## Children and Young People Select Committee

**Agenda**

Wednesday, 15 May 2013  
**7.30 pm**, Committee Room 1  
Civic Suite  
Lewisham Town Hall  
London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Andrew Hagger (Tel: 020 8314 9446)

### Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 April 2013</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Declarations of interest</td>
<td>7 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Young carers</td>
<td>11 - 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nursery and Childcare Review - Scoping Paper</td>
<td>23 - 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Select Committee work programme</td>
<td>77 - 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Referrals to Mayor and Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the public are welcome to attend committee meetings. However, occasionally, committees may have to consider some business in private. Copies of agendas, minutes and reports are available on request in Braille, in large print, on audio tape, on computer disk or in other languages.
Members of the committee, listed below, are summoned to attend the meeting to be held on Wednesday, 15 May 2013.

Barry Quirk, Chief Executive
Tuesday, 7 May 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor John Paschoud (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jenni Clutten (Vice-Chair)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor David Britton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Stella Jeffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Marion Nisbet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Stephen Padmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jacq Paschoud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Philip Peake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Alan Till</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Dan Whittle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Alan Hall (ex-Officio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kevin Bonavia (ex-Officio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Exon (Church Representative)</td>
<td>Church of England Southwark Diocesan Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsignor N Rothon (Church Representative)</td>
<td>Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Southwark Commission for Schools and Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Archibald (Parent Governor Representative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Saunders (Parent Governor Representative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SELECT COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 9 April 2013 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors John Paschoud (Chair), Jenni Clutton (Vice-Chair), Stella Jeffrey, Stephen Padmore, Jacq Paschoud, Alan Till, Dan Whittle, Sharon Archibald (Parent Governor Representative) and Monsignor Nick Rothon (Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Southwark Commission for Schools and Colleges)

APOLOGIES: Gail Exon, Councillors David Britton, Marion Nisbet and Philip Peake

ALSO PRESENT: Ruth Griffiths (14-19 Strategic Lead), Andrew Hagger (Scrutiny Manager), Frankie Sulke (Executive Director for Children and Young People) and Chris Threlfall (Head of Education Infrastructure)

1. Confirmation of Chair and Vice-Chair

Resolved:

The Committee confirmed the election of Cllr John Paschoud as Chair of the Committee and Cllr Jenni Clutton as Vice-Chair of the Committee

2. Minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2013

Resolved:

The Committee agreed the minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2013

3. Minutes of the joint meeting of the Children and Young People Select Committee and the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee held on 13 February 2013

3.1 Cllr John Paschoud noted that his declaration of interest at 2.3 was incorrect, as he is a member of the Sydenham and Forest Hill Youth Forum but not on the management board.

Resolved:

The Committee agreed the minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2013, subject to correcting point 2.3

4. Declarations of interest

No interests were declared

5. Select Committee work programme

5.1 Andrew Hagger, Scrutiny Manager, introduced the item and explained the outline of the draft work programme.
5.2 The Committee discussed the Young Carers item for the 15 May 2013 meeting, requesting information on:
- Raising the awareness of young caring situations, including the difficulties around this for parents and children and the potential large number of young carers who do not identify as such and get therefore receive little or no assistance.
- The support provided to young carers.
- Linkages to other organisations
- How support for the adults that young carers look after can relieve pressure on the young carer.
- The effect on the academic achievement of young carers.
- The protocol developed with schools, details of it and progress made.
- Monsignor Rothon offered to ask someone from Christ the King to attend to explain how they support Young Carers.

5.3 The Committee discussed an in-depth review looking at nursery provision, potentially looking at availability, funding and quality issues. Discussion covered the following areas:
- The framework and boundaries within which nursery provision works, including inspection of provision by Ofsted.
- New legislation and guidance from central government, such as ratios for children to child-minder and the ‘More great childcare’ paper.
- What provision is available in the borough, including the sufficiency review.
- Demographic background and profile for nursery age children to establish the supply and demand of services.
- Flexibility of the provision of nursery places.
- Recognising that there is a ‘mixed economy’ in provision, with both public and private provision, and how the local authority can influence appropriate private provision.
- The price of nursery provision, including competition and affordability

5.4 The Committee discussed receiving a scoping report at their 15 May meeting. The 1st evidence session should set out the background and key issues with a 2nd session to bring in frontline providers to share their experiences. Visits to nursery providers should also form part of the evidence taken.

5.5 The Committee discussed receiving information about DBS checks as part of the Safeguarding update item at the March 2014 meeting, including school responsibilities, the work the Lewisham Safeguarding Children Board has carried out and how safe recruitment advice is being incorporated.

5.6 The Committee also discussed moving 25th June meeting.

Resolved:

That the Committee should conduct an in-depth review looking at nursery provision and receive a scoping paper at their meeting on 15 May 2013.

The Committee agreed the draft work programme.
That the meeting of the Committee scheduled on 25 June 2013 should be moved and an alternative date arranged for either the week before or the week after.

6. Raising of Participation Age Strategy

6.1 Chris Threlfall, Head of Education Infrastructure, introduced the report and highlighted the following key issues:
- The Raising of the Participation Age is a new duty that will be phased in from now until September 2015. Many of the activities required are not new and will link into the existing strategy that works with NEETs.
- The duty is about more than just continuing in school and links in to the support that schools and colleges offer.
- Provision in Lewisham will be centred include that offered at Baseline and target vulnerable groups.
- It becomes more difficult to monitor young people and whether they are in education or training as they get older. Figures for what people are doing up to the age of 24 can be difficult to get hold of.

6.2 In response to questions, officers provided the following information:
- There is no direct link between increasing participation and increasing numbers of academies.
- Schools have a duty to provide impartial careers advice. The local authority role is to support schools on this, with monitoring and individual support in place to make sure schools are meeting consistent standards, including the IAG forum and a network of co-ordinators. At the moment, some careers advice is good, some not as good.
- Officers are mapping provision and what children achieve at KS4, with the aim of improving matching and to get a balance between academic and vocational provision (including apprenticeships).
- There are issues around Year 12 drop-outs from courses as young people find that the 2 year course they are on isn’t for them. However, getting a good placement in the first place can help prevent this, as can identifying young people who are potentially drop outs at the right time and moving them on to correct provision. Work is being done to create lower level, ‘step-up’ courses for young people and schools will be held to account for their dropout rates.
- The current curriculum turbulence may mean providers have tended towards a default setting of the tried and tested qualifications such as A-levels, which may explain the recent increase in young people studying A and AS levels.
- Schools can be too eager to encourage pupils to stay in school, though this could be due to teachers not knowing about apprenticeships and what other options there are for young people.
- There is a lot of work being carried out on NEET provision and NEET reduction. The sibling rule is often used, where if a young person becomes NEET then a family approach is taken and any siblings supported so they do not become NEET.
- The focus of participation should not be just on NEETs, there needs to be a general supply of advice so that young people know what they need to study to access later courses. Those at the top end of achievement should be encouraged to be ambitious.
• Increased knowledge of career options can help provide clarity through understanding. Young people will be inspired by knowing what they want to do and what they need to do to get there, otherwise there may not be a focus to their aspiration. Employability Days in schools include interview sessions with people from a wide range of professions and young people are encouraged to be entrepreneurial and see starting their own business as a career option.
• It is important to inspire young people and using former pupils who have succeeded is important. Lewisham has schemes such as Pupil Ambassadors and alumni which can provide this.
• The bursary fund for pupils follows national criteria set by government, with money supplied directly to schools and colleges and the local authority has no influence on this guaranteed bursary. However the discretionary bursary is decided upon using factors such as free school meal eligibility or good attendance.
• The local authority will be ready for 2015 when the full duties come into effect, although it will be challenging. An issue will be enforcement and what happens if organisations do not want to take part, for example it will be difficult to enforce with employers. Also schools need to have pupils on their roll in order to get funding so therefore a collaborative venture is challenging.
• A lot of current jobs would not count towards participating in education or training as the young person would need to be part of an accredited programme. So, for example, a young person working in the family business may not count as being in education or training, nor would someone who is working as a shop assistant in a large national retailer.
• Schools may consider opening up sixth form provision, however it can be hard to open a small sixth form as there is a lot of competition and the funding regime for sixth forms can be challenging.
• The population surge at primary school level will not affect this level of provision until 2022.
• There is employer involvement in increasing participation and CYP officers are working with Economic Development to increase apprentice numbers. There needs to be increased engagement with employers outside the borough as the reality is that most people work outside the borough. Organisations such as Christ the King Sixth Form College and Lewisham College have very good links with employers and these can be built upon. Officers are also looking to central government provision of a pre-apprenticeship scheme for those young people who may not quite be ready for a full apprenticeship, which could be ready in September.
• Any extension to provision at Drumbeat School is not linked to the raising of the participation age as they deal with very different clientele. There will be a report to Mayor and Cabinet on post-16 provision for LDD that will likely come in the autumn.
• It will take some time to develop the recognition of services to the level that Connexions had, but the hope is that Baseline will get that level of recognition.
• The NEET reduction service is delivered mainly through the Youth Service and the Youth Service changes are designed to support and enhance NEET reduction.
Resolved:

That officers should provide more information on links to employers to the Committee.

7. Referrals to Mayor and Cabinet

7.1 No items were referred to Mayor and Cabinet

The meeting ended at 9.35 pm

Chair: 

>Date: 

----------------------------------------------------
Declaration of interests

Members are asked to declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda.

1 Personal interests

There are three types of personal interest referred to in the Council’s Member Code of Conduct:–

(1) Disclosable pecuniary interests
(2) Other registerable interests
(3) Non-registerable interests

2 Disclosable pecuniary interests are defined by regulation as:-

(a) **Employment**, trade, profession or vocation of a relevant person* for profit or gain

(b) **Sponsorship** —payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than by the Council) within the 12 months prior to giving notice for inclusion in the register in respect of expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member or towards your election expenses (including payment or financial benefit from a Trade Union).

(c) **Undischarged contracts** between a relevant person* (or a firm in which they are a partner or a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest) and the Council for goods, services or works.

(d) **Beneficial interests in land** in the borough.

(e) **Licence to occupy land** in the borough for one month or more.

(f) **Corporate tenancies** — any tenancy, where to the member’s knowledge, the Council is landlord and the tenant is a firm in which the relevant person* is a partner, a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest.

(g) **Beneficial interest in securities** of a body where:–

(a) that body to the member’s knowledge has a place of business or land in the borough; and

(b) either

(i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that body; or

(ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person* has a beneficial interest exceeds 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that class.
*A relevant person is the member, their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they live as spouse or civil partner.

(3) **Other registerable interests**

The Lewisham Member Code of Conduct requires members also to register the following interests:

(a) Membership or position of control or management in a body to which you were appointed or nominated by the Council

(b) Any body exercising functions of a public nature or directed to charitable purposes, or whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy, including any political party

(c) Any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25

(4) **Non registerable interests**

Occasions may arise when a matter under consideration would or would be likely to affect the wellbeing of a member, their family, friend or close associate more than it would affect the wellbeing of those in the local area generally, but which is not required to be registered in the Register of Members’ Interests (for example a matter concerning the closure of a school at which a Member’s child attends).

(5) **Declaration and Impact of interest on member’s participation**

(a) Where a member has any registerable interest in a matter and they are present at a meeting at which that matter is to be discussed, they must declare the nature of the interest at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered. The declaration will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. If the matter is a disclosable pecuniary interest the member must take not part in consideration of the matter and withdraw from the room before it is considered. They must not seek improperly to influence the decision in any way. **Failure to declare such an interest which has not already been entered in the Register of Members’ Interests, or participation where such an interest exists, is liable to prosecution and on conviction carries a fine of up to £5000**

(b) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest they must still declare the nature of the interest to the meeting at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered, but they may stay in the room, participate in consideration of the matter and vote on it unless paragraph (c) below applies.

(c) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest, the member must consider whether a reasonable member of the public in possession of the facts would think that their interest is so significant that it would be likely to impair the member’s judgement of the public interest. If so, the member must withdraw and take no part in consideration of the matter nor seek to influence the outcome improperly.

(d) If a non-registerable interest arises which affects the wellbeing of a member, their family, friend or close associate more than it would affect those in the local area
generally, then the provisions relating to the declarations of interest and withdrawal apply as if it were a registerable interest.

(e) Decisions relating to declarations of interests are for the member’s personal judgement, though in cases of doubt they may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer.

(6) Sensitive information

There are special provisions relating to sensitive interests. These are interests the disclosure of which would be likely to expose the member to risk of violence or intimidation where the Monitoring Officer has agreed that such interest need not be registered. Members with such an interest are referred to the Code and advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance.

(7) Exempt categories

There are exemptions to these provisions allowing members to participate in decisions notwithstanding interests that would otherwise prevent them doing so. These include:-

(a) Housing – holding a tenancy or lease with the Council unless the matter relates to your particular tenancy or lease; (subject to arrears exception)
(b) School meals, school transport and travelling expenses; if you are a parent or guardian of a child in full time education, or a school governor unless the matter relates particularly to the school your child attends or of which you are a governor;
(c) Statutory sick pay; if you are in receipt
(d) Allowances, payment or indemnity for members
(e) Ceremonial honours for members
(f) Setting Council Tax or precept (subject to arrears exception)
1. Summary and Policy Context

1.1 The Young Carers Social Workers role is guided by the overall Lewisham Carers Strategy 2011-14 and Lewisham Children and Young People’s Plan 2012 – 2015.

1.2 This report relates to the overall Lewisham Carers Strategy 2012-2016 and Lewisham Children and Young People’s plan. The Carer’s Strategy is still in draft. However, the spirit and principles of these documents are at the forefront for the Young Carers service. This report outlines where progress has been made and highlights actions which are required in order to be successful in addressing the complex needs of this vulnerable group of children and young people.

