

# **Early Learning & Childcare 1140 Hours Expansion - Programme of Trials**

**Analysis of responses to Scottish  
Government discussion paper**

**May 2016**

# **EARLY LEARNING & CHILDCARE 1140 HOURS EXPANSION - PROGRAMME OF TRIALS**

**Analysis of responses to Scottish Government  
discussion paper**

**Linda Nicholson, The Research Shop**

Scottish Government  
2016

## CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE NO.
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2. INTRODUCTION	6
3. VIEWS ON WHAT THE KEY FEATURES OF SCOTLAND'S ELC MODEL SHOULD BE	9
4. VIEWS ON WHICH SPECIFIC PRINCIPLES OF ELC MODELS SHOULD BE PRIORITISED WITHIN THE PROGRAMME OF TRIALS	13
5. VIEWS ON THE KEY BARRIERS TO SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTING THE 1140 COMMITMENT	16
6. EXISTING EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE WITHIN ELC PROVISION	23
7. EXISTING EXAMPLES OF INNOVATIVE DELIVERY WITHIN ELC PROVISION	25
8. APPROACHES TO MEASUREMENT OF TRIALS	26
9. VIEWS ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTEGRATED SERVICES	30
10. ADDRESSING DIVERSITY ACROSS SCOTLAND	34
11. VIEWS ON DESIGNING TRIALS FOR DIVERSITY	36
12. INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROGRAMME OF TRIALS	39
Annex 1: List of respondents	41
Annex 2 : Examples of best practice (Q5)	43
Annex 3 : Examples of innovative practice (Q6)	53
Annex 4 : Interest in involvement in the programme of trials (Q11)	57

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 The Scottish Government is committed to increasing the Early Learning and Childcare (ELC) entitlement to 1140 hours per year for all 3 and 4 year olds in addition to eligible 2 year olds (based on free school meal entitlement criteria) by the end of the next Parliament (2020).

1.2 In recognition of the need to ensure the proposed wider provision of ELC to 1140 hours is supported with high quality delivery and responsive provision which meets local needs, the Scottish Government proposes to establish a number of trials to test different models of delivery.

1.3 On 20 January 2016 the Scottish Government published a discussion paper to seek the views of parents, other stakeholders and delivery partners on the scope and design of the trials.

1.4 73 responses to the consultation were received, 58 from organisations and 15 from individuals. A summary of views from the responses follows.

### **Views on what the key features of Scotland's ELC model should be**

1.5 The three key features of Scotland's ELC model identified most frequently were: flexible provision; qualified workforce; and quality of provision.

1.6 Respondents identified priority features which were child-focused; parent-focused; workforce-focused; policy-focused; and focused on consistency across settings.

1.7 Child-focused models of provision were envisaged as demonstrating features such as: a qualified workforce delivering quality provision in a high standard physical environment. Innovative child-driven approaches to delivery were identified including creative and outdoor contexts in play-based and nurturing environments.

1.8 Parent-focused models of provision were identified as those offering flexibility and choice; and which provide some form of capacity-building for parents, perhaps improving parenting skills and/or opportunities for training.

1.9 Workforce-focused features of provision were described as those in which staff are remunerated fairly, are valued and have well defined career structures.

1.10 Policy-focused models had narrowing the attainment gap as a clear aim and were underpinned by GIRFEC principles.

1.11 Consistency across settings was prioritised in terms of quality, terms and conditions for workforce, ratio of teacher time per child and regulatory reviews.

### **Views on which specific principles of ELC models should be prioritised within the programme of trials**

1.12 The specific principles of ELC models identified most frequently as priorities were: quality of provision; flexibility of provision; child-centred approaches; and parental choice over provision.

1.13 Trialling a range of settings and patterns of provision was recommended in order to cater for parents' variety of work, training and education commitments.

1.13 Other significant principles mentioned less frequently were: fairness/equity of access; integration between services; holistic partnership approach with parents; and evidence-based models.

### **Views on the key barriers to successfully implementing the 1140 hours commitment**

1.14 A prevailing concern was that quality of provision should not be compromised during trials and subsequent implementation and that the focus should remain child-centred throughout.

1.15 The two main barriers to successful implementation which were identified repeatedly were lack of ELC places to meet demand; and lack of staff suitably qualified and experienced to deliver the expanded hours. Problems were envisaged particularly in rural locations and in achieving diversity in the workforce.

1.16 Low pay and status not commensurate with qualifications and skills were perceived to be the key barriers to attracting and retaining staff.

1.17 A common theme across private, third sector and voluntary providers was that the funding they receive from local authorities for free places at their setting is not adequate to cover their costs, leading to an uneven playing field which hinders further expansion in provision.

1.18 Other barriers identified included: increased bureaucracy; lack of consistency across settings and local authorities; lack of effective partnership working; questions over sustainability of 1140 hours under different Government administrations; lack of information for parents about expanded provision; and concerns over the adequacy of data collection systems to capture learning from the trials.

1.19 To address some of these issues, recommendations were made for: a programme of purpose-built settings to accommodate the extra ELC space required; a significant culture and attitudinal change to improve perceptions of ELC as a positive career choice; and increased transparency in the funding from local authorities to commissioned providers.

### **Examples of current best practice within ELC provision**

1.20 49 examples of best practice within ELC provision were identified by respondents. The largest body of examples related to those where flexibility had been offered to families to enable parents to be supported to take up employment and other opportunities. Other examples focused on: increasing and upskilling the workforce; partnership working with parents; child-centred approaches; effective use of outdoor space; provision for vulnerable children; increasing parental choice; and creative pedagogies.

### **Examples of innovative delivery within ELC provision**

1.21 16 examples of innovation in delivery were identified by respondents. These covered examples of increased flexibility; increasing parental choice; partnership working with parents; sharing innovative practice via a databank; use of expressive arts; child-centred approaches and multi-agency working.

### **Approaches to measurement of trials**

1.22 Respondents recommended that trials be specific in their aims, with meaningful indicators and outcome measures in place from the start.

1.23 Trials which encompassed a wide range of settings and sectors were called for. An electronic monitoring system was recommended which could store data emerging from the trials.

1.24 Both qualitative and quantitative methods of evaluation were proposed including focus groups, case studies, self-evaluation and interview techniques. Innovative, participatory approaches were envisaged for engaging with young children to seek their views.

1.25 Assessing longer-term outcomes was identified as a particular challenge for the trials, given their limited time-span prior to full roll-out. It was acknowledged that some impacts would not emerge during the trial period.

1.26 Most respondents identified child-focused outcomes as integral to the evaluation of trials, with focus on measuring children's developmental achievements, their wellbeing and the quality of the ELC received.

1.27 Other priorities for outputs and outcomes recommended by respondents were family/parent-based such as family satisfaction with ELC provision and positive parenting and confidence. Outcome measurement of impact of the trials on the uptake of employment or training opportunities by parents was also envisaged.

### **Views on opportunities for integrated services**

1.28 There was much support for establishing integrated approaches to ELC provision, however, this was generally viewed as a relatively untapped area with much potential for development.

1.29 A common theme was that linking health and specialist additional support services to ELC provision would bring benefits in terms of targeting those most in need and increasing efficiencies in provision.

1.30 Some identified support needs of parents and recommended that service provision for them could usefully be integrated with provision of ELC for their children.

1.31 Calls were made for greater collaboration between local authorities and private nurseries over delivering seamless provision. Potential was identified also in exploring ways to integrate childminding provision with that of other providers.

1.32 A recurring view was the potential exists for development of out of school provision which links with ELC.

1.33 A few respondents considered further potential in developing links with informal pre-school provision such as holiday clubs, toddler and other playgroups and with local leisure centres.

1.34 A partnership approach between training providers and ELC workforce was recommended by a few respondents in order to facilitate effective and flexible ways to combine study and practice.

### **Views on addressing diversity across Scotland**

1.35 There was general agreement across respondents that a “one size fits all” approach to ELC in Scotland will not work on account of the diversity of environment across and even within local authorities. A common view was that the trials should aim to represent this diversity.

1.36 Rurality was identified as potentially the most challenging of setting for ELC provision with reduced parental choice, greater travel times and transport costs and lack of adequate wrap-around provision just some of the issues which were problematic in rural and remote rural areas.

1.37 Urban areas were also viewed as problematic in terms of lack of available places due to higher populations, and higher numbers of eligible two year olds in areas of deprivation.

1.38 Respondents recommended trials also address areas where parents work patterns were challenging for ELC, perhaps due to seasonal working or shift patterns, or where they worked out with their local area, and required cross-border arrangements.

1.39 Diversity across Scotland was seen as presenting issues for recruitment and retention of workforce, particularly in cities with a higher cost of living (such

as Aberdeen) or where inconsistencies between pay offered in different local authorities prevailed.

1.40 Diversity was identified in ethnicity, language spoken, religious beliefs and different support needs, all of which were seen as presenting challenges for ELC provision.

### **Views on designing trials for scalability**

1.41 In order for successful aspects of trials to be scaled up, respondents identified a number of design features to be incorporated from the start. These included ensuring they are set up as learning mechanisms; are simple and focused to enable lessons to be clearly identifiable; that thorough groundwork is undertaken to make sure they are evidence-based and testing clearly specific concepts and approaches; that they test a variety of settings which will produce relevant learning for different locations across Scotland; that they are underpinned with robust evaluative methods and have firm baseline data; that budgets for the trials are realistic and provide a genuine picture of funding and supporting infrastructure required; and that dissemination of lessons is robust and information widely shared post-trial.

### **Offers of involvement in the programme of trials**

1.42 Most of those responding to the consultation offered their involvement in taking forward the programme of trials, either as trial setting or by supporting the organisation, implementation, evaluation of trials and/or sharing information post-trial, suggesting that there will be much support and buy-in for the trials.

12.5 20 different local authority areas were represented amongst respondents offering to provide settings for trials, including urban, rural and remote rural locations. However, significant gaps included locations in Fife, Perth, Stirling and Dundee, suggesting that more work may be required to engage ELC providers within these areas with the trials.



## 2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 The Scottish Government is committed to increasing the Early Learning and Childcare (ELC) entitlement to 1140 hours per year for all three and four year olds in addition to eligible two year olds (based on free school meal entitlement criteria) by the end of the next Parliament (2020).

2.2 Free pre-school education was introduced in Scotland in 2002 with 412.5 hours available for three and four year olds per annum. Since then the number of hours has increased incrementally. By 2007 475 hours per annum were offered, normally delivered 2.5 hours per day over 38 weeks. The Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 supported the Scottish Government's policy commitment "to ensure that children have the best start in life". The 2014 Act increased entitlement to free ELC from 475 hours to 600 hours per year with a further pledge based on the Government's "One Scotland" programme (2015) to increase the hours further to 30 per week for each three and four year old and eligible two year olds by the end of the next Parliament.

2.3 The Scottish Government understands that the effectiveness of ELC depends on the quality of provision, its flexibility to meet local needs and its accessibility, including affordability. Emphasis has been placed on local response to local needs with different local authorities given scope to deliver ELC themselves and through their delivery partners in innovative ways.

2.4 By the start of the 2016 summer term, 120,000 three and four year olds in Scotland and 20,000 two year olds will benefit from free ELC. Whilst affordability and flexibility of provision can be promoted directly by the Scottish Government, quality of provision is more complex. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) work has highlighted aspects of provision which are associated with quality of delivery including smaller staff to child ratios; qualifications and particular specialisms of staff; physical environment and staff diversity including gender.

2.5 In recognition of the need to ensure the proposed wider provision of ELC to 1140 hours is supported with high quality delivery and responsive provision which meets local needs including accessibility, the Scottish Government proposes to establish a number of trials to test different models of delivery. Experiences from these will illuminate what works well, where and why. Ways to establish and share best practice emerging from different models across local authorities and other providers will be examined.

2.6 The Scottish Government sought views of parents and other stakeholders and delivery partners on the scope and design of the trials. It published a discussion paper<sup>1</sup> which set out the policy context and background to the trials, the rationale for proceeding with these, and provided examples of current innovative ELC practice. The paper was published on 20 January with views invited by 18 March. 11 open-ended questions were posed which covered current and future provision of ELC and

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2016/01/9179>

what people wanted to see from a modern, flexible, fair and responsive system by 2020. Responses were invited via Citizen Space or by emailing a dedicated mailbox. Emailed responses directly to the Scottish Government policy team were also accepted.

2.7 This report presents the analysis of views contained in the responses to the consultation. The views are those of the respondents to this consultation and do not necessarily represent the views of a wider population.

## Consultation responses and analysis

2.8 The Scottish Government received 73 responses to the consultation. Table 2.1 shows the distribution of responses by category of respondent. A full list of respondents is in Annex 1. The respondent category applied to each response was agreed with the Scottish Government policy team.

