

# DISCUSSION OF FUTURE FOR NURSERY EDUCATION IN WESTMINSTER

**Barbara Arzymanow**

Latest update October 2014 taking into account new evidence; first written in **July 2014**

## Conclusions

- I. As a Local Authority Governor of two of the four maintained nursery schools in Westminster I can see that Early Years providers need administrative help and support to keep abreast of changing funding arrangements and policies.
- II. Sufficient Government funding is available to achieve an improved performance if nursery providers adjust their operations to achieve the maximum financial benefit.
- III. Matters have been brought to a head by the Government's focus on funding part-time places at a time when Westminster had been focussing on full-time places. Approximately £1.1m of annual funding has been lost as a result.
- IV. Government policy has been directed towards increasing the number of children receiving nursery education through free part-time places for 2, 3 and 4 year-olds. On this criterion Westminster is performing poorly relative to other local authorities. The Department for Education's statistics place the percentage of 3 and 4 year-olds receiving nursery education as the lowest in England whilst Westminster is in the bottom quartile for the 2 year-old offer.
- V. Westminster could do a great deal to encourage parents to take advantage of nursery education. Methods can be found that do not require significant funding. Leaving the task to individual schools is insufficient. Innovative methods could relate to contact by social workers and health visitors, advertising in Westminster publications, recommendations in doctors' surgeries, liaison with Children's Centres, cooperation with charities and contact with ethnic minorities. This strategy should be easier to implement once public health commissioning for children aged 0-5, including the Health Visiting service, is transferred to local authorities in October 2015.
- VI. Experts and research publications are almost unanimous in believing that money spent wisely on Early Years education can transform lives and communities, especially in areas of high deprivation and poverty. Professional commentators generally regard this point as established beyond reasonable doubt.
- VII. Research suggests that addressing problems affecting children in the early years, although expensive, can save considerable amounts of money relative to putting off facing the consequences until the pupils are older. Children with a poor start to life are more likely to become future problem teenagers and adult unemployed. Without early help they may face a cycle of deprivation.
- VIII. Maintained nursery schools have higher costs per pupil to the Council than other nursery providers but are necessary because of their unique expertise with special needs children. More needs to be done to capture the funding relating to their special skills. For example, the main point made in the two emails in the appendices, one from Elizabeth Truss when she was Under Secretary of State for Education and the other from the Department of Education, was that maintained nursery schools were well placed to have a role in training other nursery staff. The Westminster maintained nursery schools are amongst the best in England on the basis of OFSTED's assessments and the breadth of children that they are able to help including special needs cases and the severely deprived.
- IX. Some opportunities for cost saving without affecting the quality of education exist. For example, there are opportunities to share activities between the nurseries. Nursery schools can charge for attendance beyond the free part-time allowance when they consider doing so to be appropriate (i.e. for parents who can afford to pay).
- X. Nursery closures would generally be inappropriate because increased capacity will eventually be required to accommodate more 2 year-olds. It is much better to fill places in a way which achieves funding.
- XI. Even after the introduction of the universal credit the poorest working families could be paying £5.00 per day for extra hours. This is a lot of money for disadvantaged families.

## **DISCUSSION OF FUTURE FOR NURSERY EDUCATION IN WESTMINSTER**

### **1. Types of Nursery Education**

Within Westminster there are four maintained nursery schools (i.e. schools financed predominantly from public funds for children too young to enter the reception class in a primary school). These are:

Dorothy Gardner Centre  
Mary Paterson Nursery School  
Portman Early Childhood Centre  
Tachbrook Nursery School

Nursery schooling is also available from private nursery schools (including profit-making, voluntary, independent and workplace establishments) and nursery classes in some primary schools.

### **2. Role of Different Types of Nursery Education**

Nursery classes are offered by 28 primary schools in Westminster and therefore totally dwarf the activity of maintained nursery schools in terms of overall pupil numbers. The main non-financial benefit of nursery facilities linked to primary schools is the scope for pupils to make a relatively seamless transition into the reception class of the primary school. A nursery class at a primary school may also have advantages for the family of a child with an older sibling at the same school. An important additional benefit is the very substantial cost savings achieved by nursery classes and primary schools sharing facilities.

Private organisations, often but not always run for profit, operate around 150 crèches, child drop-off centres, pooled childcare facilities and nurseries in Westminster. At least 60 of these could reasonably be described as proper nursery schools, although the services provided and the quality of education vary enormously. Private nursery schools have in total many more pupils than either of the other two categories but are financed primarily by fees charged to parents. However, considerable assistance from public funds is often available in respect of many of the pupils in private schools. Financial support for the private sector from public funds is not far short of the total for nursery classes in primary schools. The main benefits of private schools in the eyes of many parents are that there is more likely to be one in the desired locality, that many have better adapted to suit the hours required by working parents and that difficult children may be more likely to go elsewhere. Some parents may think that private nursery schools are superior but OFSTED reports do not support this conclusion.

The four maintained nursery schools have an ethos of seeking to help the most disadvantaged children. The disadvantages can arise from a variety of causes such as circumstances at home, poverty, conditions like autism or dyslexia, physical disabilities and speech disorders. Some of these children would not be ideally suited to private nursery schools and might not receive the best education tailored to their needs in the nursery class of a primary school. Maintained nursery schools are characterised by highly skilled, dedicated staff who typically react with horror to any suggestion that Early Years help for children should be financially rationed. Research suggests that addressing problems in the early years, although expensive, can save considerable amounts of money relative to deferring facing the consequences until the pupil is older. Children with a poor start to life are more likely to become future problem teenagers and adult unemployed, leading to continued deprivation. Some of the evidence supporting early intervention is summarised in a document headed "Addressing the false economy", which can be downloaded from [http://www.actionforchildren.org.uk/media/1418558/the\\_red\\_book\\_addressing\\_the\\_false\\_economy.pdf](http://www.actionforchildren.org.uk/media/1418558/the_red_book_addressing_the_false_economy.pdf) Some further background can be found in Appendix 6 (Frank Field Report).

In July 2011 Iain Duncan Smith, Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, said:

*“Getting Early Intervention right is crucial to breaking the inter-generational cycle of many of the social problems Britain is facing. By improving outcomes for children who have had a difficult start in life we can help them to meet their hopes and ambitions.”*

Also in July 2011 Oliver Letwin, Minister for Government Policy, stressed in connection with Early Years intervention *“the need to put more of our effort into solving problems early and cheaply, instead of spending vast sums trying (often vainly) to cure them later. Whether you measure this in terms of human happiness or in terms of taxpayer value, earlier is better.”*

Maintained nursery schools are in some respects like teaching hospitals. They are open to all if places are available but have particular expertise and experience relevant to difficult cases. **Many parents are unaware of the skills of maintained nursery schools and might seek to send their child to one if they had the full facts.**

An analysis of the take-up of free nursery places is available from:

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/197414/DFE-RB066.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/197414/DFE-RB066.pdf)

The evidence is overwhelming that children from the age of 2 generally benefit from attending a nursery school, especially if they are disadvantaged.

### 3. Costs of Running Nursery Facilities

Whilst only 7% of children of primary or secondary school age in full-time education attend private schools nationally, the position is very different for nurseries, where around 70% of establishments nationally are in the private sector. Any analysis of value in nursery education needs to compare the state offerings (i.e. maintained schools and nursery classes in primary schools) with what is available privately. Obviously this comparison only represents a real choice to families able to pay, qualify for a free place or receive funding. The fees charged by private nursery schools in Westminster vary significantly but the following table gives some typical examples. The data quoted is for term-time attendance on five mornings per week, since this arrangement most closely reflects the position for a typical pupil at a maintained nursery school. Private schools that offer only full-time places or stay open and expect attendance in the school holidays cannot be compared directly.

**Table 1: Fees & OFSTED Ratings of Some Private Nursery Schools in Westminster**

Private Nursery School	Annual Fee for Term-Time Mornings when paid for by parent	Latest OFSTED Rating
Abercorn School	£8,475	Good
Knightsbridge Kindergarten	£7,200	Good
Paint Pots Bayswater	£5,910	Outstanding
Sunrise Preschool	£5,625	Good
The Willcocks Nursery School	£7,260	Outstanding
Young England Kindergarten	£8,250	Good
<b>Average</b>	<b>£7,120</b>	

The private sector nursery fees listed in Table 1 are for children without special educational needs. The finances of the four maintained nursery schools are similar to one another and in this document Mary Paterson is often taken as an example.

