible in their approach, responding to each child as an individual learner. There is nothing in the framework that holds back a practitioner from introducing specific areas to a particular child's learning experience earlier than they might for other children, if they judge that to be appropriate. Experiences which support younger children's learning in the prime areas, moreover, will also support their learning in the specific areas. Sharing rhymes and picture books, for example, lays the foundations for reading and writing as well as for communication and language.
5. Respondents also asked for more information on the development of under twos. This will be covered in the development chart from birth to age five to be published alongside the EYFS. This will be produced on our behalf by Early Education.

The Early Learning Goals

6. The proposal on which the Government consulted was to reduce the number of ELGs from 69 to 17. The results from the online consultation show broad support for most of the new goals, with a majority in favour of the goals in five out of the seven areas of learning. Responses were less positive in relation to mathematics (50% supportive) and literacy (43%). As a result, these have been the main focus of further consideration and revision since the consultation closed.

For each of the 7 areas of learning and development listed below in 5a)-g), please say whether you agree with the early learning goals which relate to them.

Q5a Personal, Social and Emotional Development: Self-confidence and Self-awareness, Managing Feelings and Behaviour, Making Relationships.

There were 2114 responses to this question.

1250 (59%) Yes 144 (7%) No 663 (31%) Partly 57 (3%) Not Sure

Q5b Physical Development: Moving and Handling, Health and Self-care

There were 2101 responses to this question.

1191 (57%) Yes 312 (15%) No 560 (27%) Partly 37 (2%) Not Sure

Q5c Communication and Language: Listening and Attention, Understanding, Speaking

There were 2105 responses to this question.

1186 (56 %) Yes 274 (13%) No 607 (29%) Partly 38 (2%) Not Sure

Q5d Literacy: Reading, Writing

There were 2086 responses to this question.

888 (43%) Yes 607 (29%) No 522 (25 %) Partly 69 (3%) Not Sure

Q5e Mathematics: Numbers, Shape, Space and Measures

There were 2085 responses to this question.

1053 (50%) Yes 322 (15%) No 636 (31%) Partly 74 (4%) Not Sure

Q5f Understanding the World: People and Communities, the World, Technology

There were 2081 responses to this question.

1160 (56%) Yes 244 (12%) No 591 (28%) Partly 86 (4%) Not Sure

Q5g Expressive Arts and Design: Exploring and Using Media and Materials, Being Imaginative

There were 2071 responses to this question.

1199 (58%) Yes 162 (8%) No 659 (32%) Partly 51 (2%) Not Sure

Q5h Do you agree that the early learning goals define clearly enough what children should be able to do by the end of the school year in which they turn five?

There were 2057 responses to this question.

1015 (49%) Yes 609 (30%) No 433 (21%) Not Sure

7. On **mathematics**: respondents called for more to be included within the goals, on problem solving and application of number (using objects and quantities to introduce concepts like addition, subtraction and halving). Revisions have been made to build these in more prominently. On **literacy**: respondents suggested there was too much emphasis on reading and writing at too young an age. Respondents raised some specific concerns - for example, teachers suggested that writing 'simple stories' was too challenging, whilst others thought the same measure was unclear, and nursery practitioners thought that the ELGs were too formal and not sufficiently child-centred. In workshops, Year 1 and Reception teachers felt that the goals were set too high for literacy, but were better for numeracy. Teachers expressed a strong view that the EYFS should be more closely aligned to the National Curriculum.
8. The Design and Technology Association offered some specific comments on the Expressive Arts and Design goals to ensure that these adequately cover applying art and design in making things. Their detailed comments have been reflected in revisions.
9. Around one in eight respondents to the online consultation commented that the ELGs were too detailed, but this was not supported by teachers, practitioners and parents attending workshops, or in discussion with representative organisations. In workshops, teachers said they agreed that the streamlined goals were an important improvement, and made the EYFS Profile a more manageable exercise than current requirements. There were calls from teachers and practitioners, local authorities and early years organisations for guidance and exemplification to support teacher judgements against the goals. This was also the main concern of respondents to question 5h (clarity of the goals and their appropriateness overall). The Standards and Testing Agency at the Department for Education will be producing this guidance for publication in Spring 2012.
10. We are consulting again on the areas of learning and development and the ELGs to test the revisions we have made in response to feedback, and in the light of further consultation with early years and National Curriculum subject experts. The main changes are:
 - a. For **literacy**, we have sought to address comments made by online consultees and in workshops with teachers that some goals were potentially too stretching. We have:
 - i) replaced writing simple stories and captions (which was highlighted in particular by primary teachers to whom we spoke) with being able to write simple sentences. Advice from both early years and National Curriculum experts was that this is clearer to understand and reflects a more appropriate level of stretch;
 - ii) added a measure that children read and write some common phonically irregular words;
 - iii) removed the measure for children to demonstrate understanding of what has been read to them as this is not specifically related to

reading. Comparable requirements already exist in goals relating to communication and language.

- b. For **mathematics**, we have responded to feedback expressed by respondents (supported by experts) that we needed to include more on 'problem solving' and 'application of number'. We have:
- i. Amended the 'numbers' goal so that children are expected to be able to count up to 20. Experts advised that this is an appropriate level of stretch;
 - ii. Introduced application of number - using objects and quantities to introduce concepts like addition and subtraction - in the 'numbers' goal. On the advice of experts we have also included 'doubling, halving and sharing';
 - iii. Introduced 'problem solving' into the 'shapes, spaces and measures' goal. Online consultees asked for this, and it was raised by teachers to whom we spoke. Experts agreed we should include this;
 - iv. On the advice of experts, included 'time' and 'money' among the list of things in the 'shapes, spaces and measures' goal, which children should be able to describe in everyday language. We have also introduced the need to be able to use mathematical language to describe everyday objects.

11. The ELGs now read as follows:

The Prime Areas

Communication and language

Listening and attention: Children listen attentively in a range of situations. They listen to stories, accurately anticipating key events and respond to what they hear with relevant comments, questions or actions. They give their attention to what others say and respond appropriately, while engaged in another activity.

Understanding: Children follow instructions involving several ideas or actions. They answer 'how' and 'why' questions about their experiences and in response to stories or events.

Speaking: Children express themselves effectively, showing awareness of listeners' needs. They use past, present and future forms accurately when talking about events that have happened or are to happen in the future. They develop their own narratives and explanations by connecting ideas or events.

Physical Development

Moving and handling: Children show good control and co-ordination in large and small movements. They move confidently in a range of ways, safely negotiating space. They handle equipment and tools effectively, including pencils for writing.

Health and self-care: Children know the importance for good health of physical exercise, and a healthy diet, and talk about ways to keep healthy and safe. They manage their own basic hygiene and personal needs successfully, including dressing and going to the toilet independently.

Personal, social and emotional development

Self-confidence and self-awareness: Children are confident to try new activities, and say why they like some activities more than others. They are confident to speak in a familiar group, will talk about their ideas, and will choose the resources they need for their chosen activities. They say when they do or don't need help.

Managing feelings and behaviour: Children talk about how they and others show feelings, talk about their own and others' behaviour, and its consequences, and know that some behaviour is unacceptable. They work as part of a group or class, and understand and follow the rules. They adjust their behaviour to different situations, and take changes of routine in their stride.

Making relationships: Children play co-operatively, taking turns with others. They take account of one another's ideas about how to organise their activity. They show sensitivity to others' needs and feelings, and form positive relationships with adults and other children.

The Specific Areas

Literacy

Reading: Children read and understand simple sentences. They use phonic knowledge to decode regular words and read them aloud accurately. They also read some common irregular words. They demonstrate understanding when talking with others about what they have read.

Writing: Children use their phonic knowledge to write words in ways which match their spoken sounds. They also write some irregular common words. They write simple sentences which can be read by themselves and others. Some words are spelt correctly and others are phonetically plausible.

Mathematics

Numbers: Children count reliably with numbers from one to 20, place them in order and say which number is one more or one less than a given number. Using quantities and objects, they add and subtract two single-digit numbers and count on or back to find the answer. They solve problems, including doubling, halving and sharing.

Shape, space and measures: Children use everyday language to talk about size, weight, capacity, position, distance, time and money to compare quantities and objects and to solve problems. They recognise, create and describe patterns. They explore characteristics of everyday objects and shapes and use mathematical language to describe them.

Understanding the world

People and communities: Children talk about past and present events in their own lives and in the lives of family members. They know that other children don't always enjoy the same things, and are sensitive to this. They know about similarities and differences between themselves and others, and among families, communities and traditions.

The world: Children know about similarities and differences in relation to places, objects, materials and living things. They talk about the features of their own immediate environment and how environments might vary from one another. They make observations of animals and plants and explain why some things occur, and talk about changes.

Technology: Children recognise that a range of technology is used in places such as homes and schools. They select and use technology for particular purposes.