**Table 2.1: Distribution of responses by category of respondent**

Category	No.	%
Local Government	15	21
Private Nurseries	13	18
Voluntary Organisations	9	12
Representative Bodies	5	7
Unions	4	5
Local Government Nurseries	2	3
Third Sector and Voluntary Providers	2	3
Registered Childminders	2	3
Regulators	2	3
Others	4	5
Individuals	15	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>

NB Percentages do not add to 100% exactly due to rounding.

2.9 The largest categories of respondent were Local Government and individuals, each comprising 21% of all respondents. Amongst the individual respondents were parents; playgroup managers and workers; private nursery employers and employees; teachers, ex-teachers and early years' practitioners.

2.10 33 responses were submitted via Citizen Space with the remainder sent via email. Most respondents provided a response to all or most of the questions, although the length of responses to discussion questions varied considerably.<sup>2</sup> Content from all responses was entered onto one bespoke electronic database to enable direct comparison of views and analysis between respondents and across respondent sectors. Some responses contained lengthy text and detailed descriptions of examples of existing ELC provision. In such cases the analyst summarised the text, drawing on the key issues and themes to ensure that the main points were captured in the database and that analysis could be efficient.

<sup>2</sup> Question 6: "Are there existing examples of innovative delivery within ELC provision that you can share with us?" was erroneously omitted from Citizen Space and therefore the 33 respondents who replied using Citizen Space did not provide responses to this.

2.11 The analysis of responses is presented in the following ten chapters which follow the order of the topics raised in the consultation paper. Throughout the report quotes taken directly from responses have been used to illustrate specific points. These were selected on the basis that they enhanced the analysis by emphasising specific points succinctly. They are identified by respondent category as opposed to individually as not all participants agreed to their contributions being made public.

### 3. VIEWS ON WHAT THE KEY FEATURES OF SCOTLAND'S ELC MODEL SHOULD BE

#### Background

Providing ELC to families has resulted in positive impacts on many areas of their lives such as child development; narrowing the attainment gap; allowing parents to work, train or study; as well as fighting poverty and inequality in communities. The Scottish Government wishes to identify, for the purposes of the proposed trials, which features of the ELC delivery model cannot be compromised on and whether there are additional outcomes not referenced in their discussion paper which the ELC policy should aim to achieve.

#### **Question 1: What should be the key features of Scotland's ELC model?**

3.1 This question attracted a substantial volume of response with 64 respondents identifying what they considered should be the features which should not be compromised in the ELC delivery model.

3.2 The three features which were identified most frequently were:

- Flexible provision (33 mentions).
- Qualified workforce (31 mentions).
- Quality of provision (25 mentions).

3.3 Overall, respondents identified priority features which were child-focused; parent-focused; workforce-focused; policy-focused; and focused on consistency across settings. Their responses are outlined in more detail below.

#### **Child-focused priority features**

3.4 Nine features were identified which focused on children's experiences of ELC:

#### Qualified workforce (31 mentions)

Respondents from every sector identified a qualified workforce as essential for Scotland's ELC model. Many respondents specified that initial staff qualification is not sufficient, but the workforce should be continuously updating skills, be monitored and be inspected regularly. Key aspects of this model were envisaged as:

- Teacher qualified and led.
- Robust staff monitoring.
- Continuous self-assessment.
- Reflective approach.
- Accessible professional learning opportunities.
- Flexible/innovative approach to continuous professional development in rural areas.
- Appropriate quality inspection frameworks and regulatory arrangements.
- Staff fully aware of the quality standards expected and indicators for measurement of these.

### Quality of provision (25 mentions)

Respondents from nine categories identified quality of provision as an essential feature of Scotland's ELC model. A shared belief was:

"The length of time spent at nursery is not equal to the quality of the time spent at nursery" (Local Government Nursery).

Some respondents argued that "quality" as a concept needs further definition. Others, however, identified aspects of quality provision as:

- Qualified staff.
- Accessible staff training.
- Meeting of each child's individual developmental and care needs.
- Properly funded provision.
- Robust regulation.

### Quality of physical environment (14 mentions)

Respondents across seven sectors identified quality of ELC physical environment as essential with most referring to access to outdoor space (such as woodland; open space) in addition to an appropriate indoor learning environment. One respondent suggested that at least half of children's time should be spent outdoors. Another recommended involvement with the local community (as part of the wider environment) as potentially enhancing quality of the child's experience.

### Child-centred approach (11 mentions)

Respondents from six sectors referred to the need for a child-centred approach which was child-driven rather than economically-driven or based on any other stakeholder's needs. They envisaged that under this approach, the day would be designed around individual children's requirements, with care taken to ensure they are not in ELC for longer than is optimum for them; the day would be balanced to cater for their needs; activities would be tailored to cater for individual children's level of social confidence and previous experience; care would be taken to ensure the number of hours per day and the number of settings per day do not impact adversely on the child; and a children's rights approach would be adopted.

### Responsive and creative workforce (10 mentions)

Six respondent categories were represented amongst those who identified a responsive and creative workforce as a priority for Scotland's ELC model. A recurring view was that the workforce should be capable of adapting to accommodate the requirements of a wide spectrum of children including those with additional needs; those from different cultures; those with disabilities; those with opportunities; and those experiencing disadvantages.

### Other features

The remaining four child-focused features identified as priority were:

- Play-based learning (7 mentions).
- Appropriate staff to child ratios, particularly for younger children (6 mentions).
- Nurturing environment (5 mentions). One registered childminder remarked: "Not all children are ready for large group care and giving families the option for a more nurturing small group care should be a goal for all councils across Scotland."
- Staff diversity including gender and ethnicity (1 mention).

## **Parent-focused priority features**

3.5 Five features were identified which focused on parents' requirements:

### Flexible provision (33 mentions)

Respondents across eight sectors considered flexibility of provision for parents to be an essential feature of Scotland's ELC model. They envisaged this as offering parents convenience and accessibility, being available when and where required. Such provision was seen as accommodating and catering for parents' variable work and study patterns in addition to possible ad hoc engagements such as one-off job interviews.

The term "funding to follow the child" was used by several respondents with some emphasising their view that there should be no funding restrictions in order to enable children to attend ELC provision close to, say, their parents place of work.

A few respondents recommended ELC provision which is open all year around and not just in term time. Some commented that one size does not fit all and in rural areas longer hours of provision may be required to cater for parents' lengthier travel times for drop off and pick up. One aspect of flexible provision was therefore envisaged as allowing local authorities to determine patterns of provision which best meet their local needs.

### Parent choice (14 mentions)

Respondents across seven categories identified parental choice of type of provision as essential. Choices might include: location of provision (including outwith the region); ratio of staff to child (for example where children have special needs and 1:1 provision is required); options of nursery or childminder (particularly in rural areas where travel distances can be greater); number of hours in ELC (without pressure to take up all 30 hours); and private nursery or voluntary provider over local authority provider.

### Capacity-building for parents (11 mentions)

Respondents across seven categories recommended that some form of capacity-building for parents should be integrated into Scotland's ELC model:

"Parents also want to be supported and to work in partnership with the provider, so parental engagement should be a key element embedded within any model" (Representative body).

Capacity-building was envisaged as involving improving parenting skills; developing effective partnerships with parents; helping parents to enrich their child's home learning environment; integrating with services for families and children with opportunities for parents to engage in family and adult learning; supporting parents into training and employment.

### Other features

The remaining features identified as priority which are parent-focused were:

- Seamless provision (9 mentions) manifested in local co-ordination and multi-disciplinary working and featuring 7am – 7pm provision which includes blended approaches (with increased recognition of the role child-minders can play in this).

- User-friendly and accessible information on options (2 mentions) which ensure that parents have all the information they need in a variety of formats regarding ELC choices.

### **Workforce-focused priority features**

3.6 Three features were identified which focused on workforce requirements:

- Appropriately remunerated workforce (9 mentions) which reflects the value placed on ELC staff and which will raise their profile and attract high quality applicants to the posts. A well-defined career structure was viewed as important with wider recognition of what the job entails, both during contact time and in planning time.
- Fair funding model (7 mentions) delivered by the Scottish Government with substantial investment in the sector and equitable resources across different settings and providers.
- Sustainable ELC model which allows for forward planning (4 mentions).

### **Policy-focused priority features**

3.7 A recurring theme was that narrowing the attainment gap as an outcome should not be compromised in any future ELC model (12 mentions). Respondents recommended that the model should be evidence-informed (3 mentions) and in-line with:

- GIRFEC (8 mentions)
- National Improvement Framework (2 mentions)
- Curriculum For Excellence (2 mentions)
- SHANARRI well-being indicators (2 mentions)

### **Priority features focusing on consistency across settings**

3.8 A few respondents emphasised what they viewed as the importance of standardisation (3 mentions) across settings in terms of quality, terms and conditions, teacher time per child and regulatory reviews (3 mentions). One local authority remarked:

“In providing Early Learning and Childcare we must ensure that we maintain a quality service for children and families and that this is provided consistently, children should receive the same level of care, learning and quality in all settings.”

One respondent recommended that Scotland’s ELC model is supported by a common information technology system which will enable common data to be collected and comparisons to be made.

### **Implications for proposed trials**

3.9 The three features of Scotland’s ELC model which respondents highlighted as essential were flexible provision; qualified workforce; and quality of provision. Whatever settings, methods of delivery and ELC provision trialled, these three features should, therefore, not be compromised but should be key design features.

## 4. VIEWS ON WHICH SPECIFIC PRINCIPLES OF ELC MODELS SHOULD BE PRIORITISED WITHIN THE PROGRAMME OF TRIALS

### Background

The Scottish Government acknowledges that different models of ELC provision might be better at delivering different outcomes. The principles they would like to see provision based on might include providing quality, flexibility, fairness, promoting parental choice, accessibility, integration with other services, value for money, integration with home life, preparation of children for school, enabling work, addressing the differing needs of children at different ages and stages and sustainability, but there may be many more which others can identify.

### **Question 2: Which specific principles of ELC models should be prioritised within our programme of trials?**

4.1 This question also attracted a significant volume of response with 64 respondents identifying what they considered should be the specific principles of ELC models to be prioritised within the trials.

4.2 Many respondents took their lead from the principles suggested in the discussion paper, however it became clear from responses that words such as “quality” and “fairness” held different meanings for different respondents. Suggestions were made that further development of understanding and clarity over terminology may be helpful:

“Our view is that the term 'quality' needs to be unpacked and broken down to ensure that we have a means of understanding what 'quality provision' may mean for children of different ages and stages and also what quality provision means for families across the full spectrum in terms of socio-economic circumstances” (Representative Body).

### **Priority principles most frequently identified**

4.3 Four specific principles of ELC models were identified most frequently as requiring prioritisation within the proposed programme of trials:

- Quality of provision
- Flexibility of provision
- Child-centred approaches
- Parental choice over provision

4.4 Trialling a range of settings and patterns of provision was recommended in order to cater for parents’ variety of work, training and education commitments. Respondents also urged that parental choice be incorporated as a priority into the trials, manifested in choice of hours taken up and choice of settings where provision can be accessed:

“Parents should be able to choose an ELC setting (subject to meeting appropriate nationally agreed quality criteria) which best suits their child, family, working circumstance and locality, rather than local authorities choosing where to fund 1140 hours. In addition, local authority “capping” of partner provider funded places must be removed to ensure the family’s choice of early years setting is maintained and available to them” (Representative Body).



4.5 Several respondents specified that trials should incorporate blended approaches and “jigsaw models” in order to provide the wrap-around care which offers most flexibility to parents.

4.6 Three respondents called for flexibility to include that of providers being free to trial operating models which work best for local needs.

4.7 Respondents from a wide range of sectors re-iterated their recommendation for priority to be given to provision appropriate to the age and stage of each child. Some emphasised in particular the different needs of two year olds in comparison to older children receiving ELC, with some respondents arguing that staff will require an in-depth understanding of attachment and the importance of consistency and continuity for young children:

“Addressing the need of 2, 3 and 4 year olds is most definitely a priority, having 2 years mixing with older children is causing difficulties and there needs to be proper facilities for these younger children not just giving them places in already established 3-4 year old centres, their needs and development are very different and need to be addressed properly” (Local Government Nursery).

4.8 Two respondents called for a rights-based approach to underpin the ELC models to be trialled, in keeping with United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and the indicators within SHANARRI.

4.9 A repeated theme was to ensure that no matter the setting, additional support for learning should be provided with specialist services integrated within the ELC framework. Provision for children with deafness was highlighted in addition to specialist provision for children for whom English is not their first language.

