

Title: Early Years Foundation Stage (Safeguarding and Welfare Requirements) Regulations 2012 IA No: DFE0018 Lead department or agency: Department for Education Other departments or agencies:	Impact Assessment (IA)
	Date: 01/02/2012
	Stage: Final
	Source of intervention: Domestic
	Type of measure: Secondary legislation
Contact for enquiries:	

Summary: Intervention and Options	RPC Opinion: AMBER
--	---------------------------

Cost of Preferred (or more likely) Option			
Total Net Present Value	Business Net Present Value	Net cost to business per year (EANCB on 2009 prices)	In scope of One-In, Measure qualifies as One-Out?
£2.3m	£2.5m	£-0.3m	Yes OUT

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?
 To simplify the EYFS and reduce associated burdens and paperwork for providers, to improve flexibility and clarity for professionals. The reforms are supported by a full public consultation, and by the recommendations of an independent review led by Clare Tickell, Chief Executive of Action for Children. The existing welfare and safeguarding requirements, essential for children's safety and well-being, are being amended to simplify, clarify or strengthen key areas: fewer written risk assessments; clarity and flexibility on staff:child ratios; key guidance on safeguarding practice and staff supervision; clarity for childminders on their use of assistants.

- What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?**
1. Simpler processes and reduced paperwork, allowing more time with children and greater flexibility for professional judgement.
 2. Greater clarity, helping providers and inspectors understand requirements.
 3. Adoption of the latest best practice in safeguarding children from harm.
 4. Adoption of effective processes for employing suitable people, and maintaining suitable premises, etc.

What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)
 The preferred option is informed by the evidence, by the recommendations of the Tickell review, and by responses to consultation with practitioners, teachers, academics, representatives of professional organisations, parents, carers and children. The safeguarding and welfare proposals are strongly welcomed. The option to make no changes would leave the sector with welfare requirements which many consider burdensome, and unclear in places, and which do not reflect important aspects of best practice. A further option, to remove the Safeguarding and Welfare requirements entirely, would be unacceptable because it could leave vulnerable children at risk of poor quality support and, in some cases, at risk of unsafe or abusive practices.

Will the policy be reviewed? It will/will not be reviewed. **If applicable, set review date:** Month/Year

Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A				
Are any of these organisations in scope? If Micros not exempted set out reason in Evidence Base.	Micro Yes	< 20 Yes	Small Yes	Medium Yes	Large Yes
What is the CO ₂ equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO ₂ equivalent)	Traded:		Non-traded:		

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible SELECT SIGNATORY: Sarah Teather Date: 26.3.12

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option 1

Description:

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year	PV Base Year 2011	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: -£7.1m	High: £11.7m	Best Estimate: £2.3m

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	£2.9m	£1.0m	£11.2m
High	£4.2m	£1.9m	£20.9m
Best Estimate	£3.5m	£1.5m	£16m

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Small one-off time cost to local authorities to revise safeguarding training and guidance.
 Small one-off time cost to providers to enable their staff to become familiarised with, and understand, the revised safeguarding and welfare requirements.
 Some annual costs for a small percentage of providers to meet requirements for staff supervision.

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

None

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	Optional	£1.6m	£13.8m
High	Optional	£2.7m	£22.9m
Best Estimate	£0m	£2.1m	£18.3m

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Reduced burden on practitioners and teachers in terms of fewer written risk assessments, of particular benefit to childminders.

Childminders will benefit from the removal of the requirement to seek Ofsted's permission to leave children with assistants.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Children, families and society benefit from improved safeguarding practice and improved levels of staff supervision.

Providers benefit from greater clarity/flexibility - for example, in observing staff:child ratios.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

The monetised benefits are based on assumptions supported by advice from the sector, and data from relevant sources such as the Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey 2010.