Excluding Special Educational Needs funding, the total current cost of running Mary Paterson is estimated to be approximately £594,000 per annum. This covers around 40 part-time and 25 full-time pupils, which is equivalent in terms of hours at school to approximately 90 morning-only pupils. The per annum cost for comparison with the private sector data in Table 1 is therefore £594,000/90 = **£6,600**.

Nursery classes in Westminster primary schools receive funding of £4.56m for 642 full-time and approximately 328 part-time pupils. The equivalent number of morning-only places for the purpose of calculating figures comparable to those in Table 1 is 1,613 (i.e. 2 X 642 + 328). The per annum cost for comparison with the private sector data in Table 1 is therefore £4,560,000/1,613 = **£2,830**.

The costs of running nursery facilities, excluding additional special needs expenditure, are therefore as set out in Table 2, where all figures are expressed as morning-only equivalents. In the case of private nursery schools the cost is, of course, borne largely by parents rather than public funds.

**Table 2: Cost of Running Nursery Facilities and OFSTED Ratings**

	<b>Annual Cost for Term-Time Mornings</b>	<b>Latest OFSTED Rating</b>
Private Nursery Schools – Westminster average based on examples in Table 1.	<b>£ 7,120</b>	Mainly Good-some Outstanding.
Mary Paterson – example of a Maintained Nursery School	<b>£ 6,600</b>	Mary Paterson is Outstanding in every category! Three out of the four Westminster maintained nursery schools are Outstanding.
Nursery Classes in Westminster Primary Schools – average	<b>£ 2,830</b>	Varies

Private nursery schools and maintained nursery schools have very similar running costs. Nursery classes in primary schools are much cheaper because of shared facilities. These classes may however not cover the full age range of a nursery school. Private schools are the cheapest for local authorities because huge discounts are available to fill otherwise empty places (see Table 3).

#### **4. Non- Financial Reasons for Choice of Nursery Type**

Parents can choose private nursery schools for a number of different reasons and are often willing to bear the entire cost themselves if they can afford to pay, in order to secure their choice of nursery school. The factors influencing parents vary. Possible reasons for choosing a private nursery school include:

- Lack of a vacancy in a maintained nursery school or nursery class in a primary school.
- Need for longer hours or for opening in the school holidays, in order to fit in with work.
- Belief that the pupil will mix with a more suitable type of child.
- Desire for the child to attend a nursery that feeds the child's likely next school. This is also an important consideration for nursery classes in primary schools.
- Geographical convenience.
- Admission of a child at a younger age than would otherwise be allowed.
- An often unfounded belief that private nursery schools may be superior.

The clearest benefit of maintained nursery schools is their genuine ethos of and expertise in caring for special needs children. Research suggests that if at all possible special needs children should be educated in mainstream schools like maintained nursery schools and not in separate facilities. Mary Paterson, for example, had 21 special educational needs children, including 5 with statements, 3 proposed for a statement and 2 in the pipeline, out of a total school roll of 66 as at June 2014. Many educational experts believe that the presence of these special needs children enhances the experience of the other pupils. The latest Mary Paterson OFSTED inspection states:

*“Parents and carers are overwhelming in their praise for the quality of many aspects of the nursery. They say that it is like an ‘oasis’: ‘Everyone should have the opportunity to come to a place like this’; the staff are ‘amazingly dedicated’; and they ‘can’t praise them enough’. They report how lives have been transformed and the exceptional progress their children have made especially in independence and communication. They highly commend the support they have received from staff if their child is disabled or has special educational needs.”*

The OFSTED picture suggested by Tables 1 & 2 is not the full story and understates the benefits of maintained nursery schools. OFSTED can only rate schools for what they do. For example, a school that

has few or no special needs children can only have a limited special needs inspection. In addition, the latest OFSTED report for a school may be years out of date. Assessing the true value of a school needs to take more into account than just the OFSTED report. This point is reinforced by the fact that most nursery schools are rated as outstanding or good by OFSTED. Trying to identify important differences from OFSTED reports can be rather like choosing the best university applicants from a group who have mainly A and A\* grades in their A Levels.

## 5. Current System of Payment

Children aged 3 or above at the beginning of term are able to receive 570 hours per annum of schooling free in a maintained nursery school or in a nursery class within a primary school, providing of course that there is an available vacancy. This entitlement is usually taken as 15 hours a week during term time. In general, maintained nursery and primary schools are not open in the school holidays.

Two-year-olds from low income families evidenced by the receipt of benefits can also receive 15 hours a week of free term-time schooling in a maintained nursery school or nursery class in a primary school, again subject to a vacancy existing. Two-year-old children are also entitled to a free place if they are looked after by the local authority (e.g. foster care) or have a child protection plan. The system for 2-year olds is intended to provide the opportunity of a place to the most disadvantaged 40% of the population. Parents may wish their children to have more than 15 hours per week in a maintained nursery school or nursery class in a primary school. Under these circumstances the maintained nursery school or nursery class in a primary school can charge the parents for the excess if other sources of funding are not available.

Working couples and working single parents on low incomes can claim the Childcare Element of the Working Tax Credit. This can be used towards paying nursery charges levied on the parent(s). A maximum of 70% of parental contributions can be met in this way subject to a means tested cap which falls with rising income. Parents on the lowest income have a cap of £175 per week for one child or of £300 for two or more children. The sum of £175 per week equates to £8,750 per annum. This is in excess of any likely parental charge so that in practice the lowest income group would effectively pay just 30% of any parental charge.

As an example we can take the hypothetical case of a very low income family where both parents work and their one child is aged 4 and has a full-time place at Mary Paterson and no other special circumstances are relevant. His or her mornings will be paid for under the free 15-hour per week entitlement, which is paid by Westminster Council out of funds provided by the Department for Education. The afternoon charge to the parent(s) is determined by the school or the local authority but, if levied at the same rate as the cost of the morning place to the Council, would result in a bill of around £6,600 per annum for the parents. However, 70% of this could still be met from the Childcare Element of the Working Tax Credit, which is paid to the working parent(s) from the Government. The total actually payable by the low-income family from its own resources is therefore 30% of £6,600 i.e. approximately £2,000 per annum, equivalent to about £10 per school day (Monday to Friday in term time).

Other schemes exist for helping with nursery fees under certain circumstances. For example, employers can issue vouchers redeemable at nursery establishments up to a value of about £3,000 per employee. The benefit of these vouchers is that they are free from income tax or national insurance. In general, vouchers are not attractive to people on very low incomes who pay little tax and national insurance and may lose tax credits. Other money is available for children of young students.

As an alternative to a free part-time place in a maintained nursery school or a nursery class in a primary school, a child's parent(s) may elect to receive a free place for 15 hours per week in a private school approved by the Council. **A legal obligation exists for the Council to ensure that sufficient places are available for every eligible applicant to receive one.** If the child attends the private school for more than the 15 free hours per week, the parent(s) must still pay the extra as determined by the school. In the case of low-income working parents, up to 70% of this extra can still come from the Childcare Element of the Working Tax Credit. The voucher scheme is still available for parents who would benefit from it.

The actual payment made by the Council to the private nursery school is determined by a formula devised by the Council and is far below what a parent would pay for the same service. If Westminster were to pay at the same rate as parents, the 15 hours per week would cost in the region of £7,120 (see Table 1), which is

equivalent to £7,120/570 = **£12.49 per hour**. In fact, the Council pays **about £3.23 m** per annum to fund approximately 1,421 pupils receiving 15 hours per week of term (or the equivalent) in private nursery schools. This amount corresponds to **£2,270 per pupil** on a basis comparable to the figures in Table 2.

Table 3 gives an analysis of the current picture for the funding of different types of nursery care by Westminster.