#### **Priority principles raised less frequently**

4.10 Principles which were mentioned by fewer respondents were:

- Fairness/equity of access
- Integration between services
- Holistic partnership approach with parents
- Evidence-based

4.11 For some respondents, fairness of access in the forms of focusing trials on closing the inequality gap, removing barriers to access and ensuring equitable access across all areas of Scotland including rural locations, was paramount.

4.12 Others recommended that trials prioritise the principle of integration of services to provide a co-ordinated, multi-agency approach which includes the private sector. The overall aim was stated as ensuring families have access to a range of appropriate services and support at the time they need this.

4.13 Engaging parents in a partnership approach which straddles ELC and home settings was an emerging theme. Terms such as “family learning” and “home learning environment” were used in this context and recommended as a priority for ELC.

4.14 Several respondents expressed their support for ensuring ELC trialled models are based on robust evidence:

“Development of provision should take cognisance of research on best outcomes for children, particular attention should be focussed on concerns regarding very young children placed in group care for extended days” (Local Government body).

“Parents do need choice as one size does not fit all, families have differing care and education needs. Work needs to be done to find out what the majority of parent/carers need then trials should focus on putting services together that address these needs” (Voluntary Organisation).

4.15 A few emphasised the need to put in place a comprehensive evaluation framework to analyse the impact of the trials. One local government respondent recommended that common monitoring data across settings are adopted along with an agreed baseline.

### **Other views**

4.16 Less frequently identified as specific principles of ELC models to be prioritised within the programme of trials were:

- Educated workforce including qualified teachers leading ELC provision.
- Innovation in approaches to expand the workforce including flexible, part-time working patterns.
- Ensuring sustainability of provision informs and underpins ELC models. The requirement for adequate funding based on real costs for partner providers was a recurring recommendation. One registered childminder raised further challenges of bureaucracy:  
“Remember this needs to be a sustainable practice whether it is in a nursery or in a childminder's own home....childminders have fewer children and their overheads are just as complex as a nursery, please make sure that the pay scale reflects that and do not tar everyone with the same brush .... remember childminders largely work on their own so making whatever system is put in place red tape heavy will not work as they have their own families to care for.”
- Value for money was raised by a few respondents but without a shared view on what this means, and with some identifying potential tension in balancing value for money with ensuring quality provision.
- A few respondents requested that the principle of transparency should underpin ELC models. In particular, they urged that local authorities adopt genuine partnership approaches when working with partner providers.
- One regulator emphasised the need for trials to take cognisance of other related Scottish Government policies, such as the Play Strategy.

### **Implications for proposed trials**

4.17 The four main principles that respondents indicated they would like to see ELC provision be based upon were quality of provision; flexibility of provision; child-centred approaches; and parental choice over provision. This suggests that trials require to be highly innovative, offering a variety of setting and flexible patterns of ELC, possibly involving a range of providers working in partnership clusters, with focus on transitions between settings and blended provision packages.

## 5. VIEWS ON THE KEY BARRIERS TO SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTING THE 1140 HOURS COMMITMENT

### Background

The Scottish Government aims to implement the commitment to 1140 hours ELC by August 2020. It acknowledges that there may be barriers to address in order to fulfil this commitment. These, it suggests, could be financial, organisational, cultural, or take some other form.

### **Question 3: What do you see as the key barriers to a successful implementation of the 1140 hours commitment?**

5.1 70 respondents addressed this question. A prevailing concern was that **quality of provision should not be compromised** during trials and subsequent implementation. A view shared by many was that the lead-in time to implementation was challenging with respect to the increased workforce and capacity required and that the **focus should remain child-centred** rather than process oriented. A few respondents across several sectors identified hastily built or adapted premises and inexperienced staff lacking in training, as potential risks arising from short-cuts which may be taken to enable implementation by the target date.

5.2 The two main barriers to successful implementation identified repeatedly by respondents were lack of ELC places to meet demand; and lack of staff who are suitably qualified and experienced to deliver quality provision.

#### **Lack of ELC places to meet demand**

5.3 Respondents representing all sectors highlighted their concerns over the availability of quality ELC places to meet demand by 2020. For example, several private nurseries described their current provision of morning or afternoon places, but remarked that if children had expanded hours, the nursery would need to either double provision or half the number of children taken.

5.4 Recurring concerns were that:

- Community ELC premises (e.g. church halls) may not be suitable for physical extension and also not suitable for extended hours due to being shared with other users.
- Outdoor space cannot be compromised (e.g. by extensions to premises) as this will limit opportunity for outdoor activities.
- School buildings are not necessarily designed for two year olds who will require premises more suitable for their needs (e.g. areas for sleeping).
- Expanded hours will result in increased catering as children will have to be fed. Current settings may need to be adapted to accommodate food preparation and provision.

#### **Lack of suitably qualified and experienced workforce**

5.5 A common view was that increasing the number of suitably qualified and experienced staff to cover the expanded hours by 2020 would be a significant challenge. Problems were foreseen particularly in relation to staffing in rural areas; achieving a gender balance in staff; boosting numbers of staff who can deliver quality ELC across the range of ages from two to four years; increasing numbers of

staff with specialisms to deal with additional support needs, disabilities and additional language needs including Gaelic medium provision. Current gaps were identified in staff capable of delivering arts and other creative experiences; and those able to lead and facilitate learning using innovative and play-based approaches. One individual respondent questioned whether those currently working in the sector would even wish to change their lifestyle to working longer hours for more weeks of the year.

5.6 Increasing the numbers of qualified teachers who wish to work in ELC settings was identified as a barrier as was achieving the higher numbers of associated support and regulatory body workforces; those in national support organisations; education and training providers; payroll, recruitment and HR service staff.

5.7 Low pay and status not commensurate with qualifications and skills were perceived to be key barriers to attracting and retaining qualified and experienced staff to the profession. Inequalities in pay scales across sectors were also identified as challenging in terms of retaining private nursery staff, with some private nurseries describing how they train staff only to have them “cherry picked” by local authorities who have offered more pay and better terms and conditions.

5.8 Integrated working across professionals was perceived by one respondent (other category) to be hampered by the current mis-match in pay and status between those in ELC settings and others.

5.9 Many respondents anticipated the need for a sea-change in workforce training provision with a vast expansion in places offered to upskill those delivering ELC and those wishing to enter the profession. However, some predicted a flood of new recruits who, whilst attaining a qualification, may not have experience, which could then threaten quality of provision, at least in the short term.

5.10 A few respondents identified increased roles for registered childminders to boost the workforce delivering ELC. However, several barriers to enhancing their role were raised including what were seen as challenges in the way their services are commissioned:

“...those local authorities who are considering using childminders are placing unnecessary barriers in their way such as unwieldy tender documentation; lack of briefings/information sharing with childminders; requesting childminders have specific qualifications; lack of understanding from the authorities on the significance of Care Inspectorate grades and; suggesting there will be over-burdensome HMIE inspections carried out” (Representative Body).

5.11 One registered childminder cautioned that if local authorities decide to restrict expanded hours to their own services only, they could risk putting childminders out of business.

### **Financial barriers to successful implementation**

5.12 A common theme, particularly amongst private and third sector and voluntary providers, was that the current funding they receive from local authorities for free places at their setting is not adequate to cover all of their costs and requires to be

supplemented by top-up payments from parents who purchase additional hours. One private sector respondent agreed:

“Funding is too low as doesn’t allow private settings to act as a profitable business.”

5.13 Many of those working in private nursery settings were concerned that without increased funding per place, particularly in respect of potential additional costs for meals and expanded/alterations to premises, they could go out of business, resulting in fewer ELC places rather than more. A few private nurseries envisaged significant increases in their costs for workforce training and upskilling.

5.14 Some respondents (largely private nurseries) cited what they felt was the unfair playing field of unequal funding in relation to local authority settings as hindering their expansion to meet higher levels of demand. Calls were made for nationally set payments per child place. A few respondents across different sectors reported difficulties with cash flow in private settings due to payment patterns set by local authorities.

### **Other barriers to successful implementation identified by respondents**

5.15 A number of other barriers were identified:

#### Increased bureaucracy

A few respondents cited red tape associated particularly with inspections and eligibility checking as potentially challenging to further expansion. Having two regulators for ELC (Care Inspectorate and Education Scotland) was perceived as contributing to increased paperwork for providers.

#### Lack of consistency

Calls were made for greater consistency across settings and across local authorities in order to progress cohesively towards 1140 expansion. Current barriers were cited as inconsistent quality standards; different requirements for qualification of lead professional; varying eligibility dates such as birthdate of child or beginning of term time following eligible birthday.

A few respondents perceived a lack of overall national policy and framework with no one organisation or individual at the helm providing a clear lead. There was demand from respondents for an overarching national policy under which local flexibility could develop.

#### Lack of effective partnership working

Many respondents envisaged innovative working and liaison arrangements between stakeholders as key to unlocking greater potential for expansion. Most felt that productive relationships between local authorities and other providers were lacking with different parties adopting sometimes conflicting policies and vision and information sharing across sectors (e.g. in relation to children with particular needs) being minimal.

Close working between providers and specialist services such as speech and language therapy services was viewed as limited, as were consultative activities between providers and parents.

What was perceived as a general lack of collaborative working was seen as a factor which inhibited adherence to GIRFEC approaches and a barrier to future implementation of the 1140 hours commitment.

#### Sustainability

Questions were raised over the degree to which expanded hours would be sustainable under different Scottish Government administrations; and indeed, following trials.

#### Lack of information about expanded provision

A few respondents considered that current information on provision is patchy and sometimes misleading due to being incomplete. There was confusion over where comprehensive information about all provision in one geographical area could be accessed. This lack of complete information was viewed as possibly contributing to lack of take up of places for two year olds and was identified as a potential barrier to take up of expanded hours provision.

Ensuring information is accurate and portrays ELC services in an appropriate manner was viewed as challenging but necessary as part of managing parental expectations of what was on offer.

#### Lack of appropriate and comprehensive monitoring data

A few respondents expressed concern that appropriate monitoring and data collection systems may not be in place to capture information on outcomes during the trials, thereby reducing opportunity to learn from them.

### **Question 4: How might these trials be designed to overcome such barriers?**

5.16 Most of those who identified barriers to successful implementation also provided views on how such barriers could be overcome although some simply provided recommendations more generally for how the trials should be run.

#### **Views on addressing lack of ELC places to meet demand**

5.17 A recurring view was that a programme of purpose-built settings would be required to accommodate the extra space required to meet 1140 hours demand. One representative body envisaged this as an opportunity to draw on experts from architecture, planning and design to create innovative ELC settings building on best practice in other jurisdictions. Others identified new requirements such as meal preparation and sleeping space to be built into future design.

5.18 The trials were seen as testing innovative uses of existing settings whilst also putting in motion plans for a new infrastructure of settings, built specifically for ELC delivery.

### **Views on addressing lack of suitably qualified and experienced workforce**

5.19 An underlying theme was that significant culture and attitudinal changes are required to improve perceptions of the status of the ELC workforce and make the profession attractive to men and women alike.

5.20 One key route to changing attitudes was seen as providing pay and terms and conditions commensurate with the skills and qualifications demanded of the job, with parity between workers in different sectors. One union recommended early research to establish the range of terms and conditions and pay of qualified childcare staff to allow a benchmark position to be set. Several respondents highlighted the need for future pay and conditions to take account of non-contact planning and preparatory time in addition to additional training time demanded by the expanded hours.

5.21 Many respondents recommended that in order to meet the 1140 hours commitment by 2020, significant work would be required immediately to put in place policies to developing the existing workforce, in addition to attracting, training and retaining additional workers. A phased approach was the preferred option in which gradual expansions in college places could be put in place to accommodate increased demand for qualifications. Calls were made for creativity in terms of routes to qualifications and opportunities for currently untapped potential to be drawn into the workforce (e.g. older people who have been made redundant; parents of children receiving ELC; returners to the workforce; men).

5.22 One local authority specifically suggested that gender diversity be a focus within trials in order to showcase good practice examples of a diverse workforce in operation.

5.23 A recurring theme was that registered childminders could play a key role in an expanded workforce. One respondent (other category) saw merit in early discussions with the Scottish Childminding Association over the role and potential influence of this sector in relation to providing flexibility of provision and mixed models of care. A representative body suggested showcasing childminders who are already involved in successful “blended” models of care, providing the link between other provision and meeting the individual needs of families.

5.24 One Third sector and Voluntary provider emphasised the need for the trials to involve non-statutory providers such as childminders, playgroups, private nurseries and out of school care, all of which could contribute to the increased flexibility and additional workforce required for 1140 hours.

