

RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2014/15

**EDUCATION & LIFELONG LEARNING
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

24TH FEBRUARY 2015

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF
LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

Agenda Item 2

**Medium Term Service Planning –
School Admission Arrangements –
Funding for Provision of Nursery
Education**

Author: Paul Lucas - Director of Legal & Democratic Services
Tel: 01443 424105

1. MEMBERS WILL FIND ENCLOSED:

- A. Copy of the Cabinet Report (**Pages 3 - 275**)
- B. Copy Decision Notice of Cabinet (**Pages 277 - 283**)
- C. Copy Extract of Overview and Procedure Rules re: Call-in (**Pages 285 - 289**)
- D. Copy of Prescribed Call-in Form (**Pages 291 - 292**)

2. PROCEDURE

- 2.1 Each case for Call-in must be considered on its merits and there is no set procedure.
- 2.2 On the 12th February 2015 a meeting of Cabinet was held to consider the report '**Medium Term Service Planning – School Admission Arrangements – Funding for Provision of Nursery Education**' (Copy of the report is attached as Appendix A)
- 2.3 The Cabinet decision in respect of the above was published on Thursday 12th February, 2015. (Copy of the decision is attached as Appendix B.)
- 2.4 Rule 17 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules dealing with call-in is reproduced as Appendix C of this report.
- 2.5 A call-in form was received on 19th February, 2015, which complied with the relevant criteria. (A copy of the Prescribed call in form is attached as Appendix D)

- 2.6 Members will note that the Call-In Provisions were changed at the Council's Annual General Meeting in May 2014, to enable any 3 Non-Executive Members (from either (i) at least 2 political groups or (ii) in the case of an unallocated Member(s) – that unallocated Member(s) and a Member(s) from a political group). **Of the three Members making the Call-in, one Member is a member of the Committee and therefore will be able to vote on the matter.**
- 2.7 The three Members who called in the decision will be invited to address the Committee, on a proposal that the decision relating to **Medium Term Service Planning – School Admission Arrangements – Funding for Provision of Nursery Education** be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration with regard to the reasons set out in the Notice of the Call In form (as reproduced below)
- Reason for calling in decision: -*
- 1. Members relied on the EPPE report that was specific to English pre school children not in-school benefits of early years education in Wales or the RCT area;*
 - 2. Members did not look at alternative areas to make savings;*
 - 3. Members did not consider the numbers of people who would be affected by this decision;*
 - 4. Members failed to extend consultation appropriately with key stakeholders post Mosely;*
 - 5. Members presumed and made assumptions in their decision that fails to deliver an equitable service across Rhondda Cynon Taf. Therefore further consideration in view of the aforementioned 1-5.*
- 2.8 One of the three Members will be given the right to make a final address to the Committee membership immediately before a vote is taken on the proposal.
- 2.9 If the proposal to refer the matter to Cabinet for reconsideration is passed then the matter will be referred: If the proposal is lost then the decision will take effect from the date of this meeting i.e 24th February 2015.
- 2.10 The relevant Cabinet portfolio holder will be invited to the meeting to answer any questions Members of the Committee may have with regards to the subject matter of the call in.

3. **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the Committee adopt the procedure for the conduct of the meeting set out in paragraphs 2.7.and 2.8 above.

Appendix A

AGENDA ITEM 2

RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

12TH FEBRUARY 2015

MEDIUM TERM SERVICE PLANNING – SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS – FUNDING FOR PROVISION OF NURSERY EDUCATION

JOINT REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR, EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING, GROUP DIRECTOR, CORPORATE AND FRONTLINE SERVICES AND GROUP DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES

AUTHORS: Chris Bradshaw, Director, Education and Lifelong Learning (01443 744001), Chris Lee, Group Director, Corporate and Frontline Services (01443 424026) and Andrew Gwynn, Service Director, Children's Services (01443 495118)

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To report the results of the consultation exercise initiated by Cabinet together with additional information and an Equality Impact Assessment ('EIA') regarding the service change proposal in relation to the funding for provision of Nursery Education within Rhondda Cynon Taf in order to assist Cabinet in determining whether or not it wishes to progress with the proposal and, if so, how. If implemented the proposal would produce an overall saving to the Council of £2.166 million per year.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Cabinet: -

- 2.1 Considers the outcome of the Consultation and the potential impact on equalities issues in respect of the Proposal as outlined in the report (together with its appendices);
- 2.2 Notes that in officers' opinion the Council would be acting in compliance with its relevant statutory duties as outlined in the report, should Cabinet proceed with implementation of the Proposal;
- 2.3 Determines whether or not it considers that the implementation of the Proposal would ensure that the Council is compliant with its statutory duties as regards the provision of nursery education for children from

the term after their third birthday and such provision is sufficient for Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council;

- 2.4 Decide on whether or not, and if so how, it wishes to proceed with the Proposal; and
- 2.5 Request the Group Director, Corporate and Frontline Services to update the draft 2015/16 budget strategy to reflect the financial implications of the decision taken at paragraph 2.4 above, prior to Council on the 4th March 2015. As part of this update, if appropriate, any savings achievable in 2015/16 should be used to reduce the level of Transitional Funding (i.e. use of the Medium Term Financial Planning and Service Transformation Reserve) needed to deliver a balanced budget for that year.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 On the 10th October 2014 Cabinet considered a proposal to amend the funding for the provision of Nursery Education and determined to initiate a consultation thereon.
- 3.2 At that time, the latest projected budget position for the Council indicated an estimated gap over the 3 years from 2015/16 to 2017/18 of £70.7M with an initial gap for 2015/16 totalling £31.2M.
- 3.3 On the 29th October 2014 Council received a report on the implications of the provisional local government settlement, as announced on the 8th October 2014. This confirmed that the Council was facing an initial budget gap for 2015/16 of £30.450M, which after taking into account decisions already made would reduce to £22.646M.
- 3.4 On the 22nd January 2015 the Cabinet agreed a draft budget strategy for 2015/16 which included the implications of the final settlement, a recommended 3.8% Council Tax increase, an increased tax base, plus a number of base budget updates. The resultant budget gap was £16.526M for 2015/16.
- 3.5 The draft budget strategy includes a number of proposals to deal with the budget gap, including the use of £6.592M from the Medium Term Financial Planning and Service Transformation Reserve, reducing the balance of this reserve to £0.5M.
- 3.6 In respect of the medium term forecast, the draft strategy indicated that a remaining projected budget gap to 2017/18 of £46M still needed to be addressed.
- 3.7 Given the size of the budget gap faced and the timescale requirements for any implementation of service changes, Cabinet agreed to receive reports on potential service change/cut proposals as soon as these become available.