Discount rate (%)

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 1)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:			In scope of OIOO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: £1.7m	Benefits: £2m	Net: £0.3m	Yes	OUT

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

Why the early years are important

The evidence is clear that children's experiences in their early years strongly influence their outcomes in later life, across a range of areas from health and social behaviour to their employment and educational attainment. The most recent neuroscientific evidence highlights the particular importance of the first three years of a child's life. A strong start in the early years increases the probability of positive outcomes in later life; a weak foundation significantly increases the risk of later difficulties.ⁱ These findings are reflected in children's educational outcomes, which show a strong correlation between EYFS results and Key Stage 1 results.ⁱⁱ Children's experiences in their early years provide the essential foundations for both healthy development and their achievement through school.ⁱⁱⁱ These links (explored further in DfE Research Report DfE-RR034) illustrate why it is important to ensure that children's early experiences equip them with the skills they need for life.

In the UK, the Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project found that attending a high quality pre-school setting has a positive impact on children's academic and social development, and that the benefits largely persist through to the end of Key Stage (KS) 2.¹ It also found that disadvantaged children in particular benefit from good quality pre-school experiences, especially where they mix with children from different social backgrounds.²

Although a quality early years experience is shown to be good for all children, it is also particularly helpful for children from poorer socio-economic backgrounds, specific ethnic minority groups and those for whom English is an additional language (EAL). There is evidence that early years interventions can narrow the gap between disadvantaged and other children in terms of their cognitive development³. This is also the case for social and behavioural development.⁴

The strongest signs of good/high quality settings include the fostering of warm interactive relationships with children, and the presence of more qualified staff, especially trained teachers.^{5,6} Moreover, settings achieving higher quality scores, and better progress for their children, are those which view educational and social development as complementary and equal in importance.⁷

The safeguarding and welfare requirements are essential to the maintenance of quality and standards, by setting out the steps providers must take to secure children's basic safety and well-being, and by working in conjunction with the learning and development requirements to promote children's progress.

¹ Sylva, K., Melhuish, E. Sammons, P. Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2009) *Final report from the primary phase: pre-school, school, and family influences on children's development during Key Stage 2 (age 7–11)*, (Effective Pre-School and Primary Education 3–11 project (EPPE 3–11)), London: DCSF/ IOE

² Sylva, K., Melhuish, E. Sammons, P. Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2009) *Final report from the primary phase: pre-school, school, and family influences on children's development during Key Stage 2 (age 7–11)*, (Effective Pre-School and Primary Education 3–11 project (EPPE 3–11)), London: DCSF/ IOE

³ Springate, I., Atkinson, M., Straw, S., Lamont, E. and Grayson, H. (2008) *Narrowing the gap in outcomes: early years (0–5 years)*, Slough: NFER

⁴ Springate, I., Atkinson, M., Straw, S., Lamont, E. and Grayson, H. (2008) *Narrowing the gap in outcomes: early years (0–5 years)*, Slough: NFER

⁵ Sylva, K. Melhuish, E. Sammons, P. Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2004) *The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education Project*, London: DfES

⁶ Melhuish E., Belsky J., Macpherson K., Cullis A. (2010) *National Evaluation of Sure Start: Quality of Childcare centres used by 3-4 year old children in Sure Start areas and the relationship with child outcomes*. London: Birkbeck

⁷ Sylva, K. Melhuish, E. Sammons, P. Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2004) *The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education Project*, London: DfES

The Rationale & Aims of the Early Years Foundation Stage

The Early Years Foundations Stage (EYFS) was introduced to improve quality in early years provision, and help all children achieve their potential, including narrowing the gap between the achievement of disadvantaged children and the rest.⁸ The quality of early years provision is a key influence on children's later progress and well-being.⁹ The EYFS was therefore devised with the following aims:

- setting the standards for children's learning, development and care;
- improving quality and consistency in the early years sector;
- laying a secure foundation for future learning through learning and development planned around the individual needs and interests of each child;
- providing for equality of opportunity; and
- creating the framework for partnership working.

The 2007 consultation on the original EYFS revealed significant support for the framework. Responses welcomed the proposals to reduce fragmentation and confusion by bringing together the existing standards and guidance, to improve quality across the sector, and to place the interests of individual children at the heart of the system – with a special focus on disadvantaged and vulnerable children.¹⁰ The Regulatory Impact Assessment¹¹ (RIA) evaluated these objectives, and also highlighted that a single framework would reduce bureaucracy and help create a level playing field between maintained, voluntary and private sectors. The RIA considered that the existing system put unnecessary burdens on providers and Ofsted in delivering and inspecting early years learning and childcare.