Expressive arts and design

Exploring and using media and materials: Children sing songs, make music and dance, and experiment with ways of changing them. They safely use and explore a variety of materials, tools and techniques, experimenting with colour, design, texture, form and function.

Being imaginative: Children use what they have learnt about media and materials in original ways, thinking about users and purposes. They represent their own ideas, thoughts and feelings through design and technology, art, music, dance, role play and stories.

12. The further learning and development consultation will run from 20 December 2011 to 19 January 2012. Details can be found on the DfE website: <http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/index.cfm?action=consultationDetails&consultationId=1788&external=no&menu=1>.

Language

13. The Government wants the EYFS to help ensure children's English language skills are sufficiently developed to allow them to take full advantage of Year 1 and the opportunities that schools offer. It also recognises that bilingualism is an important asset conferring positive advantages for children's learning and development. The revised draft EYFS tries to strike a balance between supporting children's overall language development (including through opportunities for children to use their home language in settings), and ensuring appropriate opportunities are provided for children to reach a good standard of English, to be ready for school. It also seeks to ensure that the assessment requirements appropriately measure children's progress in English, taking due account of the needs of children who have not had the appropriate time or support to develop their English language skills.

Q6 Does paragraph 1.7 of the revised draft EYFS get the balance right?

There were 2033 responses to this question.

910 (45%) Yes

505 (25%) No

618 (30%) Not Sure

14. In responses to consultation that were negative, or unsure, comments were focused on the requirement to 'provide opportunities to develop and use the child's home language in play and learning, supporting their language development at home.' Some respondents were concerned that this might entail an increase in the level and range of support which providers would be expected to offer. For example, some asked if this meant securing translation assistance for every individual child whose home language was not English, or if settings were required to recruit staff fluent in different languages. They highlighted particular challenges for settings where children speak multiple languages, if this were the sort of expectation being set.

15. The new framework does not prescribe that specific resources should be made available, nor does it advocate increasing the level and range of support which providers are expected to offer. The intention is that providers continue to take reasonable steps, consistent with current good practice, to support language development in home languages, as well as English, in discussion with parents. Providers are asked to judge what is appropriate and what can be reasonably managed, taking account of the range of languages children in their setting use and the language skills of their staff.

Play

16. The revised draft EYFS asks practitioners to achieve an appropriate balance between adult-led and child-initiated play in supporting children's learning. Feedback was mixed on whether the paragraphs offered practitioners sufficient clarity about expectations with a number of respondents asking for more guidance on what constitutes an appropriate balance.

Q7 The EYFS requires providers to support children through *planned, purposeful play*. The Tickell review recommended that this requirement should be explained more clearly. Do you agree that paragraphs 1.10 and 1.11 of the revised draft EYFS clearly outline expectations of the approach practitioners should take to supporting children's learning?

There were 2110 responses to this question.

795 (38%) Yes

1031 (49%) No

284 (13%) Not Sure

17. Some respondents argued there should be stronger emphasis on child-initiated and child-led activities; that play should be spontaneous and an outlet for imagination and creativity and children should be free to follow their own interests. The EYFS allows for this in its clear emphasis on the need for responsive support for individual children, reflecting their age and stage of learning, their motivations and interests. But it also is clear that teaching in the early years must help prepare children for more formal learning settings, ready for Year 1.
18. Tickell made clear that there is a role for teaching as well as play in the EYFS. The very best practice in the early years acknowledges the importance of children using their curiosity and experiencing the pleasure of learning through play. But the best practice also ensures that all children grow up literate and numerate and ready for the next stage of their learning. That is why Tickell emphasised that early years practitioners should adopt a fluid, flexible approach that includes supporting children to be ready for a more formal setting as they get older. Readiness for Year 1 and later life depends on an approach to child development which combines play and teaching in safe environments in the early years and in which children experience warm positive interaction, and can explore and learn, with appropriate support from skilled adults.
19. The EYFS sets a general expectation that the level of adult-led activities should usually increase for older age ranges, but play remains essential (indeed teaching in the EYFS, as Tickell notes, generally takes the form of guided play). Skilled parents and practitioners know how to get the balance right; responding to each child's individual emerging needs and interests, and tailoring their support appropriately in response; ensuring each child is guided to develop the skills which are essential for their future progress.
20. In finalising the EYFS framework for implementation next year, we will ensure a clear and strong emphasis on play as an essential vehicle for children's learning, helping young children develop the flexibility of thought and confidence to become good learners.
21. A number of respondents queried the suggestion that there should be a move towards adult-led learning as children start to prepare for Reception class. In finalising the framework we will ensure that where the EYFS refers to preparation for school, that this means preparedness for Year 1.

Wraparound and Holiday Providers

22. Some children attend more than one early years setting at a time and/or access a childcare provider for a limited period only. In these circumstances the draft revised EYFS framework makes clear that providers should make a judgement about how to apply the EYFS in the wraparound setting. They need not necessarily meet all aspects of the learning and development requirements. What is offered in the way of learning and development support should reflect the amount of time children spend in the setting, and the support for their learning being provided elsewhere.

Q8a Paragraphs 1.14 - 1.15 explain the learning and development requirements for settings where children spend a limited amount of time, outside school hours - for example, holiday and wraparound care. Do you think these paragraphs contain appropriate requirements for wraparound and holiday providers? Please explain.

There were 1917 responses to this question.

1188 (62%) Yes	239 (12%) No	490 (26%) Not Sure
----------------	--------------	--------------------

Q8b Are the requirements explained clearly?

There were 1900 responses to this question.

1283 (68%) Yes	310 (16%) No	307 (16%) Not Sure
----------------	--------------	--------------------

23. A clear majority of respondents to the online consultation agreed that the requirements proposed were clear and appropriate. Respondents welcomed the emphasis on providers working together across settings to share information and provide a sensible overall package of support for individual children. Some respondents suggested that wraparound and holiday care should be limited to taking part in leisure activities and self-initiated play opportunities. The framework does not prevent providers from offering this sort of care if it appropriately reflects children's other learning opportunities. Based on the feedback received we propose to retain the requirements for limited contact providers as they stand, and to retain the wording that was used in the draft EYFS on which we consulted over the summer.

Section 2: Assessment

Paperwork for formative (ongoing) assessment

24. There are two types of assessment in the EYFS. The first is formative assessment which practitioners should use on an ongoing basis to identify children's needs and plan activities to meet them and support children's future progress. The second is summative assessment when practitioners take stock of children's overall progress at a particular point in time. Tickell review feedback was in favour of continuing to require formative assessment, although some people expressed concerns about the paperwork that was associated with it. The revised draft EYFS retains the requirement that practitioners undertake ongoing formative assessment, but aims to make clear that the paperwork should be kept to the absolute minimum required to promote children's successful learning and development.

Q9 Paragraph 2.2 aims to discourage practitioners from completing excessive levels of paperwork. Do you think these paragraphs would achieve this aim? Please explain.

There were 2109 responses to this question.

896 (42%) Yes

633 (30%) No

580 (28%) Not Sure

Q10 Do you have any further comments on paperwork associated with the formative assessment of children's learning and development?

There were 1945 responses to this question.

951 (49%) Yes

815 (42%) No

179 (9%) Not Sure

25. Tickell review feedback suggested that paperwork worries may often be a response to perceived pressures, or reflect practitioners' own training needs, rather than the requirements of the EYFS. Feedback from the EYFS consultation similarly suggested a continued concern on this issue, with online respondents (and teachers and early years practitioners at workshops) indicating that a sense of pressure from local authorities and Ofsted to do more paperwork than is necessary is a driver behind concerns.

26. Many respondents suggested that examples of good practice and clear guidelines on appropriate evidence would be useful, including to mitigate the risk that local authorities or Ofsted place additional demands on providers. Ofsted will ensure that their inspection schedule and training for inspectors reflects the EYFS requirements clearly and appropriately. Our broader communications will reinforce our expectation that paperwork should be kept to the absolute minimum required to promote children's successful learning and development.

Assessment at age five (the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile)

27. The Tickell review highlighted concerns about the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP), pointing in particular to it being over-long and complicated, and that it was not always used by Year 1 teachers because they felt there was a disconnect between the content of the EYFSP and the National Curriculum. Responding to Dame Clare's advice on how the EYFSP could be simplified, the revised EYFS proposed that it should be slimmed down to reflect the new (reduced) 17 ELGs and that 'emerging' and 'exceeding' bands be included in the assessment measures, to help identify clearly where children are still working towards, or have gone beyond, the expected levels of the goals. Guidance was provided in the revised draft EYFS framework to show what 'emerging' or 'exceeding' levels of development might look like, with 'emerging' defined as expected levels of development for around age four, and 'exceeding' defined as children reaching Year 1 attainment levels.

Q11 Do you think the revised draft EYFS Profile would provide an improved vehicle for capturing the essential information about a child's development at the point at the end of the EYFS? Please explain.

There were 2038 responses to this question.