2. Recommendations

Context

2.1 The new Lewisham Carers Strategy 2012-2016 is being developed and as part of the overall strategy it is recognised that clear strategic priorities and outcomes are needed to ensure that the specific needs of Young Carers are addressed in line with the current and forthcoming Lewisham Children and Young People’s Plan.

2.2 The strategy sets out the long term vision and anticipated outcomes for Young Carers by analysing the current position of Young Carers, their experiences and needs. It will include a detailed action plan setting out what needs to happen to improve the everyday lives of Young Carers and move towards achieving the overarching national outcomes for children and young people within the context of a whole family approach.

2.3 Carers Trust report that there are over 175,000 Young Carers in the UK. Further research suggests that there are a substantial amount of disabled and chronically ill adults who are forced to rely on their children for their survival and wellbeing, and as a result their children become Young Carers. Stress, tiredness and mental ill-health are common factors experienced by Young Carers, as well as living with traumatic life changes such as bereavement, family breakup, loss of income and housing or having to witness the effects of an illness or addiction on their relative.
3. Details

Raising Awareness

3.1 There is a single dedicated Young Carer Social Worker in Children and Young Peoples Directorate’s Referral & Assessment Team working four days a week. The Young Carers Social Worker’s role consists of:

- holding a caseload of more complex cases and providing one-to-one direct support to Young Carers who may be at risk and by completing a Young Carers assessment where appropriate. The assessment enables the Social Worker to identify and provide appropriate services for Young Carers and to develop a robust package of care, which in turn enables the young person to achieve the five outcomes under ‘Every Child Matters’.
- Raising awareness of Young Carers needs and how to recognise young caring situations. Raising awareness is a fundamental part of the Young Carers Social Worker’s remit and is an on-going aspect of the role.

3.2 Carers Lewisham support over 500 Young Carers as young as 5 years old. As the largest provider of carers services in the borough, Carers Lewisham receives core funding from Lewisham Council and the CCG to support its work with carers in Lewisham. The Young Carers Social Worker role complements the services provided by Carers Lewisham and provides a valuable link between the voluntary and statutory sector. This provides an additional safeguard for the most vulnerable.

3.3 The Young Carers Social Worker has undertaken a number of awareness raising sessions within Statutory settings and with external and voluntary agencies. These sessions aim to raise awareness amongst professionals and others of the issues facing Young Carers. They also explain programmes of training in respect of Young Carers. The training specifically targets organisations who provide universal services and/or front line support for children and their families, ultimately aiming to increase agencies abilities to recognise young caring situations either singly or working in partnership, as well as encourage all agencies to work in partnership to support Young Carer’s and their families (Appendix 1).

3.4 Between 2011 – 2012 the Young Carers Social Worker received 94 notifications of children who were Young Carers. From this number, 64 children were assessed. The maximum number of Young Carer assessments undertaken in one family was three children. A number of notifications received were for Young Carers as young as 5 years. Two Young Carer assessments were undertaken with carers of this age. Other cases required further investigation to ascertain the family circumstances and a number of these indicated that the children or young person was not a Young Carer (others were providing the necessary support) and these cases were signposted to appropriate services. A number of young people can prove difficult to support as some parents do not engage with services or decline consent for the Young Carer service to work with their children. On these occasions the Young Carers Social Worker first ascertains that there are no safeguarding issues. Several cases highlighted issues which met the Child Protection threshold and involved notification into the Referral & Assessment Duty Team for further investigation. Children's Social Care are also responsible for carrying out carers assessments in respect of 16 to 18 year old young adults.

3.5 In cases where Young Carers assessments were completed and needs identified, referrals were made to the appropriate service. As many Young Carers had complex
needs, on occasions this would involve making several referrals for one family. As examples: Blind Aid, The Macmillan’s Trust and MS Trust. Additionally other agencies such as the Cassel Centre, Speedwell and other statutory, voluntary or charitable organisations. Needs are assessed case by case so that services are appropriately targeted.

Ethnicity of Young Carer’s Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White British</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender of Young Carers

The percentage of young carer referrals by gender 38 female and 26 male

Young Carer Age

The percentage of young carer referrals by age group. The highest age category 13 - 16yrs closely followed by the 6-9yrs.
3.6 There is a risk that young carers needs may not be prioritized or recognized by agencies who could play a pivotal role in ensuring that young carers are acknowledged and their needs met. For example, to support Carers Lewisham, Children & Young Peoples Directorate organised a mail out to all Secondary and Primary schools in the borough, to promote the School Charter and the process required by each school to agree and sign-up to 1) a pledge to acknowledge that Young Carers are Seen and Heard, 2) Recognised, 3) respected, 4) Valued 5) Supported. Carers Lewisham continue to promote and encourage this endeavour to the schools in Lewisham with an increasing number of schools signing up.

Young Carers

3.7 Young carers provide practical, emotional and physical support within their families and can be as young as 5yrs old, the effect of which can have a significant impact on their life chances. Young carers can feel anxious and stressed, and experience issues with school attendance and punctuality, the relationships that they have with their peers and their behaviour in and outside of school and so support needs to be targeted to reduce the risk of being permanently excluded from school. Due to their caring responsibilities, many young carers can also find it difficult to engage in activities away from home.

3.8 Research suggests that there is a strong link between being a young carer and underachieving in school and this is reflected in the cases that the Young Carers Social Worker continues to support on a daily basis. Additionally, young carers are more likely to be excluded from school because they find it difficult to talk to someone who they feel they can trust about how they are feeling which can then manifest itself in ‘acting out’ their stress and distress. Many young carers may not therefore receive help until their situation reaches a point of crisis. Once these cases have been assessed, the additional support required can involve making several referrals to appropriate support services. This can include charitable organisations to alleviate some of the basic needs that many of young carers experience, such as the need for food, white goods, beds and bedding. ( Appendix 2)
4 Opportunities

PSLA

Family Pathways

4.1 They have commissioned a Young Carers’ Club for 5-8 yr olds to Carers Lewisham. It has been running since Feb 2013 but they have no data or information as to numbers yet.

Family Action

4.2 Family Action works in partnership with Carers Lewisham and run a young carers’ family project offering holistic family intervention to young carers up to 16 and other family members. It offers practical and emotional support to all members of the family, including advocacy, signposting, form-filling and emotional support. Carers come through Carers Lewisham. Both organisations have a project worker each who work in partnership and to date they have worked with around 40 families. The funding is coming to an end in October 2013 as they are currently funded through Comic Relief.

4.3 Family Action Building Bridges also supports young carers for those with mental health issues and offers holistic family support, parental workshops, respite activity for children, building peer support and family activities. They also have a happiness and wellbeing programme, aimed mainly at parents, and offer key worker outreach support.

4.4 Family Action work with Adult Social Care around using the ‘Think Family approach’ within their assessments.

4.5 Within services senior leads need to specifically consider Young Carers when implementing new procedures to address the complex needs of vulnerable groups. This will be addressed through the quarterly Young Carers Steering Group meetings.

4.6 The Young Carers Social Worker will continue to work alongside the IT department on developing systems to accurately capture information relating to Young Carers so these areas can be reported upon. This will be built into future upgrades of ICS. Additional work will also take place with Carers Lewisham, Carers Strategic Officer and the Young Carers Social Worker to improve the collation of data.

4.7 Evidence suggests that joint working between Children and Adults is essential to reduce the number of children in inappropriate or harmful caring roles and the Young Carers Social Worker continues to work as a link between both services.

5 Support for Young Carers in Lewisham

5.1 During 2012/2013, a total of seven voluntary sector organisations continue to be commissioned to provide a range of projects and services to meet the diverse needs of carers in Lewisham. The Young Carers Social Workers role is funded by Lewisham Core funding. A range of organisations receive a combination of funding from the Lewisham Core funding (which includes monies that have remained targets for carers) and the PCT.
5.2 Carers Lewisham support over 5000 unpaid carers, 500 of which are young carers. They offer young carers occasional breaks and activities away from home such as workshops, Art therapy and a safe place to share their feelings with other young carers. A number of other facilities are also offered and are linked in with agencies which support young carers. An example is the Yew Tree Project for those carers who have a parent with a terminal illness.

5.3 There is also a Community Respite Service for carers and people with learning disabilities provided by PLUS and Family Action Building Bridges Project who support families where a parent has a mental health problem. There are also services available for Black and Minority Groups, namely Family Health ISIS and the Vietnamese carers project respectively, there is also the Young Carers Team within Carers Lewisham. The Young Carers Team, which is part of Carers Lewisham, is also instrumental in providing valuable support to carers in Lewisham. It has been found that the support service within the borough are varied and collectively are able to meet young carers needs when they have been identified.

Other Sources of Support for Young Carers

Targeted Family Support (TFS)

5.4 TFS take referrals from Carers Lewisham and also LBL’s Young Carers’ Social Worker. They have worked with a number of families with young carers and have also made referrals to Carers Lewisham and LBL’s Young Carer’s Social Worker and work alongside them.

Children’s Centres

5.5 Our Children’s Centres also work with young carers for example, one of our Children’s Centres is planning a young carers’ club – they have identified in partnership with schools some 30 children in the locality who are young carers. Another Childrens Centre also runs a Young Carers Drop In.

5.6 Where Children’s Centres are aware that the children are or possibly have the potential to be young carers, they work with the family to ascertain their needs, ensure that children and their parents are signposted and linked to resources that provide services. They also look at how the children can be best supported in the immediate term, for example meeting with the children and their parents to look at other activities that the children may be interested in and benefit from.

Examples of this are:

- Working with young carers professionals with TAC meetings and telephone liaison
- Linking children into the local scout groups
- Finding out about extra curricular activities at their school
- Providing a meeting space within the Children’s Centres for the children and parents to do homework and get support
- Looking at volunteers within TCS and if there is a role there
- Offering one to one family support in the home to help parents with learning disabilities to develop basic housekeeping and cooking skills
- Packages of support are tailored to a family’s individual needs as each child’s need are unique to their situation.
• Examples of families they are currently working with include:

• four children in a family where mother is terminally ill and the two older children do some of the caring of their younger siblings
• 2 children in a family where mother has learning difficulties and is very vulnerable, needing help with home work, nutritious meals and keeping safe from inappropriate adults
• one young child who is already attempting to assist his older brother who is severely autistic and mother’s parenting capacity is poor.

6 Conclusion

6.1 It has been a priority to raise awareness of young carers in the borough, within Statutory Services, the voluntary sector and with charitable organisation. There continue to be challenges and there is still a considerable amount of work to be done. However the Young Carers Social Worker, the Carers Strategic Officer and Carers Lewisham continue to share ideas to achieve good outcomes for this vulnerable group of children and young people by using the guidance given within the Carers Strategy 2011-2013 and the Children’s and Peoples Action Plan for Young Carers. This is an on-going process and the intended outcomes will be acted upon through consultation within the Young Carers Steering Group, various statutory meetings and the continued drive by all to raise awareness of Young Carers needs. By aiming to inform agencies and all professionals who work with vulnerable groups, that Young Carers are children and young people who deserve the life chances the same as their peers, and this can only be achieved by recognizing, identifying and appropriately support such Young Carers before the point of crisis.

7. Financial Implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

8. Legal implications

Equalities Legislation

8.1 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

8.2 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

• eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
• advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
• foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

8.3 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is
not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

8.4 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/

8.5 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

(1) The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
(2) Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
(3) Engagement and the equality duty
(4) Equality objectives and the equality duty
(5) Equality information and the equality duty

8.6 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/

9. Crime and disorder implications

There are no crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

10. Equalities implications

There are no equalities implications arising from this report.

11. Environmental implications

There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

12. Background documents

None.

Originator of the report
Helen Hay, Service Manager for Referral & Assessment
020 8314 3188
### Appendix 1

**Promotional and Raising Awareness of Young Carer 2011-April 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral &amp; Assessment Duty</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossroads</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral &amp; Assessment Teams 2,3,4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>August, Sept, Oct, Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young People and Substance Misuse CRI</td>
<td>Sept 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST Inclusion Team (Kaleidoscope)</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers Working Group</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connisborough College Young Carers Workshop</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact a Family</td>
<td>Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAM Northover</td>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Children’s Safeguarding Board LSCB</td>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Bridges</td>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Disability Coalition</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Health ISIS</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Disability Coalition</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT Support &amp; Development Workers Hospital Team</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Meeting Assessment and Support ASC</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSB</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedwell</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers Partnership Board</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCB</td>
<td>Jan 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Action</td>
<td>Feb 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targetted Family Support (TFS)</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Substance Misuse</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Young Carers Promotional and Raising Awareness Target for 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trilogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Marac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Offending Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Support Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBL Family Support Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassell Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Health Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Hospital Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC Visual Impairment Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix 2
### Referrals and Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macmilian Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttle UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlindAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham disability Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact a Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candle Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth support Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trilogy Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Marac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Social Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers Lewisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Homeless Intervention and Prevention SHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single homeless Project SHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact a Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Health ISIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. **Purpose of paper**

1.1. At its meeting on 9 April 2013, the Committee decided as part of its work programme to undertake an in-depth review into Nursery and Childcare Provision.

1.2. This paper sets out the rationale for the review, provides some background information on the current situation within Lewisham and sets out proposed terms of reference for the review.

1.3. The in-depth review process is outlined at Appendix A.

2. **Recommendations**

2.1. The Select Committee is asked to:
   - note the content of the report
   - consider and agree the proposed terms of reference for the review, outlined in section 6 and the timetable, outlined in section 7.

3. **Background**

3.1. At the meeting of the Children and Young People Select Committee on the 9 April 2013, the Committee discussed undertaking an in-depth review looking at the issue of childcare and nursery provision within Lewisham.