3.8 The outcome of the 10th October 2014 meeting was that Cabinet agreed: -

- To note the outcome of the judicial review of the Cabinet's decision of the 8th January, 2014 to amend school admission arrangements (the 'January 2014 Decision').
- To initiate a further consultation process in respect of the school admission arrangements service change proposal, as detailed in paragraph 5 and Appendix 1 to the 10th October 2014 Cabinet report.

3.9 This report sets out details of the 10th October 2014 proposal together with the results of the consultation process, further additional information in respect of the proposal and an EIA.

4. THE SERVICE CHANGE PROPOSAL – SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS: FUNDING FOR PROVISION OF NURSERY EDUCATION

CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS

4.1 Under the Council's current school admission arrangements, the level of provision is generally full time. The Council tries to ensure this provision is available at a maintained school within the family's school catchment area or, if available, offer places in neighbouring schools.

4.2 It is not compulsory for children to start school until the term following their 5th birthday. Therefore, attendance between the age of 3 to the term following the child's 5th birthday is optional to parents (Section 8 of the Education Act 1996).

4.3 A child therefore becomes of compulsory school age at one of the three dates in the year following their 5th birthday (Start of Compulsory School Age Order 1998 S.I. 1998 No. 1607):

Child's Date of Birth	Compulsory Date to Start School
1 April – 31 August	1 September
1 September – 31 December	1 January
1 January – 31 March	1 April

4.4 Rhonda Cynon Taf currently has inconsistent school entry arrangements being adopted across its infant and primary schools depending on available capacity. These being:

- start School the day after their 3rd birthday
- start School the term after their 3rd birthday

- start School in the September following their 3rd birthday

Schools which fall into each of these categories can vary from year to year.

- 4.5 The latest Starting School Booklet (2015/16) outlining admissions policy was published in September 2014.

4.6 The Academic Year

Year	Age During Academic Year
Pre Nursery	3
Nursery	4
Reception	5
Yr1	6
Yr2	7
Yr3	8
Yr4	9
Yr5	10
Yr6	11

SERVICE REVIEW - INITIAL LONG LIST OF OPTIONS

- 4.7 A long list of options for change was considered in respect of the proposed changes to funding arrangements and to enable cost savings to be realised to assist in closing the budget gap faced by the Council.

This initial list is detailed below:

1. Status Quo
2. Full time the term after the child's 3rd Birthday
3. Part time (half day) the term after the child's 3rd birthday and Full time Nursery
4. Part time (half-day) the term after the child's 3rd birthday and Part time (half-day) Nursery and Full time Reception
- 4a. Option 4 plus 50% play facility funded by the Council
- 4b. Option 4 plus 50% play facility chargeable to the parent
5. Part time (half-day) the term after the child's 3rd birthday and full time the term after the child's 4th birthday
6. Part time (half-day) the term after the child's 3rd birthday, part time (half-day) Nursery and Part-time Reception to term after 5th birthday
7. Single point admission in the September following the child's 3rd birthday (full time)
8. Single point admission in the September following the child's 3rd birthday part time (half-day) nursery and full time Reception
9. Single point admission in the September following the child's 3rd birthday with part time (half-day) nursery and initial part time

(half-day) Reception transferring to full time Reception the term following the child's 5th birthday

- 4.8 Appendix 1A illustrates the level of provision for each option.
- 4.9 Appendix 1B provides an analysis of the consideration of each option.
- 4.10 The proposed preferred option is option 5.

THE SERVICE CHANGE PROPOSAL

- 4.11 It is proposed that the Council seek to amend the way in which school entry arrangements (subject to school capacity) are funded across all of its schools.
- 4.12 The proposed funding arrangement should be based on:
 - Part-time (half day) (15 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 3rd birthday (pre-nursery and nursery);
 - Full-time (30 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 4th birthday (nursery and reception); and
 - Funding up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary or independent registered education providers from the term following the child's third birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school (n.b. in this context 'suitability' shall relate to the availability of a place at a school which, in the Council's opinion, is within a reasonable radius of the child's ordinary place of residence i.e. where those with parental responsibility for the child live)

(the 'Proposal').

THE PROPOSAL - DETAILS

- 4.13 **Under the Proposal children already in receipt of full-time nursery provision (during the 2014 - 2015 academic year) would continue to be funded for full-time provision i.e. they would not be affected by the Proposal.**
- 4.14 Whilst actual arrangements for initial school entry are effectively a matter for individual headteachers under the Local Management of Schools Scheme, it is proposed that the way in which the Council funds schools would be in line with the above criteria.
- 4.15 Members will, of course, be aware as a result of the January 2014 Decision that some schools may decide to continue to offer and fund full-time nursery provision in any event, funding from within their

allocated budget, and this is a matter for each governing body to determine.