816 (40%) Yes	582 (28%) No	425 (21%) Partly	215 (11%) Not Sure
---------------	--------------	------------------	--------------------

Q12 Do you agree with the content of the 'emerging' and 'exceeding' bands? Please explain.

There were 2017 responses to this question.

832 (41%) Yes	550 (27%) No	442 (22%) Partly	193 (10%) Not Sure
---------------	--------------	------------------	--------------------

Q13 Do you agree that the terms 'emerging', 'expected' and 'exceeding' appropriately describe levels of progress? Please explain.

There were 2064 responses to this question.

1019 (50%) Yes	418 (20%) No	482 (23%) Partly	145 (7%) Not Sure
----------------	--------------	------------------	-------------------

Q14 The revised draft EYFS asks practitioners to supplement the Profile and give Year 1 teachers a short commentary on each child's skills and abilities in relation to the three characteristics of effective learning (paragraph 2.7). Do you agree this is helpful? Please explain.

There were 1987 responses to this question.

1150 (58%) Yes

208 (10%) No

629 (32%) Not Sure

Q15 Do you have any further comments on the proposed revised draft EYFS Profile?

There were 1836 responses to this question.

797 (44%) Yes

960 (52%) No

79 (4%) Not Sure

28. The majority of respondents agreed, or partly agreed, the revised draft EYFS Profile (EYFSP) was an improvement. Teachers, practitioners and experts that we consulted in workshops, and at other events, generally felt the EYFSP has been helpfully simplified, was easier to translate for Year 1 teachers and was better aligned with the National Curriculum. Parents at workshops also welcomed the simplification and streamlining of the ELGs in the new framework, and any further work that would aid communication with them, and between practitioners, about their child's development.
29. Some respondents expressed concern that categorising children under the three terms 'emerging', 'expected' and 'exceeding' was labelling them unnecessarily. But when this issue was discussed with parents, teachers and experts in workshops, the key concerns were to ensure that judgements were appropriately backed by evidence (particularly where children were 'emerging') and that additional support needs identified were acted upon. It was also recognised that for data collection purposes it was important to have a simple system.
30. Some respondents suggested that the bandings were too simplistic and did not capture the range of attainment that could be achieved within the bands. And some highlighted that this system (taken together with the guidance provided populating the 'emerging' band) was not suitable for showing progress for children with SEN, or children with more complex needs. Respondents called for guidance and clearer examples to support teacher judgements across the bands.
31. The majority of respondents welcomed the requirement that Reception teachers report on the characteristics of learning for each child to accompany the assessment of the ELGs. This was supported in workshops held with parents, teachers and experts. Respondents noted that this information would be useful for the transition from the EYFS to Year 1.
32. In response to concerns raised that the 'emerging' band descriptors were unhelpfully limited to a level of development just below the expected level, we propose to remove the descriptors provided in the EYFS draft framework for this band to ensure that this category is relevant to all children who are not yet

reaching expected levels, including children with SEN or disabilities. For consistency, we propose similarly removing the 'exceeding' category descriptors (although the framework will indicate that development in this band should be judged with reference to programmes of study in Year 1 of the National Curriculum, and potentially beyond for some children).

33. Guidance being developed to support teacher judgements for the EYFSP will respond to widespread calls for greater exemplification and explanation about how to use the new EYFSP to assess children. The guidance will cover reporting on the characteristics of learning as well as the ELGs. The development chart from birth to age five will also help practitioners to make judgements about the level of progress of children, particularly those that they judge to be at the 'emerging' level.

The progress check at age two

34. The draft revised EYFS framework introduces a requirement on all settings to provide parents with a written report of a progress check on their child's development at age two, highlighting what their child can do, any areas of concern, and how the setting plans to tackle any emerging issues. It is focused on the three prime areas. Online consultation feedback was mixed, but in workshops where this issue was addressed there was strong support for the progress check, when parents and practitioners had the opportunity to explore the idea and understand its purpose.

Q16 Do you agree there should be a requirement for providers to give parents a written summary of their child's development in the prime areas when their child is 24 - 36 months (paragraphs 2.3-2.4)? Please explain.

There were 2096 responses to this question.

1080 (51%) Yes 497 (24%) No 519 (25%) Not Sure

Q17 Do you have any further comments on the 24 - 36 months summary of development?

There were 1951 online responses to this question.

1049 (54%) Yes 809 (41%) No 93 (5%) Not Sure

35. Respondents to the online consultation recognised it was important for parents to be better supported to help give their child the best possible start in their learning. They also supported the summary being prepared as part of an ongoing dialogue with parents (as the draft framework requires). Many settings highlighted that they already provide this sort of information to parents on a more regular basis than the new requirement proposes.

36. Some parents and practitioners were worried that children would miss out if they

did not enter a setting until age three. Our proposals do not prevent any provider undertaking a progress check at age three. Indeed the reformed EYFS (as well as the current framework) emphasises the need to assess children's progress continuously, in partnership with parents. In practice we would anticipate that many children will, anyway, be assessed when they first join a setting, reflecting feedback in our workshops that this is widespread practice. However, we do not propose to introduce a requirement on providers to prepare a written summary for parents at this age.

37. The need for supporting guidance for practitioners on reporting the outcome of the progress check to parents emerged as a key theme in workshops and through the online consultation. This included in particular a request for further guidance covering child development between birth and age five (that will be provided in the birth to age five development chart).
38. It was suggested (in workshops and other discussions) that the DfE might provide a standard template for reporting the outcome of the progress check to ensure consistency of approach and help parents be clear about what they should expect. We do not intend to produce a standard DfE template because we consider that the requirements of the framework set the appropriate level of prescription for this task. We would also not want to stifle existing work in this area and the good practice to which Dame Clare referred. Many settings already share this sort of information with parents, as part of existing requirements linked to partnership between practitioners and parents, and we want to build on that good practice. The framework gives practitioners flexibility to use a format for sharing information appropriate to practice in their setting and/or to reflect the needs of a particular child and/or their parents' preferences. Ofsted inspectors will seek evidence only that the setting is sharing the required information in writing with parents.
39. However, recognising that some practitioners would welcome some sample models to inform their practice, we have asked National Children's Bureau to consider how they can support the sector to do the progress check well and to produce a selection of examples and good practice models for sharing information with parents.
40. The extension of the free early education entitlement to 40 per cent of two year olds means that more children will increasingly benefit from early education. More children will have the opportunity to have their learning needs identified quickly and to receive appropriate support, including for emerging special educational needs.
41. Practitioners need to be able to engage confidently with parents to discuss their children's progress and help parents to support their child's development at home. Both online and workshop respondents raised concerns about the skills and knowledge of the workforce to discuss any issues about children's progress with parents. In particular, respondents cited concerns about knowledge of child development and practitioner skills and confidence in tackling sensitive issues.
42. We are working with our partners to explore opportunities to support practitioners to communicate effectively with parents about their child's development, including

through guidance and training. For the longer term, Professor Nutbrown's review of early education and childcare qualifications will consider how qualifications and training can be adapted to support implementation of the EYFS.

43. If the timing is right, parents can usefully draw on the information from the early years progress check at two to support the Healthy Child Programme health and development review carried out by health visitors. Looking further ahead, we are working with health and early years experts on the feasibility of a single integrated review at age two, bringing together the early years progress check with the current health visitor review. If testing of models is successful this would be introduced in 2015.

Children with Special Educational Needs

44. We want to ensure that the framework reflects and responds appropriately to the needs of children with special educational needs (SEN) and disabled children. The revised draft EYFS framework is designed to be fully inclusive for all children. Providers are required to have equal opportunity policies that show how they will meet the needs of children with SEN, and disabled children.

Q18 Do you think that paragraph 2.10 of the revised draft EYFS is clear in relation to the assessment of children with special educational needs?

There were 1993 responses to this question.

990 (50%) Yes 502 (25%) No 501 (25%) Not Sure

Q19 Do you have any further comments on the assessment of children with special educational needs?

There were 1845 responses to this question.

690 (37%) Yes 1052 (57%) No 103 (6%) Not Sure

45. Feedback from consultation on SEN and disability issues was related to three main aspects of the EYFS: its universality and applicability for children with special educational needs and disabled children; the progress check at age two; and the EYFSP assessment. Other sections of this document highlight feedback on the EYFSP categories for assessment and how we are responding to ensure the overall assessment format is relevant for children with SEN (see page 18). This section responds to other issues raised in relation to provision for this group of children.
46. Respondents to the SEN questions suggested that further information and guidance is needed on how children with SEN are assessed against the individual early learning goals. We will ensure that the guidance to support teacher judgements for the EYFSP will make reference to reasonable adjustments to the

assessment process for children with SEN as appropriate, for example showing how children can be assessed against the ELGs through non-verbal communication, including gesture, signing, body movement and the use of communication aids. We will develop this guidance with the help of relevant experts.