**Table 3: Cost of Westminster Nursery Provision (3 & 4 year-olds)**

	Annual Cost to Council	Annual Cost to Council per pupil on equivalent part-time basis	Cost per hour	Number of full-time pupils funded by Council	Number of part-time pupils funded by Council	Total Number of pupils funded by Council
Private Nursery Schools	£ 3.23m	£ 2,270	£ 3.98	0	1,421	1,421
Maintained Nursery Schools	£ 2.25m	£ 6,740	£ 11.82	85	164	249
Nursery Classes in Primary Schools	£ 4.56m	£ 2,830	£ 4.96	642	329	971

Notes:

1. In the above table references to an equivalent part-time basis relate to the annual cost of a child being at the establishment for 15 hours per week for 38 weeks of the year (i.e. during term time).
2. The annual fees for a pupil at a private nursery school in Westminster are typically around £7,120 on an equivalent part-time basis when paid by the parent(s) without Council funding, as per Table 1.
3. The data in the above table is for 3 and 4 year-olds only. The position regarding 2 year-olds is discussed in the section headed **"Uptake of Free Nursery Places"** i.e. section 8 below.

## 6. Challenges Ahead

The broad policy of Westminster has been to pay for what the Government funds but not to use money from Council Tax or business rates to provide extra. The Government, Westminster and nursery school teachers are all agreed that there is and should be a long-term trend towards nurseries offering longer hours, taking children at a younger age, raising the standard of care and helping children with special or higher needs. Unfortunately the Government and Westminster's four maintained nursery schools have approached these issues from different directions. The schools have focused first on offering full-time places and helping children in need. The Government has taken action to make nursery education affordable to more people, spread its resources more widely by offering more part-time places, encourage children to start at a younger age and raise the standards of the weaker schools. Both sides have strong arguments. Parents value full-time places because they often wish to work. In addition, children with difficult backgrounds may benefit from longer at school. Experience also suggests that there is unsatisfied demand for longer hours but that part-time places are not always easy to fill. On the other hand part-time places can stretch available money to cover more children more evenly. In addition, two part-time places probably do more good in total than one full-time place, because a lot can be achieved in half a day.

As Table 3 shows Westminster has funded a large number of full-time pupils in nursery classes within primary schools and in maintained nursery schools. **The Government essentially wishes to discontinue the bulk of this expenditure and Westminster does not wish to take on the financial burden.** Without urgent action the four maintained nurseries could suffer a fatal blow even though primary schools have been more involved in creating the imbalance. The voice of four could easily be drowned by the twenty-eight.

## 7. Case for Supporting Westminster Maintained Nursery Schools

There is a powerful case for supporting the four maintained nursery schools.

- a) **Westminster's four maintained nursery schools are recognised amongst nursery teachers both in London and nationally as being amongst the very best nursery schools in England.** Two of the four maintained nursery schools were rated as outstanding by OFSTED in all six areas of assessment. One of the others was rated outstanding overall whilst the fourth nursery was assessed as good in all respects.
- b) **Maintained nursery schools are considered by local authorities and OFSTED to offer high standards of education nationally.** More than two-thirds of the 152 local authorities in England are financing some maintained nursery school provision, despite the fact that the places that they provide are more expensive to the Council than places in other categories. One reason for so many councils supporting maintained nursery schools is a desire to have expertise relevant to difficult cases. Some relevant statistics appear in Table 4, which is extracted from a report published by the National Audit Office in February 2012. As set out in that table 96% of Maintained Nursery Schools nationally are rated as good or outstanding by OFSTED against 76% to 79% for the other categories listed. The pattern of maintained nursery schools being the most costly to local authorities applies nationally (see hourly rates in Table 4).
- c) **The need for maintained nursery schools is greatest in areas of high deprivation affecting children.** Nearly 40% of children in Westminster live in a family reliant on benefit. The position is worst in the most deprived areas, which are largely in the neighbourhood of Church Street and Harrow Road. Three of the four Westminster maintained nursery schools are in this locality. At Mary Paterson approximately 32% of pupils had special educational needs as at June 2014 and some others had been referred owing to difficult circumstances.
- d) **The maintained nursery schools will be important in building up the take-up of the programme for providing part-time places for eligible 2 year-olds.** This effort is strongly supported by Government. Mary Paterson already had 27% of its pupils being 2 year-olds as at August 2014. If the Government's ambitions for 2 year-olds and 3 & 4 year-olds are to be achieved, it may even become necessary to build new nursery schools. It would be daft to close leading, outstanding nursery schools now only to replace them with inferior organisations in the future.
- e) **The higher costs of running maintained nursery schools are largely a reflection on their uncompromisingly high standards.** These schools typically employ teachers on nationally-determined pay scales, which can be 50 per cent higher than other Early Years professionals. Maintained nursery schools have additional costs, for example, they have historically been required to have a head teacher. Whilst nursery schools can share a head teacher through a federation procedure, one of the reasons for the success of maintained nursery schools is that they have an experienced, highly qualified head on the premises. OFSTED place great emphasis on the day-to-day involvement and leadership of the head. Westminster also has the added costs associated with being in central London and obviously cannot move its four maintained nursery schools to cheaper areas outside the borough because of the need to serve their existing communities with high deprivation.

Table 4: Providers delivering the free entitlement to a part-time nursery place for all 3 &amp; 4 year-olds - national data

Sector	Provider type (or 'setting')	Number of providers <sup>1</sup>	Percentage of total (%)	Number of children receiving the free entitlement	Percentage of total (%)	Average hourly funding rate <sup>2</sup> (£)	Percentage of providers rated good or outstanding by Ofsted <sup>3</sup> (%)
<b>Maintained</b> <sup>4</sup> Settings for which government grants are the main source of funding	<b>Nursery schools</b> Discrete schools for young children with their own headteacher and governing body	420	1.5	340,540	40.9	6.83	96
	<b>Nursery classes</b> Classes for young children within primary schools	7,440 <sup>5</sup>	26.0			3.97	76
<b>Non-maintained</b> Settings not directly maintained by government funding	<b>Private</b> Day nurseries and pre-schools run for profit	13,720 <sup>6</sup>	47.9	457,600	55.0		77
	<b>Voluntary</b> Day nurseries and pre-schools run not-for-profit	6,000	21.0			3.77 <sup>7</sup>	79
	<b>Independent</b> Classes for young children connected to independent (fee-paying) schools	1,050	3.7	36,660	4.0		78
		<b>28,630</b>		<b>834,800</b>		<b>3.95</b>	<b>78</b>

1 - Estimated number of providers from early years and schools censuses

2 - Calculated from total funding, including base rates and supplements, for local authorities implementing funding formulae in April 2010, divided by total funded hours reported.

3 - Calculated from over 19,000 providers inspected by Ofsted from September 2008 to March 2011

4 - Includes academies and direct-grant nurseries.

5 - Includes 370 special schools where an estimated 4,040 three- and four-year-olds were benefiting from some free early education in January 2011. These schools are outside the scope of our study.

6 - Includes childminders, providing around 1 per cent of free entitlement education

7 - Local authority returns to the Department do not split funding or hours for private, voluntary and independent providers.

Source: National Audit Office analysis of Department for Education and Ofsted data

<http://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/10121789.pdf>



## 8. Uptake of Free Nursery Places

The immediate priorities of the Government are to ensure that as many children as possible take up the offer of free part-time places for all 3 & 4 year-olds and the 40% most needy 2 year-olds. In the absence of special needs, money for other purposes is very limited. According to the latest figures released by the Department for Education Westminster has the poorest uptake of the 3 & 4 year-old, free part-time offer out of all 152 local authorities in England with just 77% of eligible children participating, compared with 90% in Inner London and 97% for England as a whole (See Appendix 3). The Westminster/Tri-Borough team have produced their own statistical analysis which comes up with different percentages from the Department for Education. According to this team Westminster had a 3 & 4 year-old take-up of 82% against 94% for England as a whole. On Westminster's analysis the borough is no longer bottom but is still one of the poorest performers in both London and England. The Department for Education and the Westminster/Tri-borough analyses use the same data for numbers children taking up free places, in both cases as at January 2014. Westminster uses the 2011 census for population estimates whereas the Department for Education uses estimates for 31 December 2013. In principle, if the estimates are made wisely, the Department for Education data should be more accurate. However, the Department for Education does warn, "Some caution should be exercised when comparing take-up rates at local authority level." They further explain, "In some cases, local authority take-up rates can exceed 100%. This can occur due to differences between how the early years census data is counted and how the population estimates are calculated. Population estimates for sub-national and individual age groups are subject to a greater degree of uncertainty than national population estimates. Therefore, take-up rates at local authority level should be treated with more caution than national take-up rates." The Department for Education figures for percentage take-up are generally considered to be the best available.

