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Where started in 1997-1998

- Very high levels of child poverty, among the highest levels in Europe, very low early years service base

- Labour Manifesto commitment to universal pre-school education for 3 and 4 year olds (5 days a week, 2.5 hours per day, school term time only) all children

- National childcare strategy designed to increase quantity, accessibility, and quality of day care for working parents, children of working parents

- Comprehensive Spending Review on Services for Children under 8, HMT review that resulted in Sure Start poor children
  - 3 different strands: early education, childcare, and integrated services for poor children
What we did: four major developments that encapsulate changes over the 10 years

• 2002, merger of Sure Start Unit with Early Years and Childcare in DfES (as was) creating integrated service framework for under 5s

• 2003, Every Child Matters Agenda, creating integrated service framework for all children 0-19, backed up by Children Act 2004

• 2004, Publication of Ten Year Childcare Strategy, backed up by Childcare Act 2006

• 2009 Publication of Next Steps for Early Learning and Childcare, backed up Apprenticeship, Skills, Children and Learning Act, 2009
### Most important of the Changes: Sure Start and Every Child Matters

#### Sure Start: 1999

- result of Treasury review of services for young children, key principles: early intervention and poverty matters
- Area based initiative aimed at poor areas, for all under 4s in the area
- Local partnerships free to design program, but common set of goals, **outcome driven**
- 524 local programmes set up, eventually ‘mainstreamed to become Sure Start Children’s centres

#### Every Child Matters: 2003

- Response to death of a child, failure of services to work together
- Integration of children’s social care, education, youth offending, 0-19
- Built on 5 outcomes: being healthy, staying, safe, enjoying and achieving, economic well being, and making a positive contribution
- Improved information sharing, creation of DCS role,
- Reframing of responsibilities around the person not the profession, Dept for Children, Schools and Families (2007) *but name changed by new Govt in 2010, Dept for Education*
Key Themes consistent over the Blair-Brown era

- Reducing child poverty (PM announcement 1999)
- Reducing gaps in outcomes between poor children and the rest
- Evidence based policy
- Supporting parents/supporting parenting
- *Progressive universalism*: System designed to ensure maximum support for most disadvantaged within a universal platform of services for all children
Government, increasingly interested in parents, but why?

- Are parents:
  - Consumers?
  - Clients?
  - Pupils?
  - Co-producers?
- Are parents really mothers?
- Are fathers providers? Male role models? Benefits cheats?
- Impact of adult conditions on capacity to parent; Think Family work on chasm between adults’ and children’s services
- Risks for government in parenting
  - Cultural diversity
  - Nanny state
The Role of Government: supporting parents and parenting

Reduce pressures

- Rights and legal protection
- Financial support
- Support in kind

For example:
- Access to maternity and paternity leave
- Flexible working and flexible childcare
- Targeted benefits

Enhance capabilities

- Information and guidance
- Skills and training
- Intervention

For example
- Before and after birth, midwife and health visitor support
- Family Intervention programmes
- Family Nurse Partnerships

Intervening to safeguard children
What has research told us that has informed all policy development?

Two pre-eminent studies

• Effective Provision of Preschool Education (Sylva, Melhuish, Sammons, Siraj-Blatchford, and Taggart)

• National Evaluation of Sure Start (Melhuish and Belsky)
Key messages from EPPE

1. Quality and Duration matter (months of developmental advantage on literacy age five)
2. Most important predictors of success

![Bar graph showing the effects upon literacy]

- Home environment: Mean EFFECT = 0.5
- Social class: Mean EFFECT = 0.4
- Quality pre-school: Mean EFFECT = 0.3
- Duration of pre-school: Mean EFFECT = 0.2
- Low birthweight: Mean EFFECT = 0.1
- Gender: Mean EFFECT = 0.0
Impact still evident at age 11

3. What makes preschools effective

- Quality of the adult-child verbal interaction.
- Knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.
- Knowledge of how young children learn.
- Adults skill in supporting children in resolving conflicts.
- Settings that paid attention to diversity performed better overall, probably because took a personalised approach to children
- Helping parents to support children’s learning at home.
What have we learned from Sure Start about supporting poor families

• Three impact studies:
  – 2005, mixed results; good for the poor, some negative results for the poorest
  – 2007, overall good results, and no differences between the groups
  – 2010, good results for parents, improved health indicators for children
Impact evidence, 2005: Sub-group findings
Somewhat disappointing, but much to learn

Among non-teenage mothers (86% of total):

- greater child social competence in SSLP areas
- fewer child behaviour problems in SSLP areas
- less negative parenting in SSLP areas

Effects on children appeared to be mediated by effects on mother:

- SSLP $\rightarrow$ less negative parenting $\rightarrow$ better child social functioning

Among teenage mothers (14% of total):

- less child social competence in SSLP areas
- more child behaviour problems in SSLP areas
- poorer child verbal ability in SSLP areas