47. Practitioners working with children with special educational needs and disabled children agreed that the proposed progress check at age two would be very useful in helping to identify needs early. Parents of children with a special educational need and disabled children suggested that this check should lead to case conferences for more complex needs, including the presence of those with specialist knowledge of the child's condition. They felt that the key person should be the lead person for the check for children with complex needs.
48. The SEN and Disability Green Paper "*Support and Aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability*" proposed improvements to the quality of early identification and intervention for children from birth to age 25. This includes radical reform to the statutory assessment system and the introduction of a single plan for supporting children with more complex needs. The aim is to use the highly successful early support approach in the new assessment process, to place families at the heart of assessment and develop a package of support that works for them. The reforms will bring together education, health and social care services to develop a single plan for each child. The plan will be clear about who is responsible for which services, and will include a commitment from all parties across education, health and social care to provide those services.
49. This proposal was welcomed by most respondents to the SEN Green Paper consultation. 20 pathfinders covering 31 local authorities, and their Primary Care Trust partner areas, will be testing out key proposed reforms. This work will include looking at the best ways in which the single plan can support children with SEN and disabled children. A number of the pathfinders are focusing on early age groups of disabled children and those with SEN. We will look at how the SEN single assessment process and the progress check at two can best be brought together.
50. The Government will publish a next steps document following up the Green Paper shortly.
51. The Government's recent announcement of the Early Language Development Training for practitioners working with children up to five years old, will focus on improving communication and language skills for children in the foundation years, particularly those with SEN. The programme will help the most disadvantaged children with a special focus on under threes who are at risk of language delay. It will provide early language expertise network support for parents and family support workers.
52. The introduction to the revised EYFS will make clear that the framework is for all children, regardless of their level of development or whether they have a special educational need or a disability. And the requirement to make reasonable adjustments to support the needs of children with special educational needs and disabled children will remain.

Section 3: Safeguarding and welfare

53. The Government wants to ensure that the environment in which early education and childcare is provided helps children thrive. The safeguarding and welfare requirements support providers to keep children safe and promote positive relationships. They are largely unchanged from the current EYFS requirements, reflecting the Tickell review feedback that there continues to be broad agreement that they cover the right issues appropriately. Some improvements have been made, reflecting Dame Clare Tickell's advice that requirements in relation to child protection training could be clearer and to reduce unnecessary burdens linked to paperwork for risk assessments.

Overall requirements

Q20 Do you agree that the safeguarding and welfare requirements are set out clearly and cover the right areas? Please explain.

There were 1986 responses to this question.

1504 (76%) Yes 331 (17%) No 151 (7%) Not Sure

54. Over three quarters of respondents to the online consultation agreed that the safeguarding and welfare requirements were set out clearly in the revised draft EYFS framework and this was reinforced in feedback from workshops. Reflecting the very positive feedback overall on this section we do not intend to make major changes to the framework provisions on which we consulted (although some small amendments will be made, as detailed in this section).

Training

55. Early years staff have an important role to play in safeguarding and promoting children's welfare. Their ability to recognise and respond appropriately to signs of abuse is critical to safeguarding children. In light of some recent Serious Incident Reviews, the Government is keen to respond positively to strengthen training arrangements without increasing burdens on providers unnecessarily. The new framework's clearer requirements on child protection training have been welcomed by respondents, who recognise them as useful in equipping staff better to fulfil this role.

Q21 The requirements for staff training on safeguarding now include examples of inappropriate staff behaviour which are warning signs for the possibility of child abuse (paragraph 3.9). Do you think this will better equip staff to take action to protect children where necessary? Please explain.

There were 1973 responses to this question.

1587 (81%) Yes 104 (5%) No 282 (14%) Not Sure

56. Some respondents to the online consultation suggested that the framework should define more specifically the type and frequency of training needed. The Government does not consider it appropriate to specify further the requirements of training. The framework sets clear parameters for the key issues to be covered to equip practitioners with the necessary skills and knowledge to perform their roles. Judgements on training needs and the frequency with which training is provided to individuals, are for employers to make (in group provision), reviewing the skills, experience and qualifications of their staff on an ongoing basis. Childminders must reflect on their own expertise and further development needs and pursue training as appropriate. Reflecting strong support for existing provisions in this area, we intend to retain the policy as expressed in the draft framework.

Supervision

57. Dame Clare Tickell recognised that strong supervisory practice in a setting provides the safe environment practitioners need to deal effectively with difficult situations and to support their continuing professional development. The proposed new provisions on supervision in the EYFS identify the key things discussions should cover, which are in line with the '*Working Together to Safeguard Children*' advice.

Q22 Do you think that the requirement for staff supervision (paragraph 3.19) would help leaders and managers support their staff and keep children safe from harm? Please explain.

There were 1982 responses to this question.

1423 (72%) Yes 90 (5%) No 469 (24%) Not Sure

58. Again there was very strong support for this aspect of the safeguarding requirements. Some respondents highlighted that supervision was part of good management practice already in many settings. Some suggested it would be important that those offering supervision had undertaken appropriate training. The framework makes it clear that providers have a responsibility to ensure that staff are properly trained and qualified to fulfil their responsibilities effectively, this includes any supervisory responsibility.

Ratios (age)

59. The more time that staff spend working directly with children, the better the quality of interaction and the overall learning experience for children. The ratios in the EYFS reflect both quality and safety considerations.

Q23 The current EYFS sets a lower age limit of 17 for people looking after children unsupervised whilst the General Childcare Register (GCR) for those looking after older children sets a minimum age of 18. We think that it is important that our youngest children should be looked after by responsible adults. We therefore propose that only those over the age of 18 should be counted in ratios for both the EYFS and the General Childcare Register. Do you agree that we should raise the age limit in the EYFS?

There were 2081 responses to this question.

1771 (85%) Yes 125 (6%) No 185 (9%) Not Sure

60. A high number of respondents to the online consultation thought the age limit for looking after children unsupervised should be increased to 18. Some suggested that the suitability of a person to work with young children was not dependent on age, but on the maturity and capability of the individual, and should be for managers to decide. A small proportion of respondents felt the change might create financial difficulties for settings reliant on 17 year olds. Sector organisations and their members expressed concern that the age limit might discourage providers from taking on apprentices.

61. The Government has noted the strong support expressed for this proposal (to raise the age at which staff count in ratios and can work unsupervised from 17 to 18), but considers that the concerns raised about possible burdens on providers are also important and should be considered carefully. In light of this, and ongoing wider work to review the General Childcare Register, as well as the review of qualifications being led by Professor Nutbrown, we want to reflect further on this proposal with sector representatives.

Childminder training

62. We consider that it is important that those seeking to be registered as childminders should have completed relevant training on the EYFS to increase their effectiveness and impact in supporting children when they start practising.

Q24 Childminders have previously been allowed six months to complete their training after registration. This means that they can look after children without having been trained in the EYFS. Do you agree that childminders should be trained to understand fully the requirements of the EYFS before they can register and look after children? Please explain.

There were 1992 responses to this question.

1515 (76%) Yes 276 (14%) No 201 (10%) Not Sure

63. Over three quarters of respondents to the online consultation agreed that childminders should be trained fully before looking after children (with around three quarters of childminders who responded supporting the proposal). In workshops, the proposition was supported by nursery practitioners and childminders. In line with strong support for this consultation proposition, we will implement this proposal for September 2012.

Risk assessments

64. It remains critical for providers to assess the risks children are exposed to as part of effective safeguarding policy. Changes we have proposed for the new framework respond directly to Tickell's recommendation that we could remove the requirement to have a written risk assessment for outings undertaken by settings. The new provision asks providers and practitioners to make professional judgements about outings, guided by a clear overarching provider policy about how to assess and manage risks. This balances the need to protect children with reducing unnecessary burdens for practitioners.

Q25a Paragraphs 3.54 and 3.64 explain the requirements for risk assessments by settings. Do you think the explanation is clear? Please explain.

There were 1977 responses to this question.

1283 (65%) Yes 467 (24%) No 227 (11%) Not Sure

Q25b Do you think this would help providers keep children safe without completing unnecessary paperwork? Please explain.

There were 1934 responses to this question.

1135 (59%) Yes 328 (17%) No 471 (24%) Not Sure

65. The majority of respondents to the online consultation welcomed the provisions made in the framework. Most respondents thought that the proposals would help providers keep children safe without completing unnecessary paperwork. Some were concerned that not requiring written assessments for every repeat outing

could mean children were exposed to unreasonable risks if it meant that risks were not properly reviewed. The framework is clear that providers must review relevant risks to children in their care. The change being made is that a written assessment is not **required** for outings with children, reflecting the Tickell finding that the production of such assessments in writing had become unduly burdensome for practitioners. Providers must still assess risks, and will sometimes want to prepare a written risk assessment, but this is for them to judge. We recognise that the example we offered in the revised EYFS of a risk assessment not being necessary for repeat outings risked being inconsistent with the overarching provision. For repeat outings, as for any other, providers must of course judge whether a written risk assessment is needed. We will therefore remove this example from the framework. Some respondents were concerned about Ofsted's expectations during inspection. Ofsted will ensure that the revised inspection schedule, and inspector training to support the new EYFS, properly reflect the EYFS reforms.