- 4.16 The Proposal would see the removal of the provision of home to school transport and school meal provision for part-time pupils.
- 4.17 It is proposed that the Proposal takes effect from 1st September 2015.
- 4.18 The Proposal's funding arrangements are summarised in the table below (part time the term after the child's 3rd birthday, full time the term after the child's 4th birthday full time Reception) :-

Option	3rd Birthday By:	Pre Nursery			Nursery			Reception		
		Age 3 In Year			Age 4 In Year			Age 5 In Year		
		Sept	Jan	Apr	Sept	Jan	Apr	Sept	Jan	Apr
Current Arrangements (where capacity allows)	Dec	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
	Mar	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
	Aug	NO	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
Recommended:- PT term after 3 FT term after 4 FT Rec Sept	Dec	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
	Mar	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT
	Aug	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT
		NO = No admission								
		PT = Part Time								
		FT = Full Time								

- 4.19 Pupils would therefore start school the term following their 3rd birthday on a part time basis and would become full-time during the Nursery year, the term following their 4th birthday and continue into Reception on a full time basis. Where schools are unable to offer pre-nursery admission due to capacity issues (and therefore would not be able to offer the new minimum admissions arrangements) then alternative provision would be offered at another school or through a private provider.
- 4.20 This approach would still be as generous as the level of provision provided in the majority of Councils across Wales.
- 4.21 School budgets are mainly funded based on pupil numbers therefore it would reduce the funding requirements at a school level with a budget reduction across all schools amounting to £2.061M.
- 4.22 Pupil number reductions at individual schools would be dependent upon actual pupil numbers and dates of birth as at the determined date of implementation.
- 4.23 Whilst the Proposal relates to the basis on which the Council will provide funding to schools, it is ultimately the responsibility of individual

school governing bodies to determine their own budgets and spending plans and as previously noted they may decide to continue with full-time provision subject to their individual budgetary positions.

- 4.24 Schools may wish to consider (if capacity allows) implementing a playgroup or Meithrin session in the School. This would however be dependent on a Governing Body decision. Assistance can be provided by the Council, if required, in respect of setting up such a provision.

FINANCIAL APPRAISAL

- 4.25 Individual School Budgets (ISB) are prepared on a financial year basis therefore all options have been modelled on the financial year 2014/15. Using the data averaged over the admissions count (actual/estimate) of January 2014, June 2014, September 2014 and January 2015 to implement the new options would result in the following savings as compared to the 2014/15 ISB.
- 4.26 Only compulsory age school children's Free School Meals are components of the Revenue Support Grant (RSG), with Pre Nursery and Nursery children's Free School Meals being an unfunded cost to the Council. Therefore if Nursery children become part time and do not have a school meal the Council would save approximately £105k.

Saving Analysis

Option		Annual Saving
		£'000
	Part time the term after the child's 3 rd birthday, full time the term after the child's 4 th birthday	£2,061
	Saving on Free School Meals	£105
	Total Saving	£2,166

- 4.27 As the Proposal results in a reduction in full time equivalent pupil numbers the saving is not compromised by the continuation of previous school protection requirements.

Transition Savings

- 4.28 In order to implement the new admissions procedure there are two approaches that can be considered, i.e.

- a. **Fully implement** - i.e. if the new procedure was implemented in September 2015 then the pre-nursery and nursery children who have already accessed a full time place the previous term, would revert to part time. Therefore, all nursery children would be part-time from the autumn term (September) 2015.
- b. **Phased (Service Change Proposal option)** - i.e. those children already in pre-nursery or nursery would continue their 100% place and only those new starters from September 2015 would commence on a part-time basis. Therefore, schools would have a mixed pre-nursery and nursery provision of full and part-time children for the first two years of transition.

4.29 Both these options can be implemented at the start of the 3 term dates during the Academic Year.

The following table shows the phased savings over the Financial Years 2015/16 and 2016/17:-

Option		Implementation Date	2015/16	2016/17	Total
			Gross Annual Saving £'000	Gross Annual Saving £'000	Gross Annual Saving £'000
a	Fully Implement	September 2015	1,477	689	2,166
b	Phase-in	September 2015	1,330	836	2,166

(Figures are based on 2014/15 actual and estimated pupil count data)

5. **CONSULTATION EXERCISE**

- 5.1 As previously reported to Cabinet it is important that the Council consults fully with the public, staff and other interested stakeholders on the Proposal. Consultation feedback will need to feed into any decision about the Proposal.
- 5.2 The financial pressures facing the Council are undoubtedly a very important part of the context. However, as part of the decision making process, Cabinet must take into account not only the Council's budgetary position, but also among other matters the Council's relevant statutory responsibilities and the responses received through consultation.

- 5.3 As noted at paragraph 3.8 of this report, on the 10th October 2014 Cabinet considered the Proposal and agreed to initiate a public consultation on it.
- 5.4 The consultation in respect of the Proposal was originally scheduled to run during the period 21st October – 5 p.m. 16th December 2014 (the 'Consultation').
- 5.5 However on the 16th December 2014 Cabinet received a presentation in respect of the latest budget position. As part of that presentation Members were also given an update in respect of the Consultation process relating to the Proposal initiated by Cabinet and a statement was made by the Council's Monitoring Officer.
- 5.6 The statement was issued in response to the recent Supreme Court judgment in respect of Moseley v Haringey LBC ('Moseley'). Extracts from that statement are copied below: -

When the Council consults the Council's overriding duty is to consult fairly, given the audience it is consulting with and the requirement that adequate information is given on which consultees can respond.

The Moseley case gives guidance on what fairness requires when the Council is consulting on a 'preferred option'. Members will be aware that in relation to this Proposal the Consultation was based on a preferred option.

It was understood that the position prior to the Moseley decision was that [unless there was any statutory requirement to do so] there was generally no duty to provide information about an option that was not the Council's preferred option. Indeed, legal advice taken by the Council prior to initiating the Consultation confirmed this point. Cabinet therefore initiated the Consultation on this understanding.

However the Supreme Court took a much more robust approach to this principle than any Court had previously when asked to consider this particular issue. In overturning the original decision of the Administrative Court and the Court of Appeal where both Courts infact found Haringey Council's consultation to be lawful, the Supreme Court's decision has had the apparent result of imposing rigorous further requirements on the Council in terms of the information it may now be obliged to provide to consultees. The Moseley decision means that the law relating to consultation should have infact been interpreted differently in some respects to how it had been previously.

Essentially the effect of the Moseley decision means that when the Council undertakes a consultation it must now give careful consideration as to what details of rejected options and the reasons for the rejection of those options it should give to consultees as well as

why it has chosen a particular option – i.e. its preferred option over all others.

5.7 The decision in the Moseley case was given after the Consultation was launched but prior to the original Consultation period ending and clearly before any final decision is taken in respect of the Proposal.