Various ideas have been put forward to try to explain the disappointing uptake of free nursery places in Westminster. Some commentators have suggested that the problem is high turnover in people living in Westminster. However, the likely impact of people moving into and out of the borough is too small to provide an explanation. The latest statistics released in June 2014 cover the year to June 2013. In this period 16,646 people (all ages) moved into Westminster and 22,984 moved out. The combined total of 39,630 represents around 17% of the population. This is clearly not big enough to explain a difference in take-up of 20% between Westminster (77%) and England (97%). Other boroughs also have people moving in and out with a total averaging 15,886 for each local authority in England and Wales. Boroughs with more movement than Westminster include amongst others Barnet, Camden, Ealing, Islington, Southwark and Wandsworth. Other suggestions as to why Westminster does not do better include ethnic diversity and deprivation but also fail to reflect the evidence fully.

The 2-year offering only began to fund places in September 2013 and is therefore harder to evaluate. Originally the offering was directed at the 20% most disadvantaged children but this has now been changed to 40% in time for this September's admissions. However, Westminster is also performing poorly in building up places for 2 year-olds with performance in the bottom quartile (See Appendix 4). Westminster has so far concentrated on mopping up cheap unused places in the private sector but is reaching saturation in this respect. In other Westminster settings Mary Paterson has led the way with 2 year-olds who now account for 27% of its pupils.

Westminster funds free places in a wide range of private nursery schools. The largest number of these places is at St. Nicholas Preparatory School, which has 70 early years pupils funded by Westminster but still only represents around 5% of Westminster-funded private nursery school places. St. Nicholas was graded as "good" following the latest OFSTED inspection (December 2010) in the four categories relating specifically to early years. The school has no children with Statements of Special Educational Needs. OFSTED assessed the "overall welfare, health and safety of pupils" in the school as a whole (not specifically early years) as "inadequate" (the lowest category). Whilst the school may have improved since the last inspection, it is clearly not in the same league as schools like Mary Paterson or able to offer the same range of specialist skills.

My findings about Westminster's disappointing performance at encouraging the uptake of free part-time places and in selecting which private schools to support are very similar to the views just published by the independent charity Family and Healthcare Trust (see Appendix 5). Further evidence that Westminster is falling behind in Early Years education is presented in Appendix 7. The data shows that a good level of development at age 5 is achieved by a smaller proportion of children in Westminster than in the region or in England as a whole. The reduction in performance amongst children receiving free school milk highlights the severity of deprivation. The excellent GCSE performance in Westminster helps to confirm that the hurdles in the path of a good result can be overcome. Experts believe that the children who are doing well at GCSE are not those who are most neglected in the Early Years and that nursery education is the best way to begin breaking the cycle of deprivation.

As well as action relating to 2 year-olds the Government has announced two other moves to help family budgets:

- a) The 30% cost of extra hours currently paid by poor working families will be reduced to 15%. This change will occur once universal credit is introduced. The monthly limit will be £646 for one child and £1108 for two or more children.
- b) The Government has announced a new scheme to offer Tax-Free Childcare for working families, which will replace the current system of Employer Supported Childcare. Once established, the scheme will be worth up to £2,000 per child, saving a working family with two children under 12 up to £4,000 a year. It will be introduced in autumn 2015 and will ultimately be open to around two million families with children under 12. To be eligible, both parents will need to be working, each earning less than £150,000 a year, and not receiving support through tax credits (or in future Universal Credit).

## 9. Cost-cutting

Westminster funds 727 full-time nursery places (see Table 3) which the Government essentially wishes to stop funding (see section 6 –“Challenges Ahead”). This would mean a reduction of £1.1m in funding received from the Government by Westminster and represents as much as 11% of total Westminster nursery school funding from Government or 49% of that for maintained nursery schools.

- If the four maintained nursery schools stopped offering full time places and filled all vacancies under the 2 year-old part time offering they would be accepting an additional 170 part time 2 year-olds. The Government provides funding of at least £6.07 per hour for 570 hours each in respect of these pupils, corresponding to a total of £588,000. Various supplements are available such as a start-up grant of £2,000 per 2 year-old pupil if certain flexibility conditions are met which would enable the lost revenue to be made up in at least for the first year. The complete elimination of full-time places has been examined purely to set out the arithmetic and not as a serious proposal. There are other ways of making the books balance such as charging parents able to pay for extra hours and assisting with training of staff for other schools and combining activities within the nursery schools. The training opportunity is given high prominence in the two emails attached to this document as appendices from The Rt. Hon. Elizabeth Truss MP and the Department of Education.
- The Government has announced that it will provide £50 million extra funding in 2015 to 2016 to nurseries, schools and other providers of government-funded early education to support disadvantaged 3- and 4-year-olds. Westminster's share of this sum can reasonably be expected to be roughly £300,000.

## Appendix 1

---

### Email from Liz Truss to Barbara Arzymanow

**Note: This email was sent to Barbara in a personal capacity before she was elected as a Councillor and whilst Liz Truss was still Undersecretary of State for Education**

2014/0026471POLT

02 May 2014

Dear Barbara,

Thank you for your email of 26 March, updating me on your work on maintained nursery schools.

I am always interested to read about your work in early education and the efforts you and your colleagues are making to give children, especially those who are most disadvantaged or have special educational needs, the best possible start in life. I agree with your comments that some of the highest quality childcare and early education is found in maintained nursery schools and school nurseries, and this is exactly what I highlighted in my recent speech at Policy Exchange on the 7 April.

Like you, I want teachers and nurseries in the driving seat of improvement. As we see in schools, I want to see strong providers, like nursery schools, working with weaker providers to improve practice.

I want to use the existing network of teaching schools – outstanding schools working with neighbouring schools to provide high-quality staff training and development – to play a much larger role in the early years and to reach out to all providers. Some are already doing this brilliantly. For example in Bristol, in March 2013 a consortium of three nursery schools with children's centres were awarded teaching school designation, working closely with the primary teaching schools in the area, as well as the local colleges and universities. Over 800 practitioners benefited last year, helping close the gap in early years outcomes in Bristol.

This is exactly the kind of activity I want to promote in nursery schools. We have 16 nursery schools that are teaching schools, and I want to strengthen those links even further and make them more widely available. I recently announced that 20 teaching schools are establishing new links with early years providers and I would like to see this grow too.

Nursery schools are so distinctive, in part because of their highly qualified staff, and I want more types of providers to aim for these high standards of early education. We are extending School Direct to the early years for the first time, meaning that nurseries will have the ability to train early years teachers. Similarly, Teach First has now recruited its first cohort of early years teachers and recently announced an increase in places for next year. Maintained nursery schools should seize this opportunity and lead the market in this work; they have the expertise and excellent practice to make a real impact on the next generation of early years teachers.

The focus on quality that I have outlined above puts nursery schools in a strong position to lead the sector on innovative practice, train early years teachers and drive up standards in their local area. I am keen to see others show the sort of initiative and leadership that some are already demonstrating, and would be grateful for your continued support in this locally.

One comment on a specific issue you raise is about the tri-borough move where Westminster City Council will stop funding full-time nursery places. The Government funds all local authorities to provide an entitlement for eligible two-year-olds and all three- and four-year-olds with 570 hours of funded early education per year, which as you know is usually taken as 15 hours per week during term time, until they reach compulsory school age. The provision of any additional funded hours above the statutory entitlement is a matter for individual local authorities.

We recognise, however, that the cost of childcare can have a significant impact on the family budget. In addition to extending the early learning entitlement for two-year-olds to children from low income working families this September, the Government also pays 70 per cent of the childcare costs parents are paying for, up to £122.50 a week for one child and £300 a week for two or more children. Once universal credit is

introduced this will rise to 85 per cent of costs to a monthly limit of £646 for one child and £1108 for two or more children.

We have also announced a new scheme to offer Tax-Free Childcare for working families, which will replace the current system of Employer Supported Childcare. Once established, the scheme will be worth up to £2,000 per child, saving a working family with two children under 12 up to £4,000 a year. It will be introduced in autumn 2015 and will ultimately be open to around two million families with children under 12. To be eligible, both parents will need to be working, each earning less than £150,000 a year, and not receiving support through tax credits (or in future Universal Credit).