3.2. During the meeting the Committee discussed what nursery and childcare provision is available in the borough, the standards set on provision by Ofsted, costs of provisions and provision for children with extra needs. Additionally they discussed what national guidance is available and benefits for children when entering schools at reception stage from previous nursery and childcare education. They also noted the number of changes to policy in relation to early years that had recently emerged from central government.

3.3. Since the April Children and Young People Select Committee meeting Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector, Sir Michael Wilshaw, launched Ofsted’s ‘Good early years provision for all’, a consultation on changes to the inspection framework aimed at improving the quality of early years provision. It was announced that from September 2013, nurseries and pre-schools judged less than good will need to improve rapidly and that the new designation of ‘requires improvement’ should act as a catalyst to get all early years providers to good as soon as possible.
4. **Policy context**

4.1. The report by the Department for Education, ‘More great childcare’ (attached at Appendix B and released in January 2013) sets out a plan of action for how the government will achieve its vision of a dynamic childcare market, delivering high quality early education. It incorporates the government’s response to Professor Cathy Nutbrown’s independent review, ‘Foundations for Quality’.

4.2. The vision for early education and childcare is to make sure there is more great childcare available for parents and children. The report highlights that a good start in early years can have a positive effect on children’s development, preparing them for school and later life. The reforms proposed seek to benefit both society and the economy by delivering high quality education in the early years at the same time as helping parents back to work.

4.3. ‘More great childcare’\(^1\) sets out four key priorities:

- **Raising the status and quality of the workforce**
  - Early Years Teachers will be introduced to build upon the strengths of the Early Years Professionals programme. Early Years Teachers will specialise in early childhood development and meet the same entry requirements and pass the same skills tests as trainee school teachers.
  - Early Years Educators will be introduced to improve the quality of people below graduate level working in the early years.

- **Freeing high quality providers to offer more places**
  - Nurseries in England have relatively tight staffing rules which drive higher costs for parents and lower pay for staff. In turn, low pay undermines the attractiveness of the profession to potential applicants. The aim will be to free high quality providers to offer more places by allowing greater flexibility, including ratios of staff to children, allowing providers extra income to pay staff more and giving parents more choice.

4.4. The quality of the early years workforce and the relevant qualifications on offer at the moment are not good enough. Staff are on low pay and in too many cases lack basic skills.

- Early Years Teachers will be introduced to build upon the strengths of the Early Years Professionals programme. Early Years Teachers will specialise in early childhood development and meet the same entry requirements and pass the same skills tests as trainee school teachers.

4.6. There will also be more flexibility to home-based childminders, who will still only be able to look after six children in total. However, the number of under-5s childminders can look after will increase from three to four, and the number of under-1s they can look after from one to two. These will be maximum limits on the number of children child-minders can look after – childminders will be free to carry on using existing ratios and parents will be able to choose childminders who care for fewer children if they wish.

---

\(^1\) ‘More Great Childcare’ Department for Education

http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/earlylearningandchildcare/a00220847/more-great-childcare
Improving the regulatory regime

4.7. A rigorous regulatory and inspection regime is important, and should ensure providers are focused on quality rather than process, and provides parents with assessments in which they can have confidence. Local authorities can also inspect early years providers who are implementing the early education programme for three- and four-year-olds as well as two-year-olds from low-income families.
- The Ofsted inspection rating will be the sole test of whether a provider can offer funded early education for two, three and four-year-olds, ending duplication in inspection.
- Reforms will also be made to Ofsted’s early years inspections

Giving parents more choice

4.8. The report highlights that too few parents have the choice of a good childcare provider, and that this is particularly true in more deprived areas.
- Childminder Agencies will be created to relieve childminders of some of the burdens of setting up their own business, provide training and match childminders with parents
- It will be easier for schools to teach younger children by removing the requirement on schools to register separately with Ofsted if they wish to provide for children under three.
- Encourage private and voluntary nurseries to use existing flexibilities which allow them to have graduates leading classes of 13 children per adult.

4.9. The Children and Families Bill 2013\(^2\) underpins the priorities set out in ‘More Great Childcare’ and will take forward the Government’s commitments to improve services for vulnerable children and support strong families as well as wider reforms including the systems for adoption, looked after children, family justice and special educational needs. The Government is reforming childcare to ensure the whole system focuses on providing safe, high-quality care and early education for children. The enabling measures in the Bill support wider reforms to increase the supply of high quality, affordable and available childcare and include introducing childminder agencies and removing bureaucracy so that it is easier for schools to offer wrap-around care. The Bill is currently at the report stage in the House of Commons.

4.10. The Ofsted consultation document ‘Good early years provision for all’\(^3\) was released in April, with a closing date of 24 May 2013. The documents proposed that from September 2013:
- A single judgement of ‘requires improvement’ will replace the current ‘satisfactory’ judgement for all early years providers

\(^2\) Children and Families Bill 2012-13
http://www.education.gov.uk/a00221161/children-families-bill

\(^3\) Good early years provision for all
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/good-early-years-provision-for-all
• Early years non-domestic settings judged as ‘requires improvement’ will be the subject of a full re-inspection within two years; they will have a maximum of four years to become good.
• Where an early years non-domestic setting fails to become ‘good’ following two consecutive inspections, this would be likely to lead to an ‘inadequate’ judgement and subject to the monitoring arrangements as set in the early years inspection framework.
• Where any inadequate early years setting has failed to improve sufficiently and is still judged to be inadequate when reinspected, it is likely that steps may be taken to cancel that setting’s registration.

4.11. Lewisham’s Sustainable Communities Strategy sets out six key priorities for the borough as a whole. This review will fall under the ‘Ambitious and achieving’ priority, which will inspire our young people to achieve their full potential by removing the barriers to learning.\(^4\) The review also falls under the ‘Safer’ priority, which aims to keep our children and young people safe from harm, abuse and criminal activity as well as the ‘Dynamic and prosperous’ priority, which aims to increase access to the number, quality and range of employment opportunities.

4.12. Lewisham’s Children and Young People’s Plan for 2012-2015, entitled ‘It’s everybody’s business’\(^5\) sets out key areas for impact and priorities surrounding children and young people. This review will fall under the ‘Make sure early intervention makes a difference’ key area of impact, which sets out to ensure early intervention and targeted support approaches are embedded and have direct impact for children. It also falls under priority EA1, ‘Raise achievement at all key stages’, the aim of which is to work together with all settings, schools and institutions to ensure the best possible outcome for all our children and young people.

5. Meeting the criteria for a review

5.1. A review into Nursery and Childcare Provision meets the criteria for carrying out a scrutiny review, because it is:
- Timely given the changes to central government policy and legislation
- The issue affects a number of people living working and studying in the borough

6. Key lines of Inquiry

6.1. In light of new legislation and changes to government policy, the Committee will consider the implications of these for nursery and childcare provision.

\(^4\) Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2020

\(^5\) Lewisham Children and Young People’s Plan 2012-2015
6.2. In order to understand nursery and childcare provision in the borough and the levels of funding, affordability, quality, availability and accessibility, officers will provide information in their first report relating to the following key questions:

**Funding and affordability**
- How is nursery and childcare provision funded in Lewisham?
- What are the ranges in prices of nursery and childcare provision across the borough?
- How does the price of nursery and childcare provision compare to other nearby boroughs?

**Quality**
- What is the statutory framework and national policy for nursery and childcare provision and how has this recently changed?
- What is the range of quality of nursery and childcare provision in the borough, including private, voluntary and independent and school provided nurseries and childminding?
- What is the role of the Early Years Improvement Team in supporting the improvement of nursery and childcare provision?
- What is the role of Ofsted in relation to nursery and childcare provision?

**Availability and accessibility**
- Where is nursery and childcare provision available within the borough?
- What is the demand for nurseries and childcare?
- How flexible is the provision on offer in different types of settings such as private, voluntary and independent and school provided nurseries and childminding?
- Is nursery and childcare provision available for children with extra needs?

6.3. Building upon this understanding, the Committee could then consider the following key lines of inquiry:

**Funding and affordability**
- Does the support from central government in the form of funding and benefits provide affordability in nursery and childcare provision for Lewisham residents?
- Is nursery and childcare provision affordable for Lewisham residents?

**Quality**
- To what extent will the changes to government policy and legislation improve nursery and childcare provision?
- Within the resources available, what more could the private, voluntary, independent and school nursery and childcare providers in the borough do to improve the quality of their provision?
- Within the resources available, what more could the Early Years Improvement Team do to improve the quality of nursery and childcare provision in the borough?

**Availability and accessibility**
- Is current nursery and childcare provision appropriate for the needs of the parents and children of Lewisham?
• How could the flexibility in the availability and accessibility of provision be improved?
• How are providers of nurseries and childcare seeking to meet the increase in demand for free places in September 2013 and 2014, as well as increasing demands due to a rising population?

7. Timetable

7.1. The Committee is asked to consider the outline timetable for the review as set out below:

First evidence-taking session (2 July 2013):
• Report from officers providing information around funding and affordability, quality and availability and accessibility as outlined in 6.2.

Fact-finding visit (September 2013)
• Visit to private nursery, school nursery and childminder, including opportunities to speak to parents.

Second evidence-taking session (9 October 2013)
• Report from officers highlighting how the benefits system gives financial support to families to help with childcare and nurseries.
• Representatives from private, voluntary and independent sector nursery and school nursery

Recommendations and final report (3 December 2013)
• The Committee will consider a final report presenting all the evidence taken and agree recommendations for submission to Mayor & Cabinet.

8. Further implications

8.1. At this stage there are no specific financial, legal, environmental or equalities implications to consider. However, each will be addressed as part of the review.

For further information please contact Andrew Hagger, Scrutiny Manager on 020 8314 9446 or email andrew.hagger@lewisham.gov.uk
How to carry out an in-depth review

1 Scoping
- Consider local & national context and identify the key issues
- Agree objectives and key lines of enquiry of the review
- Agree structure (methods of evidence gathering to be used)
- Agree timetable for review

2 Evidence Gathering
Formal meetings can consider:
- Written evidence
  - Reports
  - Key documents
  - Case studies
  - Best Practice
  - Data and analysis
- Oral evidence
  - Questioning officers of the Council, Partner agencies & expert witnesses
- Results of “Other” evidence gathering activities
  - Consultation (surveys, focus groups)
  - Site visits
  - Research

3 Agree recommendations and draft report
- All evidence and key findings presented to Committee
- Committee agrees evidence-based recommendations and draft report

Mayor and Cabinet
- Meets twice, once to consider report, once to consider response

4 Final report
- Committee agrees final report and recommendations for referral to Mayor and Cabinet

5 Response
- Committee receives Mayoral response to their final report and recommendations within 2 months

6 Monitoring and Review
- Committee monitors the implementation of the agreed recommendations
- Considers further follow-up review?
More great childcare

Raising quality and giving parents more choice

January 2013
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Foreword by Elizabeth Truss MP

Every parent wants the best for their child. They expect childcare to be safe and of good quality, because high quality childcare promotes children’s development in the early years. The availability of affordable, safe and stimulating care is crucial in supporting families by enabling parents to work. It is equally crucial to the development of babies and young children as the foundation for their future success at school and in life.

We have been fortunate to see important improvements in the quality and professionalism of childcare in recent years. Children have benefited from the hard work, skill and commitment of those who work in early years, as shown by the improving results of assessments at age five. But it is clear that we face an enormous challenge.

The affordability and availability of childcare are growing concerns to many working parents, and some childcare providers are struggling in these tough economic times. Too many parents are unable to work as they would choose and, as Professor Cathy Nutbrown told us in her report last summer, the quality of provision for children could be improved. That is why this Government is determined to ensure that the system delivers high quality at good value for children, parents and the tax-payer. I am clear that we can do better. We need consistently high quality nursery education and childcare that attracts the best possible staff. We need a system of regulation and inspection that has high expectations of quality, and which gives providers the incentives and the flexibility they need to deliver the best for children.

Making the changes we need will not be easy, nor instant. Tackling them demands a long-term plan and determined action.

We have a good tradition of early education in England, and some fine examples of excellent practice. But we should be prepared to encourage all providers to learn from the best, and learn from effective practice in other countries.

The plans in this document are the first step. They set out our proposals to build a stronger and more professional early years workforce, and to drive quality through everything it does. In particular, they explain how we will:
build a stronger, more capable workforce, with more rigorous training and qualifications, led by a growing group of Early Years Teachers;

drive up quality, with rigorous Ofsted inspection and incentives for providers to improve the skills and knowledge of their staff;

attract more, high quality providers with new childminder agencies, which will recruit new people, train and guide them and lever up quality in an area of the sector that has lagged behind;

free providers to offer more high quality places, with greater flexibility to invest in high-calibre staff and more choice for parents.

ELIZABETH TRUSS MP
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (education and childcare)
Executive summary

We want to make available more great childcare for parents and children.

If we want our children to succeed at school, go on to university or into an apprenticeship and thrive in later life, we must get it right in the early years. If we want to use the talents of parents, and particularly mothers, to the full, we must ensure there is enough high quality childcare available.

More great childcare is vital to ensuring we can compete in the global race, by helping parents back to work and readying children for school and, eventually, employment. And it can help build a stronger society, with more opportunities for women who want to work and raise children at the same time, and better life chances for children whatever their background.

We will deliver more great childcare by:

- raising the status and quality of the workforce;
- freeing high quality providers to offer more places;
- improving the regulatory regime; and
- giving more choice to parents.

Raising the status and quality of the workforce

There is nothing more important in early education than the quality of the staff who are delivering it. As Professor Nutbrown pointed out in her review of qualifications for the early education and childcare workforce\(^1\), the quality of the workforce and the qualifications on offer at the moment are not good enough. Staff are on low pay and in too many cases lack basic skills.