5.8 Having regard to the importance and effect of the Moseley decision officers considered it prudent to extend the Consultation period in relation to the Proposal until 30th January 2015.

By extending the Consultation period by a further period of just over six weeks, consultees were given an opportunity to review the options considered by Members prior to Cabinet launching the Consultation on the preferred option in addition to being provided with an explanation as to why the preferred option is preferred based on the advantages and disadvantages of each option.

5.9 At the Cabinet meeting on the 16th December 2014, Members were provided with a copy of the additional information that it was proposed be provided to consultees to address the points raised in Moseley.

5.10 Following the presentation and Monitoring Officer statement Cabinet resolved to: -

- (i) Note the implications of the Supreme Court decision in Moseley;
- (ii) In light of Moseley extend the Consultation period until 5 p.m. on 30th January 2015;
- (iii) Note the additional information that would be provided to consultees should Cabinet resolve to extend the Consultation; and
- (iv) Note copies of the additional information would be distributed in exactly the same way as the original Consultation materials.

5.11 Any response to the Consultation received by the Council during the extended period was treated in exactly the same way as a response received prior to the extension being approved. The additional information produced was also distributed in the same way.

5.12 The Consultation in total therefore ran from 21st October 2014 – 5 p.m. 30th January 2015, a period of 14 weeks.

5.13 The Consultation was conducted in-house. The Consultation process and materials were agreed by the Council's Corporate Management Team. The Consultation materials (including questionnaire) were considered to provide clear information in an appropriate and understandable format.

5.14 The Consultation materials were printed in house and the distribution of materials was undertaken by Council couriers. A comprehensive distribution exercise of the Consultation materials was undertaken. In

excess of 45,000 copies of the materials were distributed to schools to be forwarded onto parents/carers, registered childcare providers, Flying Start users and school governors. Copies were also obtainable from Council libraries, leisure centres, Communities First offices and One4All centres. Following the Consultation extension copies were also placed at doctors' surgeries across the County Borough. The Consultation (including its extension) was widely promoted in the press and via social media, including the Council's Twitter account.

- 5.15 The Council also held nine engagement sessions across the County Borough affording the opportunity for consultees to discuss and share views on the Proposal. Representatives from both the Council's Education and Early Years and Family Support Service ('EYFSS') Departments were present at each session. A Cabinet Member/ Cabinet Members attended each event. A number of engagement sessions were also held with young people via School Councils as well as views sought on the Proposal from headteachers.
- 5.16 Consultees were able to respond to the Consultation through various channels, including a dedicated Consultation email address, a freepost postal address, via an online questionnaire and providing feedback at the local engagement sessions.
- 5.17 A detailed report outlining the methodology used in analysing the responses and the results of the extensive Consultation is attached at Appendix 2. Attached to Appendix 2 of this report Members will find a copy of the Consultation materials produced and which were available to Consultees in respect of this Proposal. This includes the additional information that was made available to consultees following the Consultation extension. This information provided the detail of the alternative options that were considered as part of developing the preferred option and provided commentary on those alternatives to consultees.
- 5.18 Prior to this meeting and throughout the Consultation period a facility was made available for Cabinet Members to view all responses received through the various channels as a result of the Consultation. This was done to ensure Cabinet gives due regard and conscientious consideration to all elements of the Consultation feedback and responses received. This approach also ensures Cabinet gains a comprehensive and genuine understanding of the wide range of views and opinions expressed by the consultees prior to making its decision.
- 5.19 An EIA attached at Appendix 3 to this report has also been undertaken in respect of the Proposal. Its content is discussed further below.

6. **THE COUNCIL'S STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSAL & OFFICER ANALYSIS OF KEY POINTS RAISED IN THE CONSULTATION**

- 6.1 As outlined to Members in the Cabinet report of 10th October 2014 the Council has a number of statutory duties which are relevant to the Proposal. These duties are set out below and Members are reminded that they must be borne in mind prior to Cabinet taking any decision in relation to the Proposal.
- 6.2 In addition, and to assist Members with any decision they may take, officers have addressed some of the key points and themes raised in the Consultation, as well as the issues that were highlighted to Members in the 10th October 2014 report as requiring further investigation and/or analysis (which included using information which became available, and/or was provided, through the Consultation process itself).
- 6.3 However, Members should refer to the detail of Appendix 2 to gain a complete understanding of all the emerging themes that arose from the Consultation.
- 7. THE COUNCIL'S DUTY TO SECURE THAT THE PROVISION OF NURSERY EDUCATION IS "SUFFICIENT" FOR ITS AREA**
- 7.1 Clearly central to the Proposal is that the Council must continue to meet its statutory obligations in respect of the provision of nursery education.
- 7.2 Section 117 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 defines 'nursery education' as full-time or part-time education suitable for children who have not attained compulsory school age (whether provided at schools or elsewhere).
- 7.3 In accordance with section 118 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (and regulations made thereunder) the Council must secure that the provision (whether or not by it) of nursery education for children from the term after their third birthday, is **sufficient for its area**.
- 7.4 In determining whether the provision of such education is sufficient for its area the Council:-
(a) may have regard to any facilities which they expect to be available outside their area for providing such education; and
(b) shall have regard to any guidance given from time to time by the National Assembly for Wales.
- 7.5 In 1999/2000 the former Welsh Office published guidance which set out guiding principles and targets for early years education. Although the guidance was for the year 1999/2000, it has not since been superseded. The guidance at that time made it clear that the target was to provide "free, at least half-time, good quality" education. "Half-time" meant a minimum of 10 hours a week for around the same number of weeks as the normal school year.

- 7.6 The Council also has a duty under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 to have regard to the latest Special Educational Needs (SEN) Code of Practice produced by the Welsh Ministers. As part of compliance with this duty the Council's commitment to general principles for children with special education needs is set out in its Starting School Booklet. It is the Council's policy, and one which would continue should the Proposal be implemented, that the special educational needs of children, including those of pre-school age, would be identified, recorded, assessed and met as early as possible and reviewed regularly.
- 7.7 Members will recall that at the meeting on 10th October 2014 the Director, Education and Lifelong Learning commented on what he considers is a sufficient amount of nursery education provision for children from the term after their third birthday who reside in Rhondda Cynon Taf to be. A paper outlining the detail of his assessment was appended to the 10th October 2014 Cabinet report.
- 7.8 That assessment has been updated to incorporate the latest available data and is attached at Appendix 4 to this report.