### **Views on addressing financial barriers to implementation**

5.25 Calls were made by several respondents for funding from local authorities to commissioned providers to be more transparent and less confusing. A recurring view was for ELC funds to be ring-fenced and set at an appropriate and standardised sum per child place. Some respondents referred to what they perceived to be the “top slicing” of funds by local authorities which cut down the funding available to private nurseries commissioned by councils.

5.26 One private nursery recommended that financial assistance is given to private nurseries in the form of recoverable VAT; reduced business rates; grants and bursaries; and free training for workers.

5.27 One recurring recommendation for trialling was a voucher scheme in which parents are provided with funding directly (in the form of vouchers) which they can “spend” at the provider(s) of their choice. Under this model, providers would not have to tender for contracts from the local authority, but would be able to participate on the basis that they had passed relevant inspection.

### **Views on addressing other barriers**

5.28 Views on addressing other identified barriers were:

#### Bureaucracy

- Offer universal option of expanded hours to all 2 year olds.
- Rationalise regulation to only one regulator per setting.

#### Lack of consistency

- Introduce a national framework for childcare provision.
- Introduce equal pay and conditions across different providers.
- Introduce one policy lead to provide direction and an overarching structure.

#### Ineffective partnership working

- Greater involvement of the voluntary sector was recommended as: “.....involving the Third Sector Interface and its local networks strategically at an early planning stage, would help maximise the third sector’s contribution, increase significantly the flow of information, and reduce the barriers” (Voluntary organisation).
- Integrated working between stakeholders regarding planning for any new build/extensions for the purpose of the trials.
- Routine involvement and engagement with parents/families and ELC providers to be strengthened in trials.
- Care Inspectorate and Education Scotland to liaise to rationalise inspection regimes and duplication and minimise burden on services in trials.

#### Sustainability

- Cross-party consensus required on ELC policy.
- Ensure expanded number of hours continues post trials.

#### Lack of information

- Identify one clear information point for comprehensive and impartial information on ELC provision.
- Trial local databases of options; use community newsletters; other local accessible outlets for provision of information.

#### Lack of appropriate and comprehensive data

- National Care Standards and SHANARRI could be used to help develop an evaluative framework for the trials.
- Careful planning of a baseline and evaluative framework required which is open and transparent and includes comprehensive assessment of costs.



### **Implications for proposed trials**

5.29 The two main barriers to successful implementation of the 1140 commitment were identified as lack of ELC places to meet demand; and lack of suitably qualified and experienced workforce.

5.30 Trials could test models of increasing physical space for ELC provision through expert involvement in changing design and altering existing premises with acceptable compromises on outdoor space. Alongside increasing physical capacity, trials could test innovative approaches of upskilling staff and attracting staff to the sector, perhaps through collaborative work with local colleges; outreach work with schools; and awareness raising and publicity work to make ELC the profession of choice.

5.31 The particular challenges of establishing and retaining a suitably qualified workforce in rural areas were raised, suggesting that trials should incorporate rurality and innovation in learning such as greater use of e-learning or satellite hubs of learning bringing together ELC workforce from across the region with an outreach tutor.

## 6. EXISTING EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE WITHIN ELC PROVISION

**Question 5: Are there existing examples of best practice within ELC provision that you can share with us?**

6.1 Respondents were invited to identify examples of current outstanding service from providers and describe what features of these make them exceptional, for example, specialised services or ways in which they respond to a particular challenge.

6.2 From the responses 49 distinct examples were identified and are outlined in Annex 2. The largest body of examples related to those where flexibility had been offered to families to enable parents to be supported to take up employment and other opportunities. The focus and number of examples provided are summarised in Table 6.1.

**Table 6.1: Summary of examples of best practice** (further information in Annex 2)

Topic	No. of examples	Key themes
Providing flexibility	14	Supporting parents Supporting families Improving take-up of places
Workforce	7	Increasing numbers Upskilling and training Commensurate pay and conditions
Partnership working with parents	7	Improving parenting skills Supporting families holistically
Child-centred approaches	6	Child development Quality of provision Smooth transitions Rights-centred approaches
Outdoor space	4	Use of outdoor space in ELC provision
Provision for vulnerable children	3	Provision for vulnerable children
Increasing parental choice	2	Cross-border funding Removing caps on partner-provider places
Creative pedagogies	2	Providing creative experiences
Other	4	Provision for Asylum seekers and refugees Partnership working between organisations Use of expressive arts Data bank – sharing information

### Implications for proposed trials

6.3 Within the 49 examples of best practice were very few relating to use of outdoor space; provision for vulnerable children; providing creative experiences;

provision for asylum seekers and refugees; partnership working; use of expressive arts; and existing mechanisms for sharing information on best practice. Trials could, therefore, cover aspects of these to fill gaps and generate information on best practice in these fields. The relatively high number of 'providing flexibility' examples may have been a result of the Discussion Paper's specific focus on this area.

## 7. EXISTING EXAMPLES OF INNOVATIVE DELIVERY WITHIN ELC PROVISION

**Question 6: Are there existing examples of innovative delivery within ELC provision that you can share with us?<sup>3</sup>**

7.1 Respondents were invited to identify examples of innovative approaches to providing high quality, flexible ELC anywhere in the world from which we should be learning. They were also invited to highlight existing innovative delivery models in Scotland whose impact could usefully be evaluated.

7.2 From the responses 16 distinct examples were identified over and above some which had already been mentioned as examples of best practice. The examples are outlined in Annex 3 and are summarised in Table 7.1.

**Table 7.1: Summary of examples of innovative practice** (further information in Annex 3)

Topic	No. of examples	Key themes
Providing flexibility	3	Supporting parents
Increasing parental choice	3	Enabling ELC in home setting Supporting parents
Workforce	2	Increasing the skilled workforce
Partnership working with parents	2	Supporting families
Data bank	2	Sharing innovative practice
Use of expressive arts	2	Creative experience for children
Child-centred approaches	1	Child development
Partnership working between organisations	1	Multi-agency working

### Implications for proposed trials

7.3 The views expressed on innovative delivery support those given in response to previous questions in highlighting the value placed on flexibility, choice, skilled workforce and partnership models of working. This suggests, once again, that these features should be key elements of trials. Once more, innovation in use of expressive arts within ELC was mentioned.

<sup>3</sup> This question was omitted in error from the online version of the consultation document. Responses were received, therefore, only from those submitting their responses in other ways.

## 8. APPROACHES TO MEASUREMENT OF TRIALS

### Question 7: What outcomes should we be measuring through this programme of trials?

8.1 Respondents were asked for their views on what a successful trial would look like and how it would be measured. Views were invited on what indicators will be needed to inform decisions on future delivery; what areas of children's and families' lives might the expansion of high quality, flexible ELC have a positive impact on; and how to measure the impact of a particular delivery model on providers and other stakeholders.

#### General views on trials and their evaluation

8.2 57 respondents addressed this question. Many provided general views on how the trials and their evaluations should be set up and executed. It was considered that the trials should be specific in what they aim to achieve in order that meaningful indicators can be devised and outcome measures established from the start. Although local initiatives were envisaged, many respondents called for evaluative material to be shared in order to promote learning more widely. Trials were recommended which encompass all sectors and settings. An electronic monitoring system was called for which could record evaluative data in addition to performing booking and accounts functions.

8.3 One broad recommendation was to use existing data collection mechanisms and build on these if possible in order to avoid unnecessary additional burden. The current inspection frameworks were amongst those mentioned in this regard, in addition to the adoption of GIRFEC principles and SHANARRI outcome measures. One local government respondent recommended aligning with Community Planning Partnership area outcomes. Specific references were made to the quality indicators in the Care Inspectorate's publication, "How well are we improving the lives of children and young people" which sets out a framework for measurement of impact including 22 quality indicators; Ferre Laever's Leuven Scale for measuring the impact of increased hours of ELC on children's wellbeing, engagement and involvement was also highlighted.

8.4 Respondents envisaged that evaluation would be based on both qualitative and quantitative data. Several identified approaches such as focus groups, case studies, self-evaluation and interviews as useful for generating information. Parents, staff, local authorities, providers and children were highlighted as potential research participants, with consultative methodologies advocated (such as Mosaic approach) to enable young children to provide views constructively.

8.5 Ten respondents identified assessment of longer-term outcomes as presenting a challenge to evaluation. A common view was that whilst aspects of process and short term outputs could be assessed in the time before roll-out to national implementation, there will not be time for longer-term impacts to emerge, nor time for experimentation and changes to original trial models to generate results:

"I think the true success of these trials will not be seen for many years.

Whether this system is a success will not really be known until the children have grown up. If the rate of drop outs from school drops and the

rates of success in education and employment go up only then will we really see if this system is working. The child’s developmental progress can be measured to some extent but the true value of this system is whether it has a long term impact” (Registered Childminder).

**Views on what should be measured**

8.6 A wide range of views was provided on the outputs and outcomes to be measured in the trials. These are grouped by category in Table 8.1. The most frequently identified outcomes were child-focused and family/parent focused.

**Table 8.1: Categories of outputs and outcomes recommended by respondents**

<b>Category</b>	<b>No. of mentions</b>
Child-focused outcomes	42
Family/parent-based outcomes	33
Economics/wider poverty outcomes	22
Workforce-focused outcomes	16
Cost-related outcomes	15
Process indicators	12
Physical infrastructure outcomes	6
Community-focused outcomes	2

**Views on child-focused outcomes**

8.7 Respondents across most sectors identified child-focused outcomes as integral to evaluation of trials. In particular they recommended outcomes related to children’s developmental achievements; their wellbeing; and the quality of ELC provision received. Less frequently mentioned were outcomes relating to: positive attachments with parents; reduction of the attainment gap between children (e.g. in expressive vocabulary); increased confidence; smooth transitions and pathways between settings; improved citizenship; and health outcomes such as reduction in obesity.

**Views on family/parent-based outcomes**

8.8 Eight sectors were represented by respondents recommending family/parent-based outcomes. Just under half of respondents who identified such outcomes called for family satisfaction with ELC provision to be measured.

8.9 Other less frequently identified outcomes were: positive parenting/confidence; flexibility in provision; family engagement and positive relationships with ELC staff; overall family wellbeing and quality of life; and parent choice over provision.

**Views on economics/wider poverty outcomes**

8.10 Respondents from eight sectors identified outcomes relating to economics and wider issues of poverty. Most recommended outcome measurement of impact of trials on the uptake of employment or training opportunities by parents. Others considered that outcomes should focus on decrease in levels of poverty and narrowing the economic gap between different areas. Four respondents suggested that outcomes relating to equality and equity issues should be established.

### **Views on workforce-focused outcomes**

8.11 Respondents from seven sectors called for outcomes relating to the impact of the trials on the ELC workforce. A range of assessments was envisaged: quality of staff; qualifications of staff; availability of staff; ease of recruitment; retention of staff; morale of staff/feeling valued and satisfied; suitability of staffing arrangements including ratio of staff to children; empowerment of staff to make their own decisions.

### **Views on cost-related outcomes**

8.12 Respondents from five sectors identified potential cost-related outcomes including: true cost of provision (e.g. covering items such as additional staff training; expanding outdoor provision; providing meals and rest areas); financial viability of models of provision; impact on affordability to parents; and cost-effectiveness.

### **Views on process indicators**

8.13 Seven sectors were represented amongst respondents who identified process indicators to include in the evaluation framework. Most frequently mentioned was measurement of impact of trials on take-up of hours, especially amongst the poorest families. Also identified were indicators relating to quality of partnership working; involvement of stakeholders in the design of the trials/co-production and engagement of different agencies; and the quality and availability of information on ELC trials for parents.

### **Views on physical infrastructure outcomes**

8.14 Three local authority respondents, two private sector respondents and one individual raised specifically the importance of measuring suitability and quality of physical provision (e.g. outdoor learning space; family learning area; dining and resting provision).

### **Views on community-based outcomes**

8.15 Two voluntary organisations recommended that the integration between the ELC centre and staff and the wider community should be measured as a community-based outcome.

### **Implications for proposed trials**

8.16 Respondents emphasised the need for trials to be clear in their aim in order for meaningful indicators to be devised and outcome measures established. Sharing of learning was recommended as a philosophy; with a wide range of settings and sectors to be tested.

8.17 Minimising bureaucracy was a general theme with respondents recommending building on existing data collection mechanisms wherever possible.

8.18 Respondents envisaged both quantitative and qualitative approaches to generating data, but from their recommendations on specific methods it is clear that qualitative data is expected to form the most significant aspect of evaluation, with innovation required to involve younger children in providing their views.

8.19 Child-focused outcomes were viewed as integral to the evaluation of the trials, with data to be collected on children's developmental achievements; wellbeing; and quality of ELC provision. Trials should, therefore, be set up with suitable evaluative

frameworks which can capture such information, informed by research expertise and/or involving independent expert evaluators.