Other issues

66. Respondents had the opportunity to comment on any other issues in the safeguarding and welfare requirements.

Q26 Do you have any further comments on the safeguarding and welfare requirements?

There were 1875 responses to this question.

714 (38%) Yes 1117 (60%) No 44 (2%) Not Sure

67. Respondents made specific suggestions on some issues, including:

- that it was unhelpful to have a caveat in the revised draft framework suggesting that 'poor weather conditions' meant that the requirements that children have daily outdoor play opportunities might not need to be followed. They argued that poor weather should not be a deterrent to children being outside, as long as they were appropriately clothed. In workshops parents welcomed that children played outside in the EYFS and wanted that to stay. We propose to remove 'poor weather conditions' from the draft framework, to ensure that the importance of outdoor play is absolutely clear.
- Guidance was requested on administering non-prescription medicines and what this would reasonably include (e.g. Calpol, teething gel). The Department (*Managing Medicines in Schools and Early Years Settings*) already provides non-statutory guidance on this issue. We consider that providers should continue to discuss with parents how the guidance can support the needs of children in their care. The EYFS will not provide statutory guidance on this issue.

68. Some respondents to the online consultation expressed concerns about the 1:30 ratio in Reception year. In tandem with the EYFS consultation, we looked into

Reception class ratios and the role of support staff (in line with Tickell's recommendation on this). Our work showed that the average teacher:child ratio is currently about 1:26. When support staff are included, the adult:child ratio is about 1:15. This means that Reception classes are already better staffed than the legal requirements demand. We therefore do not propose to change the existing requirement which is that there should be no more than 30 children to one teacher, but will continue to monitor adult:child ratios. In due course we will reflect on the outcome of the Nutbrown review (which is looking at the qualifications and roles of staff across the early years, including support staff in Reception classes) to consider any relevant findings.

Role of Ofsted

69. Ofsted inspection assesses how well providers meet the standards of the EYFS and publishes inspection reports on its website. If providers breach any of the welfare requirements Ofsted can issue a Welfare Requirements Notice. If providers do not comply with the Welfare Requirements Notice by the date specified, then Ofsted can cancel the provider's registration and prosecute as they judge appropriate. There are some breaches of requirements which can lead to immediate prosecution without a Welfare Notice first being issued. In consultation the Government asked whether the system for handling breaches of requirements could be simplified and invited views on whether any of these requirements could be appropriately dealt with in other ways.

Q27 Do you think that we should remove the automatic offence from any of the welfare requirements? If so please specify which ones need not carry an automatic offence. Please explain.

There were 1760 responses to this question.

193 (11%) Yes 1016 (58%) No 551 (31%) Not Sure

70. The majority of respondents disagreed with the proposal to remove the automatic offence from any of the welfare requirements. Many stressed that the requirements had been put in place to ensure the welfare and safety of children, and, as such, should be left as they were. Only a very small number of respondents made specific suggestions about requirements that need not carry an offence. The majority of those that commented (but fewer than 10% of the total respondents), suggested that a failure to report food poisoning to Ofsted need not carry an offence. A small number of respondents suggested that informing Ofsted of changes such as hours, addresses, charity number, could be an administrative oversight and did not necessarily constitute a risk to the welfare of children. Given that the consultation feedback argues strongly against removing them, we intend to retain the automatic offences for the new framework.

Learning and Development – powers to secure improvements

71. In consultation we also asked whether we should seek to strengthen Ofsted's powers to secure improvements in learning and development, perhaps bringing the tools at their disposal more closely in line with those available for enforcement of welfare provisions.

Q28 The Government would also welcome views whether Ofsted's powers are sufficient in the area of learning and development. Should the Government introduce a system similar to Welfare Notices for breaches of the learning and development requirements?

There were 1864 responses to this question.

564 (30%) Yes 723 (39%) No 577 (31%) Not Sure

72. There was no clear consensus of opinion on this issue, although more respondents disagreed with introducing a system similar to Welfare Notices for breaches of the learning and development requirements than were in favour. Those who supported the proposal felt that settings should be as accountable for providing quality learning and development as they were for a child's welfare. Introducing notices was envisaged as encouraging providers to place greater value on learning along with ensuring rigour and driving up standards across the early years sector. Where respondents disagreed with the proposal they largely felt that the arrangements already in place were sufficient. Some suggested that the emphasis should be on supporting settings which were failing to comply, to help them improve, rather than introducing punitive measures.

73. Given the mixed feedback on this proposal in consultation, and the need for primary legislation to deliver a learning and development notice power akin to that which exists for Welfare Notices, we will consider this issue in the longer term. More immediately we will look at opportunities to make fuller use of existing levers to drive improvements in quality, such as Ofsted recommendations in inspection reports and other communications with providers.

Section 4: Other Issues

Partnership with parents

Q31 Do you think that the revised draft EYFS would support effective partnership working with parents and carers, enhancing their involvement in children's' learning and development? Please explain.

There were 1977 responses to this question.

812 (41%) Yes 635 (32%) No 530 (27%) Not Sure

74. Views were mixed on the question of whether the revised draft EYFS would support effective partnership working with parents and carers and enhance their involvement in their child's learning and development. Respondents who answered positively felt that the simpler nature of the new EYFS would help practitioners explain it to parents. The progress check at age two was seen as a useful vehicle to help practitioners engage with parents about their child's development. The parent-friendly EYFS summary (that we will be producing) was an opportunity to highlight information from the EYFS which parents would find useful. We hope practitioners will find it a helpful tool in meeting the requirement to share information with parents about the EYFS and how it supports their child's learning.
75. Where respondents disagreed or were unsure the revised EYFS would support partnership arrangements with parents/carers, they generally considered that the current EYFS provided adequate guidance and that the revisions did not mean significant changes. Training was suggested as a means of raising awareness, amongst the early years workforce of effective strategies for engaging parents.
76. Local authorities retain a responsibility to provide training to support implementation of the EYFS. We are working with our partners to explore opportunities to support practitioners to improve practice in working with parents through guidance and/or training. This includes working with 4Children to identify examples of good practice to be made available on the Families in the Foundation Years website.
77. The Department's wider efforts to support partnership between practitioners and parents to support children's learning, include making clear in our specification to potential providers of the Parenting Classes trials, that classes should cover the relevance of play, exploration and learning to children's development; and help parents provide the best support for their child and to stimulate their children's learning and play (as appropriate to their age/stage of development). The Department for Education is working with the Department of Health on options for developing a Digital Advice Service that would support parents on a wide range of issues, including encouraging parents to get more involved in their children's learning.

Presentation

78. Dame Clare Tickell's recommendations for a reformed EYFS aimed to ensure that it was an improved tool for practitioners, is clear to read and straightforward to use and follow. In consultation we asked a number of questions about the overall presentation of the EYFS framework, its clarity and the issues covered.

The Introduction

Q1 Is the introduction to the revised draft EYFS, and the explanation of its principles, clear? If not, what changes would you suggest?

There were 2130 responses to this question.

1276 (60%) Yes 698 (33%) No 156 (7%) Not Sure

79. The majority of respondents to the online consultation agreed that the introduction to the EYFS was clear. Around a third of respondents were concerned by the term 'school readiness' which they believed compromised the assertion that the EYFS is an important phase in its own right rather than being preparation for school. This was echoed in workshops. Online respondents who felt more positively about the concept of 'school readiness' suggested that the definition could be clearer, including to reflect that children join school in Reception class when the EYFS is the required curriculum.

80. Many respondents thought that the more concise nature of the framework meant that supplementary practice guidance was needed. Most respondents advised against shortening the EYFS framework further. The introduction to this document responds on the points raised on 'school readiness'. It also confirms that supplementary guidance will be produced. The Department is working with the sector to ensure practitioners have the materials they need to implement the EYFS with confidence.

Ease of navigation

Q29 Overall, do you think that the revised draft EYFS is clear and easy to navigate? Please explain.

There were 2033 responses to this question.

1160 (57%) Yes 555 (27%) No 318 (16%) Not Sure

81. The majority agreed that the revised draft EYFS framework was clear and easy to navigate. Respondents noted that the slimmed down version was more manageable and easier to follow. The simplicity of language used and the layout were also found to be more user-friendly.

82. Whilst a more concise framework was found to be helpful overall, respondents felt that the reduced detail might be problematic for some users, particularly less experienced staff. We hope that the commitments made in the introduction to this document regarding the provision of supplementary practice materials offer some reassurance on this.

Q30 Do you think the Government should make any further revisions to the EYFS, to simplify and shorten it further? Please explain

There were 1953 responses to this question.