KEY POINTS RAISED IN THE CONSULTATION IN RELATION TO THIS DUTY

- 7.9 It is clear that the vast majority of respondents are against the Proposal. However the majority agreed with the principles of the Proposal that protecting children already in receipt of full-time provision is important and that if implemented full-time provision should be effective from the term following a child's fourth birthday. One of the key themes that emerged from the Consultation that relate to this duty was that the Proposal could impact negatively on the level of educational standards and learning of young children. Consultation respondents felt that children who are not educated full-time (30 hours per week) from the age of 3 years old would have lower levels of attainment as they progress through the education system. Respondents also believed that the Proposal could have a negative impact on social skills and an impact on deprived communities.
- 7.10 On a local level however there is no evidence to suggest that the current arrangements are having a positive impact on pupil attainment and attendance. As set out in Appendix 4 many local authorities in Wales achieve better educational outcomes than Rhondda Cynon Taf despite having a lower offer of funding for nursery provision in schools.
- 7.11 The educational outcomes for Rhondda Cynon Taf are also lower, on average, than those in England. This is despite most children attending nursery education on a part-time basis. English local authorities are required (by UK Government policy) to secure 15 hours per week for every child from the term following their 3rd birthday, until the child

reaches compulsory school age, which is the beginning of the term following a child's 5th birthday.

- 7.12 This argument is supported by a widely recognised European study into the impact of nursery education on children and young people. The Effective Provision of Pre-school Education (EPPE) study found that attending full-time provision from the age of 3 years old does not have any significant positive impact compared to attending full-time provision when it is statutory at the age of 5 years old. Much of the evidence supports the theory that attending pre-school is important at an early age, but the length of time spent there has no significant effect.
- 7.13 Other academic studies suggest that the quality of the home learning environment i.e. the activities that parents or carers undertake with pre-school children, has a more significant effect on a child's cognitive and learning development than formal childcare or pre-school. There is also little evidence to suggest that children are substantially disadvantaged or advantaged by being looked after informally e.g. by grandparents or other informal childcarers.
- 7.14 Some of those who disagreed with the Proposal suggested that the changes would impact more negatively on the learning of those children from a deprived area of the County Borough. Many people commented that deprived areas require more support in this respect.
- 7.15 However, with regards to educational attainment, many of the local authorities in Wales that are ranked higher for educational outcomes have similar levels of deprivation to Rhondda Cynon Taf, yet lower levels of nursery provision.
- 7.16 Studies also suggest that the quality of the home learning environment is only moderately associated with levels of deprivation i.e. it is more important what parents or carers do with their children than their occupation or level of qualifications.
- 7.17 As referenced in the EIA at Appendix 3, mitigation to concerns expressed in the Consultation is that there are over 2,000 children entitled to the Welsh Government's Flying Start programme in Rhondda Cynon Taf. This is targeted at children up to the age of 4 in deprived areas, providing free, part-time childcare for 2-3 year olds, an enhanced Health Visitor service, access to parenting programmes and early years development.
- 7.18 In terms of mitigating against any potential negative impact towards children's educational and learning development, the Council has a number of services dedicated to children and young people living in poverty and/or underachieving at school. For example, the recent service changes to Youth Services in Rhondda Cynon Taf are intended to have a positive impact on the attainment of future generations. The new Youth Engagement and Participation Service is more targeted at

those young people who need intervention the most, such as children on the Child Protection Register, young carers and pupils with poor attendance.

- 7.19 Consultation respondents also raised concerns that children attending nursery education on a part-time basis (15 hours per week) from the age of 3 until the term after their 4th birthday could have a negative impact on social skills, independence, development and confidence. Most parents/carers stated that, in their view, full time (30 hours) would be a sufficient amount of provision.
- 7.20 The academic evidence for this theory is mixed. For instance, Loeb (2005) found that for those children from low-income families, additional hours of pre-nursery were associated with some progress in reading and maths, and few detrimental effects on social development. Children in high-income families displayed gains in pre-reading and maths when attending for 15 - 30 hours per week (part-time), but no cognitive gains and substantially greater behavioural problems were associated with increased attendance. Studies in favour of children starting school early tend to emphasise that it is the quality of the setting rather than the quantity (hours per day/week) that make a difference to the child's development. Many of the arguments for children beginning pre-nursery at a young age are based on the early relationships that parents build with school settings and the social skills and cognitive abilities that children develop, which is still the case when children attend for less time during the day/per week.
- 7.21 With regards to potential impact on social skills, independence, confidence and development, the Council provides a number of services that can mitigate against any potential negative consequences. The Access and Wellbeing service within the Council would continue to offer support to young children to establish good attendance routines and solve any early issues around going to school. In the areas eligible, Flying Start provision provides a number of initiatives, including speech and language development. It is recognised that a complete absence of pre-school education could have a negative impact on the child's development
- 7.22 Parents/carers have also expressed that transporting their children from school to a childcare setting during the day would be difficult for them due to work/training commitments; access to transport; and cost. Car ownership in Rhondda Cynon Taf is relatively low in comparison to other areas in Wales, and it may be difficult for some parents/carers to transport children on public transport at particular times of the day and on certain routes.
- 7.23 The Council's current Learner Travel Policy, which is published in its Starting School booklet states at Section 3 '*The provision of free school transport shall be arranged to coincide with the start and end of the*

normal school day only, not at lunchtimes and shall be provided during the school term time.

