

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

20 December 2011

## Introduction

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

---

<sup>1</sup> *Supporting Families in the Foundation Years*, July 2011

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

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

## Next Steps

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

## This document

- x. The remainder of this document explains the feedback we received in response to each question raised in consultation<sup>2</sup> and sets out a proposed way forward on each issue. It is organised by theme:-
- Learning and development
  - Assessment
  - Safeguarding and welfare
  - Other issues

---

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

## Consultation methodology

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

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

---

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

## Section 1: Learning and development

### Prime and specific areas

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

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

There were 2171 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2141 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2071 responses to this question.

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

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

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

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

## The Early Learning Goals

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

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

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

There were 2114 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2101 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2105 responses to this question.

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

**Q5d Literacy: Reading, Writing**

There were 2086 responses to this question.

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

**Q5e Mathematics: Numbers, Shape, Space and Measures**

There were 2085 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2081 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2071 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2057 responses to this question.

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



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

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

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

11. The ELGs now read as follows:

## The Prime Areas

### *Communication and language*

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

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

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

### *Physical Development*

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

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

### *Personal, social and emotional development*

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

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

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

## The Specific Areas

### *Literacy*

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

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

### *Mathematics*

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

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

### *Understanding the world*

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

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

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

## ***Expressive arts and design***

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

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

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

## Language

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

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

There were 2033 responses to this question.

910 (45%) Yes

505 (25%) No

618 (30%) Not Sure

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

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

## Play

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

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

There were 2110 responses to this question.

795 (38%) Yes

1031 (49%) No

284 (13%) Not Sure

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

## Wraparound and Holiday Providers

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

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

There were 1917 responses to this question.

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

**Q8b** Are the requirements explained clearly?

There were 1900 responses to this question.

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

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





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

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

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

There were 2038 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2017 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 2064 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 1987 responses to this question.

1150 (58%) Yes

208 (10%) No

629 (32%) Not Sure

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

There were 1836 responses to this question.

797 (44%) Yes

960 (52%) No

79 (4%) Not Sure

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

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

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

## The progress check at age two

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

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

There were 2096 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 1951 online responses to this question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Children with Special Educational Needs

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

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

There were 1993 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 1845 responses to this question.

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

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

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

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

## Section 3: Safeguarding and welfare

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

### Overall requirements

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

There were 1986 responses to this question.

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

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

### Training

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



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

There were 1973 responses to this question.

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

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

## Supervision

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

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

There were 1982 responses to this question.

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

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

## Ratios (age)

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

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

There were 2081 responses to this question.

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

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

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

## Childminder training

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

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

There were 1992 responses to this question.

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

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

## Risk assessments

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

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

There were 1977 responses to this question.

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

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

There were 1934 responses to this question.

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

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

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

## Other issues

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

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

There were 1875 responses to this question.

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

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

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

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

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

## Role of Ofsted

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

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

There were 1760 responses to this question.

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

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

## Learning and Development – powers to secure improvements

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

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

There were 1864 responses to this question.

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

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

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

## Section 4: Other Issues

### Partnership with parents

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

There were 1977 responses to this question.

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

74. Views were mixed on the question of whether the revised draft EYFS would support effective partnership working with parents and carers and enhance their involvement in their child's learning and development. Respondents who answered positively felt that the simpler nature of the new EYFS would help practitioners explain it to parents. The progress check at age two was seen as a useful vehicle to help practitioners engage with parents about their child's development. The parent-friendly EYFS summary (that we will be producing) was an opportunity to highlight information from the EYFS which parents would find useful. We hope practitioners will find it a helpful tool in meeting the requirement to share information with parents about the EYFS and how it supports their child's learning.

75. Where respondents disagreed or were unsure the revised EYFS would support partnership arrangements with parents/carers, they generally considered that the current EYFS provided adequate guidance and that the revisions did not mean significant changes. Training was suggested as a means of raising awareness, amongst the early years workforce of effective strategies for engaging parents.

76. Local authorities retain a responsibility to provide training to support implementation of the EYFS. We are working with our partners to explore opportunities to support practitioners to improve practice in working with parents through guidance and/or training. This includes working with 4Children to identify examples of good practice to be made available on the Families in the Foundation Years website.

77. The Department's wider efforts to support partnership between practitioners and parents to support children's learning, include making clear in our specification to potential providers of the Parenting Classes trials, that classes should cover the relevance of play, exploration and learning to children's development; and help parents provide the best support for their child and to stimulate their children's learning and play (as appropriate to their age/stage of development). The Department for Education is working with the Department of Health on options for developing a Digital Advice Service that would support parents on a wide range of issues, including encouraging parents to get more involved in their children's learning.

## Presentation

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

## The Introduction

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

There were 2130 responses to this question.

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

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

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

## Ease of navigation

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

There were 2033 responses to this question.

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

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



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

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

There were 1953 responses to this question.

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

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

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

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

There were 968 responses to this question.

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

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

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

## Exemptions

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

## Annex A

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

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

## Annex B

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

### Organisation

11

1st Safari Day Nurseries Ltd

326 Club

4Children

Abacus Pre-School

ABC Childcare (Ipswich) Ltd

Absolute Angels Montessori Nursery

Acacia Playgroup

Acorn Montessori Nursery

Acorns Nurseries

Acorns Playgroup

Acres of Fun Ltd

Action for Children

Action in Rural Sussex

Action with Communities in Rural England

Activ8 Learning

Afasic England

Alder Bridge School

Alderley Day Nursery

Aldwickbury Prep-School

Alexandra Nursery School

All Saints Pre-School Playgroup

Alne Play Group

Alresford Youth Association

Alton Infant School

Ambitious About Autism

Anlaby Park Methodist Pre-School

Anne Frank Montessori

Appletree Childcare

Archway Children's Centre

Ark, The

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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



## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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



## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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



## Organisation

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

## Organisation

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

© Crown copyright 2011

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

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

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