The problems employers face in identifying high quality staff are exacerbated by the proliferation of early years qualifications which has occurred since the 1970s. Professor Nutbrown pointed out that there are over 400 early years qualifications for employers to consider, many of which lack rigour and depth.

We will improve early years qualifications so that parents and providers can have greater confidence in the calibre of people who are teaching our youngest children. We will raise the quality of those entering the workforce by imposing tougher entry requirements.

---

\(^1\) Foundations for Quality – the independent review of early education and childcare qualifications: Final Report (June 2012)
Early Years Teachers. We want more high quality graduates to work in the early years. Early Years Professionals have helped improve the quality of early education but public recognition of their status remains low. We will introduce Early Years Teachers to build upon the strengths of the Early Years Professionals programme. Early Years Teachers will specialise in early childhood development and meet the same entry requirements and pass the same skills tests as trainee school teachers.

Early Years Educators. We must also improve the quality of people below graduate level working in the early years. In future, people will train at Level 3 to become Early Years Educators. Only the best qualifications, which meet rigorous criteria set out by the Teaching Agency, will earn the ‘Early Years Educator’ title. All Early Years Educators will be required to have at least a C grade in GCSE English and maths. They will often act as assistants to Early Years Teachers.

It is our aspiration that over time, group childcare will increasingly be delivered by Early Years Teachers and Early Years Educators. We hope parents will come to recognise these titles as benchmarks of quality.

Freeing high quality providers to offer more places

Nurseries

In England as in many other countries, central government limits the number of children each member of staff in a nursery can look after through mandatory staff: child ratios. However, ratios in England are tighter than in comparable European countries. For instance, English nurseries can look after up to four two-year-olds for every member of staff, compared to six two-year-olds per member of staff in the Netherlands and Ireland, and eight two-year-olds in France. Other countries – such as Denmark, Germany and Sweden – do not set national mandatory ratios for children of any age.

England’s relatively tight staffing rules drive higher costs for parents and lower pay for staff. In turn, low pay undermines the attractiveness of the profession to potential applicants. In other countries, providers can use the extra income they get from taking on more children to reduce fees for parents and pay staff more, but this is not possible in England.

Crucially, other countries also ensure they employ more highly qualified professionals in the early years. In France, at least 40 per cent of staff in early years settings must hold a diploma, gained after a year-long, post-18 course. In the Netherlands, certified childcare workers must take three years of training post-18. In Denmark, childcare workers are

\footnote{Note: there are two main types of childcare provider for young children in England: nurseries and childminders. Nurseries are organisations providing early education and childcare delivered by multiple members of staff. Childminders are self-employed individuals who provide childcare, usually in their own home. The term ‘childminder’ is often incorrectly used to describe people who work in a nursery.}
required to have between three and five years vocational or tertiary education before they can work in the early years.

Where there are high quality staff, greater flexibility in staffing can work. We will, therefore, free high quality providers to offer more places by allowing greater flexibility. That flexibility for nurseries should go hand in hand with higher quality, so providers will only be able to operate with more children per adult if they employ high quality staff. This will give providers extra income to pay staff more, and it will give more parents the choice of a great childcare place for their child. We will consult on the qualification requirements which will support this additional freedom. It should be stressed that these ratios will be maximum legal limits – no settings will be obliged to use higher ratios, and parents will still be free to choose nurseries that operate on existing ratios if they prefer.

The following table shows our proposed new nursery ratios compared to the current rules in England and in other countries:

**Figure 1 Nursery ratios summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Under 1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (current ratios)</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (proposed ratios where there are high quality staff)</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:12</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:6 or 1:11</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: DfE obtained figures by a bespoke survey of 15 OECD countries (fieldwork carried out in 2012).*

*Notes:*
- England - Over-3s ratio is 1:13 if led by a teacher.
- France - Ratios vary by provider type: crèches (1:5 children who cannot walk and 1:8 children who can walk); jardins d’éveil (1:12 children between two and three years old); kindergartens and pre-schools (1:26 children aged three to compulsory schooling, where led by a teacher)
- Ireland - In sessional pre-school provision the staff:child ratio is 1:11 for children aged 2.5 years to six years. In full/part time daycare provision the ratio is 1:6 for two year olds and 1:8 for three to six year olds
- Germany - although there are no national mandatory staff:child ratios, individual Länder (regions) are free to set their own regulations.
We also want to give more flexibility to home-based childminders. At the moment, childminders can look after six children, no more than three of which can be under the age of five and only one of which can be under the age of one.

This is too restrictive, particularly for children under the age of five. Childminders may only look after three under-5s at any one time. This contrasts with four children in France and five children in the Netherlands, Ireland, Denmark and Germany. There are no national limits at all in Sweden.

Current rules are also applied too rigidly. For example, if a parent is late picking up their child, the childminder risks breaking the rules by looking after an extra child even for a short period. The current rules also mean that if a parent wants to leave baby twins with a childminder, childminders must seek an exception as they would be exceeding the prescribed ratio of one under-1 per adult.

We will give childminders more flexibility. They will still only be able to look after six children in total. However, we will increase the number of under-5s they can look after from three to four, and the number of under-1s they can look after from one to two. We will also provide an explicit allowance for overlaps between children by making clear childminders can exceed these new ratios by one for reasonable periods of time. Once again, it is important to stress that these will be the maximum limits on the number of children childminders can look after – childminders will be free to carry on using existing ratios and parents will be able to choose childminders who care for fewer children if they wish.
The following table shows our proposed childminder ratios compared to the current rules in England and in other countries:

### Figure 2 Childminder ratios summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England (current)</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (proposed)</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfE obtained figures by a bespoke survey of 15 OECD countries (fieldwork carried out in 2012).

Notes:
- **England (current)** - Childminders can have a maximum of six children under the age of 8, a maximum of three young children (until 1st September following their 5th birthday), and a maximum of one child under 1.
- **England (proposed)** - Childminders can have a maximum of six children under the age of 8, a maximum of four young children (until 1st September following their 5th birthday), and a maximum of two children under 1. Ratios can be exceeded by one for reasonable periods of time to allow for overlaps between children.
- **Denmark** - The number of children per adult is regulated by law.
- **Ireland** - Childminders can care for five children (including their own) and no more than two under the aged of 15 months.

### Improving the regulatory regime

Key to delivering more great childcare is a rigorous regulatory and inspection regime which ensures providers are focused on quality rather than process, and provides parents with assessments in which they can have confidence. Current regulations can cause a preoccupation with relatively trivial issues, such as the amount of floorspace per child and whether the nursery has a room where staff can talk confidentially to parents. This gets in the way of allowing staff and inspectors to concentrate on the most important consideration: how well adults are interacting with children.

Ofsted offers a tried and tested means of holding providers to account which parents understand and respect. But at the moment some local authorities also inspect early years providers who are implementing the early education programme for three- and
four-year-olds as well as two-year-olds from low-income families. Local authorities currently retain £160 million a year of the funding intended to deliver early education to three- and four-year-olds, some of which is spent on duplicating work Ofsted is already doing. Furthermore, providers have to satisfy inspectors from both Ofsted and their local authority, who often issue different or even contradictory requirements. Overall we need to ensure that regulations focus on quality and safety. We will replace unnecessarily prescriptive regulations on floorspace and the like with a general welfare and safety requirement.

We believe Ofsted should become the sole arbiter of quality in the early years, focused on identifying under-performance. We propose:

- **Ending duplication in inspection.** We will make the Ofsted inspection rating the sole test of whether a provider can offer funded early education for two-, three- and four-year-olds. This will relieve local authorities of the burden of inspecting early years, enabling them to pass more of the funding they are given by central government for early education onto the front line. Providers will no longer have to accommodate separate inspections by Ofsted and local authorities.

- **Reforms to Ofsted’s early years inspections.** Ofsted are developing improvements to their inspection of the early years. Ofsted will ensure there is more involvement in the early years by Her Majesty’s Inspectors, who will focus on inspecting childminder agencies (see below) and ensuring a stronger focus on weaker providers. Weaker providers will be inspected more frequently, and providers will also be able to request a paid-for, early re-inspection if they believe they have improved since their previous inspection.

**Giving parents more choice**

At the moment, too few parents have the choice of a good childcare provider, and this is particularly true in more deprived areas. Only around one in ten nurseries and childminders were rated outstanding by Ofsted\(^3\) as of last year. 39 per cent of childminders working in the most disadvantaged areas fail to achieve a ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ rating from Ofsted, compared to 23 per cent of childminders in the richest areas.

For many parents, home-based childminders offer the most practical and flexible form of childcare. At the moment, most childminders are self-employed individuals running their own business. Many childminders are happy to work in this way. But many others have found the requirements of setting up and running their own business burdensome. This may prevent childminders concentrating on delivering high quality early education and care, and in some cases may drive people out of the profession altogether. This is one

---

\(^3\) Ofsted Annual Report 2011/12
reason why the number of childminders has almost halved over the last twenty years. Parents have seen their options for home-based care steadily decrease.

Parents can also struggle to find traditional nursery classes led by teachers. The evidence suggests groups led by better-qualified staff offer higher quality support for children age 30 months to five. It is already possible for providers to care for thirteen children per adult where a teacher is present, but private and voluntary nurseries often prefer to use non-graduates in groups with a lower ratio of 1:8. In too many early years settings, those with graduate qualifications are carrying out largely administrative functions rather than working with groups of children.

We will offer parents the choice of more great childcare through:

- **Childminder Agencies.** We will enable the creation of childminder agencies to relieve childminders of some of the burdens of setting up their own business, provide training and match childminders with parents. Instead of having to investigate prospective childminders to check they are happy to entrust their children to their care, parents could instead approach a childminder agency to match them with a nearby childminder. There could be many practical benefits too. For instance, agencies could arrange for cover when childminders fall ill, saving parents the hassle of finding someone else at short notice or missing work.

- **Encouraging schools to take younger children.** We want to see many more schools offering childcare and education to young children. Some schools already do this very well in their nursery classes. We will make it easier for schools to teach younger children by removing the requirement on schools to register separately with Ofsted if they wish to provide for children under three. We are also going to reform the current cumbersome statutory processes required of schools if they want to take children lower down the age range.

- **More traditional nursery classes.** By focusing regulation and inspection on quality and outcomes, we will encourage private and voluntary nurseries to use existing flexibilities which allow them to have graduates leading classes of 13 children per adult. Together with making it easier for schools to take younger children, this will give more parents the option of a traditional nursery class led by a teacher.

---

1. A vision for early education and childcare

Over the next 10 years we want to make sure there is more great childcare available for parents and children.

As well as the influence of parents and families, high quality early education and childcare, delivered with love and care, can have a powerful impact on young children. The evidence is clear that a good start in these early years can have a positive effect on children’s development, preparing them for school and later life.

This is important for individual children and families. It is also important for our wider society and economy. We are in a challenging global environment where we must use the best of everyone’s talents. We need to support our children to be able to succeed in a world that is fast-changing, and where the skills and knowledge of a nation’s population are the best guarantee of their economic security and prosperity.

Our reforms seek to benefit both society and the economy by delivering high quality education in the early years at the same time as helping parents back to work. This will complement the Government’s wider commitments: reforming education, so that we produce bright graduates and skilled school leavers; and reforming welfare, so that it always pays to work.

We also want to give parents more choice of early education. Parents should be able to decide whether home-based care, nursery care, or a combination of the two is best for their child. We will achieve this by making it easier for new providers to enter the market and for existing providers to expand.

The proposals set out in this document will help providers to thrive, by delivering more for the investment currently made by the tax-payers and parents. This will be achieved through:

- raising the status and quality of the workforce;
- freeing high quality providers to offer more places;
- improving the regulatory regime; and
- giving more choice to parents.

This document includes the Government’s response to Professor Cathy Nutbrown’s review of qualifications for the early education and childcare workforce. It addresses the workforce issues considered by Professor Nutbrown in the wider context of the structure of childcare and its inspection framework, because we believe these issues are intrinsically linked. We have set out how we are responding to each of Professor Nutbrown’s recommendations in an appendix to this document.
We know that parents are concerned about the cost as well as the quality of childcare. As highlighted in the Government’s mid-term review, we will set out, in due course, how we intend to give parents more help with the costs of childcare. Further to the reforms in this document, the childcare commission is looking at support for parents with the costs of childcare, childcare regulation and care for school age children, and will report shortly.
2. The case for change

What works

We know what works in early years education: high quality qualifications and well-trained staff. The evidence shows that:

- Attending a high- or medium-quality pre-school has a lasting effect on social and behavioural outcomes.\(^5\)
- Pre-school quality is a significant predictor of later Key Stage 2 performance in both English and mathematics.\(^6\)
- Better-qualified staff offer higher quality support for children age 30 months to five years in developing communication, language, literacy, reasoning, thinking and mathematical skills.\(^7\)

The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project found:\(^8\)

- The quality of early years provision is related to better intellectual/cognitive and social/behavioural development in children at entry to and throughout primary school.
- Children made more progress in pre-school centres where trained teachers were present.
- High quality pre-school is especially beneficial for the most disadvantaged children.