## 9. VIEWS ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTEGRATED SERVICES

### Background

Children and Families use a variety of national and local services, and co-locating or linking these with ELC provision may bring benefits to users and/or providers of the service such as integrated services which are better, more convenient and/or easier to access. In addition, integrated services may offer better value for money or raise awareness of common interests.

### **Question 8: Are there other services for children and young people that the trials should be integrated with?**

9.1 49 respondents addressed this question with much support emerging for establishing integrated approaches to ELC provision. These were viewed as building on the intentions of the Children and Young People's (Scotland) Act 2014 in terms of collaborative working and an effective way of targeting support where most needed, such as areas of deprivation.

9.2 Whilst some examples were provided of existing approaches to integrated working, many respondents considered that this is a relatively untapped area with much potential for development:

“Consultation with the sector would be beneficial to identify opportunities to extend current levels of integration and joint working, building on the work of the Early Years Collaborative. Levels of integration with other services are currently very limited, so this is an opportunity to make improvements” (Voluntary Organisation).

9.3 A few respondents recommended that developing links with relevant services should be an early priority for ELC providers, with one voluntary organisation advocating grounding this in initial mapping to gain an understanding of local needs.

### **Integration with health and social care services**

9.4 A common theme across a wide range of respondent sectors was that linking health and specialist additional support services to ELC provision would reap benefits in terms of targeting those most in need and increasing efficiencies in provision (for example, reducing missed appointments).

9.5 Links were envisaged with health visitors; health centres; health care professionals; dental hygienists; and supporting services such as interpreters.

9.6 Many respondents identified integrated working with additional specialist support services to include:

- Educational psychologist
- Speech and language professionals
- Disability services
- Mental health services
- Audiology services
- Play therapists

9.7 To harness such a variety of services under one roof, several respondents recommended developing the Family Centre approach which a few described as a “one stop shop” to accessing ELC along with family support services more generally. Examples of current effective Family Centre approaches were given:

- Midlothian Council – “Lifelong Learning and Employability, Financial Inclusion Network, Housing, Health, Children’s Services are all services within Midlothian Council that our Family Learning Centre model will connect with to offer a ‘one stop shop’ service to local children and families” (Local Government) .
- West Dunbartonshire Council – Through the Raising Attainment Challenge WDC is developing a family support hub based on two ELC centres and two primary schools in the Clydebank area which may provide the catalyst to trial more family orientated approaches to childcare.

### **Integration with other services for parents**

9.8 It was acknowledged by a few voluntary and other sector respondents that parents may have support needs themselves and that service provision for them could usefully be integrated with provision of ELC for their children. Services identified specifically were: those to address drug dependence; mental health services; parenting classes; and behaviour management classes.

9.9 Three respondents recommended further development of initiatives such as Stay and Play as ways to engage with parents and involve them in ELC provision.

### **Collaborative working across ELC settings**

9.10 Calls were made for greater collaboration between **local authorities and private nurseries** in particular over delivering seamless provision. Much potential was identified in exploring ways of integrating childminding provision with that of other providers.

9.11 A recurring theme was that potential exists for development of out of school provision which links with ELC. A holistic model of provision was envisaged **linking ELC with out of school settings**, bringing together siblings who attend different settings through the school day (e.g. primary school and nursery), with some respondents recommending extension of provision to breakfast clubs and youthwork settings to cater for older children.

9.12 Integrated working was viewed as essential to **smooth transitions between settings and between stages**, such as ELC to primary school.

9.13 Seven respondents highlighted in particular what they perceived to be potential for developing links with **informal pre-school provision**. Holiday clubs, toddler and other playgroups were mentioned:

“The trials should encourage use of service provision such as childminders who already provide integrated services in their communities – access to Bookbug; toddler groups; childminding groups and who know the families in their communities. This knowledge and experience should not be undervalued” (Representative body).

**Integration with local leisure services**

9.14 Six respondents identified potential in ELC providers linking with local leisure services in order to access community facilities for physical activity and also for creative arts.

**Integration with training providers**

9.15 Three respondents recommended that a partnership approach with training providers for the ELC workforce is engendered in order to promote effective and flexible ways of combining study and practice.

**Implications for proposed trials**

9.16 There was strong support for establishing integrated approaches to ELC provision with links between ELC, health and specialist additional support services highlighted in particular, perhaps within a Family Centre setting, suggesting merit in trialling this approach.

9.17 Other dominant themes were increasing collaborative approaches between local authorities and private sector providers; integrating childminding provision with other provision; and furthering links between out of school settings with ELC. Trials focusing on exploring such opportunities could be undertaken in a variety of geographical settings such as urban, suburb and rural to identify where impact is of most benefit and also the different challenges to be faced in forging these collaborations.

## 10. ADDRESSING DIVERSITY ACROSS SCOTLAND

### Background

Scotland encompasses great regional and local diversity and to be successful the models of ELC provision will need to be cognisant of and reflect these local needs. There may be local and regional characteristics which preclude a “one size fits all” approach. There will be local challenges which ELC trials will need to address.

### **Question 9: Are there local/regional characteristics that should be explicitly built into the trials?**

10.1 53 respondents addressed this question with widespread agreement that a “one size fits all” approach to ELC provision is not appropriate in view of the diversity in environment across Scotland, even within local authority areas. Some saw this as an opportunity for innovation to thrive with standard models tweaked and adapted to suit local circumstances. A few respondents recommended that local consultation and mapping should precede consideration of tailored, local approaches:

“Local mapping should therefore be built into the trials so that there is clarity about what the local and regional needs actually are”  
(Representative body).

“There is a need to create bottom up models which are community led”  
(Other).

10.2 A recurring theme was that the trials should aim to represent the diversity of environment, with one respondent specifying that the same approach should be tried out in different environments to generate comparator data:

“...it would be important, where possible, for trials to take place in more than one area where there are significant regional differences and therefore this would provide a comparator and also key findings for more than one type of location” (Representative body).

### **Challenge of rural areas**

10.3 The most common regional characteristic identified by respondents as potentially challenging was rurality. Respondents across a wide range of sectors identified a number of particular challenges which remote, rural and island areas present for ELC such as: reduced parent choice of setting; greater travel distances; cost of transport; lack of wrap-around provision despite likely longer parent absence due to travel to work time; and reduced access to specialist services, for example, services for deaf children. One island local authority commented:

“Island communities create different challenges. The small, dispersed communities with scattered populations and poor travel networks require individual approaches.”

### **Challenges of urban areas**

10.4 High density populations create pressure on places in some inner cities according to some respondents, reducing options and flexibility for parents. Most respondents identifying pockets of urban environments as challenging referred to areas of multiple deprivation, and recommended that trials cover such areas where,

for example, take-up of ELC places requires to be encouraged; outreach work is needed; staffing and infrastructure needs to cater for higher numbers of eligible two year olds; a wide range of additional needs exist and multi-agency approaches adopted; and wrap-around care may be vital to enable parents in low income households to access different work and study opportunities.

### **Views on other challenges and characteristics to build into trials**

10.5 Ten respondents referred specifically to building trials around accommodating **different parental work patterns**. Suggestions were made to base trials in commuter belts and suburbs where parents are more likely to work out with the local area and therefore require out of school hour care for their children, or perhaps have cross-border ELC demands.

10.6 A few respondents suggested ELC trials are based where there are greater shift workers, part time workers and/or seasonal patterns of work.

10.7 Eight respondents recommended trials address challenges in **recruiting and retaining qualified and suitable workforce**. The higher living costs in cities such as Aberdeen were identified as challenging for low paid workers with potential difficulties for recruitment in such areas. Different rates of pay across neighbouring local authorities for workers in similar posts were also highlighted as potentially challenging for the stability of the ELC workforce. One respondent suggested that training provision for workers in rural areas may require innovative approaches and links between different organisations.

10.8 Differences in **demography** between areas of Scotland in terms of ethnicity, religious beliefs and languages spoken were highlighted by eight respondents as worthy of examining in trials. The circumstances of refugees and travellers were identified as potentially challenging for ELC provision.

10.9 Two respondents called for trials to compare settings with access to varied **open space** from limited and contained, to large, open areas.

10.10 One respondent suggested that **community ethos** in terms of cohesion, values and community capacity may impact on effectiveness of ELC provision and could be incorporated as a variable into the trials.

### **Implications for proposed trials**

10.11 The diversity of environment across Scotland was recognised with calls for models of ELC provision to be tested in different circumstances, for example, trialling the same approach but in different locations.

10.12 As rurality was the most commonly identified challenge for ELC provision, with island communities seen as presenting especial difficulties, remote rural settings should feature in the trials.

10.13 Other settings identified as priority for trials were commuter belts and suburbs where parents are likely to work out with the local area and therefore have different needs with respect of wrap-around care, transitions for their children between

settings, longer hours of care and perhaps shift patterns and/or other irregular work routines to be facilitated.

10.14 Trials focusing on workforce recruitment and retention in different locations will also have merit, with innovative models required to address challenges in both inner city and rural locations.

## 11. VIEWS ON DESIGNING TRIALS FOR SCALABILITY

### Background

The Scottish Government wishes to maximise the value of the ELC programme by ensuring that the lessons learned from trials can be applied to similar ELC settings in Scotland. Consideration is required on what needs to be factored into the design of the trials to enable this.

### **Question 10: How can we design the trials in such a way as to ensure scalability?**

11.1 44 respondents addressed this question. An overarching theme across a wide range of responses was that trials should be set up from the outset as **learning mechanisms** intended to produce lessons of more general applicability.

11.2 A few respondents recommended that **thorough groundwork be undertaken** prior to setting up trials including examining evaluations of trials in other jurisdictions, consulting with key stakeholders and ensuring common understandings of concepts such as “playful approaches to arts and creativity”.

11.3 17 respondents from a wide range of sectors emphasised the need for **trials to test a variety of settings** and provider models; patterns of provision (e.g. seasonal); scale of budget; size; rurality; “hard to reach” communities; outdoor space access. By doing so, they envisaged that aspects of the trials would be relevant to areas throughout Scotland.

11.4 11 respondents recommended that **robust evaluative methods** are used to assess the trials. Standardised approaches to evaluation with measurable outcomes were advocated, with appropriate indicators and data collection mechanisms in place from the start. One respondent called for “experts” to conduct the evaluations which some emphasised should be done with rigour. The challenge of time needed for outcomes to be realised was highlighted once again, with one respondent identifying the need for:

“.....a reasonable timeframe for the trials so that approaches can be applied effectively without appearing to be a ‘quick fix’ and ending up being ineffective in the long term when rolled out” (Voluntary organisation).

11.5 A few respondents specified the importance of **establishing baseline data**; comparator areas where the same provision is trialled but in different settings; representative samples; and qualitative data collection during interviews with parents and other key stakeholders, in addition to quantitative measurement.

11.6 It was suggested that the Care Inspectorate Registration Team could usefully provide the Scottish Government with information on the pattern and location of variation to existing services and any new applications to register services in order to provide a database of provision as a backcloth to the trials.

11.7 28 respondents identified broad ways to set up the trials to make them mechanisms for shared learning. A few recommended establishing “cluster groups” which involve all providers in one area, supported by regional funding.

11.8 Two respondents referred to the “test of change” model established through the Early Years Collaborative as having potential for application to the trials. A voluntary organisation suggested action research as an appropriate approach to learning from the trials, or a “quality improvement model”.

11.9 Two respondents emphasised their view that trials should be kept simple; a local authority recommended focusing trials on key themes and core concepts. One representative body suggested that standardisation across trials, for example, in childminder pay, would aid scalability.

11.10 A common view amongst five respondents from different sectors was that the trials should be **underpinned by realistic budgets** to provide a genuine picture of potential for expansion. One respondent, however, cautioned that limited funds should not be wasted:

“The government should ensure that what money is available for trials is not wasted on never to be employed initiatives - we know what the problems are with early learning and care provision. Hence a handful of excellently funded initiatives targeted in specific local authorities and issues (universality, rural provision, disability services, poverty mitigation childminding, etc.), because of their nature, would be better than a plethora of trials that didn't amount to anything” (Other body).

11.11 Eight respondents from a range of sectors identified **robust dissemination** of lessons, including sharing events run by the Scottish Government, as necessary to ensure issues of scalability can be addressed. One local authority suggested that there are currently effective local models of provision which could be usefully shared and scaled up and these could be the focus of early dissemination.

11.12 Several local authorities and others cautioned that it is unlikely that successful approaches can be transported wholesale to settings elsewhere in Scotland, but that **aspects of approaches** are more likely to be relevant to other areas. In learning from trials, they emphasised the need to identify pilots which could be **tailored for other local circumstances**, with aspects extrapolated for scaling up elsewhere.