- 7.24 Under the Proposal, children attending part-time nursery education would no longer be eligible for 'Home to School' transport i.e. transportation to and from school. As at January 2015, 25 children were receiving Home to School transport for pre-nursery provision. 285 children were receiving Home to School transport for nursery provision. (Those children with SEN would continue to receive transport, if required.) When pupils enter education in line with the Council's admission arrangements and Learner Travel Policy they become eligible for school transport (subject to discretionary limits and available places in the case of Foundation Phase pupils). However it is important to note that under the Learner Travel (Wales) Measure 2008, the Council has discretion to provide Home to School transport for part-time pupils. When the Council makes use of its discretionary powers it must ensure that the policy applies to all learners in similar circumstances living in the Council's area.
- 7.25 The impact of this element of the Proposal is difficult to determine due to the possible mitigating factors that could occur following a decision by Cabinet. There is a possibility that schools could continue to offer the provision of free full-time education to children from the term following their 3rd birthday or will provide wraparound care' services (see paragraph 7.26 below) in the school. This issue is discussed further in paragraphs 7.32-7.33 below. In these circumstances, issues around transporting children would be significantly mitigated as the Council's current policy would entitle those children eligible to Home to School transport.
- 7.26 "Wraparound care" is sessional care that starts immediately before or after school, but during the normal school day. Wraparound care providers can be based on school sites or can be based in their own settings and can drop off or pick up children before or after their school nursery session.
- 7.27 It would be possible to accommodate part-time nursery pupils (subject to available places) at the start and end of the school day as they represent a relatively small proportion of pupils on existing contracted vehicles. However there would be certain practicalities associated with arranging transport provision for those children who would be in receipt of part-time nursery provision under the Proposal. Providing lunch time transport for part time pupils for example would require new contracts to be put in place with resultant additional cost implications.
- 7.28 Under the Proposal the Council would also no longer provide funding in respect of part-time pre-nursery and nursery children (3-4 year olds) receiving 'Free School Meals'.

At present, families in receipt of certain benefits can apply for children aged 3 and above to receive Free School Meals. Up to the statutory age for education of 5 years old, these are funded by the Council, with the Welsh Government providing funding thereafter (for 5-18 year olds). As part of the Welsh Government funding requirements only children and young people attending school on a full time basis may be entitled to receive Free School Meals. As at January 2014, 237 pre-nursery pupils were entitled to this provision. Clearly however whilst Welsh Government funding is dependent on children attending school full-time the Council does have a discretion as to whether it chooses to fund Free School Meals for those pupils whom may attend Nursery either part-time or full-time.

- 7.29 The Consultation results have identified that no longer funding Free School Meals for those pupils receiving part-time Nursery provision could have a potential negative impact for young children in the future, who may not receive a nutritionally balanced, hot meal at home.
- 7.30 The Council, through a number of its services, also has a duty to continue to encourage parents/carers to enrol children for nursery provision. This will continue to assist in early identification of special educational needs, safeguarding issues (around vulnerable children) and continue to have a positive impact on children's learning and development (including through the medium of Welsh).
- 7.31 Another potential impact identified was the impact on the Welsh language and this is discussed in detail in the EIA at Appendix 3.
- 7.32 In general, should the Proposal be agreed, any offers made by schools to continue to provide full-time education (30 hours per week) for pre-nursery pupils or to provide a wraparound care service (charging parents and carers a fee) would minimise the potential negative impacts raised through the Consultation. Members will recall that, following the January 2014 Decision and prior to the outcome of the Judicial Review, a number of schools (approximately 60%) confirmed to the Council in email or writing that the Governing Bodies had decided to maintain and fund full-time provision for three year olds for this current academic year. Importantly, at that time however, schools took this decision with the knowledge of what their individual school budgets would be.
- 7.33 During the Consultation, officers contacted a selection of 18 headteachers based on assessment criteria. They were asked a series of questions relating to the Proposal. The assessment criteria used and results of this exercise are set out in full in the attachment to Appendix 2 and Members should review the responses.
- 7.34 One of the questions asked was: -

“If the Council’s Cabinet agreed to change the funding arrangements for Nursery provision (and the School’s budget then revised in line with this), what would be your proposed recommendation to the Governing Body in terms of Nursery provision from September 2015 (continue with full time or change to part time)?”

8 headteachers (out of the sample of 18) said they would, where possible, recommend to the Governing Body that the School continue to offer full-time provision. Those headteachers who indicated they would propose recommending continuation of full time provision anticipated such a decision would however be kept under annual review.

- 7.35 Therefore, whilst no one can be certain at this stage, or any reliance be placed upon, what schools may or may not do following any decision in relation to this Proposal (as they would not be in a position to make a decision until the individual school budget is confirmed to them), it is likely that (i) based on the decision schools took following the January 2014 Decision and (ii) the results of the Council’s survey that a substantial minority (and possibly, even a majority) of schools would continue to provide full-time provision. However, it is also clear that some schools may revert to providing part-time provision in line with the Proposal. From the sample of headteachers contacted 10 out of the 18 indicated they would recommend this course of action to the School Governing Body. This would be likely to have the result of creating additional childcare demands within the County Borough. These childcare issues are explored further in paragraph 8 below.
- 7.36 Members will note the assessment at Appendix 4 that in the Director of Education and Lifelong Learning’s opinion the Proposal, should it be implemented, would ensure the Council continues to meet its statutory obligations as to the provision of sufficient nursery education for Rhondda Cynon Taf. The Director remains of this opinion having taken into account the Consultation responses and EIA.
- 7.37 Therefore whilst the Proposal (in relation to funding provided for nursery education provision provided in a maintained setting) would result in a reduction to the Council’s current arrangements, it still represents a service provision of nursery education, judged in officers’ opinion, to be sufficient for the Council’s area and thus compliant with the Council’s statutory duty.
- 7.38 Ultimately what is “sufficient” nursery education for this Council’s area is a matter of judgement for the Cabinet, based on what it considers the benefits of any particular amount of education and the particular educational needs of children of the County Borough to be, having taken into account officer advice and commentary as outlined in this report, the results of the Consultation and EIA.