---

\(^5\) Siraj-Blatchford, I. et al. (2011), Performing against the odds: developmental trajectories of children in the EPPSE 3-16 study, Department for Education, Research Report DFE-RR128
There has been progress in recent years

Ofsted rates 74 per cent of settings as good or outstanding compared with 65 per cent three years ago.\(^9\)

Between 2007 and 2011, the proportion of full daycare staff with at least a Level 3 qualification grew from 72 per cent to 84 per cent. The proportion of those with a degree or higher increased from four per cent to 11 per cent.\(^10\)

The Early Years Professional Status (EYPS) was launched in 2007 as a route for career progression within the sector and for talented, well-trained graduates to enter the profession. There are now 11,000 Early Years Professionals\(^11\) across the country and, in 2011, almost a third of non-LA run full daycare providers had one or more EYPs\(^12\). These new graduate leaders are already having a positive impact on the quality of early education and care for pre-school children.\(^13\)

But huge challenges remain

The Government spends almost £5 billion a year on early education and childcare:

- **Funded early education.** Cost = around £2 billion a year, rising to around £3 billion a year by the end of the Parliament. All three and four year olds can receive 15 hours of early education and care for 38 weeks of the year. Around 260,000 two-year-olds from low-income families will also be eligible from September 2014.

- **Tax credits and benefits disregards.** Cost = £1.5 billion a year through tax credits and benefits disregards; plus an additional £200m a year under Universal Credit. Depending on their income, some working parents can claim up to 70 per cent of the costs of childcare up to a maximum of £175 a week for one child and £300 a week for two or more children.

- **Employer Supported Childcare.** Cost = around £800 million a year. Parents can claim tax and National Insurance Contributions relief on the cost of childcare, using childcare vouchers or workplace nurseries provided through their employers. Depending on their individual circumstances, they can benefit from up to £900 a year through this scheme.

---

\(^9\) The report of Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Education, Children’s Services and Skills: Early years 2011/12


\(^11\) Teaching Agency data – EYPS awards 2007 to January 2013


\(^13\) The Evaluation of the Graduate Leader Fund, July 2011 (Oxford University/National Centre for Social Research DFE RB-144) The Longitudinal Study of EYPS, Sept 2012, (CeDARE, University of Wolverhampton DFE RR-239a-c)
As a share of GDP, the Government spends around 40 per cent more than the OECD average on childcare. Our spending is lower than the Nordic nations, comparable with France and higher than Germany.\(^{14}\)

Despite this, there are still major problems with the current system:

- low pay relative to other professions and other countries and perceived low status of what is a very important role;
- lack of rigour and depth in a confusing range of qualifications;
- a confusing regulatory regime, with Ofsted’s role duplicated by local authorities;
- parental choice is limited; and
- quality and availability vary too much across the country.

**Low pay relative to other professions and perceived low status of what is a very important role**

Despite some recent improvements, the early years profession has not broken out of the cycle of low pay and perceived low status relative to other professions. Although the evidence suggests that the best outcomes are achieved by high quality staff, current regulations limit the number of children each member of staff can look after, constraining salary levels. Moreover, many providers often fail to use the flexibility already available in the current system to allow well-qualified staff to look after more children and therefore offer them better pay.

**Pay rates are lower than other comparable countries**

Low wages for staff working in the early years limit the scope for further professionalisation, with many staff paid little more than the minimum wage. In 2011, the national minimum wage for those over 21 was £6.08 an hour. Those working below supervisor level in full daycare settings earn on average only slightly more than this, at £6.60 an hour.\(^{15}\)

Early years staff in other comparable European countries are often significantly better paid. This contrasts with the situation for primary school teachers, who are often better paid in England than abroad, as the table below shows:

---

\(^{14}\) These figures are from 2009 and the sources are: Social Expenditure database 2012; OECD Education database; and Eurostat for non-OECD countries

### Figure 3 Average annual salaries (GBP £)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European country</th>
<th>Childminders (family daycare)</th>
<th>Childcare workers in more formal settings (e.g. crèche or accredited play groups)</th>
<th>Supervisors / managers of formal settings</th>
<th>Primary school teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>£21,500</td>
<td>£20,350</td>
<td>£32,800</td>
<td>£38,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>£14,800</td>
<td>£18,800</td>
<td>£22,300</td>
<td>£28,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>£13,250</td>
<td>£16,300</td>
<td>£23,950</td>
<td>£25,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>£14,600</td>
<td>£19,150</td>
<td>£28,250</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>£22,500</td>
<td>£22,100</td>
<td>£34,400</td>
<td>£34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>£20,150</td>
<td>£22,450</td>
<td>£29,250</td>
<td>£23,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>£11,400</td>
<td>£13,300</td>
<td>£16,850</td>
<td>£33,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:

1. Figures are converted using Purchasing Power Parity (PPP). All figures have been rounded to the nearest 50.
2. For England, France and Finland, the salaries for childcare workers and supervisors are averages. For the remaining countries, salaries are based on mid-point estimates.
3. The salaries for childcare workers, supervisors/managers and primary school teachers are for staff in the private and public sectors, apart from the figure for primary teachers in England which is for the public sector only.
4. The salaries for childcare workers and supervisors/managers are on a full-time basis. The typical working patterns and definitions of full-time will differ by country. For England the definition of full-time used is 39 hours per week for 52 weeks per year.
5. The salary figures for supervisors in England are for staff defined as those who are qualified to supervise a group of children on their own. They do not necessarily supervise other members of staff. This is different from a senior manager who is the person with overall responsibility for managing the provision in a setting. For the other countries the salaries are for staff in either a supervisory or a managerial role.
6. The childcare worker and supervisor salary figures for England are based on staff in private, voluntary and maintained full daycare settings only.
7. For the Netherlands, the childminder salary is based on approximately £4 per child per hour for a maximum of five children for an average of 21.6 hours per week for 52 weeks per year.

Notes on Primary school teacher salaries:

8. Denmark – includes part-time workers.
9. France – based on the mid-point of the salary scale for a primary teacher with the minimum required qualifications.
10. Sweden – covers teachers in primary and lower secondary, includes part-time workers.
11. Salary data for primary school teachers in Germany not available.
Rigid staff: child ratios lead providers down the low skills, low pay route

Part of the reason for England’s low pay problem is that regulations rigidly prescribe the number of staff nurseries have to employ. This prescription, particularly in connection with two-year-olds, means providers employ staff in numbers which force a choice between paying low wages and charging parents excessively high fees.

These staffing regulations have existed largely unchanged since the 1970s. Even four decades ago they only reflected common practice of the time, rather than firm evidence that they were best at protecting children’s safety and promoting learning and development.

The staffing rules in the countries listed below allow providers to operate more flexibly, with better qualified staff on higher salaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Nurseries</th>
<th>Childminders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfE figures obtained by a bespoke survey of 15 OECD countries (fieldwork carried out in 2012).

Notes:
England - Ratio for children aged three and over is 1:13 if led by a teacher.
France - Ratios vary by provider type: crèches (1:5 children who cannot walk and 1:8 children who can walk); jardins d’éveil (1:12 children between two and three years old); kindergartens and pre-schools (1:26 children aged three to compulsory schooling, where led by a teacher).
Ireland - In sessional pre-school provision the staff:child ratio is 1:11 for children aged 2.5 years to six years. In full/part-time daycare provision the ratio is 1:6 for two-year-olds and 1:8 for three- to six-year-olds
Germany - although there are no national mandatory staff:child ratios individual Länder (regions) are free to set their own regulations.
We know that the key to success is employing staff with the skills and knowledge that make a difference for young children. Yet rigid staffing requirements mean those providers often pay wages at or close to the minimum wage. This puts a cap on quality. Talented graduates are put off working in the early years, feeding the false perception that working with young children is low status and unimportant.

Even where our centrally prescribed regulations allow flexibility, it is often not fully used. It is already possible to operate with up to 13 three- and four-year-olds to each adult where there is a teacher or other suitable graduate, but many nurseries choose not to use this flexibility. Often, this is because graduate-level staff are in managerial roles rather than working directly with children. It is not simply a question of financial constraint – the additional income generated by taking on more children would in many cases support the higher pay needed to attract a qualified graduate. This would have real educational benefits, as the evidence strongly suggests that group care with graduate leadership supports better outcomes for children.

It is clear that other countries choose to strike a different balance, with higher staff: child ratios combined with more highly qualified professionals. For example\textsuperscript{16}:

- **The Netherlands**: the initial training requirement for a certified childcare worker is three years of post-18 training. For pre-school teaching staff the initial teacher training is a three year vocational higher education course.

- **France**: at least 40 per cent of staff must be qualified up to diploma level, achieved after a year-long, post-18 course. Under the age of three, crèches have a ratio of 1:5 for children who cannot walk and 1:8 for children who can walk and who are toilet trained. Classes in écoles maternelles are led by qualified teachers, supported by assistants.

- **Ireland**: there is wide variation; but a year-long vocational training course is common. Any pre-school leader contracted to deliver a free universal pre-school scheme must hold a minimum of a Level 5 NFQ qualification (corresponds to UK Level 3) and their daycare settings have a ratio of 1:5 for one-year-olds and 1:6 for two-year-olds.

- **Denmark**: there are no national mandatory limits on the number of children nursery staff can look after. There is a maximum ratio for childminders of five children. Both pre-school teachers and childcare workers are required to undergo three to five years vocational or tertiary education, depending on prior experience.

- **Sweden**: there are no national mandatory limits on the number of children staff can look after. Childcare workers have to undertake a three year initial teacher training course, and pre-primary teachers have to undertake a 3.5 year university

\textsuperscript{16} Examples are taken from a variety of sources including the OECD Starting Strong III: A Quality Toolbox for ECEC; OECD Family Database PF 4.2 A; the British Embassy in France; and bespoke survey of OECD member states carried out by the Department in 2012.
teacher training course. Two years ago, the Government proposed that existing degrees in education should be replaced by four new professional degrees: pre-school education, primary school education, subject education and vocational education.

- **Germany**: there are no national mandatory limits on the number of children staff can look after. However, individual Länder (regions) can set their own regulations. More bachelor degree-level Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) programmes are emerging at university level. In 2011, the Ministers of Youth from German Länder agreed on a resolution about a common title (‘approved pedagogue for early childhood’) and common contents for these degree programmes.

### Lack of rigour and depth in a confusing range of qualifications

In October 2011, the Government asked Professor Cathy Nutbrown to conduct an independent review of early education and childcare qualifications. Her final report, ‘Foundations for Quality’\(^1\), published in June last year, was a timely reminder of the case for a more professional and more highly qualified workforce.

Professor Nutbrown rightly celebrated many examples of excellent practice, but also highlighted a number of concerns over the quality of early years qualifications. She expressed ‘significant doubts over whether the content of courses covers the skills and knowledge that people need to work in the sector’\(^2\).

### Proliferation of qualifications

As Professor Nutbrown said, there is currently ‘a complex and at times confusing qualifications picture’. Since the 1970s, the number of early years qualifications has grown exponentially, as the following graph from the Nutbrown Review shows:

\(^{17}\) *Foundations For Quality – the independent review of early education and childcare qualifications: Final Report (June 2012)*

\(^{18}\) *Review of Early Education and Childcare Qualifications: Interim Report (March 2012)*
If anything, this graph underestimates the scope for confusion. A list provided to the Nutbrown review by the Children’s Workforce Development Council showed that there were over 400 different early years qualifications for employers to consider. About half of these are regarded as “full and relevant” to the Early Years Foundation Stage.

**Employer concerns over quality**

Given the large number of qualifications held by people working in the early years, it is not surprising to learn of significant concerns over variation in quality.

Professor Nutbrown concluded that the proliferation of qualifications had left employers in a difficult position: ‘When employers come to recruit staff, they face a bewildering array of qualifications, some of which they do not trust (either because they are unsure that the content is suitable, or because they lack confidence that it has been taught to the right standard)”.

Indeed employers have found that, because early years qualifications are often substandard, they are forced to spend time training new staff for basic tasks.

**Low expectations of literacy and numeracy**

Professor Nutbrown wrote that ‘at present, there is no requirement for those studying at any level to demonstrate competence in English and mathematics in order to complete an early years qualification’.
Parents trust nurseries to help their children learn to speak and add up in the crucial early stages of their development. Yet early years qualifications do not presently require learners to have mastered basic literacy and numeracy. This is damaging both to children’s development and to parents’ confidence in the system as a whole.

A confusing regulatory regime, with Ofsted’s role duplicated by Local Authorities

In the past, regulations have focused too much on process not practice

Providers are responsible for the quality of their provision. They should always act in the best interests of the children in their care, responding to the wishes of parents and the available evidence. But in the past, they have too often been bound by overly prescriptive paperwork and bureaucracy. The new, slimmed-down Early Years Foundation Stage has improved the situation considerably.

But there is more to do. For instance, regulations currently prescribe: the amount of floorspace per child (3.5 m\(^2\) for children under two, 2.5 m\(^2\) per two-year-old, and 2.3 m\(^2\) per three- to five-year-old); an area for children to sleep; an area for staff to talk to parents confidentially; and an area where staff can spend time away from children. These features may be desirable in a nursery, but we do not believe regulations should prescribe the layout of a nursery with such specificity. We must trust professionals to make these decisions.

Strengthening inspection in the early years

Ofsted’s inspection regime is one of our system’s great strengths. An Ofsted inspection provides a recognised benchmark of quality and plays a crucial role in monitoring and improving the quality of provision and the outcomes for young children. Both parents and providers rightly value the rigour that the Ofsted process brings to early education and care.

In response to the reform of the Early Years Foundation Stage, Ofsted has strengthened the focus on the quality of care and learning and the outcomes for children through their revised inspection framework. Early feedback on this is encouraging, but we need to go further to ensure that regulations are reasonable and inspection judgements are as rigorous as possible.

We want to improve the Ofsted regime further. For instance, we want to see more involvement by HM Inspectors in the inspection of early years. Those HMIs that do work in the early years focus on the more complex areas of inspection such as children’s
centres, with the inspection of early years settings carried out by contracted inspectors instead.

The current system of inspection for childminders could also be improved. Each individual childminder is inspected every three or four years, usually for only around three to four hours. There is no question of the desirability of a thorough inspection regime for childminders, but it is less clear how far the current system drives quality.