You mentioned that the nursery school where you are a governor accepts two-year-olds and also offers 8am to 6pm provision. If there are others in the area that do the same, one way forward might be for them to share their experience with the schools that I mentioned elsewhere that are interested in setting up this sort of provision. You may wish to contact Mr Neil Dube at the Department, who can facilitate contact with these schools. He can be contacted by email at: [Neil.Dube@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Neil.Dube@education.gsi.gov.uk).

Thank you for your continued support on increasing the amount of quality, affordable childcare. I hope this reply is helpful to you.

With best wishes,

**Elizabeth Truss MP**  
**Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Education and Childcare**

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) This email has been certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

## Appendix 2

---

### Email to head at Mary Paterson from Department of Education

Dear Ms Gambell

I am writing on behalf of the Secretary of State for Education, to thank you for your letter of 30 April, about maintained nursery schools.

As the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Education and Childcare highlighted in her recent speech at the Policy Exchange on 7 April, nursery schools have made a significant contribution to both delivering high quality early education and leading high quality teaching. Recent proposals, that this government is taking forward, will put teachers and nurseries in the driving seat of improvement. We want to see strong providers, like nursery schools, working with weaker providers to improve practice.

One way of doing this is to grow the existing network of teaching schools. We want to see outstanding schools working with neighbouring schools to provide high-quality staff training and development, and to play a much larger role in early years by reaching out to providers. Some are already doing this successfully. For example, in Bristol, a consortium of 3 nursery schools with children's centres was awarded teaching school designation. It worked closely with the primary teaching schools in the area, as well as local colleges and universities. Over 800 practitioners benefited last year, helping to close the gap in early years outcomes within the Bristol area.

This is exactly the kind of activity we want to promote in nursery schools. We have 16 nursery schools that are teaching schools and 20 teaching schools who are establishing new links with early years providers. There are plans to designate many more nursery schools as teaching schools.

Nursery schools are so distinctive, in part because of their highly qualified staff. More types of providers should aim for these high standards of early education. We are extending School Direct to the early years for the first time, meaning that nurseries will have the ability to train early years teachers. Similarly, Teach First has now recruited its first cohort of early years teachers and has recently announced an increase in places for next year. Maintained nursery schools should seize this opportunity and lead the market in this work; they have the expertise and excellent practice to make a real impact on the next generation of early years teachers.

As regards funding for nursery schools, local authorities (LAs) are funded for early education through the dedicated schools grant, which funds education for all children aged 2 to 16 in England. LAs, in consultation with their schools forum, are responsible for deciding how best to distribute funding across their locality. From this, LAs set their own local rates and should work closely with providers to establish the true cost of a place and set funding rates at a level that allow nurseries to be sustainable.

The focus on quality outlined above, puts nursery schools in a strong position to lead the sector on innovative practice, train early years teachers and drive up standards in their local area.

Our policy officials would be grateful if you could share this letter with your members.

Once again, thank you for writing and I hope this information is helpful.

Your correspondence has been allocated reference number 2014/0036038. If you need to respond to us, please visit: [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus) and quote your reference number.

As part of our commitment to improving the service we provide to our customers, we are interested in hearing your views and would welcome your comments via our website at: [www.education.gov.uk/pcsurvey](http://www.education.gov.uk/pcsurvey).

Yours sincerely

David Chapman  
Ministerial and Public Communications Division  
[www.gov.uk/df](http://www.gov.uk/df)

### Appendix 3

#### Percentage of 3- and 4-year-old children benefitting from funded early education places by local authority

##### England – Position in January each year

Westminster comes out worst - see red below.

	3- and 4-year-olds				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>ENGLAND</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>NORTH EAST</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>
Darlington	97	100	100	100	96
Durham	96	95	96	95	94
Gateshead	96	96	96	96	96
Hartlepool	99	99	98	100	97
Middlesbrough	101	100	101	101	101
Newcastle upon Tyne	94	94	93	95	98
North Tyneside	98	99	98	100	98
Northumberland	100	100	101	100	99
Redcar and Cleveland	100	102	105	104	100
South Tyneside	91	95	96	93	96
Stockton-on-Tees	102	99	100	98	99
Sunderland	98	98	101	102	102
<b>NORTH WEST</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>
Blackburn with Darwen	94	93	92	94	97
Blackpool	98	98	101	95	91
Bolton	97	96	100	100	98
Bury	94	95	96	96	97
Cheshire East	98	99	100	104	103
Cheshire West and Chester	101	101	105	105	106
Cumbria	99	100	102	103	102
Halton	91	90	91	90	88
Knowsley	98	99	100	99	98
Lancashire	95	96	97	98	98
Liverpool	100	97	97	98	101
Manchester	89	89	89	92	93
Oldham	94	93	95	97	99
Rochdale	93	93	96	96	95
Salford	94	94	95	100	100
Sefton	101	99	100	100	100
St. Helens	94	97	98	96	97
Stockport	97	97	97	99	100
Tameside	96	97	96	97	99
Trafford	95	97	96	97	99
Warrington	100	101	102	100	100
Wigan	91	90	92	92	93
Wirral	98	98	89	100	100

	3- and 4-year-olds				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>99</b>
Barnsley	95	97	98	97	97
Bradford	91	91	94	95	96
Calderdale	102	100	105	103	113
Doncaster	93	92	91	93	95
East Riding of Yorkshire	103	104	104	103	103
Kingston Upon Hull, City of	95	96	95	96	98
Kirklees	94	95	96	97	97
Leeds	99	98	98	99	101
North East Lincolnshire	96	96	96	97	97
North Lincolnshire	95	92	91	90	91
North Yorkshire	98	96	98	100	99
Rotherham	93	95	97	97	100
Sheffield	95	94	94	93	94
Wakefield	99	100	102	101	103
York	101	100	102	103	101
<b>EAST MIDLANDS</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>99</b>
Derby	95	92	90	94	96
Derbyshire	99	98	100	99	99
Leicester	89	91	93	93	96
Leicestershire	96	95	96	98	99
Lincolnshire	99	97	100	101	99
Northamptonshire	94	95	96	97	98
Nottingham	95	95	95	96	98
Nottinghamshire	98	99	99	98	100
Rutland	106	104	100	107	109
<b>WEST MIDLANDS</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
Birmingham	85	88	91	92	94
Coventry	94	93	94	94	93
Dudley	95	94	96	96	96
Herefordshire	95	96	96	96	97
Sandwell	89	88	91	94	96
Shropshire	100	98	97	98	94
Solihull	107	108	112	110	109
Staffordshire	95	96	98	97	98
Stoke-on-Trent	90	90	92	94	94
Telford and Wrekin	95	98	97	96	96
Walsall	93	95	95	96	96
Warwickshire	98	98	98	98	98
Wolverhampton	93	92	92	90	91
Worcestershire	100	98	101	102	104
<b>EAST OF ENGLAND</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>
Bedford Borough	100	101	103	106	108
Cambridgeshire	95	95	97	95	97
Central Bedfordshire	97	97	100	101	102

	3- and 4-year-olds				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Essex	98	98	99	98	99
Hertfordshire	98	97	96	96	96
Luton	93	94	96	96	96
Norfolk	96	95	96	97	96
Peterborough	94	95	97	100	104
Southend-on-Sea	95	93	94	95	98
Suffolk	94	93	95	94	93
Thurrock	89	88	90	92	96
<b>LONDON</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>INNER LONDON</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>90</b>
Camden	85	83	77	82	81
City of London	98	76	102	115	108
Hackney	87	90	92	96	98
Hammersmith and Fulham	93	92	93	93	90
Haringey	83	84	88	90	90
Islington	93	97	97	98	96
Kensington and Chelsea	77	75	77	79	79
Lambeth	86	88	89	91	92
Lewisham	81	82	84	86	85
Newham	92	93	97	100	100
Southwark	89	85	83	88	88
Tower Hamlets	90	91	91	93	94
Wandsworth	93	91	92	93	90
Westminster	87	82	82	79	77
<b>OUTER LONDON</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>93</b>
Barking and Dagenham	79	80	84	89	90
Barnet	85	82	84	84	86
Bexley	97	95	97	98	99
Brent	81	82	84	89	92
Bromley	94	95	97	99	100
Croydon	88	88	87	88	87
Ealing	91	90	92	95	94
Enfield	83	83	85	87	87
Greenwich	89	91	89	89	91
Harrow	81	82	84	87	90
Havering	95	97	100	101	102
Hillingdon	95	96	96	98	101
Hounslow	80	79	82	87	89
Kingston upon Thames	90	92	94	94	93
Merton	94	95	102	99	95
Redbridge	93	95	94	94	96
Richmond upon Thames	96	99	98	97	99
Sutton	89	89	90	92	93
Waltham Forest	88	88	90	91	93
<b>SOUTH EAST</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
Bracknell Forest	96	93	92	91	92