Rationale for the revised EYFS

The government recognises that the EYFS has done much to raise standards. However the framework is seen as overly elaborate, unwieldy and in some respects burdensome. It can seem inaccessible to parents as well as to less-experienced practitioners. This causes some confusion between providers and Ofsted inspectors, sometimes leading to costly complaints, investigations and appeals. Consultation has supported selected revisions to the welfare requirements, improving clarity and flexibility for providers, reducing paperwork on risk assessments, and including the latest best practice on safeguarding children from harm.

During summer 2011, the government conducted a full public consultation on the revised EYFS. The consultation revealed strong support for the reforms to the safeguarding and welfare requirements. Most were happy with the new material on the warning signs of inappropriate behaviour by adults, with the new requirements for supervision, and with the proposal for childminders to be trained before they register and before they look after children. There was little support for removing any of the automatic offences.

The full summary of consultation responses is available in the government response document.

Tickell Review

The government's proposed revised EYFS is informed by an independent review, led by Dame Clare Tickell, Chief Executive of Action for Children. The government asked Dame Clare to

⁸ DfES (2004) *Every Child Matters: Change for Children*, DfES: London

⁹ DfES (2004) *Every Child Matters: Change for Children*, DfES: London

¹⁰ DFES (2006) *The Early Years Foundation Stage - consultation on a single quality framework for services to children from birth to five*, London: DfE, available at: www.education.gov.uk/consultations/

¹¹ DFES (2007) *Regulatory Impact Assessment for the Early Years Foundation Stage and Registration of Early Years Provision*, London: DfES

consider how the EYFS could be improved and how burdens could be reduced. Tickell reported on 30 March 2011, after gathering a wide range of evidence from people working in the early years sector, academics, representatives of professional organisations, parents, carers and children. The review collected over 3,300 written responses to the call for evidence conducted in August and September 2010.

Policy objectives

The proposed reforms are designed to achieve the following policy objectives:

1. Simpler processes, allowing more time with children and encouraging professional judgement.
2. Greater flexibility, enabling settings to meet requirements without unnecessary uncertainty or rigidity.
3. Greater clarity, helping providers and inspectors understand requirements.
4. Keep children safe so that they grow in confidence and build secure relationships.

Policy Options

Option 1 – a revised EYFS (the government’s proposed approach)

The government believes its proposed reforms will re-shape the EYFS for the benefit of children, families, practitioners and teacher. The reforms represent a simplification of the framework, reducing burdens, improving flexibility and clarifying requirements – while protecting the quality and standards which are essential for children’s development and safety. The reforms include the implementation of a recommendation of the Plymouth Serious Case Review, to increase practitioners’ and managers’ awareness of how to recognise signs of possible abuse and neglect. To further reinforce the importance of safeguarding, the government proposes introducing the term ‘safeguarding’ to the title of this section of the framework and to the relevant statutory instrument. The new requirement for supervision time – offering opportunities for staff to discuss issues and raise concerns, and receive support, etc. – further enhances the essential practices for safeguarding children. In addition, the Tickell review found that providers’ interpretations of requirements for written risk assessments can cause unnecessary burdens, taking practitioners away from working with children. The government proposes to clarify that written risk assessments are not required for every outing, and that providers must judge whether a risk assessment is needed for new types of outings.

Greater clarity will also be introduced to the staff:child ratio requirements, to help providers make appropriate judgements about how to flexibly deploy staff. Childminders will no longer be required to make individual applications for Ofsted permission to leave children with childminder assistants: Ofsted’s current practice, of granting such permission in most cases for a maximum of 2 hours, will now be made explicit in the EYFS. Childminders will also continue to be required to obtain parental agreement, per current conditions. The 2-hour limit derives from the maximum amount of time an assistant can be solely responsible for a child without actually registering as a childminder in their own right, specified as a condition for the Early Years Register.