**Ofsted role duplicated by local authorities**

At the moment, Ofsted are not the only arbiters of quality in the early years. Local authorities also have a role in determining which providers should qualify for funding for early education. They also approve training in connection with the Early Years Foundation Stage.

As Dame Clare Tickell reported in her review of the Early Years Foundation Stage, there have been mixed views on the experience of inspection and monitoring by local authorities. Some practitioners asserted that they were asked to gather disproportionate amounts of information to show how they met the EYFS requirements. Dame Clare drew attention to the need to tackle perceived inconsistencies around EYFS requirements from local authorities on the one hand and Ofsted on the other.

For example, there was a perception that local authorities sometimes asked providers to gather information not required by the EYFS or by Ofsted. This proliferation of requirements with which providers think they have to comply can be confusing, expensive and time consuming. It can also divert resources from where local authorities can add most value – ensuring that the most disadvantaged children receive early education and childcare that meets their needs.

Local authorities also act as gatekeepers to funding and as a statutory training provider, removing flexibility from the system and creating another layer in the process. Some providers operating in several areas have said that differing local practice adds to administrative burdens, making it more difficult for established national operations, with strong professional standards, to expand in response to parental demand. These local practices mean local authorities retain the money intended for educating three- and four-year-olds. In 2012-13, local authorities retained £160 million of funding and we want to see more of this pass to the front line.

---
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Early years inspections not fully integrated with schools inspections

Schools are routinely inspected by Ofsted, but they currently have to have an additional early years inspection if they register as an early years provider to take two-year-olds. Early years provision in schools for children aged under three – even if it is run by the school governing body – needs to be separately registered with, and inspected by, Ofsted.

Parental choice is limited

The supply of places has risen in recent years, notably in full daycare. But there is an increasing challenge to ensure that sufficient numbers of good quality places are available to meet the increased demand created by demographic changes, the extension of free places to 40 per cent of two year olds, and parents who want to keep working while raising children.

Parents want a choice between quality home-based and nursery care. Many parents particularly value home-based childminders because of the distinct, flexible care that they can provide, especially for the youngest children.

However, the number of registered childminders has almost halved, from over 100,000 twenty years ago to around 57,000 now, as the chart below shows:

Figure 6 Number of registered childminders, England 1992-2011

Sources: Childminding in the 1990s; 2001 Childcare Workforce Survey; 2002/03 Childcare Workforce Survey; Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey 2011
Parents may also be reluctant to use home-based care due to concerns over quality. Ofsted has found that the quality of childminding has persistently lagged behind the quality of other types of childcare, and that childminders have not been able to close the gap between them and other providers.

**Quality varies too much across the country**

Parents value being able to choose which provider most suits their needs, but parents in disadvantaged areas are far less likely to have a choice of high quality provision than those in more affluent areas. Inspection evidence shows that early education provision in disadvantaged areas is generally of lower quality.

The difference in quality of provision between the best- and worst-performing parts of the country is stark. For instance, in the best-performing local authority in the country, just 8 per cent of providers are rated less than good by Ofsted. Yet in one London authority, 45 per cent of providers are rated less than good.

Deprived areas are hit most by this variability in quality. Only around one in ten nurseries and childminders were rated outstanding by Ofsted as of last year.\(^{20}\) 39 per cent of childminders working in the most disadvantaged areas fail to achieve a ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ rating from Ofsted, compared to 23 per cent of childminders in the richest areas.

---

\(^{20}\) Ofsted Annual Report 2011/12
3. A plan of action

This document sets out our plan of action to tackle these issues and to achieve this new vision for the early education and childcare sector. We will take action on four key priorities:

- raising the status and quality of the workforce;
- freeing high quality providers to offer more places;
- improving the regulatory regime; and
- giving more choice to parents.

A. Raising the status and quality of the workforce

We know from the evidence at home and abroad that the quality of staff is crucial in delivering high quality early education.

This Government agrees with Professor Cathy Nutbrown’s view that the workforce supporting our babies, young children and their parents should be well-qualified, well-respected and well-led.

Early Years Teachers

We need to move decisively away from the idea that teaching young children is somehow less important or inferior to teaching school-age children. The evidence shows that gaps in educational attainment between the weakest and strongest performers, and the well-off and less well-off, are already well-established before children reach school. The evidence also shows that graduate leadership is the best way to improve outcomes for young children.

We want to raise the status of the profession so that more high quality graduates consider a career in early education. There are already courses for graduates leading to Early Years Professional Status, but we want to go further. We will introduce Early Years Teachers to build upon the strengths of the Early Years Professional Status programme. Existing Early Years Professionals will be recognised as the equivalent of Early Years Teachers. Early Years Teachers will be specialists in early childhood development, trained to work with babies and young children.

We will start training the first Early Years Teachers from September 2013. We will improve the existing standards for Early Years Professionals so that they more closely match the Teaching Standards for classroom teachers. Early Years Teachers will have to meet the same entry requirements as primary classroom trainee teachers – at least a C grade in English, maths and science at GCSE. From September 2014, they will be
required to pass the same skills tests as classroom teacher trainees before they start their courses.

Learning from the example of the French école maternelle infant schools, we also want to see more school teachers teaching younger children. We will change the rules so that it is easier for schools to offer provision to the under-threes. These changes are set out in further detail below.

We will also examine how we can attract top graduates into the early years.

**Early Years Educators**

We will ensure new and better qualifications at Level 3, to qualify people to become ‘Early Years Educators’. Early Years Educator qualifications will be the modern equivalent of the highly respected Nursery Nurse Diploma, which used to be provided by the National Nursery Examination Board (NNEB) but was discontinued in the mid-1990s.

Building on the richer content and standards recommended by Professor Nutbrown, the Teaching Agency will publish new, tougher criteria for the new qualifications early in Summer 2013. They will consult widely this Spring to ensure that these criteria meet the needs of employers and prevent the proliferation of qualifications that has been a problem in the past. Awarding bodies will need to develop higher quality qualifications in time for introduction from September 2014 in order to comply with the new tougher criteria.

Training providers will be expected to include a high proportion of practical work experience in their courses. Entrants will be expected to have secured at least a C grade in GCSE English and mathematics.

Apprenticeships will offer a high quality route to becoming an Early Years Educator. We will also put in place a transitional measure to support delivery of the early education programme for two-year-olds from low-income families. From September 2013, we will offer a limited number of bursaries to better qualified apprentices taking early years qualifications. They must have at least C grades in GCSE English and mathematics. Those who receive bursaries will become the first Early Years Educators.

We agree with Professor Nutbrown that it would not be practical to apply the new criteria retrospectively. This would be disruptive to the workforce. The most sensible approach is that qualifications are assessed against the criteria in place when they were awarded. This will ensure that nobody is unfairly disadvantaged by changes to the system.
Better quality training

Practitioners within the early education and childcare sector need to keep their skills and knowledge up-to-date, whether this is through continuing with formal qualifications or through regular continuing professional development. This should include the sharing and dissemination of best practice and awareness of what works.

We will work with partners in further education and training to improve the quality of training available to childcare trainees, including through ensuring that the quality of placements they experience are normally only in good or outstanding settings and are of high quality themselves.

We will remove constraints on childcare training; for example, the obligation to use only local authority-approved first aid training. This will ensure that there is competition in the market for high quality training and professional development.

B. Freeing high quality providers to offer more places

We know that children are safest and develop best when they are looked after by high quality staff. Our reforms, in particular the introduction of Early Years Teachers and Early Years Educators, will place much greater emphasis on the skills and knowledge of those caring for and educating young children.

To support these developments, we need to take a fresh look at the rules that limit the numbers of children who can be cared for by each adult. In England these have remained largely unchanged since the 1970s.

We want to shift the focus away from the quantity of staff in a nursery towards the quality of education and care children are receiving. We should rely on professional, knowledgeable and qualified staff to consider the developmental needs of each child, thinking about how and when they would best benefit from larger, group-based activity. Quality and safety are paramount, so we will only allow providers to operate higher staff: child ratios if they employ high quality staff.

This move to put the needs of the child at the heart of decisions over staffing is critical if we are to give providers the flexibility to operate effectively, recruit more highly skilled staff and demonstrate their ability to offer outstanding education and care.

Learning from international examples

There is much to admire in the French approach, which aligns a more highly qualified workforce, paid a wage that reflects higher levels of skill and knowledge, with an approach to levels of staffing that gives providers the freedom to operate effectively. There is no doubt that the coverage and nature of French childcare is a key factor in the high level of female participation in the labour market.
Figure 7  A summary of the French system (estimated salaries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Pedagogical structure</th>
<th>Qualification level</th>
<th>Average annual salaries (GBP £ converted with PPP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daycare (Crèches)</td>
<td>Groups of children in structured activity</td>
<td>40 per cent of childcare staff must be comprised of people qualified to diploma level</td>
<td>£16,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childminders (Assistantes maternelles)</td>
<td>Home-based – can be part of childminding agency where groups operate</td>
<td>120 hours of training – 60 hours before the childminder can care for children, the remaining 60 hours in the two following years.</td>
<td>£13,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school (Écoles maternelles)</td>
<td>Nursery class teaching</td>
<td>Led by qualified teachers</td>
<td>£25,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INSEE / déclarations obligatoires des entreprises aux organismes sociaux (màj, extrapolée 2012). Salary figures for pre-school staff as of 2010 obtained via a DfE survey of UK Embassies (November 2012)

Note: Salary figures for daycare staff and childminders,

There are, of course, differences between France and England. In particular, England has far more private and voluntary provision, as well as the universal framework of the Early Years Foundation Stage. But this should not stop us examining what works in France.

Running through French provision is a sense of respect for professional judgement and a belief in the importance of skilful and knowledgeable staff. We need to give providers in England the flexibility to build this sense of professional skill and knowledge within their own practice.

A new approach to staffing in nurseries

We need to change the way we think about staffing in the early years, placing the emphasis on the individual development needs of each child, rather than relying on tight central prescription. Professional judgement should be backed with, and decisions based on, up-to-date evidence on child development, with Ofsted continuing to hold providers to account for the quality of education and care.

We will amend the Early Years Foundation Stage so that, from September 2013, high quality providers, employing highly qualified staff, will be able to offer more high quality places. Early years settings will only be able to use these higher staff: child ratios if they employ enough highly qualified staff. We will consult on exactly what qualification requirements will enable providers to operate our proposed higher ratios. For instance,
subject to consultation, we might require settings to meet one of the following criteria in order to be able to operate higher ratios:

- 70 per cent of staff qualified to at least Level 3;
- 100 per cent of staff qualified to at least Level 3;
- 100 per cent of staff have at least a C in English and Maths;
- At least one graduate in the setting plus 70 per cent of other staff qualified to at least Level 3; or

Ratios based on the individuals working with children – so that only a staff member with a Level 3 qualification and/or English and Maths GCSE can use the higher ratio

**Under-2s**

We recognise that the youngest children need more attention from adults, both in terms of their development and for practical reasons, such as the need to change nappies. In most cases, we will expect staff to look after no more than three children under two, as is currently the case.

However, we think that experienced and well-qualified staff are capable of looking after another child and so, for providers employing these staff, we will increase the upper limit to four babies. This is most likely to be for shorter periods of time, rather than for full day sessions.

**Group settings**

Structured group learning can be highly beneficial for toddlers and young children, playing a crucial role in emotional, intellectual and social development. We want to see these groups increasingly led by the new Early Years Educators.

Where staff are sufficiently qualified, we will increase the number of two-year-olds each adult can look after from four to six. This would bring England into line with practice in most European countries that have mandatory ratios, while not going as far as France where adults can look after eight two-year-olds each. For three-year-olds, there will be no change to the upper limit of eight children per member of staff in group settings without a graduate leader.

**Nursery classes**

In nursery classes for three- and four-year-olds, where a qualified graduate is working with the children, it is already possible to run groups on the basis of one adult to thirteen children. Yet too few providers, especially in the private and voluntary sector, take advantage of this flexibility, despite the evidence about the benefits that graduate leadership can have.
We will maintain the existing ratio of one adult to 13 children, but we want to see more teacher-led nursery classes using the flexibility already available. This will be supported by the introduction of Early Years Teachers and Early Years Educators.

### Figure 8 Nursery ratios summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under 1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England (current ratios)</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (proposed ratios where there are high quality staff)</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:12</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:6 or 1:11</td>
<td>1:8 or 1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfE obtained figures by a bespoke survey of 15 OECD countries (fieldwork carried out in 2012).

Notes:
- England - Over-3s ratio is 1:13 if led by a teacher.
- France - Ratios vary by provider type: crèches (1:5 children who cannot walk and 1:8 children who can walk); jardins d’éveil (1:12 children between two- and three-years-old); kindergartens and pre-schools (1:26 children aged three to compulsory schooling, where led by a teacher).
- Ireland - In sessional pre-school provision the staff:child ratio is 1:11 for children aged 2.5 years to six years. In full/part time daycare provision the ratio is 1:6 for two-year-olds and 1:8 for three- to six-year-olds.
- Germany - although there are no national mandatory staff: child ratios individual Länder (regions) are free to set their own regulations.

### Childminders

With greater professionalisation, childminders also deserve greater flexibility.

At any one time, childminders can currently care for a maximum of six children under the age of eight. Of these six children, a maximum of three may be young children, and there should only be one child under the age of one. This is more restrictive than many comparable countries. Such a tight restriction arguably makes sense in the case of the youngest children, but it does not reflect the significant development that children undergo between the ages of two and five.
In future, childminders will be able to look after up to four children under the age of five, with no more than two under 12 months. This will bring England in line with practice in France, while not going as far as Ireland, Denmark, Germany, Sweden or the Netherlands.