	3- and 4-year-olds				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Brighton and Hove	98	100	101	103	105
Buckinghamshire	98	93	95	96	96
East Sussex	94	95	96	97	97
Hampshire	96	95	95	96	95
Isle of Wight	99	97	98	97	98
Kent	94	94	95	96	97
Medway	96	95	97	97	98
Milton Keynes	92	91	90	92	93
Oxfordshire	97	96	97	96	99
Portsmouth	94	94	93	94	93
Reading	94	88	88	92	94
Slough	86	83	87	92	93
Southampton	96	95	96	96	97
Surrey	95	95	96	95	95
West Berkshire	94	94	95	96	96
West Sussex	97	96	96	97	98
Windsor and Maidenhead	95	97	103	100	101
Wokingham	93	100	102	100	100
<b>SOUTH WEST</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>
Bath and North East Somerset	100	101	103	103	105
Bournemouth	98	100	96	99	102
Bristol, City of	90	90	91	92	93
Cornwall	98	98	100	101	99
Devon	99	99	101	102	101
Dorset	98	98	102	99	100
Gloucestershire	98	98	98	99	100
Isles of Scilly	134	123	112	100	100
North Somerset	96	97	101	98	99
Plymouth	98	99	100	99	99
Poole	88	86	90	90	90
Somerset	97	97	97	98	98
South Gloucestershire	99	99	99	99	103
Swindon	93	94	97	96	96
Torbay	100	99	105	105	101
Wiltshire	95	94	93	93	94

Source: Early Years Census (EYC), School Census (SC), and School Level Annual School Census (SLASC)

## Appendix 4

---

Percentage of 2 Year Old children benefitting from funded early education places by local authority

England – Position in January 2014

Westminster comes out 37<sup>th</sup> from the bottom out of 152 local authorities i.e. in the worst quartile. See red below.

	<b>No. of 2 year-olds with places</b>	<b>Estimated No. of 2 Year Olds</b>	<b>% of 2 year- olds with places</b>
<b>ENGLAND</b>	<b>81,586</b>	<b>682,161</b>	<b>12.0</b>
<b>NORTH EAST</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>30,802</b>	<b>16.4</b>
Darlington	190	1,358	14.0
Durham	950	5,935	16.0
Gateshead	310	2,381	13.0
Hartlepool	250	1,161	21.5
Middlesbrough	430	1,960	21.9
Newcastle upon Tyne	710	3,365	21.1
North Tyneside	340	2,406	14.1
Northumberland	380	3,258	11.7
Redcar and Cleveland	270	1,598	16.9
South Tyneside	310	1,656	18.7
Stockton-on-Tees	290	2,561	11.3
Sunderland	620	3,070	20.2
<b>NORTH WEST</b>	<b>13,430</b>	<b>87,656</b>	<b>15.3</b>
Blackburn with Darwen	340	2,189	15.5
Blackpool	150	1,663	9.0
Bolton	580	3,914	14.8
Bury	330	2,558	12.9
Cheshire East	260	4,039	6.4
Cheshire West and Chester	380	3,660	10.4
Cumbria	640	5,139	12.5
Halton	390	1,713	22.8
Knowsley	290	1,863	15.6
Lancashire	1,410	14,000	10.1
Liverpool	1,150	5,257	21.9
Manchester	1,810	7,291	24.8
Oldham	500	3,290	15.2
Rochdale	620	3,000	20.7
Salford	550	3,396	16.2
Sefton	450	3,030	14.9
St. Helens	400	2,116	18.9
Stockport	470	3,515	13.4
Tameside	470	3,043	15.4
Trafford	390	3,041	12.8
Warrington	300	2,535	11.8
Wigan	680	4,011	17.0
Wirral	880	3,768	23.4
<b>YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER</b>	<b>11,200</b>	<b>66,794</b>	<b>16.8</b>
Barnsley	740	2,928	25.3
Bradford	2,410	8,191	29.4
Calderdale	470	2,661	17.7

	<b>No. of 2 year-olds with places</b>	<b>Estimated No. of 2 Year Olds</b>	<b>% of 2 year- olds with places</b>
Doncaster	700	3,846	18.2
East Riding of Yorkshire	300	3,386	8.9
Kingston Upon Hull, City of	820	3,505	23.4
Kirklees	840	5,755	14.6
Leeds	1,350	9,929	13.6
North East Lincolnshire	410	2,032	20.2
North Lincolnshire	230	2,045	11.2
North Yorkshire	610	6,357	9.6
Rotherham	580	3,172	18.3
Sheffield	990	6,774	14.6
Wakefield	580	4,029	14.4
York	160	2,133	7.5
<b>EAST MIDLANDS</b>	<b>6,350</b>	<b>55,546</b>	<b>11.4</b>
Derby	760	3,543	21.4
Derbyshire	670	8,646	7.7
Leicester	590	4,880	12.1
Leicestershire	560	7,418	7.5
Lincolnshire	1,250	7,990	15.6
Northamptonshire	770	9,433	8.2
Nottingham	760	3,980	19.1
Nottinghamshire	960	9,293	10.3
Rutland	30	386	7.8
<b>WEST MIDLANDS</b>	<b>9,950</b>	<b>72,495</b>	<b>13.7</b>
Birmingham	3,060	16,416	18.6
Coventry	880	4,724	18.6
Dudley	80	3,872	2.1
Herefordshire	200	1,979	10.1
Sandwell	600	4,570	13.1
Shropshire	290	3,239	9.0
Solihull	230	2,439	9.4
Staffordshire	1,020	9,375	10.9
Stoke-on-Trent	580	3,443	16.8
Telford and Wrekin	470	2,337	20.1
Walsall	570	3,717	15.3
Warwickshire	770	6,402	12.0
Wolverhampton	500	3,518	14.2
Worcestershire	700	6,276	11.2
<b>EAST OF ENGLAND</b>	<b>7,370</b>	<b>74,844</b>	<b>9.8</b>
Bedford Borough	210	2,057	10.2
Cambridgeshire	530	7,633	6.9
Central Bedfordshire	330	3,343	9.9
Essex	1,740	16,990	10.2
Hertfordshire	1,180	15,558	7.6
Luton	440	3,380	13.0
Norfolk	930	9,596	9.7
Peterborough	430	2,861	15.0
Southend-on-Sea	350	2,253	15.5
Suffolk	1,010	8,758	11.5
Thurrock	240	2,404	10.0
<b>LONDON</b>	<b>11,520</b>	<b>119,080</b>	<b>9.7</b>

	No. of 2 year-olds with places	Estimated No. of 2 Year Olds	% of 2 year- olds with places
<b>INNER LONDON</b>	<b>4,460</b>	<b>44,419</b>	<b>10.0</b>
Camden	240	2,573	9.3
City of London	0	50	0.0
Hackney	450	3,705	12.1
Hammersmith and Fulham	190	2,341	8.1
Haringey	330	3,524	9.4
Islington	300	2,391	12.5
Kensington and Chelsea	160	1,760	9.1
Lambeth	400	3,967	10.1
Lewisham	430	4,407	9.8
Newham	530	4,968	10.7
Southwark	590	4,107	14.4
Tower Hamlets	270	3,782	7.1
Wandsworth	340	4,326	7.9
Westminster	220	2,474	8.9
<b>OUTER LONDON</b>	<b>7,060</b>	<b>74,820</b>	<b>9.4</b>
Barking and Dagenham	590	3,776	15.6
Barnet	480	5,398	8.9
Bexley	380	3,132	12.1
Brent	330	4,466	7.4
Bromley	360	4,173	8.6
Croydon	480	5,634	8.5
Ealing	420	5,101	8.2
Enfield	700	4,964	14.1
Greenwich	380	4,109	9.2
Harrow	320	3,282	9.7
Havering	380	2,861	13.3
Hillingdon	370	4,105	9.0
Hounslow	310	3,964	7.8
Kingston upon Thames	170	2,300	7.4
Merton	260	3,128	8.3
Redbridge	420	4,511	9.3
Richmond upon Thames	150	2,887	5.2
Sutton	170	2,663	6.4
Waltham Forest	430	4,099	10.5
<b>SOUTH EAST</b>	<b>9,670</b>	<b>110,821</b>	<b>8.7</b>
Bracknell Forest	130	1,609	8.1
Brighton and Hove	360	2,961	12.2
Buckinghamshire	340	6,588	5.2
East Sussex	700	5,716	12.2
Hampshire	1,310	16,106	8.1
Isle of Wight	210	1,354	15.5
Kent	1,900	18,427	10.3
Medway	590	3,567	16.5
Milton Keynes	490	4,133	11.9
Oxfordshire	600	8,439	7.1
Portsmouth	460	2,728	16.9
Reading	170	2,351	7.2
Slough	190	2,598	7.3
Southampton	420	3,125	13.4
Surrey	730	14,978	4.9
West Berkshire	110	2,130	5.2