- 7.39 In order for the Council to continue to meet its statutory responsibilities in respect of the provision and sufficiency of nursery education should Cabinet resolve to proceed with implementation of the Proposal, officers would monitor its impact particularly from an educational achievement perspective. When appropriate data and evidence becomes available officers would report back to Elected Members, for example through the Cabinet and Scrutiny monitoring process, in order to inform them of the outcomes and effects of the Proposal following implementation, particularly in respect of the issues raised in the Consultation and EIA.

8. THE COUNCIL'S DUTY TO SECURE "SUFFICIENT" CHILDCARE FOR WORKING PARENTS

- 8.1 Any change to educational provision will affect the childcare needs of those with parental responsibility. Cabinet will therefore need to consider its duty under section 22 of the Childcare Act 2006 (the '2006 Act') to "secure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that the provision of childcare (whether or not by it) is sufficient to meet the requirements of parents in their area who require childcare in order to enable them (a) to take up, or remain in work; or (b) to undertake education or training which could reasonably be expected to assist them to obtain work."

Childcare in this context means (a) childminding or day care in which the provider is required to be registered with the Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales ("CSSIW"); (b) care provided by a person of a description approved in accordance with a scheme made by the Welsh Assembly e.g. Working Tax Credit.

A person acts as a 'child minder' if the person looks after one or more children under the age of eight on domestic premises (premises which are wholly or mainly used as a private dwelling) for reward; and

A person provides 'day care' for children if the person provides care at any time for children under the age of eight on premises other than domestic premises.

- 8.2 The duties under the 2006 Act require the Council to shape and support the development of childcare provision in its area in order to make it flexible, sustainable and responsive to the needs of the community. The intention is to ensure that parents are able to access childcare locally that meets their needs and enables them to make a real choice about work.
- 8.3 The effect of the wording "*reasonably practicable*" within the 2006 Act is to allow the Council to take into account its resources and capabilities in making decisions about when to intervene to address gaps in the childcare market. The Council is not under a duty to provide

the childcare directly (although it has the power to make provision if it so chooses).

- 8.4 It is not the intention of the duty to oblige the Council to meet the individual childcare needs of every working family, but to ensure that at a community level, the Council is taking strategic action with its partners to address gaps in childcare.
- 8.5 When considering the sufficiency of childcare, Cabinet must have specific regard to the matters outlined in section 22(2)(a) of the 2006 Act, being (i) the needs of parents for childcare who are eligible for the childcare element of Working Tax Credit; (ii) the needs of parents for childcare in respect of which an amount of childcare costs may be included in the calculation of Universal Credit (n.b. for both (i) and (ii) parents can only claim for the costs of *registered* or *approved* childcare in this regard); (iii) the provision of childcare which is suitable for disabled children and (iv) the provision of childcare involving the use of the Welsh language.
- 8.6 The Council is expected to support the development of childcare where there is sufficient parental demand that a childcare setting or a child minder could operate and be sustainable.
- 8.7 As part of these duties a Childcare Sufficiency Audit must be completed on a triennial basis, complemented by an annual refresh. On the 23rd June 2014 Cabinet agreed the Council's Childcare Sufficiency Audit 2014-2017 triennial plan (the 'CSA'). The outcomes are critical for the forward planning of childcare, workforce development and Flying Start Services. Cabinet also agreed the 2014-2015 Childcare Development Delivery plan. The plan identifies eleven key priorities that will drive partnership work over the next three years to ensure that there is even more childcare available in areas of identified need and the sustainability of existing childcare businesses is supported more effectively. Having recently considered and approved both documents Members will appreciate their importance and particular relevance to the Proposal, although clearly they are reflective of the position at a particular moment in time. Both documents are annexed at Appendix 5A and 5B.
- 8.8 Cabinet will also need to have regard to Welsh Government guidance when considering its statutory duty under s.22 of the 2006 Act. The particular relevant points from the guidance in addition to the matters already set out in the statute itself, and of particular relevance for this report, state that:
 - i. Local authorities should consider the particular issues around access to childcare for black and other ethnic minority parents, lone parents and those making the transition to work, including those training.

- ii. Local authorities will also need to consider availability of childcare to support parents working atypical hours.
- iii. Local authorities are required to secure childcare of sufficient duration and reliability to enable parents to make a real choice about work. Local authorities are required to act to secure sufficient childcare that is registered by the CSSIW.

8.9 As regards points 8.8 i) – iii) above some of the steps being undertaken by the Council to address these matters include:-

- Linking with Jobcentre Plus officials and the local colleges to support parents who wish to return to work or training.
- Working closely with settings to encourage them to offer childcare outside of the normal working day to support those parents and carers who work atypical hours. Childminders are especially important for this policy as they have the capacity to be more flexible, although some day nurseries now offer care before 7am, after 6pm and at weekends. Network childminders have additional training to enable them to offer respite and emergency care for children in need and/or those with additional learning needs. It is considered however that the majority of parents choose to use family childcare support if they work atypical hours.
- In respect of the Council's duty to act to secure sufficient childcare that is registered by the CSSIW then the CSA (together with the annual refresh) is primarily used as the basis for informing the local childcare market and where gaps exist. Working with CSSIW and Family Information Service ('FIS'), officers can identify where provision is currently unregistered and work with those providers and the relevant umbrella organisation to support them through the registration process. To facilitate this the Council has commissioned Clybiau Plant Cymru Kids' Club to run a series of workshops specifically around CSSIW registration, National Minimum Standards and staff management. A range of settings are attending these workshops, from out of school clubs, playgroups to open access playscheme providers. The CSA identifies areas where a need for additional childcare has been identified and the EYFSS work with a range of agencies, including schools, to try and address this need.

8.10 The EYFSS works with a wide range of internal and external partners including; umbrella organisations (such as Clybiau Plant Cymru Kids Clubs), 3rd sector childcare providers, Welsh language organisations (such as Mudiad Meithrin and Menter Iaith) and the Council's Disabled Children's Team to ensure that suitable childcare is developed where, and when families need it. The Out of School Childcare Grant (OOSCG) from Welsh Government enables the Council to support early years and childcare settings in a variety of ways (see further detail below).