Option 2 – no change

Maintaining the current system would mean that providers would continue to be regulated by an unnecessarily burdensome requirement on risk assessments, and by a lack of clarity about other requirements such as staff:child ratios. It would also mean that the requirements would not include some important additional safeguards to protect children from harm.

Option 3 – remove the EYFS

Tickell found that there are very few providers who would like to see the EYFS removed completely, and this is especially true of the welfare requirements. There is widespread agreement that a regulatory framework is necessary to keep children safe and to promote good practice in child development. The EYFS is necessary to continue to maintain standards and protect children from harm, and to act as a minimum quality threshold to support the government's investment in free early education for 15 hours a week for 3-4 year olds and disadvantaged 2 year olds.

Costs and benefits of Preferred Option

The following section provides a summary of the monetised costs and benefits and the main non-monetised costs and benefits.

Monetised costs and benefits

Costs

One-off costs:

Local authorities will incur some costs in revising the guidance and training they offer to providers on welfare and safeguarding. The assumptions regarding local authority time are the same as the assumptions used in the impact assessment for EYFS learning and development. For 152 LAs, the best estimate is £167,000 (see Assumptions below).

We assume that it will take between 30-45 minutes to familiarise each member of staff (either through joint sessions, or individual reading) on the new requirements (assumption based on knowledge of practitioners in the sector). These assumptions have been tested with an informal group of representatives from the sector, since the consultation. Costs are estimated between £2.7m - £4.0m (covering the range: 30-45 minutes; see Assumptions below). In practice, many providers will familiarise staff within existing time scheduled for 'administrative/training/supervision' outside childcare times. Therefore, the cost estimates are based on conservative assumptions and likely to be on the high side. Early years teachers in schools will use existing 'administrative/training/supervision' time to familiarise themselves with the revised welfare requirements.

Total One-off costs: £2.9m – £4.2m

Annual costs:

The new requirement for supervision of staff could entail some time costs for a small section of group providers. For most providers, there will be no extra costs - as they already fulfil the requirements as standard practice within existing time. Based on advice from the sector, we have made a conservative estimate of between 10% and 20% of group providers in the private and voluntary sectors, for whom supervision could be a new practice with extra time costs. For these providers, we estimate that staff will participate in supervision sessions for an average of 30 mins every other month.

Annual costs are therefore estimated to be: £1.0m - £1.9m.

Over 10 years, the total costs (one-off + annual) amount to between £12.5m and £23.6m. The present value of these costs over this 10 year period is between £11.2m and £20.9m.

Benefits

One-off. No one-off benefits.

Annual:

The revised requirement for clarifying that written risk assessments are not required for every outing will reduce the burdens on providers. A number of assumptions have been made around the time it takes to complete a written assessment. We have estimated the cost savings for childminders separately as there are likely to be more outings per year with childminders. We have assumed approx 50 outings a year for childminders and 15 outings a year for other providers. For all providers, we assume a reduction of between 30% and 50% in written risk assessments. The best estimate for benefits at between £1.6m and £2.7m a year (see Assumptions below).

Childminders will benefit from the removal of the requirement for childminders to each seek Ofsted's permission to leave children with assistants. Permission seeking is only required once in each cycle (3 – 4 years), and is assumed to take one hour. 25% of childminders use assistants, but a large proportion of these do not seek to change their existing conditions. Applications are made by those new to the register, or seeking to change their existing conditions, for example by recruiting an assistant. We estimate this to be about 15% of those with assistants, giving total cost savings of £0.07m.

Over a 10 year period the best estimate of benefits is between £16m and £26.6m.

The present value of these benefits over this 10 year period is between £13.8m and £22.9m.

Net Monetisable Benefits (Benefits Less Costs)

Over a ten year period, the estimate of net monetisable benefits ranges from £-7.6m to £14.1m.

The present value is between £-7.1m and £11.7m.

We take the best estimate as the average of the two.

Again, the positive net present values are estimates of opportunity/notional cost savings, and caution should be taken when interpreting these estimates. However, evidence from the sector has been used in reaching the estimates.