	<b>No. of 2 year-olds with places</b>	<b>Estimated No. of 2 Year Olds</b>	<b>% of 2 year- olds with places</b>
West Sussex	830	9,608	8.6
Windsor and Maidenhead	80	1,923	4.2
Wokingham	70	2,120	3.3
<b>SOUTH WEST</b>	<b>7,060</b>	<b>61,351</b>	<b>11.5</b>
Bath and North East Somerset	210	1,869	11.2
Bournemouth	370	2,050	18.1
Bristol, City of	690	5,946	11.6
Cornwall	750	5,804	12.9
Devon	710	7,828	9.1
Dorset	420	4,010	10.5
Gloucestershire	670	6,898	9.7
Isles of Scilly	0	13	0.0
North Somerset	290	2,485	11.7
Plymouth	640	3,134	20.4
Poole	220	1,770	12.4
Somerset	550	6,032	9.1
South Gloucestershire	440	3,282	13.4
Swindon	410	2,937	14.0
Torbay	240	1,418	16.9
Wiltshire	450	5,853	7.7

Source: Adapted from Early Years Census (EYC), School Census (SC), and School Level Annual School Census (SLASC)

## Appendix 5

---

### London Childcare Report 2014

London Borough Profiles

*Published by the Family and Childcare Trust, an independent charity.*

*The full text of the City of Westminster profile is reproduced below:-*

#### Westminster

##### Background

- 13,700 children aged 0-4
- 20,200 children aged 5-14
- 30 per cent of children live in poverty (before housing costs)

##### Childcare costs

Nurseries, childminders and holiday childcare significantly more expensive than the London average, whereas after-school clubs are cheaper.

##### Gaps in provision

- Date of last childcare sufficiency report – 2011, although a new report is due in 2015.
- The main gaps in provision are childcare for two, three and four year olds, including those qualify for free early education and for children whose parents have atypical work patterns. There is no recent data on the sufficiency of after-school and holiday childcare.

##### Free early education

- 886 two year olds eligible for free early education in September 2014.
- 43 per cent of eligible two year olds were receiving free early education in January 2014 compared to the England average of 67 per cent.
- 26 per cent of eligible two year olds were receiving their free early education in settings judged to be inadequate or in need of improvement in January 2014 compared to 13 per cent across England.
- 77 per cent of three and four year olds have taken up their free early education compared to 96 per cent across England.

##### Comments

The Family and Childcare Trust is concerned about the low uptake of free early education for two, three and four year olds in this local authority, as well as the high proportions of two year olds who are placed in settings judged to be inadequate or in need of improvement.

## Appendix 6

---

Introduction and Recommendations from the Frank Field Report on Child Poverty (The yellow highlighting is mine.)

### Introduction

Frank Field was commissioned by the Prime Minister in June 2010 to provide an independent review on poverty and life chances by the end of the year. The aim of the review is to:

- generate a broader debate about the nature and extent of poverty in the UK;
- examine the case for reforms to poverty measures, in particular for the inclusion of non- financial elements;
- explore how a child's home environment affects their chances of being ready to take full advantage of their schooling; and
- recommend potential action by government and other institutions to reduce poverty and enhance life chances for the least advantaged, consistent with the Government's fiscal strategy.

### Review findings

The question the Review found itself asking was how we can prevent poor children from becoming poor adults. The Review has concluded that the UK needs to address the issue of child poverty in a fundamentally different way if it is to make a real change to children's life chances as adults.

We have found overwhelming evidence that children's life chances are most heavily predicated on their development in the first five years of life. It is family background, parental education, good parenting and the opportunities for learning and development in those crucial years that together matter more to children than money, in determining whether their potential is realised in adult life. The things that matter most are a healthy pregnancy; good maternal mental health; secure bonding with the child; love and responsiveness of parents along with clear boundaries, as well as opportunities for a child's cognitive, language and social and emotional development. Good services matter too: health services, Children's Centres and high quality childcare.

Later interventions to help poorly performing children can be effective but, in general, the most effective and cost-effective way to help and support young families is in the earliest years of a child's life.

By the age of three, a baby's brain is 80% formed and his or her experiences before then shape the way the brain has grown and developed. That is not to say, of course, it is all over by then, but ability profiles at that age are highly predictive of profiles at school entry. By school age, there are very wide variations in children's abilities and the evidence is clear that children from poorer backgrounds do worse cognitively and behaviourally than those from more affluent homes. Schools do not effectively close that gap; children who arrive in the bottom range of ability tend to stay there.

There is a range of services to support parents and children in those early years. But, GPs, midwives, health visitors, hospital services, Children's Centres and private and voluntary sector nurseries together provide fragmented services that are neither well understood nor easily accessed by all of those who might benefit most.

The current poverty measure that is most commonly referred to is the 60% median income measure. The previous government pledged to halve child poverty by 2010-11 and eradicate it by 2020. Its policies and programmes to achieve this ambitious target included very heavy investment in income transfers through tax credits, support to parents through its New Deal programme to help lone parents into work, and early years services, including the Sure Start Programme for under fives in the most deprived areas.

There has been significant improvement in building early years service provision over the last ten years. High quality, professionally led, childcare programmes to support parents, and some intensive programmes are well evidenced to show they can be cost effective. But, current services are also very variable and there is generally both a lack of clear evidence of what works for poorer children and insufficient attention to developing the evidence base.

Progress was made towards meeting the financial poverty targets in the early stages of the strategy, but it has become increasingly clear that not only has the 2010/11 target not been met but it would require very large amounts of new money to meet the 2020 target. Such a strategy is not sustainable in the longer run, particularly as we strive to reduce the budget deficit. But even if money were not a constraint there is a clear case to be made for developing an alternative strategy to abolish child poverty. This is what the Review sets out to address.

It is this strategy which offers the prospect of preventing poor children from becoming poor adults. The evidence about the importance of the pre school years to children's life chances as adults points strongly to an alternative approach that focuses on directing government policy and spending to developing children's capabilities in the early years. A shift of focus is needed towards providing high quality, integrated services aimed at supporting parents and improving the abilities of our poorest children during the period when it is most effective to do so. Their prospects of going on to gain better qualifications and sustainable employment will be greatly enhanced. The aim is to change the distribution of income by changing the position which children from poor backgrounds will be able to gain on merit in the income hierarchy.

### Overarching recommendations

There are two overarching recommendations.

- To prevent poor children from becoming poor adults the Review proposes establishing a set of Life Chances Indicators that measure how successful we are as a country in making more equal life's outcomes for all children.

Nothing can be achieved without working with parents. All our recommendations are about enabling parents to achieve the aspirations that they have for their children.

- To drive this policy the Review proposes establishing the 'Foundation Years' covering the period from the womb to five. The Foundation Years should become the first pillar of a new tripartite education system: the Foundation Years leading to school years leading to further, higher and continuing education.

### Recommendations

#### The Foundation Years

1. The Review recommends that government, national and local, should give greater prominence to the earliest years in life, from pregnancy to age five, adopting the term Foundation Years. This is for several reasons: to increase public understanding of how babies and young children develop and what is important to ensure their healthy progress in this crucial period; to make clear the package of support needed both for children and parents in those early years; to establish the Foundation Years as of equal status and importance in the public mind to primary and secondary school years; and to ensure that child development and services during those years are as well understood.

2. The Review recommends that the Government gradually moves funding to the early years, and that this funding is weighted toward the most disadvantaged children as we build the evidence base of effective programmes. The Fairness Premium, introduced in the 2010 Spending Review, should begin in pregnancy.