In addition, we will make clearer in the Early Years Foundation Stage the flexibility to look after an extra child for a reasonable period of time. This will give childminders the scope to respond better to parents’ needs – for example, to allow an overlap between the children they are looking after, perhaps because a parent is late picking up their child. At present, childminders can feel that the rules are too rigid for them to be able to make sensible arrangements of this sort.

**Figure 9  Childminder ratios summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England (current)</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (proposed)</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfE obtained figures by a bespoke survey of 15 OECD countries (fieldwork carried out in 2012).

Notes:

*England (current)* - Childminders can have a maximum of six children under the age of 8, a maximum of three young children (until 1st September following their 5th birthday), and a maximum of one child under 1.

*England (proposed)* - Childminders can have a maximum of six children under the age of 8, a maximum of 4 young children (until 1st September following their 5th birthday), and a maximum of two children under 1. Ratios can be exceeded by one for reasonable periods of time to allow for overlaps between children.

*Denmark* - The number of children per adult is regulated by law.

*France* - No information is available on the variations in ratios that may exist by age of children.

*Ireland* - Childminders can care for five children (including their own) and no more than two under the age of 15 months.
Consultation

We are consulting on the detail of these new, more flexible rules for nurseries and childminders. We will respond to this consultation in the Spring, with a view to the changes coming into force from September 2013.

Inspection

All Ofsted inspected providers – childminders and those in group settings – are subject to the Early Years Foundation Stage and will be inspected by Ofsted accordingly. Ofsted will expect providers to justify the staffing structure they use and the way they use the flexibility they have, explaining how it is best for the children in their care and how it helps to deliver better outcomes for those children.

C. Improving the regulatory regime

The skills, knowledge and capability of the people who work with young children are paramount. The evidence is clear on the importance of staff quality to the successful outcomes for children in early education. Accordingly, we will ensure there is a strong focus on quality, including staff quality, in the Ofsted inspection arrangements.

Reform of the Early Years Foundation Stage, with its greater focus on learning and development, has given Ofsted the scope to sharpen the focus on the quality and standards of children’s care, learning and development, and the progress children make towards the early learning goals set out in the slimmed-down EYFS. Since September 2012, inspectors now make three key judgements: how well the setting meets the needs of the range of children who attend; the contribution of the early years provision to children’s well-being; and the leadership and management of the early years provision.

Early feedback on the new framework suggests it is encouraging providers and staff to focus more strongly on the quality of care and children’s learning, and less on issues of process.

Our reforms mean we need to strengthen further the quality of early years inspection and reduce duplication in the system. Increasing the freedom for professionals to exercise their judgment also means increasing the accountability of providers. It is right to place more power in the hands of professionals to do what is best for young children. It is also right that those professionals should be held accountable for their judgements in a rigorous and transparent way. Parents expect care that ensures their children’s safety and wellbeing, with learning and development that will equip them to thrive in school and later life. Taxpayers rightly expect that public money spent on free early education, or on tax credits to support the costs of childcare, pays for high quality care and learning.
The best providers understand that the quality of staff, and their engagement with children, are key to the best outcomes for those children. This must remain at the heart of Ofsted’s inspection regime.

**HMI s working to improve early years**

Ofsted will substantially increase the input of HMIs in the early years from September 2013.

This increase in more experienced and well-qualified HMIs devoted to early years improvement will enable Ofsted to:

- enhance the quality assurance of Ofsted inspections;
- identify the most successful practice, through detailed analysis of inspection data trends and examples;
- broker links between weaker providers and outstanding schools, children’s centres and nurseries;
- challenge nursery chains and other private and voluntary providers to identify where improvements are needed; and
- develop and deliver robust arrangements for the regulation and inspection of new childminder agencies.

**Inspections targeted on weaker providers**

Ministers will give Ofsted greater freedom to target inspections on those providers who will most benefit, in particular weaker providers most in need of improvement. The current inspection arrangements give Ofsted some flexibility in terms of when inspections are scheduled, so that good and outstanding providers have longer periods of time between inspections. But this flexibility operates within the limits of an individual inspection cycle of four years. The effect is that Ofsted is obliged to inspect some providers more regularly than necessary, while others who would benefit more from Ofsted engagement have to wait longer than they usefully might between inspections.

We will work with Ofsted to develop new arrangements that place more emphasis on Ofsted’s judgement about which providers would most benefit from inspection. This could mean, for example, closer and more frequent engagement with those who are at the lower end of the ‘satisfactory’ category.

All providers will still be firmly within the Ofsted inspection regime, and Ofsted will retain the right to undertake a no-notice inspection on any registered provider.

The development of childminder agencies (outlined below) will also allow Ofsted to target inspections more effectively. There is no doubt that a thorough inspection regime is
desirable, but it is less clear how far the current system drives quality. Each childminder is inspected every three or four years, usually for only around three to four hours. Agencies will deliver intensive support to childminders, with regular monitoring visits and training. Ofsted will carry out thorough inspections of agency support and monitoring systems. Where childminders are registered with agencies, we do not envisage Ofsted needing to inspect each of them individually. Instead, Ofsted will inspect a sample of individual childminders to ensure that agencies are appropriately assessing the quality of childminders on their books. Childminders who do not join childminder agencies will continue to be inspected individually. The regulation and inspection of childminder agencies will be overseen by Ofsted’s HMIs.

**Early re-inspection for improving providers**

There is currently no means for nurseries, schools and childminders with an ‘inadequate’ or ‘satisfactory’ rating to request an early re-inspection if they believe their service has improved. Providers should not have to suffer the reputational damage of an ‘inadequate’ or ‘satisfactory’ Ofsted rating for several months, or even years, if they believe they have taken rapid action to improve quality.

We intend to make it possible for providers to request and pay for an early re-inspection. We are considering with Ofsted how best to deliver this re-inspection route. This will encourage providers to improve their practice and give those who are serious about improving the quality of their provision an opportunity to be recognised. We will look for an early opportunity to bring forward legislation, which will – subject to the will of Parliament – enable such inspections to take place.

Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector will also set out in more detail, in the Spring of 2013, his plans for further improvement of early years inspection, in the light of the proposals in this document.

**Moving further from process to outcomes**

Improvements to the learning and development requirements of the EYFS have been widely welcomed. However, the sections of the EYFS framework dealing with welfare and safeguarding remain overly complicated and duplicate requirements of other legislation. We will publish proposals shortly to improve these rules, making clearer the overriding responsibility of providers to ensure that children are safe and well cared for.

**Ofsted as the sole arbiter of quality**

We will also clarify for providers the roles of Ofsted and the local authority in judging the quality of provision. An Ofsted inspection rating should be the sole test of whether a provider is fit to offer the early education programme for two-, three- and four-year-olds funded by the taxpayer. We will propose changes to statutory guidance covering the
early education programme to emphasise the primacy of Ofsted inspection results in determining providers’ eligibility for funding.

This is good news for providers and for local authorities. It will provide clarity for providers, who have sometimes struggled to reconcile conflicting advice from Ofsted and their local authority. It will also mean that local authorities can pass on more of the £160 million of early education funding which they currently retain. For local authorities, it will free them from their existing quality improvement role and enable them to focus resources on ensuring that the most disadvantaged children are able to access early education that meets their needs.

D. Giving more choice to parents

The best way to ensure favourable outcomes for children is to give frontline staff the flexibility to respond to the needs of the children in their care. The changes to the staffing requirements we are proposing will help, and the shift that the changes that we and Ofsted have agreed – to focus ever more on practice rather than process – will reinforce the importance of children’s outcomes over paperwork.

There are also some structural changes that will help increase frontline flexibility. We will shortly publish proposals to make the registration regime more straightforward, more transparent and, ultimately, more effective. We will also tackle inefficiencies such as multiple registrations for the same provider operating on different sites.

Diversity of provision is a source of real strength in early education and care. It means we can draw on the expertise, passion and enthusiasm of the widest possible range of organisations in working with young children. It also helps ensure real choice for parents. We need to make it easier for new, high quality childcare providers to enter the system, whilst making it easier for existing providers to improve and progress. We also want to make it easier for providers to link up group- and home-based care, so that where parents wish, children can experience the best of both.

Many parents may want their children to benefit from group care, but not necessarily for the whole day. Flexible partnership arrangements between high quality nurseries, schools and childminders can offer children variety. We want to ensure that unnecessary obstacles to working in this way are minimised.

Childminder agencies

We want to make it simpler for talented people to become childminders and for quality childminders to operate and grow their business. Therefore, in addition to making it easier for existing childminders to care for more young children, we will also create new routes for people to enter childminding.
At the moment, most childminders are self-employed individuals running their own business. Many childminders are happy with these arrangements. But many other current and former childminders have found the requirements of setting up and running their own business far too burdensome. In some cases, it has prevented childminders from concentrating on delivering high quality early education and care, and in others it has driven people out of the profession altogether. This is one reason why the number of childminders has almost halved over the last twenty years.

We will therefore enable the creation of childminder agencies to provide childminders with a new framework of training, support and quality improvement. Childminders who join agencies will find they can concentrate on childminding rather than administrative tasks such as arranging training and finding clients.

Parents will also benefit. Instead of having to investigate every prospective childminder to check they are happy to entrust their children to their care, they could instead approach a childminder agency to match them with a nearby childminder. The agency would be quality assured and inspected by Ofsted, offering parents reassurance. There could be many practical benefits too. For instance, agencies could arrange for cover when childminders fall ill, saving parents the hassle of finding someone else at short notice – or even having to take a day off work to look after the children themselves.

We will legislate so that, subject to the will of Parliament, childminder agencies will be able to:

- **provide regular training and quality assurance**;
- **match supply and demand**, helping to fill places and act as a point of contact with parents. They will also be able to resolve complaints and other issues;
- **take on administrative tasks**, for example, around registration and insurance. This will allow childminders to focus on caring for children; and
- **be registered with, and inspected, by Ofsted**, who will inspect and report on agencies’ quality. Agencies will have their performance assessed so that parents and childminders know exactly how well agencies are fulfilling their duties and supporting childminders. Ofsted will also inspect a sample of childminders under an agency, with a reduction in the overall bureaucracy of inspection without compromising quality.

The agency approach may be particularly attractive to people who have previously thought about entering the profession but been put off. This might include, for example, a new parent looking for a career change that lets them spend time with their child, but daunted by the prospect of unsupported self-employment. Equally, it might be attractive to a nursery worker, interested in working for themselves, but nervous about leaving the supporting structure of group provision.
It will not be compulsory for childminders to join agencies. Many existing childminders have already overcome barriers to enter the market – the registration process, the costs of training – and have built up successful small businesses. It is absolutely right that these childminders continue to be free to operate independently. However, for new or existing childminders, such as those working in rural areas where support is lacking, for example, agencies can offer a formalised support network and a more secure way of working.

We do not intend to be restrictive about the business model for childminder agencies and we see considerable scope for innovation. Beyond setting out the core functions of an agency – supporting and training staff, registering with Ofsted, quality assurance – we will not prescribe a single approach. Agencies will be free to respond to the needs of parents and childminders directly, as well as to local need. We anticipate a variety of business models, including:

- agencies led by high-quality nurseries, primary schools or children’s centres who want to increase the choice of provision available to parents in the local area;
- organisations offering both group-based and home-based provision, perhaps with flexibility for parents to move their children between the two; and
- childminder-led agencies, with experienced childminders moving to a training and development role, supporting other childminders in the agency.

We are working with providers to develop the agency proposition and business model in the coming months. We plan to look at existing childminder networks and groups, using good practice to inform the best approach for agencies. We will also look to other countries with childminder agencies, such as France and the Netherlands, to see what works and what could helpfully be brought to bear on the English model. We will pilot agency arrangements in 2013, with the aim of agencies operating (and being registered and inspected) by 2014, subject to Parliamentary approval. We will publish more guidance on setting up agencies and the implications for childminders of joining them in due course.

**Encouraging schools to offer more early years provision**

We hope that some schools will choose to run childminder agencies, offering an opportunity to combine support for childminders with broader services to offer both group-based and home-based care, as well as using their teaching expertise. Involving schools could lead to an increased focus on early education through the childminders within school-led agencies, and create the opportunity for the children with those childminders to engage with school early.

We also want to make it easier for schools to be able to offer provision for under-5s. Countries like France, where children can start at *école maternelle* infant schools
from the age of two, offer a model that is well-established and respected. Many primary schools already have nurseries attached and so provide early years education directly, and around 50% of children’s centres are on school sites. We want to build on this, and remove barriers to schools improving their offer to younger children.

Subject to legislation, we will remove the current requirement for schools to register separately with Ofsted in order to provide for children under three. We will reform the current cumbersome statutory processes for schools to change their age range, to make it easier for them to offer early years provision for two-year-olds.

The development of Early Years Teachers working with our youngest children will make it easier for schools to offer early years education, as the teaching workforce will cover all ages.

**Supporting providers to develop their own national standards**

As frontline professionals have more flexibility to respond to the needs of children in their care, so the onus for developing and maintaining professional standards in settings will increasingly shift to providers themselves. The providers that can demonstrate a strong commitment to quality will be the ones that flourish, as parents become ever more demanding consumers of their services.

We want to make it easier for the entrepreneurs running good and outstanding nurseries to move into new areas, where there is not sufficient high quality provision. In the past, providers who sought to expand too often reported that variations in funding levels and local quality requirements held them back.