Among lone parent families (40%):

- poorer child verbal ability in SSLP areas

Among workless households (33%):

- poorer child verbal ability in SSLP areas
### A possible explanation: user satisfaction and reach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wants yes</th>
<th>Wants yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs yes</td>
<td>Needs no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal users, grateful and compliant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benign neglect; probably providing good voluntary effort, good for child mix</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wants no</th>
<th>Wants no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs no</td>
<td>Needs yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ignore, probably using other local services, children fine</strong></td>
<td><strong>Requires real resource to engage, probably unpopular with other users</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second impact study 2007
longitudinal study comparing Sure Start children with
Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) children

5 outcomes clearly indicated beneficial effects for SSLPs. These were for:

• child **positive social behaviour** (cooperation, sharing, empathy)
• child **independence / self-regulation**
  (works things out for self, perseverance, self-control)
• **Parenting Risk Index** (observer rating + parent-child relationship, harsh discipline, home chaos)
• **home learning environment**
• **total service use**

In addition there were better results in SSLPs for:

• child immunisations
• child accidents

• But these 2 outcomes could have been influenced by timing effects
Reasons for differing results

1. Amount of exposure
   
   It took 3 years for a programme to be fully functional. Therefore
   • in the first phase children / families were not exposed to fully functional programmes for much of the child’s life
   • in the second phase children / families are exposed to fully functional programmes for all child’s life

2. Quality of services
   
   • SSLPs have been reorganised as SSCCs with clearer focus to services following lessons from earlier years, and NESS
   • early on staff had a lot to learn. As knowledge and experience have been acquired over 7 years, SSLPs have matured in functioning
   • hence it is likely that children / families are currently exposed to more effective services than in the early years of Sure Start
Third impact study 2010
Impact of established Sure Start programmes on 5 year olds and their families

Significant difference between SSLP area children and MCS children

- Mothers reporting greater life satisfaction
- Less chaotic homes
- Better home learning environments
- Children better physical health, less likely to be overweight
- Greater reduction in worklessness in Sure Start families

But

- Less attendance at school meetings
How has it all come together? England policy on early years, childcare and parenting: massive achievements in ten years!

- Maternity leave extended to 12 months, paid leave for 9 months
- Right to request flexible working for all parents with children up to age 6 (in first 2 years, 25% of working parents made request, 81% granted)
- Child poverty rate reduced by \( \frac{1}{2} \) (absolute measure) 15%, (relative measure)
- A Sure Start Children’s Centre in every community. Currently 2.5 million children using 3,500 Children’s Centres, progressive model with more funding going for Sure Start Children’s Centres in poorer areas
- All children in early years provision accessing single play based framework, EYFS
- Legislation passed, making provision of Children’s Centres statutory duty for local authorities
- Legislation passed requiring every local area to have a strategy for reducing child poverty

_Gap narrowing in school readiness between poor children and the rest based on Early years Foundation Stage profile._
What does it cost, what is it worth?
1997 spend on EY and CC: £2.1 Billion
2010 spend on EY and CC: £7.8 billion

What have we achieved:
- an infrastructure for EYCC
Enshrined in legislation;

Free nursery education: £600 mil
Quality and Sustainability: £3 bil
Children's centres: £1.5 bil
Maternity: £1 bil
Childcare tax credits: £250 mil
Employer supported childcare: £1.5 bil
Where are we now; new government, big cuts.....

Actually, some good news

- Free entitlement to 15 hours a week for all 3 and four year olds maintained
- Poorest 40% of 2 year olds also to get 15 hours a week free
- Ongoing commitment to Children’s centres
- Expansion of Health visitor work force by 50%

But some real dangers

- Removal of the ‘ring fence’ on children’s centre and child care funding, discretion at local level
- Great emphasis on improved parenting to reduce the likelihood of poverty in next generation, weakening of commitment to today’s poor children
- Strong emphasis on Sure Start for the ‘neediest’ and payment by results funding systems
- Childcare element of working tax credits reduced from maximum of 80% to 70% of childcare costs
- Biggest danger is increase in child poverty as unemployment rises due to overall cuts in public spending and changes to benefit system
Systems and delivery lessons

**For the front line**

- Data systems critically important; need to know who is not coming as well as who is.
- Parent satisfaction is essential but not sufficient to improve outcomes for children.
- Working collaboratively takes time and serious consideration to the aims of other organisations.

**For policy makers**

- Clarity on policy intent: improving child outcomes or enabling parents to work?
- Quality correlated with outcomes; quality needs better salaries, career structures and training.
- What decisions need to be made locally, state wide, nation wide?
If you want to know more, 3 books to read:

- **Providing a Sure Start**
  - How government discovered early childhood
  - Naomi Eisenstadt

- **Early Childhood Matters**
  - Evidence from the Effective Pre-school and Primary Education project

- **Britain’s War on Poverty**
  - Jane Waldfogel