3. No longer should governments automatically increase benefits for children but in each financial year consider whether the life chances of poorer children will be increased more by transferring any benefit increases into building the Foundation Years.
4. The increased funding should be targeted at those factors we know matter most in the early years: high quality and consistent support for parents during pregnancy, and in the early years, support for better parenting; support for a good home learning environment; and, high quality childcare.
5. Government should start now to develop a long term strategy, to increase the life chances of poorer children by narrowing the gaps in outcomes between poorer and richer children in the Foundation Years. This will prove the most cost effective way of addressing inequalities in adult life outcomes. We hope that the Government's social mobility strategy, to be published in the New Year, will reflect this recommendation.
6. The strategy should include a commitment that all disadvantaged children should have access to affordable full-time, graduate-led childcare from age two. This is essential to support parents returning to work as well as child development.
7. The Review has focussed on the early years, but recognises that important changes can and do take place later in children's lives and that investment in the early years will not be fully effective unless it is followed up with high quality services for those who need them most later in childhood. The Review therefore recommends that the Government extends the life chances approach to later stages in childhood.

#### Foundation Years service delivery

8. Sure Start Children's Centres should re-focus on their original purpose and identify, reach and provide targeted help to the most disadvantaged families. New Sure Start contracts should include conditions that reward Centres for reaching out effectively and improving the outcomes of the most disadvantaged children.
9. Local Authorities should open up the commissioning of Children's Centres, or services within them, to service providers from all sectors to allow any sector, or combination of sectors, to bid for contracts. They should ensure services within Children's Centres do not replicate existing provision from private, voluntary and independent groups but should signpost to those groups, or share Centres' space. This should encourage mutuals and community groups to bid and help ensure that efficiencies are made. Non-working parents should spend one nursery session with their children. The pattern of provision that has been developed in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland in order to meet local needs of the most vulnerable children should act as a template to those providers in England who have successfully won contracts.
10. Local Authorities should aim to make Children's Centres a hub of the local community. They should maintain some universal services so that Centres are welcoming, inclusive, socially mixed and non-stigmatising, but aim to target services towards those who can benefit from them most. They should look at how they could site birth registrations in Centres, provide naming ceremonies, child benefit forms and other benefit advice. Children's Centres should ensure all new parents are encouraged to take advantage of a parenting course. Midwives and health visitors should work closely with Centres and ensure a consistency of service is provided, with continuity between the more medical pre birth services and increasingly educational post natal work. Children's Centres should seek to include parents' representation on their governance and decision-making bodies.
11. Local Authorities should consider joining with surrounding authorities to establish Poverty and Life Chances Commissions to drive policy in their localities like the Liverpool City Region has pioneered.

12. The Department for Education, in conjunction with Children's Centres, should develop a model for professional development in early years settings, looking to increase graduate-led pre school provision, which mirrors the model for schools. The Department should also continue to look for ways to encourage good teachers and early years professionals to teach in schools and work in Children's Centres in deprived areas, through schemes such as Teach First and New Leaders in Early Years.

13. Local Authorities should pool data and track the children most in need in their areas. A Local Authority should understand where the children who are most deprived are, and how their services impact upon them. Central Government should review legislation that prevents Local Authorities using existing data to identify and support families who are most in need with the intention of making use of data by Local Authorities easier, and provide a template for successful data sharing which respects data privacy issues. In particular, Department for Work and Pensions should ensure that new legislation on the Universal Credit allows Local Authorities to use data to identify families most in need.

14. Local Authorities should ensure use of services which have a strong evidence base, and that new services are robustly evaluated. Central Government should make a long term commitment to enable and support the bringing together of evidence around interventions, learning from examples such as the National Institute for Clinical Excellence and the Washington State Institute. We understand this will be covered in more detail by the Graham Allen Review on early intervention.

15. Ofsted ratings for childcare and schools in disadvantaged areas compared with more affluent areas should be included as one of the Department for Education's indicators in its Business Plan and government policy should aim to close the gap. Ofsted should continue to report on schools and childcare settings' engagement with parents. This is a particularly key area, for which settings should consistently be held to account.

16. The initiatives for the wider society should be taken up by the Behavioural Insight Team based in the Cabinet Office. This Review recommends that it leads, along with key Departments, an examination of how parenting and nurturing skills can be promoted throughout society.

17. A Cabinet Minister should be appointed for the Foundation Years, at the next re-shuffle.

#### Continuing Foundation Years progress in narrowing attainment gaps

18. The Department for Education should ensure schools are held to account for reducing the attainment gap in the same way they are for improving overall attainment. Where a school has a persistent or increasing attainment gap, this should have a significant bearing on the inspection for the school, ultimately this should be a major factor in a decision on whether the school is judged inadequate.

19. The Department for Education should continue to publish and promote clear evidence on what is successful in encouraging parental engagement in their children's learning.

20. The Department for Education should ensure that parenting and life skills are reflected in the curriculum, from primary school to GCSE level. This should culminate in a cross-curricular qualification in parenting at GCSE level which will be awarded if pupils have completed particular modules in a number of GCSE subjects. The Manchester Academy is currently developing a pilot scheme which could be used as a basis for this GCSE.

#### New measures of poverty and life chances

21. The Review recommends a new suite of measures to run alongside the existing financial poverty measures. The new measures will inform and drive policy, as well as spending decisions aimed at narrowing the outcome gaps between children from low and higher income families. The Review's primary measurement recommendation is that the Government adopts a new set of Life

Chances Indicators. These indicators will measure annual progress at a national level on a range of factors in young children which we know to be predictive of children's future outcomes, and will be created using national survey data.

22. Existing local data should be made available to parents and used anonymously to enable the creation of Local Life Chances Indicators which can be compared with the national measure. In order to make this local data as useful as possible, information collected by health visitors during the age two health check, which this Review recommends should be mandatory, and information collected as part of the Early Years Foundation Stage (following the results of Dame Clare Tickell's review) should be as similar as possible to the information used to create the national measure.

23. The Government should develop and publish annually a measure of 'service quality' which captures whether children, and in particular children in low income families, have suitable access to high quality services.

24. This Review is about ensuring that the life chances of the very poorest children are enhanced. We suggest that a new measure of severe poverty should be developed. This will focus attention on prolonged material and financial deprivation and we recommend the Government begins to develop a strategy specifically to help the most disadvantaged children.

## Appendix 7

---

Marmot Indicators for Local Authorities in England, 2014 – Westminster

The tables below show key indicators of the social determinants of health, health outcomes and social inequality relating to educational achievement. Results for each indicator for this local authority are shown below.

### Giving every child the best start in life

	Period	Local value	Regional value	England value	England worst	England best
Good level of development at age 5 (%)	2012/13	49.6	52.8	51.7	27.7	69.0
Good level of development at age 5 with free school meal status (%)	2012/13	41.4	43.1	36.2	17.8	60.0

### Enabling all children, young people and adults to maximise their capabilities and have control over their lives

	Period	Local value	Regional value	England value	England worst	England best
GCSE achieved 5A*-C including English & Maths (%)	2012/13	69.6	65.0	60.8	43.7	81.9
Maths with free school meal status (%)	2012/13	62.2	50.8	38.1	21.8	76.7

### Indicator Descriptions

#### Good level of development at age 5

Source: Department for Education

Children defined as having reached a good level of development at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) as a percentage of all eligible children. Children are defined as having reached a good level of development at the end of reception if they achieve at least the expected level in the early learning goals in the prime areas of learning (personal, social and emotional development; physical development; and communication and language) and the early learning goals in the specific areas of mathematics and literacy.

#### Good level of development at age 5 with free school meal status

Source: Department for Education

Children known to be eligible for free school meals defined as having reached a good level of development (at the end of the EYFS as defined above) as a percentage of all children eligible for free school meals.

#### GCSE achieved (5A\*-C including English & Maths)

Source: Department for Education

The percentage of all pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A\*-C (including English and Maths) or equivalent. Figures are the percentage of pupils at end of Key Stage 4 for schools maintained by the local authority and are based on the local authority in which the school is located

#### GCSE achieved (5A\*-C including English & Maths) with free school meal status

Source: Department for Education

Pupils known to be eligible for free school meals achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A\*-C (including English and Maths) or equivalent, as a percentage of all pupils eligible for free school meals.