519 (26%) Yes 1166 (60%) No 268 (14%) Not Sure

83. The majority of respondents did not want any further revision of the EYFS.

84. Some were concerned that the EYFS had been slimmed down too much (as noted above) and believed that further revision would have a negative effect on the quality of the document. Respondents suggested that the EYFS needed to be expanded with additional material. Supplementary materials will be provided as set out in this document.

Q32 Please use this space for any other comments on the proposals.

There were 968 responses to this question.

85. A number of respondents used this opportunity to welcome the proposals for a new EYFS. They considered the slimmed down version to be easier to navigate, more user-friendly and welcomed that it was less prescriptive. Respondents also welcomed the reduction in paperwork, that there are fewer early learning goals and less burdensome paperwork requirements. Other comments were mostly focused on:

- additional guidance for the birth to two age range;
- the document's focus on 'school readiness';
- a call for greater emphasis on play;
- whether qualification requirements could be strengthened further to improve the quality of provision and the professionalism of the early years sector.

86. The majority of the issues raised in response to this final question have been addressed in previous sections of this report. Qualifications of the early years workforce will be considered in the Nutbrown review that will report in June 2012.

Exemptions

87. The draft revised Framework issued for consultation confirmed existing arrangements for exemptions from the requirements of the EYFS. Taking forward the Tickell review recommendations, the Government is working with relevant partners to explore the possibility of exemptions for high quality independent schools, simplifying the process for Steiner schools in particular, and the process overall. We will consult key stakeholders on policy proposals and draft regulations in due course.

Annex A

Workshops and meetings managed by the DfE and the Early Years and Childcare Strategic Partnership – 4Children during the consultation period

Date	Event
12 July	4Children seminar (London)
13 July	4Children seminar (Birmingham)
14 July	Primary Heads Reference Group meeting
14 July	Meeting with Not Just Talking
18 July	Meeting with communication champion
19 July	Co Production Foundation Years Event
27 July	4Children workshop for parents/carers (Essex)
28 July	4Children workshop for VCS, providers and LAs (London)
03 August	Meeting with Childcare Consultancy
08 August	Meeting with Early Education
09 August	Meeting with Daycare Trust
18 August	Meeting with Pre-school Learning Alliance
23 August	Meeting with 4Children
25 August	Meeting with Early Excellence
31 August	Meeting with National Childminding Association (NCMA)
08 September	Meeting with National Day Nurseries Association (NDNA)
09 September	Meeting between South East Local Authorities Leads
10 September	Childminder workshop (London)
12 September	Meeting with Design and Technology Association
14 September	NDNA consultation event (Leeds)
15 September	NDNA consultation event (London)
15 September	Two workshops with primary teachers
20 September	DfE workshop with practitioners to discuss the two year progress check
20 September	4Children workshop for parents/carers (Wiltshire)
21 September	Two DfE workshops with parents and practitioners to discuss the two year old progress check
21 September	NDNA consultation workshop (Huddersfield)
22 September	DfE workshop with practitioners to discuss the two year old progress check
23 September	4Children workshop for parents/carers (Gateshead)
26 September	4Children workshop for parents/carers (Knowsley)
28 September	4Children workshop for VCS, providers and LAs (York)
05 October	Visit to Perry Hall Primary School
07 October	Meeting with Black Voices Network
07 October	Meeting with TACTYC
21 October	Two SEN workshops with parents and practitioners
w/c 24 October	Telephone interviews with three childminders of children with SEN

Annex B

This list only includes those organisations where the respondent indicated that they were replying on behalf of the organisation (rather than as an individual)

Organisation

11

1st Safari Day Nurseries Ltd

326 Club

4Children

Abacus Pre-School

ABC Childcare (Ipswich) Ltd

Absolute Angels Montessori Nursery

Acacia Playgroup

Acorn Montessori Nursery

Acorns Nurseries

Acorns Playgroup

Acres of Fun Ltd

Action for Children

Action in Rural Sussex

Action with Communities in Rural England

Activ8 Learning

Afasic England

Alder Bridge School

Alderley Day Nursery

Aldwickbury Prep-School

Alexandra Nursery School

All Saints Pre-School Playgroup

Alne Play Group

Alresford Youth Association

Alton Infant School

Ambitious About Autism

Anlaby Park Methodist Pre-School

Anne Frank Montessori

Appletree Childcare

Archway Children's Centre

Ark, The

Organisation

Arnhem Wharf Primary School
Artisans Kindergarten
Arts Council of England
Ashcombe School
Aspect
Association for Achievement and Improvement through Assessment
Association for the Prof. Development of Early Years Educators, The
Association for Science Education
Association of Educational Psychologists
Association of Teachers and Lecturers
Attlebridge Montessori Nursery School
Aughton Early Years Centre
Auntie Ruth's Childminding
Aylward Primary School
Baby Room Project, The
Banister Infant and Nursery School
Barbados Playgroup Ltd
Barnaby Bright Nursery
Barnes Montessori Nursery
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Barracudas
Basnett Street Nursery School
Bath and North East Somerset Council
Bay Childminding Network (North Lancashire)
Bexhill and Battle Under Fives Association
Beatbullying
Beckenham Montessori Pre-School
Bedford Borough Council
Bedgrove Infant School and Nursery
Bedworth Heath Nursery and Children's Centre
Beechtree Steiner Initiative Leeds
Beechwood Park School
Ben Rhydding Pre-School Playgroup
Bents Green Pre-School

Organisation

Berkeley Playgroup
Beverly Manor Nursery School
Birmingham City Council
Birth to Five Service
Bishop Harland C of E Primary
Blackpool Council
Blyth Central Children's Centre
Bo Peep Day Nursery
Board of Deputies of British Jews
Bobbins Childcare and Education Centre
Bognor Regis Nursery School and Children's Centre
Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council
Bonbons Day Nursery
Booker Park Community Special School
Boundary Primary School
Bournemouth Montessori Centre
Brackenhill School
Bracknell-Forest Council
Bradford Academy
Bradford Christian School
Bradford Council
Bradford Early Years
Bradford Early Years, Childcare and Play
Bradford Local Authority
Bradford Metropolitan District Council
Bramble Hedge Pre-School
Brambles Community Pre-School
Brambles Nursery, The
Bramcote Hills Primary School
Brent Early Years Quality Improvement Team
Briar Rose Kindergarten Greenwich Steiner School
Brickhill Baptist Playgroup
Bridge Schools Inspectorate
Bright Horizons Family Solutions

Organisation

Bright Learners Montessori School
Brighton and Hove County Council
Brighton Steiner School
Brightstars Pre-School
Bright Start Pre-School
Brimpton House Nursery
Bristol City Council
British Heart Foundation
British Heart Foundation National Centre for Physical Activity/Health
British Psychological Society
Broadway Infant School
Bromley Methodist Church Pre-School
Brown Bear Childcare
Burbage Day Nursery
Burgoyne Pre-School
Burham Pre-School
Burscough Methodist Playgroup
Burton Pidsea Primary School
Bury and Whitefield Jewish Primary School
Bury Local Authority, Children/Extended Services Early Years Team
Busy Bee Pre-School
Busy Bees @LPs
Busy Bees Nursery Group
Buttercup Barn Day Nursery
Butterflies Montessori School
Cabin Childcare Centres, The
Calder Valley Steiner School
Calderdale Local Authority
Calmore Pre-School
Camborne Nursery School
Cambridge Steiner School
Cambridgeshire County Council
Camden Local Authority
Canterbury Steiner School

Organisation

Castle Batch Primary School
Catkins Pre-School
Cator Park Montessori Pre-School
Cayley Primary School
Central Bedfordshire Council
Chailey Heritage School
Charterhouse Pre-School
Chase Lane Primary School
Chatterboxes Pre-School
Cherry Hill Primary School
Cherry Tree Kindergarten, Greenwich Steiner School
Cherry Trees Nursery School
Cherrytree Nursery School Ltd
Cherubs Montessori Day Nursery
Cheshire East
Cheshire West and Chester Council
Children Of One End Street, The
Child Accident Prevention Trust
Childbase Nurseries
Childcare Consultancy
Childcare Corporation, The
Childcare Training and Assessment Centre
Childhaven Community Nursery School
Childminding Matters
Children and Young Peoples Services
Children Making A Change
Children's Corner Private Day Nursery
Children's Garden Day Nursery and Montessori Pre-School
Childrens House Montessori Nursery School, The
Children's Mathematics Network
Children's Services Dudley Metropolitan Council
Children's Therapy Service
Childspace
Chiltern College, The