Non-monetised costs and benefits

Non-monetised Costs

- There will be some costs to the department in making the changes to the EYFS welfare and safeguarding in settings. However, these are expected to be small since the changes are made electronically and have not been estimated here.

Non-monetised Benefits

- By introducing guidance on the specific warning signs of adult behaviours, we will achieve benefits to children and families – to the extent that children are better protected from harm. Similar benefits will also accrue from the requirements for staff supervision. In both cases, monetisation is not possible because a reduction in risk to children cannot be measured to the extent that it could reasonably be attributed to a specific practice; moreover, the desired outcome is fewer incidents of children being harmed, and it would be unreasonable to attempt to attribute any measurable reduction in numbers of incidents to a particular aspect of safeguarding practice.
- Providers of group settings will benefit from greater clarity about flexibility - for example, in observing staff: child ratios – enabling them to focus on children's needs and reduce any

uncertainty about how many children they may care for at any one time. These benefits would be very difficult to quantify and monetise, as they are benefits for providers in the general management of their setting - the benefits will accrue at the margins, are to some extent qualitative, and would be very difficult to isolate for the purposes of monetisation.

Assumptions

- *Revisions to LA training and guidance* – 5 days to revise existing training and guidance, hourly wage assumed to be £26 (ASHE 2011 – approx wage for senior official in local government).
- *Provider and staff familiarisation* – staff time has been valued using an assumed wage of £10.90, based on average of all paid staff across all types of provider, weighted by proportion of places offered (tables 3.1 and 5.17 of Childcare and Early Years Provider Survey, 2010; hourly wage for primary school teachers of £16.65 taken from School Workforce Census, adjusted for actual hours worked (DfE internal analysis). 407,615 staff are assumed to be affected by the changes (based on Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey 2010, table 5.1a - number of paid staff in maintained early years setting, plus number of paid staff in childcare providers multiplied by proportion of providers on EYR, plus working EYR childminders)
- *Annual supervision* – supervision is assumed to occur in all maintained settings, and in 80-90% of PVI settings, leaving 10-20% of PVI settings with additional supervision costs of 30 minutes per staff member every other month. 60% of settings are assumed to be PVI, giving the number of staff affected as 24,457 ($407,615 \times 60\% \times 10\%$) to 48,913 ($407,615 \times 60\% \times 10\%$). Staff time has been valued using an assumed wage of £10.90, as described above.
- *Reduction in risk assessments:*
 - 46,820 childminders (57,191 registered on EYR (Ofsted figures), of which 82% are working (Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey 2010, table 3.1). Average hourly wage of £11.40 (based on average charge of £3.80 per child per hour (Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey 2010 - p.183), and assumption of 3 children per childminder). Assumed 50 outings per year; 10 minutes to fill in each risk assessment; 30-50% of written risk assessments currently unnecessary.
 - 26,170 non-childminder providers (83,361 registered providers on EYR, minus 57,191 childminders (Ofsted figures). Average hourly wage of £10.90 (based on average of all paid staff across all types of provider, weighted by proportion of places offered (tables 3.1 and 5.17 of Childcare and Early Years Provider Survey, 2010; hourly wage for primary school teachers of £16.65 taken from School Workforce Census, adjusted for actual hours worked (DfE internal analysis)). 15 outings per year; 10 minutes to fill in each risk assessment; 30-50% of written risk assessments currently unnecessary.
- *Removing requirement for childminders to seek permission to leave children with assistant:*
 - 46,820 childminders (57,191 registered on EYR (Ofsted figures), of which 82% are working (Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey 2010, table 3.1); 25% have assistants; each application takes 1 hour; 15% seek permission once every 3 years;
- *Non-wage costs* – all wage rates set out above have been uplifted by 21% to reflect additional costs of employment (eg. overheads, national insurance and pensions contributions), based on evidence from the Labour Cost Survey (2004), except for childminders.

Risks and assumptions

Fewer written risk assessments could provoke some instinctive concerns about children's safety. However, providers will remain responsible for assessing any risks and keeping children safe. Providers will be required to consider whether a risk assessment is needed for a given outing, especially for new types of outing. We judge that there will be no increase in risk to children as a

result of the changes. Indeed, the reduced paperwork should enable providers to focus even more fully on working with children.