11.13 Four respondents from different sectors emphasised the need for the **supporting infrastructure for trials to be recognised** as crucial and not simply the initiatives themselves. For example, appropriate funding and staffing were crucial for other areas looking to replicate successful aspects of trials, demonstrating the importance of transparency over the structural resources required for the trials.

### **Implications for proposed trials**

11.14 In order for successful aspects of trials to be scaled up, respondents identified a number of design features to be incorporated from the start. These included ensuring they are set up as learning mechanisms; are simple and focused to enable lessons to be clearly identifiable; that thorough groundwork is undertaken to make sure they are evidence-based and testing clearly specific concepts and approaches;



that they test a variety of settings which will produce relevant learning for different locations across Scotland; that they are underpinned with robust evaluative methods and have firm baseline data; that budgets for the trials are realistic and provide a genuine picture of funding and supporting infrastructure required; and that dissemination of lessons is robust and information widely shared post-trial.

## 12. INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROGRAMME OF TRIALS

### Question 11: Would you be interested in being involved in the programme of trials? If so, in what capacity?

12.1 52 respondents addressed this question with most interested in being involved in the programme of trials in some capacity. Annex 4 contains a summary of the interest expressed by respondent and geographical area.

#### Interest in planning, implementing and evaluating the trials

12.2 Respondents across a range of sectors, from national organisations to individuals, highlighted their interest in supporting the organisational and operational aspects of the trials. Their interest encompassed support from pre-trial planning to evaluation and roll out on a wider scale (Table 12.1).

**Table 12.1: Summary of interest in involvement in organising and operating the trials** (See Annex 4, Part 1 for further details.)

Type of involvement	No. of respondents expressing interest
Planning for and informing the programme of trials	11
Involvement in establishing the evaluative framework	9
Sharing feedback and good practice prior, during and after the trials	7
General help with the trials; supporting their implementation	3
Providing a broader picture of existing services (for planning of trials purposes)	2
Post-trials implementation on a wider basis	1

#### Interest in delivering trials

12.3 A wide variety of respondents proposed potential trial settings and focus for consideration by the Scottish Government. Their proposals are outlined in Annex 4 Part 2. Table 12.2 summarises the focus of their proposals.

**Table 12.2 Summary of focus of interest in delivering trials**

Focus	No. of respondents expressing interest
Trials involving childminders	7
Extended opening hours	7
Holistic model of provision	7
Provision for 2 year olds	4
Provision in rural areas	4
Awareness raising/communication	2
Outdoor nursery provision	2
Workforce training	2
Multi-agency working	1

Arts-based trial	1
Cross-border working	1
Overcoming barriers to take-up	1
Longitudinal trial	1
Non-specific offer of involvement as a trial setting	5

### **Implications for proposed trials**

12.4 Most of those responding to the consultation offered their involvement in taking forward the programme of trials, either as trial setting or by supporting the organisation, implementation, evaluation of trials and/or sharing information post-trial, suggesting that there will be much support and buy-in for the trials.

12.5 20 different local authority areas were represented amongst respondents offering to provide settings for trials, including urban, rural and remote rural locations. However, significant gaps included locations in Fife, Perth, Stirling and Dundee, suggesting that more work may be required to engage ELC providers within these areas with the trials.

## **ANNEX 1: LIST OF RESPONDENTS**

### **Local Government**

Aberdeenshire Council  
ADES Early Years Network  
City of Edinburgh Council  
East Ayrshire Council  
East Renfrewshire Council  
Highland Council  
Inverclyde Council  
Midlothian Council and Midlothian Sure Start  
North Ayrshire Council  
North Lanarkshire Council  
Orkney Islands Council  
Perth and Kinross Council Education and Children's Services  
Renfrewshire Council  
South Lanarkshire  
West Dunbartonshire Council

### **Local Government Nurseries**

Bellsbank ECC  
Lime Tree Day Nursery - Glasgow

### **Private Nurseries**

Arnhall Nursery  
Busy Bees Nursery Ayr  
Busy Bees Nursery(Edinburgh Park)  
Busy Bees Nursery (Inverness)  
Cairellot Nursery Limited  
Hopscotch Childcare Centre  
Jaybees (Childcare) Ltd  
Kidzcare – Edinburgh  
Kirktonholme Nursery  
Les Enfants Nursery  
North Edinburgh Childcare  
Pear Tree Nursery  
Sunbeams Nursery

### **Registered Childminders**

Jayne Kirby Childminder  
Wee Stars

### **Regulator**

Care Inspectorate  
Scottish Social Services Council

### **Representative Bodies**

Early Years Scotland  
National Day Nurseries Association  
National Parent Forum of Scotland

Scottish Childminding Association  
Scottish Out of School Care Network

Unions

Educational Institute of Scotland  
NASUWT  
UNISON  
Voice

Voluntary Organisations

Aberlour Childcare Trust  
Care and Learning Alliance  
Children in Scotland  
Early Education  
Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector  
National Deaf Children's Society  
Save the Children  
Starcatchers  
Stepping Stones for Families

**Third sector and voluntary providers**

Coldstream Playgroup  
Cumbernauld & Kilsyth Nursery & Out of School Care Service

**Other**

Childhood Practice Providers  
Fair Funding for Our Kids  
John Davis – on behalf of Common Weal  
NHS Health Scotland

**Individuals**

15 individuals including parents; playgroup managers and workers; private nursery employers and employees; teachers, ex-teachers and early years' practitioners.

## ANNEX 2: EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE (Question 5)

### Examples of Best Practice within ELC Provision

Topic	Initiative name	Location	Theme	Description	Reference
Providing flexibility	Short term full time places	Aberdeenshire	Supporting parents	Full day places (provision which covers the whole nursery day, including a free school meal) to families in crisis, this provision operates on a 12 week block with a review at 6 weeks. One 0-3 provision and about 10, 3-5 setting. Offered in some local authority settings. One of the criteria is to support parents to engage in employment/study.	Early Education
Providing flexibility	Hopscotch Childcare Centre in Hamilton	Hamilton	Supporting parents	Single-centre family service which caters for whole families making it easier for parents to access all their childcare needs in one centre. Critical evaluation welcomed of what is described as a, "It is an interesting, innovative and challenging model for our under school age children as well our out of school clubs". Registered for 21 babies, 25 twos, 65 3-5s in the nursery and 80 school-age children in the breakfast, afterschool and holiday clubs. During the hours when these out-of-school club facilities are not in use, the 3-5 registration increases to 145. Open from 7.30 am to 6.00 pm although their registration allows them to open until 9pm. This gives scope to extend opening hours in the event of a demonstrable need. Servicing 12 schools in Hamilton information sharing and working in partnership.	1. National Day Nurseries Association 2. Hopscotch Childcare Centre
Providing flexibility	Blended service	East Ayrshire	Supporting parents	Provided by Community Childminder and ELC establishments to referred families assessed as requiring care beyond 600 hours	East Ayrshire Council Save the Children

Providing flexibility	Community Childminding	Scotland	Supporting parents	Local authorities employ childminders to provide emergency or respite care, or to provide ELC for two year olds.	National Parent Forum of Scotland NHS SCOTLAND
Providing flexibility	Consultation with parents	Inverclyde	Supporting parents	The findings of consultation are used to determine developments that meet the needs of families.	Inverclyde Council
Providing flexibility	Community model	Inverclyde	Supporting parents	A range of provision is available in a community. This includes provision for children aged 0 -5 year, traditional part-time models, extended day and extended year. An integrated model of provision providing mainstream flexible places alongside provision for children with severe and complex additional support needs.	Inverclyde Council
Providing flexibility	All day provision	Norway	Supporting parents	All day childcare provision for children from birth to six. Childcare for all children in school which goes up to the age of 14. Mixture of learning and care through play much of it outside. Parents can leave their children there all day	Aberdeenshire Council
Providing flexibility	Blended service	North Ayrshire	Supporting parents	Partner providers and child minders are deployed creatively to cope with the demands of childcare.	North Ayrshire Council
Providing flexibility	Blended service	Canada	Supporting parents	Private day care and state kindergarten are blended to meet the needs of parents.	Individual
Providing flexibility	Cairellot Nursery Limited	Bishopton, Renfrewshire	Supporting parents	Example of a very small nursery which has grown to meet the needs of our community and the local authority. It has expanded 4 times over the years and this year spent in excess of £300,000 to meet the growing needs of the children within our community. The model includes: funded hours only; funded hours with wraparound; part days; full days; split week which be divided between community and private; block sessions; choice of am/pm session or a mixture of both; term time and full year.	Cairellot Nursery Limited

Providing flexibility	Family Learning Centres	North Lanarkshire	Supporting parents	Extended day provision within family learning centres in North Lanarkshire Council to support working families.	North Lanarkshire
Providing flexibility	Registered in-house sitter services.	National (Also Highland Sitter Services specifically mentioned)	Supporting parents	Service which can be delivered by the hour, with parents able to book hour-long slots as required. The cost of the sitter service is the same regardless of the number of children in the household. Sitters provide an extremely flexible service and can, for example, come to the house at weekends or on weekday mornings - e.g. sitters can arrive at 7am, get the children ready and take them to school. This service is of particular use to parents who work shift patterns, or who have to commute long distances to their workplace, or are required to travel for work events. Although this service can be expensive, it is compatible with Self Directed Support, and works well for parents of children with complex additional support needs.	National Parent Forum of Scotland Care and Learning Alliance – Highland Sitter Service
Providing flexibility	Coldstream Playgroup	Coldstream	Supporting families	0-2 yrs– home, childminder, family care, parent and toddler group; 16-24 months– as above, plus Stay and Play sessions; 2-3 yrs– playgroup (part time provision), childminders; 3-5 – nursery, childminders; 5-12 yrs– school, breakfast club, OOSC, childminders; 12 + - school, OOSC, youth groups. All supplemented with various targeted provision such as nurture group, parent drop-ins etc and also uniformed groups, sports clubs and interest groups most of which takes place within the primary school grounds. Example is facilitated by taking place in a small town without any competing services but it might be that it could be replicated around any primary school.	
Providing flexibility	Consultation with parents	Renfrewshire Council	Improving take up	Consultation within the local community ensures that a clear picture of needs of individual families is gathered and allows centres / nurseries to	Renfrewshire Council



				provide patterns of delivery which meet the needs of families. Within a local area we have an example of a service being responsive and flexible in its delivery of the entitlement to maximise the uptake of 600 hours for children – through offering children who have an afternoon placement 4 x pm sessions and 1 full day – this was in response to a high number of children not receiving their full entitlement as they were being collected early by their parents in line with primary school closure times.	
Workforce	Staff bank	Highland and Moray	Increasing the workforce	Expertise in setting up a staff bank which could be rolled out elsewhere/willingness to partner another authority to help establish this.	Care and Learning Alliance
Workforce	Commissioning childminders	North Lanarkshire	Increasing the workforce	Childminders are commissioned to deliver ELC for two year olds. This provides a homelike environment with a less busy service and low adult-to-child ratio suited to the very young child's needs. N. Lanarkshire consulted with SCMA leading to a series of information sessions to explain how the partnership would work. This encouraged childminders to register interest at that stage. The tender process itself was reviewed, explained clearly and the document condensed to two pages.	Scottish Childminding Association
Workforce	Collaborative training	Glasgow	Increasing skills of workforce	Through being given resources to work together and access training, small local organisations have been able to collaborate, co-operate and share learning more effectively, resulting in outstanding outcomes for clients.	Glasgow Council for Voluntary Services
Workforce	Training for childminders	North Lanarkshire	Increasing skills of workforce	Provision of ongoing training opportunities for childminders similar to the rest of their childcare workforce at times and places which encourage attendance and fit with the childminder's day. Since opening this up to childminders in August 2015 there are now more two year olds with childminders than any other service type in the	Scottish Childminding Association

				area.	
Workforce	Childhood Practice Award	National	Increasing skills of workforce	Education Scotland report found that in almost all centres surveyed, staff who either have the BA (Childhood Practice) award or are undertaking the qualification, believe that it is having a significant and positive impact on children's learning. Staff are delivering more child-led learning which promotes deeper and challenging learning experiences.	Scottish Social Services Council
Workforce	E-learning and use of information technology	National	On-line learning and IT use	On-line training if done well could be used in some areas. Some settings use technology for observations and administration.	Les Enfants Nursery
Workforce	Pay and conditions	Sweden and other Scandinavian countries	Pay commensurate with skill	Pay, qualifications and status which reflect ELC as a valued profession.	1. Care Inspectorate 2. Kirktonholme Nursery
Partnership with parents	Family nurture centres	Fife	Parenting	Combination of parenting classes with childcare	Care Inspectorate
Partnership with parents	Parent and child bonding	East Ayrshire	Parenting	Referred families with a child under 3 are offered a place in an ELC establishment through a multi-agency allocation process. Parent and child attend together one day per week to promote positive bonding, increase knowledge and understanding of child development and to create community connections. This was positively evaluated by Strathclyde University in 2015.	East Ayrshire Council
Partnership with parents	Stay and Play model	National	Parenting	Parents attend regular sessions with their children and family learning is at the heart of our provision.	Early Years Scotland
Partnership with parents	Your Child Choices	National	Supporting families	Delivery of Family Sign Language to families of newly diagnosed deaf children and practitioners in early years' settings. This training aims to improve communication between deaf children and their surroundings, at home or in nursery.	National Deaf Children's Society
Partnership with parents	Stepping Stones for Families	National	Supporting families	Provision of a holistic approach to early learning and childcare provision in which the well-being	1. Stepping Stones for