Organisation

Chives Montessori School
Christchurch Nursery School
Cippenham Nursery School
Clapham Pre-School (Bedford)
Clevedon Montessori School
Close Nursery School, The
College of Occupational Therapists
Columbia Primary School
Combe Grove Manor Day Nursery
Communication Council, The
Communication Trust
Community and Children's Services, City of London
Community Arts Network Community Integrated Care
Consortium of Early Years Practitioners
Corrie Primary School
Cottages Day Nursery, The
Council for Learning Outside the Classroom
Coventry City Council
Coventry Local Authority, Educational Psychology Service
Crockerne C of E Primary School
Cuckoo Hall Academies Trust
Cuddle Club Day Nursery
Cullingworth Pre-School
Cultural Learning Alliance, Youth Music National EY Roundtable, The
Culverdene Day Nursery
Cumbria County Council
Cut and Paste Childcare
Daisyfield Childrens Centre
Dalestorth Primary School
Darlington Borough Council
Darlington Local Education Authority
Dawn to Dusk Day Nursery
Daycare Trust
Derby City Local Authority

Organisation

Derby High School
Derby Montessori School
Derbyshire Community Health Services
Derbyshire County Council Childcare Improvement Service
Derbyshire Local Authority
Design and Technology Association, The
Desmond Anderson School Nursery
Devon Child Minding Association
Devon Learning and Development Partnership
Dial Park Primary School
Dobwalls Nursery and Fun Club
Doncaster Early Years Professional Network
Doncaster Local Authority
Douglas Valley Nursery School and Children's Centre
Downs Barn School
Driffield C of E Infant School
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council
Dulwich Wood Nursery school and Children's Centre
Earlham Early Years Centre
Early Childhood Education Group (ECEG)
Early Childhood Forum
Early Education
Early Years/Childcare Consultants Team, Telford/Wrekin Council)
Early Years
Early Years and Childcare Service Suffolk County Council
Early Years Equality
Early Years Foundation Stage Team, Islington Children's Centre
Earlyarts
Easington Lane Primary School - Foundation Unit
East Community Pre-School
East Street Children's Centre
East Sussex County Council
East Tilbury Infant School and Nursery
Eastwood Nursery School Centre for Children and Families

Organisation

Eden Montessori Nursery
Edison Learning
Edith Rose Nurseries Ltd
Educare for Early Years Ltd
Elmfield Rudolf Steiner School
Elmtree School and Nursery
Ely Nursery
Emerson Valley Playgroup
Epping Montessori Nursery
Essex County Council
Ethnic Minority Achievement Service
Eureka Nursery
Everton Nursery School and Family Centre
Every Disabled Child Matters, Council for Disabled Children
Exeter Steiner School
Eythorne Elvington Primary School
Fairfield School
Family Action
Farnham Montessori School
Federation of Thomas Wall Nursery/Robin Hood Infants School
Fern Hill Primary School
Field Lane Children's Centre
First Steps Bath
Flax Bourton Primary School
For Under 5's Ltd
Fosse Neighbourhood Centre
Foundation Stage Leader
Freshfield Nursery School
Frogmore Montessori Nursery/Plympton Montessori Nurseries
Finchley Reform Synagogue Kindergarten
Garden Primary School
Garden Room Montessori Nursery
Garfield Primary School and Childrens Centre
Gloucestershire City Council, Early Years

Organisation

Gloucestershire County Council
Grace's Day Nursery
Grade Ruan Under 5s
Grantham Farm Montessori School
Great Coates Village Nursery School
Greenacre Pre-School
Greenwich Steiner School
Greetland Private Day Nursery
Greystones Pre-School
Guildford Day Nursery
Guildford Grove Primary School
Hadley Wood Pre-School and Playgroup
Halton Borough Council
Ham Drive Nursery School
Hammersmith and Fulham Council, Early Years Foundations Service
Hampton Wick Infant and Nursery School
Hampshire County Council
Hannah More Infant School
Happy Days Nurseries
Happy Hours Pre-School
Harcourt Pre-School
Harrogate Hill Primary School
Hartlepool Local Authority
Hazelwood Nursery and Schools Out Club/Planet Vibe)
Heaton Children's Services
Heckington Pre-School
Hedon Nursery School
Henlow Village Pre-School
Hextable Kindergarten
Hiawatha Montessori School
Hickory House
High Down Infant School
Highbury Community Nursery
Highfield Children's Centre

Organisation

Highlands Park Pre-School
Highwood Nursery
Hillcrest Montessori Nursery School
Hillingdon Local Borough Council
Hillmead Primary School
Hilltop Pre-School
Holly Grange Montessori Nurseries Limited
Holly Lodge Montessori Nursery
Holy Family Playgroup
Homerton Children's Centre
Honey Bears Day Nursery Ltd
Honeybeez Childcare
Honeysuckle Nursery School
Horsham Montessori and Southwater Montessori
Hull City Council
Hungerford Nursery School Centre for Children and Families
Hutton Primary School
Hyde Pre-School
I CAN
i2ie Childminding
Independent Association of Preparatory Schools
Ilkley Pre-School
Immanuel Pre-School
Independent Day Nursery
Independent Schools Council
Independent Schools Inspectorate
Ingfield Manor School
Innovations Children's Centre
Institute for Effective Education
Iona School Kindergarten
Iver Heath Infant and Nursery
Janet Genter Community Nursery
Jesmond Nursery, The
Jumping Beans Village Pre-School

Organisation

Just Learning
Kapers Nursery
Kegworth Primary School
Kendal Nursery School
Kennford Playbox
Kent County Council
Kernow Early Years
Kiddi-creche, The School House
Kidmore End Pre-School
Kids at Worthing Nursery
KIDS Charity
Kidsland Ltd
Kidsunlimited
Killinghall and District Playgroup and Pre-School
King Edward's School
Kingfisher Nursery
Kingfishers Playgroup
King's Oak Primary School
Kingston Kindergarten
Kirkby East Children's Centre
Kirkgate Pre-School
Kirklees Early Learning and Childcare Services
Knebworth Pre-School
Knowsley Borough Council
KOOSA Kids Ltd
L.U.C.A. Ladybirds Playschool
Laburnum Lower School
Lake Street Community Playgroup
Lancashire County Council
Langford Nursery
Langtons Infant School
Lanterns Nursery and Children's Centre
Laurel Way Playgroup
Leaden Hall School

Organisation

Leaps and Bounds Nursery
Learning Support Service
Learning through Landscapes
Learning Trust, The
Leatherhead Trinity School and Children's Centre
L'Ecole des Petits and L'Ecole de Battersea
Leeds City Council, Early Years Service
Leicester City Council
Leicestershire County Council
Ley Top Primary School
Lidget Green Primary School
Lincolnshire Montessori
Linden Bridge School
Linden Lea Group
Linden Primary School
Links Children's Centre (Services for Young Children)
Little Acorns Day Nursery
Little Acorns Montessori Nursery
Little Angels Nursery
Little Bears Day Nursery
Little Cakes Montessori School
Little Cherubs Nursery
Little Ducklings Childminding/Shobdon Arches Pre-School
Little Explorers
Little Mead Primary School
Little Montessorians Pre-School
Little Owls Pre-School
Little Poppets Nursery School
Little Stars Day Nursery
Little Sunshines Pre-School
Littlesteps Pre-School
Littleview Day Nursery
Locking Stumps Pre-School
Loders Primary School

Organisation

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
London Borough of Barnet
London Borough of Bromley, Early Years Teams
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Havering
London Borough of Hounslow
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Merton
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Sutton
London Early Years Foundation
Longhoughton First School
Lotus Montessori Childcare
Lune Park Children's Centre
Luton Borough Council
Luton Local Education Authority
Lydalls Nursery School
MA Education Ltd
Maidenhead Nursery School
Malton Montessori School
Manor Primary School
Manorbrook School
Maria Montessori School
Marlow Montessori School
Mary Elton School
Maulden Pre-School
Meadowbrook Montessori School
Meadowcroft Infants
Mencap
Merrydays Montessori Nursery School
Meynell Games Group
Michael Hall School
Milkshake Montessori Nursery School

Organisation

Milton Primary School
Miltonhall Montessori Nursery School
Minehead First School Playgroup
Mini Mariners Nursery
Miss Polly's Kindergarten
Moat House Children's Centre
Monkton Pre-Prep School
Monkton Wyld Court Kindergarten
Montessori at Brook Green, The
Montessori Centre International
Montessori House
Montessori Nursery School, The
Montessori Pre-Prep School
Montessori Schools Association
Moorfield School
Morelands Primary School
Mucky Pups Childcare Ltd
Mulberry Bush Day Nurseries Ltd, The
Mundesley Infants
Music House for Children
Myrtle Tree Montessori
Nagila Pre-School
Nat. Assoc. for Language Development in Curriculum/Reading University
Nasen
National Association for Primary Education
National Association of Head Teachers
National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers
National Campaign for Real Nursery Education
National Childbirth Trust
National Childminding Association
National Children's Bureau
National Day Nurseries Association
National Drama
National Education Trust