Wider impacts

Children – the early years are a crucial stage in children’s learning and development. The evidence is clear that their experiences strongly influence their outcomes in later life. EPPE (Effective Provision of Pre-school Education) has shown that pre-school has an important impact on children’s development. Disadvantaged children in particular can benefit significantly from good quality pre-schools experience and early identification. The revised EYFS will better reflect how children develop and will therefore help improve the quality of a child’s ‘pre-school’ experience. The changes will ensure more practitioners’ and teachers’ time is devoted to the care and development of children, while ensuring standards are maintained.

Parents – the revised EYFS will highlight the importance of involving parents whenever possible, in planning and reflecting on children’s process. The revised EYFS strengthens the extent to which practitioners are expected to work in partnership with parents to meet the individual needs of children. The diversity of early years provision available to parents will be respected, and consulting parents will continue to be a crucial part of the process for exemption from the EYFS.

Practitioners - the new EYFS will provide practitioners with the support, flexibility and freedom to support children to develop the key skills needed for life and learning. The revised requirements will be made clearer, enabling practitioners to deliver more effective support, without unnecessary bureaucracy and paperwork. This will allow practitioners to spend more time with children and more freedom to exercise their professional judgement. It will also ensure that the EYFS dovetails more effectively with the National Curriculum allowing Year 1 teachers to use the assessment information more effectively to support children with the National Curriculum.

LA – a more streamlined and clearer EYFS will reduce training costs, and costs incurred resolving queries about unclear requirements.

Small Firm Impact Test

We are applying for the moratorium for micro-businesses to be waived for the purposes of these regulations because the welfare and safeguarding requirements are essential for the basic safety and well-being of children, many of whom attend providers who are micro-businesses. All businesses in the early years sector are currently obliged to meet the requirements, and the proposals for a revised EYFS will remove unnecessary burdens, ambiguities and inflexibilities which have become associated with the framework – thereby ensuring that practitioners’ and teachers’ time is devoted as much as possible to the care and development of children. If micro-businesses were exempted from the changes, they would be left with the burdens of the current regime – while larger businesses enjoyed the benefits of the new simpler framework.

Competition Assessment impact test

The new regulations will not directly limit the number or range of suppliers.
The new regulations will not indirectly limit the number or range of suppliers.
The new regulations will not limit the ability of suppliers to compete nor reduce suppliers’ incentives to compete vigorously.

The amendments to the regulations broadly affect all types of businesses equally. There is no strong reason to believe that any particular market segment will be disproportionately adversely affected. The simplified regime may lower barriers to entry and encourage new entrants, improving the competitive nature of the market. Simplifying of the learning and development

goals increases the scope for innovation. The level of choice for parents will not be affected, and switching costs will not rise as a result of these policies.

One-In-One-Out (OIOO)

All childminders are assumed to be private sector. From the Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey 2010 (table 4.7) we infer that 44% of non-childminding providers are provided by the public sector and that 56% are provided by the private and voluntary sector. Combining these assumptions and weighting by proportion of places we estimate that 60% of all providers are from the private and voluntary sector. Monetised costs to PVI sector and benefits to PVI sector excluding childminders have been calculated using these assumptions (shown on pg 2 above). The policy is designed to reduce existing burdens with the costs of the changes being almost exclusively transitional, and so it qualifies as an OUT for ONE-IN-ONE-OUT purposes.

ⁱ HM Government (2010) *Maternity and Early Years, Making a good start to family life*, London: DfE/DH

ⁱⁱ DCSF (2008) *How strong is the relationship between Foundation Stage Profile (2005) and Key Stage 1 (2007)*, DEP2008-1634, Deposited in House of Commons Library

ⁱⁱⁱ Dyson, A. Hertzman, C. Roberts, H. Tunstill, J. and Vaghri, Z. (2009) *Childhood development, education and health inequalities, Report of task group, Submission to the Marmot Review*