				needs of the family are met as well as addressing the childcare needs. This leads to positive outcomes for families.	Families 2. Childhood Practice Providers
Partnership with parents	Family support service	Fife	Supporting families	Support is in schools rather than family centres. Needs to be evaluated to see if it could be feasibly rolled out across Scotland.	Aberdeenshire Council
Partnership with parents	Integrated Family Learning Centres – Woodburn Primary School	Midlothian	Supporting families	A re-design and re-configuration of services in an existing Primary School to establish a Family Learning Centre. From planning to full-scale opening, this was achieved in 15 months. Midlothian Sure Start Third Sector staff work alongside Midlothian Council staff. Central focus of the Family Learning Centre approach is to engage parents in their child's learning and development. 100 families a day can now access a team to support their child and family, under one roof and firmly rooted in their local community. The Family Learning Centre has the 0-3, 3-5, Primary School and Out of School Care all located in the one building, to promote a seamless transition for children and families.	Midlothian Council and Midlothian Sure Start
Child centred	Child centred approaches	Sweden and other Scandinavian countries	Child development	Emphasis on building individual children's confidence and self-esteem.	Care Inspectorate
Child centred	Reggio Emilia and TeWhariki curricula	Italy and New Zealand	Child development	Child-focused experience where the voices of children are clearly heard and their rights are respected. These models ensure children are participating in their own lives and learning.	1. Individual 2. Childhood Practice Providers 3. Scottish Out of School Care Network 4. Cumbernauld & Kilsyth Nursery & Out

					of School Care Service 5. Stepping Stones for Families
Child centred	Rights-based approach	Germany	Children's rights	Every child between the age of 1 and 3 having the legal right to early childhood support	Care Inspectorate
Child centred	Smooth transitions	North Ayrshire	Transition through settings	Many of our early years' classes sit within the primary school estate allowing enhanced and positive transition into the primary stages.	North Ayrshire
Child centred	Smooth transitions	Lime Tree Day Nursery – Merrylee Primary School Shaw Mor Family Learning Centre – Tinto Primary School Kelvinpark Family Learning Centre – Hillhead Primary School Govan Family Learning Centre – Pirie Park Primary School Knightswood Early Years Centre – StNinian's Primary School Garthamlock Family Learning – St Rose of Lima Primary School	Transition through settings	Extended day nursery co-located with a primary school on the same campus. This type of delivery means that parents only have to leave and collect their children (aged up to 12 years) from one place. This also improves the transition to formal education at 5 as they are already familiar with the school.	UNISON
Child centred	Glasgow City Council nursery in Hillhead.	Glasgow	Quality provision	Excellent provision with well trained and motivated staff and located in a park setting with lots of opportunity for outdoor activities. It is also based within the grounds of Hillhead Primary which will help with transitioning to school.	Individual
Outdoor	Local Nature Kindergarten	Perth and	Use of outdoor	High quality provision with a summer club during	Perth and

space		Kinross	space	the summer months.	Kinross Council Education and Children's Services
Outdoor space	Forest School approach	Scotland	Use of outdoor space	Outdoor learning.	Cumbernauld & Kilsyth Nursery & Out of School Care Service National Day Nurseries Association
Outdoor space	Outdoor Nursery based in Pollock Park in Glasgow	Glasgow	Use of outdoor space	Children are engaged in outdoor play for the vast majority of the day regardless of the weather (unless it gets very extreme).	Individual
Outdoor space	Secret Garden	Fife	Use of outdoor space	Out-door education.	Childhood Practice Providers
Provision for vulnerable children	City of Perth Early Childhood Centre	Perth	Providing for vulnerable children	High quality provision for vulnerable children throughout most of the year.	Perth and Kinross Council Education and Children's Services
Provision for vulnerable children	A local authority in Scotland	Scotland	Providing for vulnerable children	An innovative example using GIRFEC and an out of school care breakfast club in one LA in Scotland is where head teachers identified children who were often late or missing school. A local out of school care service, which also runs a breakfast club, was commissioned by the LA to provide a pick-up service from the child's own home, to the breakfast club, where a nutritious meal and play was provided then the children were taken to school, on time, every day. It was reported that the children's wellbeing and engagement in school was vastly improved through this practical support.	Scottish Out of School Care Network
Provision for vulnerable	Kilpatrick school nursery	West Dunbartonshire	Providing for vulnerable	A nursery for children with a high level of need: physical; health related and learning related. An	West Dunbartonshire

children			children	expanded service is due to open in October 2016.	Council
Increasing parent choice	Cross-border funding	Ayrshire	Funding follows child	Funding paid to the setting the child attends irrespective of where a child lives.	National Day Nurseries Association
Increasing parent choice	No capped places in private settings	Highland and Angus Councils	Funding follows child	Allows funding to follow the child in quality settings.	National Day Nurseries Association
Creative pedagogy	Cowgate Under 5s centre	Edinburgh	Creative experience for children	A model for a 8am to 6pm service that employs creative pedagogy and is run by a manager who is not a teacher.	1. John Davis University of Edinburgh on behalf of Common Weal 2. Aberlour Childcare Trust 3. Childhood Practice Providers
Creative pedagogy	Froebal and Montessori	National	Creative experience for children	Creative delivery of early learning and childcare.	Aberlour Childcare Trust
Use of expressive arts	Hillend Children's Centre in Inverclyde	Inverclyde	Providing for vulnerable children	Starcatchers ran a pilot combining their artist in residence model with Creative Skills training for 11 members of staff with positive results. They report that use of expressive arts has been invaluable in giving non-verbal children opportunities to express themselves and shape their own learning, and staff have made clear links between the artistic process and the delivery of GIRFEC and SHANARRI outcomes, the Curriculum for Excellence and the implementation of UNCRC particularly articles 12,13 and 31. A full, independent evaluation of the pilot is due for publication May 2016.	Starcatchers
Partnership working	Blending of Outdoor Kindergartens with Local	Scotland	Transition through settings	2 types of establishment working in partnership so that a greater number of children can be	Individual

between organisations	Authority nurseries			accommodated while maintaining consistency and continuity for the children.	
Working with Asylum seekers and refugees	Daisy Chain, Govanhill	Govanhill	Working with Asylum seekers and refugees	Working with Asylum seekers and refugees.	Childhood Practice Providers
Data bank	<a href="https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Main_Page">https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Main_Page</a>	International	Sharing best practice	Comparative data on ELC and education (and sometimes including out of school care) across European countries. This web resource gives separate country reports on ELC, including staff training/qualifications/ policies and financial support etc.	Scottish Out of School Care Network

#### Features of work which makes provision exceptional

- Establishments in which children have regular and meaningful interactions with qualified teachers who are expert in early years education.
- Good transitions between nursery and school.
- Focus on free play.
- Outdoor play; outdoor focused ELC provision e.g. Forest school programmes in nurseries
- partner providers with level 9 qualified managers as well as having Early Years GTCS registered teachers
- Child-centred approaches.
- Parental (fathers as well as mothers, other carers) engagement particularly where families are living in difficult circumstances and need additional support.
- Wraparound care services, which offer provision 8am-6pm for siblings to be cared for across the day whilst accessing nursery and school.
- Opportunities for continued CPD.
- Workplace-based nursery provision, in particular the potential for a nursery that is shared between different employers who are located in the same building or area, e.g. in a business park.

## ANNEX 3: EXAMPLES OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICE (Question 6)

### Examples of Innovative Practice within ELC Provision

Topic	Initiative name	Location	Theme	Description	Reference
Providing flexibility	“Stretched funding” models	Various	Supporting parents	Spreading the allocated funding per child over a greater number of weeks (e.g. 52 weeks) to provide out of term time provision but also to enable parents to budget and not be faced with higher out of term time costs.	Jaybees (Childcare) Ltd Busy Bees Nursery Inverness National Day Nurseries Association Individual
Providing flexibility	Altered hours for ELC settings	Orkney Islands	Supporting parents	Instead of a 3 hours 10 min model in full time settings, Orkney Islands adopted different models of ELC provision and allowed parents flexibility to align with parents’ needs.	Orkney Islands Council
Providing flexibility	Learning from primary school flexible hours models	Highland Council	Supporting parents	Trialling flexibility models in 4 primary schools in Highland, 2 large schools offering 8-6pm provision, 1 offering 9-3pm using a 1:8 staff child ratio and a 4 <sup>th</sup> offering an early level class. View to transferring knowledge from these to ELC settings.	Highland Council
Increasing parent choice	Gloucestershire Model	Gloucestershire	Supporting parents	Parents are given ELC funding and enabled to choose how they spend this within accredited settings.	Individual
Increasing parent choice	Childminders delivering ELC	West Lothian	Enabling ELC in home setting	Use of childminders to deliver 600 hours of ELC.	Scottish Childminding Association
Increasing parent choice	Play and Care Stepping Stones for Families	Ayrshire Glasgow	Enabling ELC in home	High quality childcare in own home which is particularly beneficial	Stepping Stones for



			setting	where there are additional support needs or parents work various inconsistent hours (e.g. shifts).	Families
Workforce	Opening Doors	Inverness, Ross-Shire and Sutherland	Increasing the skilled workforce	Flexible student-centred approach to mentoring potential childcare workers involving group learning days and one-to-one mentoring.	Care and Learning Alliance
Workforce	Childhood Practice Award	National	Increasing the skilled workforce	SSSC working in partnership with Education Scotland and other stakeholders to support a programme of enhanced learning in the sector. The Childhood Practice award and the virtual nursery are examples of innovative delivery and approaches to supporting learning.	Scottish Social Services Council
Partnership with parents	"Blether bags"	A nursery – not identified	Supporting families	Many of the children and the families using the service do not have English as their first language. These families are supported through the use of topic resource bags ("blether bags"). Older children in the school were encouraged to record the names of the items in the bags in both English and Polish. The bags can be taken home by nursery children and explored with parents. Parents were very much involved in learning and feel part of the nursery and school community.	Care Inspectorate
Partnership with parents	Families and Schools Together (FAST)	UK wide	Supporting families	Programme run in the UK by Save the Children for parents of early primary age children. Designed to improve parents' confidence, their relationship with their child and their engagement with their child's education. This may provide a	Save the Children

				model for the early years' sector.	
Data bank	"My World Outdoors" <a href="http://www.careinspectorate.com/index.php/my-world-outdoors">http://www.careinspectorate.com/index.php/my-world-outdoors</a>	International	Sharing innovative practice	Publication with examples of innovative and excellent practice supporting national guidance and Scotland's Play Strategy.	Care Inspectorate
Data bank	Childcare Commission resources	International	Sharing innovative practice	Childcare Commission's range of sources of international evidence.	Children in Scotland
Use of expressive arts	Pen Green Children's Centre and Research Base – <a href="http://www.pengreen.co.uk">http://www.pengreen.co.uk</a>  Thomas Coram Centre <a href="http://www.thomascoram.camden.sch.uk/#">http://www.thomascoram.camden.sch.uk/#</a>  Reflections Nursery <a href="http://www.reflectionsnurseries.co.uk/light-everywhere/4577814764">http://www.reflectionsnurseries.co.uk/light-everywhere/4577814764</a>	National	Creative experience for children	ELC that uses arts and creativity at the heart of service delivery.	Starcatchers
Use of expressive arts	The Playground <a href="http://www.starcatchers.org.uk/sites/default/files/The%20Playground%20report%20W%20EB.pdf">http://www.starcatchers.org.uk/sites/default/files/The%20Playground%20report%20W EB.pdf</a>	2 settings in South Lanarkshire and 1 setting in East Renfrewshire	Creative experience for children	Residency based projects delivered by Starcatchers which places artists in childcare settings for extended periods of time to support outcomes based on a consistency of contact between children, staff, parents and the artists involved.	Starcatchers
Child centred	Montessori approach	National	Child development	Holistic approach to child development	National Day Nurseries Association
Partnership working between organisations	Pen Green <a href="http://www.pengreen.org">www.pengreen.org</a>	Corby in Peterborough	Multi-agency approach	Internationally acclaimed 'centre of excellence'. As well as being an integrated children's centre offering families a multi-agency co-located service Pen Green also has as Research and Training Centre located alongside the Children's Centre. Pen Green promotes a strong community development ethos, at least 50% of the	Midlothian Council and Midlothian Sure Start ADES Early Years' Network

				workforce are local parents who they have supported to become fully qualified Early Years Practitioners.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