Organisation

National Literacy Trust
National Portage Association
National Union of Teachers
NC London NHS/Cambridge Education
Netherthong Playgroup
New River Green Children's Centre
Newick House
Nightingales Day Nursery
Nippers Children's Day Nursery Lancaster
Nippers Children's Day Nursery
Nippers Nursery Westgate
Noah's Ark Pre-school
Norfolk Early Years
Norfolk Lodge Montessori Nursery
North Cheshire Jewish Nursery
North East Lincolnshire Council
North Lincolnshire Local Authority
North London Rudolf Steiner School
North Somerset Council
North Tyneside Council
North Yorkshire County Council
Northamptonshire Childminding Association
Northamptonshire County Council
Northleaze C of E Primary School
Northumberland County Council
Northwood Primary School
Norwich Steiner School
Nottingham County Council
Nottingham Trent University
Nutkin Nursery - Day Care
Oaklea Montessori Children in Care
Oaks, Quedgeley and The Beacon Children's Centre, The
Ofsted
Oldham Borough Council

Organisation

Oldham Local Authority
OMEP UK (World Organisation for Early Childhood Education)
Open EYE Campaign for Early Years Education
Orchard House School
Ormesby Primary School
Orsett Playgroup
Oughtibridge Primary School
Oughton Primary and Nursery School
Our Lady's Catholic Primary School
Out of School Alliance
Overdale Pre-School
Owl Pre-School
Oxclose Nursery
Oxenhope Pre-School
Oxfordshire County Council
Paediatric Continence Forum, The
Paignton and Brixham Children's Centre
Paint Pots Pre-School and Nursery
Paradise Park Children's Centre
Parenting UK
Patchwork Private Nursery
Pavilion Montessori School, The
Paws Community Nursery School
Peasedown St John Primary School
Pennywell Early Years Centre
Persona Doll Training
Peter Pan Nursery School
Peter Pan Playgroup/Farnborough College of Technology
Phoenix Montessori Nursery
Pied Piper Pre-School
Pippins
Pippins Childcare and Education Centre
Pippins Children's Nursery
Pitstop Playschool

Organisation

Pixies Tree Day Nursery
Play England
Play Station Nursery
Playgroup Network
Playtime Day Nurseries
Playwise Ltd
Playwork London
Plymouth City Council
Plymouth Early Years Service
Pool Pre-School Group
Poplars Nursery School Ltd, The
Powells C of E Primary School
Pre-School Learning Alliance
Pudsey Lowtown Primary School
Puffins of Exeter Ltd
Purston Infant School
PVI - Young Explorers Childcare
Quaggy Development Trust
Queen Mary's School
Rachel McMillan Nursery School and Children's Centre
Racing Start
Rainbow Centre (Marham), The
Rainbow Pre-School
Rainbow Private Day Nursery
Rebecca's Day Nursery
Rectory Garden Montessori School
Red House School
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council
Redwell Infant School
Reeth and Gunnerside Confederated Primary
Repton Pre-School
Research Centre for Therapeutic Education, University of Roehampton
Ringwood Waldorf School
Rising Star Montessori Nursery School

Organisation

Rising Stars Children's Centre
River Mole Pre-School
Riverside Children's Centre
Rochdale Local Authority
Rocking Horse Day Nursery
Rooftops Montessori Nursery School
Rosary Catholic Primary School, The
Rosemary Early Years Centre
Rosewood Montessori Nursery School
Rotherham Local Authority
Roundabout Nursery
Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter
Royal Borough of Kingston
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health
Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Royal Spa Nursery School
Royston S John Baptist Primary
Royal Society for the Protection of Animals
Rudolf Steiner School, South Devon
Rugby Montessori Nursery School
Rutland County Council
Rydal Day Nursery
Ryde School with Upper Chine
Ryhope Infant School and Early Days
Salford City Council
Saltaire Primary School
Sandcastles Children's Nursery
Sandwell Adventure Play Association
Saxon Pre-School
School Food Trust
Seedlings Montessori Nursery
Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council

Organisation

Serco Inspections
Service Children's Education
Seymour House
Sheffield Out of School Network
Shropshire Council - People's Directorate
Simple Solutions for Education
Siskin Infant and Nursery School
SkillsActive
Slough Centre Nursery School
Smartstarts Day Nursery
Somerford Children's Centre (
Somerset County Council
Somerset Road Pre-School
South Gloucestershire Council
Southampton City Council
Southend-on-Sea Council, Early Years and Childhood Service
Southfields Pre-School
Southwark Council Children's Services
Southwark Primary School
Sparrows Pre-School
Special Educational Consortium
SPL Education Ltd
Springfield School
Springles Day Nursery
St Agnes Nursery School
St Albans School for Girls
St Andrew's Primary School
St Anne's C of E Primary School
St Bernadette Catholic Primary School
St Edmund's Montessori Pre-School
St Edmund's Nursery School and Children's Centre
St Georges Community Children's Project
St Helens Council
St John the Evangelist C of E Primary School

Organisation

St Joseph's School
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School
St Leonard's Primary School
St Luke's Playgroup
St Mary's Catholic Primary School
St Mary's C of E Voluntary Controlled Primary School
St Mary's Nursery
St Matthew's Montessori School
St Michael Steiner School, The
St Michael's Church Pre-School and Nursery
St. Nicholas' Chantry C of E Voluntary Controlled Primary School
St Pauls Nursery
St Paul's Pre-School
St Paul's Primary School
St Peters Elwick School
St Peter's Pre-School, Grange Park
St Philips Marsh Nursery School
St. Botolph's Nursery
St. Elizabeth's Catholic Primary School
St. Marks Church Pre-School
St. Mary's University College
St. Matthew's Infant School
Stanley School, Wirral
Starbank Primary School
Stathern Primary School
Steiner Academy Hereford
Steiner Waldorf Schools Fellowship
Stepping Stones Playgroup
Steps Community Nursery
Stockbridge Pre-School
Stockton Heath Primary School
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
Stoke Holy Cross Primary School
Streetsbrook Infant and Nursery School

Organisation

Strong Close Nursery and Children's Centre
Studham Voluntary Controlled Lower School and Pre-School
Sturry Pre-School
Suffolk County Council
Sunbeams Playgroup
Sunderland Borough Council
Sunderland Local Authority
Sunflower
Sunflower Montessori Nursery School
Sunflower Playgroup
Sunflowers Day Nursery
Sunlands Kindergarten
Sunny Days Nursery
Sunny Days Pre-School
Sunshine Morning Nursery
Sunshine Pre-School
Sure Start, Bradford
Sure Start Partnership, Swindon
Sure Start Service, Slough
Surrey County Council
Sutton Upon Derwent C of E School
Tameside Council
Tate (Art)
Telford and Wrekin Local Authority
Templegate Tiny Tots
Testwood Baptist Church Pre-School
Teynham Community Pre-School
Thomas Boughey Nursery School
Thomas Telford School
Thornton Playgroup
Thurton C of E Primary School
Tiddly Winks Nursery School
Tiny Tots Playgroup
Top of the Hill Pre-School

Organisation

Topsy Turvy Pre-School
Tots R Us Pre-School
Town Nursery, The
Toybox Nursery
Trafford Council
Training Depot Day Nursery
Treasure Children Forever Pre-School
Treasure Montessori Nursery and Playschool
Tribal Group Plc
Trinket Box Pre-School
Tweeddale Children's Centre
Unicorn School
Unite
Universities Council for the Education of Teachers
University of Portsmouth
University of Cambridge Nrich Maths Project
University of London
University of Sheffield
University of Warwick Nursery
Upper Knapp Farm Day Nursery
Victoria Park Nursery School
Victoria Park Nursery School and Children's Centre
Village Montessori Nursery School
Voice (Union for Educational Professionals)
Wakefield Methodist School
Wakefield Metropolitan District Council
Walker Day Care Nurseries Ltd
Walliscote Primary School
Wandsworth Council
Warren Childcare Centre
Warrington Borough Council
Warwickshire Local Authority, Early Years Advisory Team
Waterlily Nursery Ltd
Weelsby Primary School

Organisation

West Kidlington School
West Leigh Infant School
West Sussex County Council
Westbourne House School
Westminster City Council
Westwood Farm Community Pre-School)
Weyhill Montessori
Whitehills Nursery School
Willow Brook Primary and Nursery
Willow Tree Kindergarten
Windlesham House School
Windwhistle Primary School
Wokingham Borough Council
Wokingham Day Nursery
Woodberry Day Nursery Ltd
Woodbridge Primary School
Woodcroft Nursery School
Woodland Corner
Woodlands Day Nursery
Woodlands Primary School
Woodville Community Pre-School
Wormley C of E Primary School
Wyke Community and Children's Centre/Nursery
Wynstones School
Yellow Brick House Nursery
Yeo Moor Primary School
YMCA Training
York College Nursery
York Council, City of
York Montessori School
York Steiner School
Yorkshire Play
Youth Sport Trust
Z2K

© Crown copyright 2011

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence,
visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/>
or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.