The reforms that we are making will:

- make it easier for high quality providers to expand;
- lead to greater transparency in funding which will mean providers can begin to plan with greater certainty;
- ensure that consistent national quality standards overseen by Ofsted will make it easier for providers to develop their own quality assurance mechanisms; and
- lead to better and more consistently understood qualifications which will make it easier for providers to recruit the right staff.
## Appendix: Government response to recommendations of Professor Cathy Nutbrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutbrown recommendation</th>
<th>Recommended action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The Teaching Agency should develop a more robust set of ‘full and relevant’ criteria to ensure qualifications promote the right content and pedagogical processes.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted.</strong> Teaching Agency will consult on revised set of ‘full and relevant’ criteria and proposals for the Early Years Educator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) All qualifications commenced from 1 September 2013 must demonstrate that they meet the new ‘full and relevant’ criteria when being considered against the requirements of the EYFS.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted in principle,</strong> but timescale changed to September 2014. The Teaching Agency’s ‘full and relevant’ consultation will state that we will ensure that new Early Years Educator Level 3 qualifications will be in place from 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The previously articulated plan to move to a single early years qualification should be abandoned.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted.</strong> The Teaching Agency’s ‘full and relevant’ consultation will state this plan will not happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The Government should consider the best way to badge qualifications that meet the new ‘full and relevant’ criteria so that people can recognise under what set of ‘full and relevant’ criteria a qualification has been gained.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted.</strong> The ‘Early Years Educator’ title will offer a recognised badge of quality for qualifications which meet the new ‘full and relevant’ criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The EYFS requirements should be revised so that, by September 2022, all staff counting in the staff:child ratios must be qualified at</td>
<td><strong>Still under consideration and subject to consultation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutbrown recommendation</td>
<td>Recommended action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6)</strong> The EYFS requirements should be revised so that, from September 2013, a minimum of 50 per cent of staff in group settings need to possess at least a ‘full and relevant’ Level 3 to count in the staff:child ratios.</td>
<td>Still under consideration and subject to consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7)</strong> The EYFS requirements should be revised so that, from September 2015, a minimum of 70 per cent of staff in group settings need to possess at least a ‘full and relevant’ Level 3 to count in the staff:child ratios.</td>
<td>Still under consideration and subject to consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8)</strong> Level 2 English and mathematics should be entry requirements to Level 3 early education and childcare courses.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted in principle.</strong> The Teaching Agency’s ‘full and relevant’ consultation will set out that entrants to Level 3 Early Years Educator courses will be expected to have secured at least a C grade in GCSE English and mathematics. We will consult on proposals on how this might be made a requirement, including by inserting a requirement for English and maths GCSEs into the Early Years Foundation Stage Statutory Framework, in due course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9)</strong> Tutors should be qualified to a higher level than the course they are teaching.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted in principle.</strong> DfE will work across Government (i.e. with BIS) to help Further Education and other post-16 providers to promote good practice in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10)</strong> All tutors should have regular continuing professional development and contact with early years settings. Colleges and training providers should allow sufficient time for this.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted in principle.</strong> DfE will work across Government (i.e. with BIS) to help Further Education and other post-16 providers to promote good practice in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11)</strong> Only settings that are rated ‘Good’ or ‘Outstanding’ by Ofsted should be able to host students on placement.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted in principle.</strong> DfE will work across Government (i.e. with BIS) to help Further Education and other post-16 providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutbrown recommendation</td>
<td>Recommended action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12)</strong> Colleges and training providers should look specifically at the setting’s ability to offer students high quality placements.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted.</strong> DfE will work across Government (i.e. with BIS) to help Further Education and other post-16 providers to promote good practice in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13)</strong> The Department for Education should conduct research on the number of BME staff at different qualification levels, and engage with the sector to address any issues identified.</td>
<td><strong>Keep under review.</strong> The Teaching Agency’s ‘full and relevant’ consultation will seek views on whether or not the proposals for the content and standard of new qualifications have equality implications, and we will consider including questions in future Childcare and Early Years Provider surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14)</strong> Newly qualified practitioners starting in their first employment should have mentoring for at least the first six months. If the setting is rated below ‘Good’, this mentoring should come from outside.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted in principle.</strong> Settings should consider how they can put mentoring arrangements in place for new front line staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15)</strong> A suite of online induction and training modules should be brought together by the Government, that can be accessed by everyone working in early education and childcare.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted in principle but no action by Government.</strong> Rather the sector/settings should seek to draw this together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16)</strong> A new early years specialist route to QTS, specialising in the years from birth to seven, should be introduced, starting from September 2013.</td>
<td><strong>Not accepted.</strong> We agree with Professor Nutbrown that there is a need to transform the status of the profession and we want more high quality graduates to consider a career in early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutbrown recommendation</td>
<td>Recommended action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education. We do not, however, consider a route to the award of QTS is necessary to do this. We will introduce Early Years Teachers who will be specialists in early childhood development trained to work with babies and young children from birth to five. The training route and the new Teachers’ Standards (Early Years) will build on the strengths of the EYPS programme. Early Years Teacher Status will be seen as the equivalent to QTS, therefore entry requirements to Early Years Teacher training courses will be the same as entry to primary teacher training. This change will give one title of ‘teacher’ across the early years and schools sectors which will increase status and public recognition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) Any individual holding Early Years Professional Status (EYPS) should be able to access routes to obtain QTS as a priority. **Not accepted.** Those with EYPS are graduates already trained specifically to work with babies and children from birth to five years. Existing Early Years Professionals will in future be seen as the equivalent of Early Years Teachers. Early Years Professionals will therefore not need to obtain QTS to increase their status, although routes are already available to QTS if they wish to take them.  

18) I recommend that Government considers the best way to maintain and increase graduate pedagogical leadership in all early years settings. **Accepted.** We will introduce Early Years Teachers to lead the further improvements in quality we want to see. We will set out funding arrangements for Early Years Teachers in due course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutbrown recommendation</th>
<th>Recommended action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19) I am not recommending that the Government impose a licensing system on the early years sector.</td>
<td>No action for Government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Purpose

1.1 To advise Members of the Select Committee of the work programme for the municipal year 2013/14.

2 Summary

2.1 At the beginning of the municipal year, each select committee drew up a draft work programme for submission to the Business Panel for consideration.

2.2 The Business Panel is due to consider the proposed work programmes of each of the select committees on 14 May 2013 and agree a co-ordinated overview and scrutiny work programme, avoiding duplication of effort and facilitating the effective conduct of business.

2.3 However, the work programme is a “living document” and as such can be reviewed at each Select Committee meeting so that members are able to include urgent, high priority items and remove items that are no longer a priority.

3 Recommendations

3.1 The select committee is asked to:

- note the work programme attached at Appendix B and discuss any issues arising from the programme;
- specify the information and analysis required in the report for each item on the agenda for the next meeting, based on desired outcomes, so that officers are clear on what they need to provide;
- note all forthcoming executive decisions, attached at Appendix C, and consider any key decisions for further scrutiny.

4. The work programme

4.1 The work programme for 2013/14 was agreed at the meeting of the Committee held on 9 April 2013 and will be considered by the Business Panel on 14 May 2013.

4.2 The Committee is asked to consider if any urgent issues have arisen that require scrutiny and if any existing items are no longer a priority and can be removed from the work programme. Before adding additional items, each item should be considered against agreed criteria. The flow chart attached at Appendix A may help members decide if proposed additional items should be added to the work programme.
programme. The Committee's work programme needs to be achievable in terms of the amount of meeting time available. If the committee agrees to add additional item(s) because they are urgent and high priority, Members will need to consider which medium/low priority item(s) should be removed in order to create sufficient capacity for the new item(s).

5. The next meeting

5.1 The following items are scheduled for the next meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Review Type</th>
<th>Link to Corporate Priority</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Falling Through The Gaps – Response from mayor and Cabinet</td>
<td>In-depth review response</td>
<td>Young people's achievement and involvement, Protection of children</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nursery and Childcare Review</td>
<td>In-depth review</td>
<td>Young people's achievement and involvement,</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ofsted foster care report</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>Protection of children</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 The Committee is asked to specify the information and analysis it would like to see in the report for each item, based on the outcomes the committee would like to achieve, so that officers are clear on what they need to provide for the next meeting.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

7. Legal Implications

7.1 In accordance with the Council’s constitution, all scrutiny select committees must devise and submit a work programme to the Business Panel at the start of each municipal year.

8. Equalities Implications

8.1 The Equality Act 2010 brought together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act included a new public sector equality duty, replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
• eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
• advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
• foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

8.2 There may be equalities implications arising from items on the work programme and all activities undertaken by the Select Committee will need to give due consideration to this.

9. Date of next meeting

9.1 The date of the next meeting is 25 June 2013.

10. Background Documents

Lewisham Council’s Constitution

Centre for Public Scrutiny the Good Scrutiny Guide – a pocket guide for public scrutineers
Scrutiny work programme – prioritisation process

Does this issue affect a number of people living, working and studying in Lewisham?
  - Yes
  - No

Is the issue strategic and significant?
  - Yes
  - No

Can scrutiny add value? Is performance likely to improve as a result of scrutiny activity?
  - Yes
  - No

Will scrutiny work be duplicating other work?
  - No
  - Yes

Is the Council due to review the relevant policy area (allowing scrutiny recommendations to influence the new direction to be taken)?
  - Yes
  - No

Is it an issue of concern to partners, stakeholders and/or the community?
  - Yes
  - No

Are there adequate resources available to do the scrutiny well?
  - Yes
  - No

Is the scrutiny activity timely?
  - Yes
  - No

ACCEPT
High Priority

CONSIDER
Medium/Low Priority

REJECT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item</th>
<th>Type of review</th>
<th>Strategic priority</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Delivery deadline</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raising of Participation Age strategy</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young carers</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP2, CP7</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery and Childcare Provision</td>
<td>In-depth review</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster carers jeans</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth review - Falling through the gaps - children at risk through, potentially, being unknown to the local authority</td>
<td>In-depth review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP2, CP7</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and achievement in Lewisham Schools</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked after children performance and participation strategy</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings 2012/13 (subject to timetables from finance)</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Play Clubs update</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school placements planning</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention and targetted support (incl Childrens Centres and visit)</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN Pathfinder (incl site visit)</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on Youth Service Reforms (Joint meeting with Safer Stronger Communities SC)</td>
<td>Standard review</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate parenting update</td>
<td>Performance monitoring</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding status and update (incl LSCB)</td>
<td>Performance monitoring</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Schedule**

1) Tue 09 Apr (Due 28 Mar)  5) Wed 09 Nov (Due 28 Oct)
2) Wed 15 May (Due 07 May)  6) Tue 03 Dec (Due 21 Nov)
3) Tue 20 Jun (Due 13 Jun)  7) Wed 28 Jan (Due 21 Jan)
4) Wed 09 Oct (Due 01 Oct)  8) Tue 04 Mar (Due 22 Feb)
### MAYOR & CABINET May 1 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and details of Item</th>
<th>Directorate responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variations to Kender Phase 4 Disposal &amp; Appropriation of Kender Phase 4 (Kender Triangle) New Cross SE14 for planning purposes</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Southern Housing sites</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral from Housing Select Committee</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument of Government Athelney /Elfrida Federation &amp; nomination of LA governor</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment/ Re-appointment of LA Governors</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAYOR & CABINET(CONTRACTS) May 1 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and details of Item</th>
<th>Directorate responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Meals Contract</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Contract Award</td>
<td>Customer Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAYOR & CABINET May 22 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and details of Item</th>
<th>Directorate responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Children &amp; Young People Select Committee - ‘Falling through the gaps’ in-depth review</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Children and Young People Select Committee and the</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People/ Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and details of Item</td>
<td>Directorate responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption Statement of Purpose and Children’s Guides.</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Statement of Purpose</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment/ Re-appointment of LA Governors</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Matters Progress</td>
<td>Customer Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Community Involvement</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Prudential Borrowing Programme of Investment 2013-14</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cross Gate Healthy Living Centre Scheme</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of freehold interests in Nos. 4 &amp; 15 Parkcroft Road SE12</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catford Town Centre Local Plan</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catford Stadium Site – Release of Covenant</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Site Allocations Local plan</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Management Local Plan-Submission Stage</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAYOR & CABINET(CONTRACTS) May 22 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and details of Item</th>
<th>Directorate responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award of contracts - consultancy services Primary Places Programme for Employers Agent and other professional services.</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAYOR & CABINET June 19 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and details of Item</th>
<th>Directorate responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Grants Programme – Community Centres</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Children and Young People Select Committee on Strengthening Specialist Provision</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Healthier Communities Select Committee on the implementation of the recommendations or the Premature Mortality Review</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Housing Select Committee on the Select Committee Work Programme.</td>
<td>Customer Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Sustainable Development Select Committee on neighbourhood planning.</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Draft Charging Schedule – Version 2</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAYOR & CABINET(CONTRACTS) June 19 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and details of Item</th>
<th>Directorate responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Company Obligation delivery partner procurement decision</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building School for the Future Brent Knoll</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprocurement of the Learning Disability Framework Agreement - Appointment of providers to Framework</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR &amp; CABINET July 10 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title and details of Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>Directorate responsible</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission to consult on proposals to enlarge 1) Coopers Lane Primary School from 2 to 3FE 2) Forster Park Primary School from 2 to 3FE</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards of contracts for the construction of 1) the Primary Phase of Prendergast Ladywell Fields College 2) the enlargement of Adamsrill from 2 to 3FE.</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAYOR &amp; CABINET(CONTRACTS) July 10 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title and details of Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree the selection/approval of (Fire, Asbestos &amp; Water Hygiene) Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards of contracts for the enlargement of John Stainer Primary from 1 to 2 FE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAYOR &amp; CABINET September 11 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title and details of Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Supply and Demand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAYOR &amp; CABINET(CONTRACTS) September 11 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title and details of Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People Contract Award Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>