## ANNEX 4: INTEREST IN INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROGRAMME OF TRIALS (Question 11)

### PART 1: PLANNING AND UNDERTAKING THE TRIALS

Main topic of interest	Respondent	Location	Further details
Planning/informing the programme of trials	Care Inspectorate	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of trials including pre-trial criteria.</li> <li>• Sharing information from registered services database.</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	National Deaf Children's Society	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend consultation with British Sign Language National Advisory Group.</li> <li>• Recommend consultation with Disabled Young People's Advisory Group</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	NASUWT	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willing to be involved in further consultations and on relevant working party.</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	EIS	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willing to be involved in design and delivery of trials.</li> <li>• Willing to willing to seek feedback from any members who are involved in trials and to feed this back to the relevant personnel.</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector	Glasgow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer to share information from database of organisations providing support to children, their families and young people.</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	Coldstream Playgroup	Coldstream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share views on how services could be developed locally.</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	Inverclyde Council	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer of involvement in "table top" exercises.</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	NHS SCOTLAND	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of evidence</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	Save the Children	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will feed learning from Early Years and Childcare Strategy Forum to inform development of trials.</li> </ul>

Planning/informing the programme of trials	Childhood Practice Providers	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will ask students to identify examples of excellence and examples of challenges.</li> </ul>
Planning/informing the programme of trials	Kirktonholme Nursery	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Happy to participate in group planning discussions and share experiences.</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	Care Inspectorate	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of measureable outcomes.</li> <li>Assist with evaluation.</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	National Parent Forum of Scotland	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offer of advice on how to consult with and engage with parents.</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	Children in Scotland	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assistance with evaluation</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	Hopscotch Childcare Centre	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assistance with evaluation</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	EIS	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assistance with evaluation</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	NHS Scotland	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for planning and undertaking evaluation with regard to individual and population indices of health, wellbeing and child poverty.</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	Scottish Childminding Association	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involvement in evaluating improvement outcomes for children.</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	Linda Carr, Head of Centre First Adventures Nursery and Chair for West Lothian Network NDNA	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to be part of evaluation team.</li> </ul>
Establishing evaluative framework and involvement in evaluation of trials	Avril Williamson, 36 years working as a teacher and head teacher in nursery schools and classes.	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to be part of evaluation team and provide advice.</li> </ul>
Sharing feedback and good practice	Care Inspectorate	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing examples of innovative practice.</li> </ul>
Sharing feedback and good practice	Early Education	England-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sharing information about parallel</li> </ul>

			developments in England.
Sharing feedback and good practice	EIS	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will seek feedback from its members in trials and feedback to relevant personnel.</li> </ul>
Sharing feedback and good practice	NHS Scotland	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can share information using its national public health networks.</li> </ul>
Sharing feedback and good practice	National Day Nurseries Association	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can share information through the sector.</li> </ul>
Sharing feedback and good practice	North Lanarkshire Council	North Lanarkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to share good practice with others.</li> </ul>
Sharing feedback and good practice	National Deaf Children's Society	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to share learning from their Early Years' project, "Your child, your choice".</li> <li>Willing to share resources for parents and practitioners.</li> </ul>
General help with trials/supporting the implementation of the trials	Children in Scotland	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of specific support for trials, for example, identification of funding models; delivery of training.</li> </ul>
General help with trials/supporting the implementation of the trials	National Day Nurseries Association	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helping to overcome barriers; support for implementation; disseminating information across the sector.</li> </ul>
General help with trials/supporting the implementation of the trials	Scottish Childminding Association	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of training and support for childminding services involved in trials.</li> </ul>
Providing broad picture of services	Care Inspectorate	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sharing of details in its database of registered services.</li> </ul>
Providing broad picture of services	National Day Nurseries Association	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of national perspective of private and third sector nursery landscape.</li> </ul>
Post-trials implementation	EIS	Scotland-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to be involved in scaling up/implementation.</li> </ul>

## PART 2: DELIVERING A TRIAL

Main topic of interest	Respondent	Location	Further details
Trials involving childminders	Care and Learning Alliance	Highlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Managed childminding service” in which CALA provides line management to registered childminders (e.g. financial help; help with policies; mentoring).</li> </ul>
Trials involving childminders	Wee Stars registered Childminder	Annandale /Lockerbie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to be part of a trial.</li> </ul>
Trials involving childminders	City of Edinburgh Council	City of Edinburgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blended approach using childminders with other ELC provision for under-3s with additional support needs.</li> </ul>
Trials involving childminders	Midlothian Council and Midlothian Sure Start	Midlothian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blended approach using 8 childminders contracted by the local authority to deliver ELC to 2 year olds.</li> <li>Already in discussion with Scottish Childminding Association about this.</li> </ul>
Trials involving childminders	Scottish Childminding Association	Scotland-wide West Lothian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will assist any local authority wishing to involve childminders in their trials.</li> <li>Suggest West Lothian as location as there is already an established Community Childminding Service there with local authority contracts set up for childminders for eligible 2 year olds.</li> </ul>
Trials involving childminders	Scottish Childminding Association	South Lanarkshire Scottish Borders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blended childcare service involving contracted childminders.</li> </ul>
Trials involving childminders	South Lanarkshire Council	South Lanarkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full costed proposal made to recruit more childminders on contract (6 in total) in areas of high deprivation and each to provide ELC for 1 x 2/3 year old and 1 x ¾ year old.</li> </ul>
Extended opening hours	East Ayrshire Council	East Ayrshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flexible model of longer opening hours over a calendar year in centres where this is not</li> </ul>

			available at the moment.
Extended opening hours	City of Edinburgh Council	Edinburgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional hours in 8 standalone nursery schools.</li> </ul>
Extended opening hours	Highland Council	Highlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scaling up existing pilots to cover holidays and seasonal working.</li> </ul>
Extended opening hours	Sunbeams Nursery	Dunoon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to be involved in extended hours pilot.</li> </ul>
Extended opening hours	East Renfrewshire Council	East Renfrewshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full days and/or 1140 hours in one of their family centres which are providing 600 hours currently.</li> </ul>
Extended opening hours	Cumbernauld & Kilsyth Nursery & Out of School Care Service	North Lanarkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to provide pilot for extended hours as they already operate from 7.30 to 6.00 pm to support parents working patterns</li> </ul>
Extended opening hours	Scottish Out of School Care Network	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to trial school holiday provision for most deprived children.</li> </ul>
Holistic model of provision	North Ayrshire Council	Garnock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variety of models of provision for children aged 2 – 18 year olds all under one roof in campus at Garnock. Focus on deprivation.</li> </ul>
Holistic model of provision	Stepping Stones for Families	Glasgow; S. Ayrshire; E. Ayrshire; Renfrewshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holistic model of provision including full day care; sessional care; OOSC; crèche; and childcare in the family home.</li> </ul>
Holistic model of provision	Hopscotch Childcare Centre	South Lanarkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Model serving whole family needs regarding childcare.</li> </ul>
Holistic model of provision	North Edinburgh Childcare	North Edinburgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to trial a model which integrates home-based care with nursery and OOSC provision.</li> </ul>
Holistic model of provision	West Dunbartonshire Council	West Dunbartonshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Family wrap-around services which link third sector and other agencies. This would need WDC to create more physical space by adapting existing buildings to be more</li> </ul>



			accommodating and increase capacity.
Holistic model of provision	South Lanarkshire Council	Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customised support for families in area of deprivation. Extended provision to 2 – 3 year olds in Hollandbush Nursery School for 52 weeks of the year from 8am – 6pm to cater for workless families.</li> </ul>
Holistic model of provision	Scottish Childminding Association	Midlothian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCMA in partnership with Midlothian Sure Start to trial linking Childminding Network with Mayfield Sure Start Centre in order to provide holistic, wrap-around support for vulnerable families.</li> </ul>
Provision for 2 year olds	North Ayrshire Council	North Ayrshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willing to trial 1140 hours with entitled 2 year olds in an area of disadvantage, in conjunction with a parent education programme to help parents return to work or FE.</li> </ul>
Provision for 2 year olds	Scottish Childminding Association	North Lanarkshire and Moray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trials to improve the adult:child ratio in ELC by using childminders.</li> </ul>
Provision for 2 year olds	Early Years Scotland	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willing to partner with a local authority to provide ELC for eligible 2 year olds using a Stay and Play model. Envisage parents staying for increasingly less time; parents taking their experience home to enrich the home learning environment.</li> </ul>
Provision for 2 year olds	Jayne Kirby, Registered Childminder	Dumfries and Galloway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently provides 600 hrs ELC for 2 year olds and willing to participate in trial.</li> </ul>
Provision in rural area	Care and Learning Alliance	Rural area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Community Hub to be used for a number of types of provision during the day and at different times of year, e.g. incorporating a breakfast club; toddler Stay and Play; pre-school; childminding; OOSC; and play scheme. All under one roof to meet local needs in rural</li> </ul>

			area.
Provision in rural area	North Ayrshire Council	Scottish island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of 1140 hours on either Arran or Cumbrae.</li> </ul>
Provision in rural area	Orkney Islands Council	Orkney islands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of ELC across a scattered island group.</li> </ul>
Provision in rural area	South Lanarkshire	Biggar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biggar Learning Community Campus.</li> <li>• Increased hours to give parents flexibility and cover their travel to work time.</li> <li>• Open 52 weeks a year.</li> </ul>
Awareness raising/communication	Scottish Childminding Association	City of Aberdeen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint work between SCMA and Aberdeen City to communicate the benefits of the childminding service. Childminding network is well established in Aberdeen.</li> </ul>
Awareness raising/communication	National Parent Forum for Scotland	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keen to consider how to strengthen parental representation and involvement and communication with parents of children in ELC.</li> </ul>
Outdoor nursery provision	Care Inspectorate	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18 outdoor nurseries are already registered with the Care Inspectorate and operate fully outdoors. Proposal to consider this model for trialling.</li> </ul>
Outdoor nursery provision	Linda Carr, Head of Centre First Adventures Nursery and Chair for West Lothian Network NDNA	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trial ELC in a setting where there is outdoor woodland space on site.</li> </ul>
Workforce training	North Ayrshire Council	North Ayrshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovative training approaches for ELC workforce centred on five early learning establishments and some primary school ELC settings.</li> </ul>
Workforce training	John Davis representing the University of Edinburgh	Edinburgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University of Edinburgh involvement in development new qualifications, setting up</li> </ul>

			practice/learning centres based on Froebel CPD qualifications. Keen also to develop a new post-graduate qualification and strengthen ties with Edinburgh College and City of Edinburgh Council.
Integrated multi-agency working	East Renfrewshire Council	East Renfrewshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to trial ELC hub in a local community offering early intervention and prevention approaches.</li> </ul>
Arts-based trial	Starcatchers	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Propose a playful arts-based trial using a residency approach in which an artist is paired with a setting to work creatively with children and staff and will engage with parents.</li> </ul>
Cross-Border working	North Lanarkshire Council	Local authorities bordering North Lanarkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing to trial ELC cross-border arrangements with bordering local authorities.</li> </ul>
Overcoming barriers to take-up	East Ayrshire Council	East Ayrshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding ELC support to access formal childcare in the home setting.</li> </ul>
Longitudinal trial	Midlothian Council and Midlothian Sure Start	Midlothian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Want to implement in Woodburn Family Learning Centre a 'Tracer Study' on the children/families attending for the 600 hours ELC. From age 2, through transition to 3-5 nursery and Primary School (and OSC), using the principle of start small, think big, tracking child/family experience, progress, development and learning.</li> </ul>
Not specific – general involvement as a trial setting	Les Enfant Nursery Lime Tree Day Nursery Kidzcare private nursery Pear Tree Nursery Busy Bee Nursery	Aberdeenshire/City Glasgow Edinburgh East Lothian Inverness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All willing to be a base for trials so long as the costs are realistic and sustainable post trial.</li> </ul>



© Crown copyright 2016

**OGL**

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [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.

This publication is available at [www.gov.scot](http://www.gov.scot)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at  
The Scottish Government  
St Andrew's House  
Edinburgh  
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-78652-256-6 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, May 2016

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA  
PPDAS69447 (05/16)

W W W . G O V . S C O T