8.11 Further examples of how the Council addresses gaps in the market include:

- Providing training and business support to childcare providers through an accredited training centre that offers qualifications suitable to the childcare industry and a wide range of continuing professional development courses for the early years and childcare workforce.
- Helping providers run efficiently; The OOSCG supports the Early Years, Childcare and Play Providers' grant scheme. This offers financial support to providers for sustainability, new provision and extension of services in current provision.
- Providing market information to providers; FIS offers families and providers information on what current provision is available. FIS Outreach Workers attend many parent orientated events in order to engage with parents and providers/organisations. Officers within EYFSS, and through service level agreements (SLAs) with umbrella organisations, offer providers information and support on areas such as market conditions, gaps and oversupply etc., as well as creating links to other providers in the locality.
- Supporting networks of and links between providers; The RCT Childminding network offers support, training and guidance to providers and regular network meetings are arranged for Flying Start professionals.
- Creating targeted incentives to address any gaps in the market. The OOSCG supports the development of new provision in areas that have been identified via the CSA. The Council has a grant scheme available to childcare providers. This offers financial support for sustainability, purchase of new resources, increased rent/staff costs due to expansion of service and establishment of new provision.
- EYFSS has also developed a 'Childcare In Schools – Guidance for Headteachers' document to assist those schools who may wish to provide childcare provision within the School. This would be published and made available to headteachers should a decision be made to implement the Proposal.

8.12 The EYFSS works with external agencies and providers to encourage and support as many providers as possible to register with CSSIW. This not only ensures that minimum standards are met within the provision but also means that parents can apply for employer based childcare vouchers and the childcare element of working tax credits (if eligible). The EYFSS also works closely with Mudiad Meithrin and Menter Iaith to support the development of welsh medium playgroups, out of school care and holiday care. The service operates a referral only scheme (Holiday Fun Time) to support children with additional needs and at risk of family breakdown to access play and childcare provision during school holiday periods (this is subject to continuing funding post April 2015). The service offers training and support to providers so that they have the skills, knowledge and equipment to cater for the needs of disabled children and those with additional needs.

- 8.13 The EYFSS consider that there are also no particular issues in relation to access to childcare for black and ethnic minority families within the County Borough. A small percentage (2.6%) of the population are from black and other ethnic minority families according to the 2011 Census information. This is in comparison with a 4.4% Wales average.

KEY POINTS RAISED IN THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE IN RELATION TO THIS DUTY AND RESULTS OF OFFICER INVESTIGATIONS AND ANALYSIS

- 8.14 Key themes emerging from the Consultation in respect of this particular duty include the following: -

- A perceived lack of sufficient childcare/wraparound provision
- The need to stop or reduce work, training or education
- Impact on working families
- Ample notice should be given

- 8.15 Many parents and carers disagreed with the Proposal on the grounds that it could inhibit them (and others in their position) from working or returning to work following maternity/paternity leave. Some respondents stated transport issues as the main reason for this, whereas others stated that there was not sufficient childcare in their area or that the childcare available is too expensive.

- 8.16 As set out above, the Council has a duty towards parents/carers taking up or remaining in employment, or undertaking education or training. A number of measures the Council has put in place to support compliance with this duty are outlined above.

- 8.17 However, Consultation respondents have expressed concerns over specific areas of Rhondda Cynon Taf, where they feel sufficient childcare is not available. As mitigation, a piece of work has been undertaken to look more closely at the areas raised by respondents to assess sufficiency of childcare and this is discussed further below.

- 8.18 83.5% of respondents did not agree that September 2015 was an appropriate implementation date. Linked to this, a number of respondents suggested that if the Proposal was to be taken forward, adequate time was needed to plan for the potential impacts that have been described elsewhere.

- 8.19 Parents and carers have also commented on the affordability of childcare and the ability to move a child from a school setting to a childcare setting during the day, particularly if they are in employment. Should parents/carers have no other option than to enrol their child in pre-nursery education (provided in the morning, for example) and pay for different formal childcare in the afternoon, this will have a negative impact on their ability to work full-time.

- 8.20 The Proposal could lead to a much heavier reliance on informal childcare within Rhondda Cynon Taf. Consultation respondents echoed that, should the Proposal be agreed, parents and carers will need to rely much more heavily on family and friends to provide transportation and care to young children that would otherwise be in full-time (30 hours per week) nursery education.
- 8.21 The CSA found that this is already the favoured form of childcare in Rhondda Cynon Taf. Many parents are choosing to return to work on reduced hours rather than full-time, looking after their child some of the time and relying on grandparents or friends to care for their child while they are at work.
- 8.22 A recent study demonstrated that 63% of grandparents in Britain provide care, to their grandchildren under the age of 16, without the child's parents being there. Other studies have found that this is most likely to be grandmothers, in the 50-69 year old age group, providing care to younger grandchildren.
- 8.23 However, grandparents in the UK are also more likely to be in paid employment than in other European countries (approximately one in four in England, compared to one in seven in other European countries), and considering grandparents in Rhondda Cynon Taf are likely to be younger than the English average of 68 years old, it is likely that even more grandparents in the County Borough are still in paid work. This could have an impact on the availability of informal care.
- 8.24 Again, the true impact of the Proposal on parents and carers is dependent on the actions of schools and childcare providers, together with the continued work of the EYFSS, and this is discussed further below.
- 8.25 Evidence gathered through the Consultation and academic research suggests that any change to education provision relating to young children is likely to impact on females disproportionately to males. According to 2011 Census information, 119,775 members of the population are female compared to a total population of 234,410 in Rhondda Cynon Taf.
- 8.26 The Consultation outlined many specific reasons that the Proposal will impact negatively on females, which can be broadly categorised as issues relating to employment and childcare responsibilities. These are explored in further detail below.
- 8.27 The comments gathered during Consultation, and academic research suggests, that there is a division of labour in Rhondda Cynon Taf, which is typical of British society. For instance, in Rhondda Cynon Taf in 2011, there were 5,155 more women than men classed as 'economically inactive looking after home or family'. This demonstrates that women are more likely to assume the caring responsibilities for

children or other relatives. Men are, therefore, more likely to be economically active than women.

- 8.28 Despite this, the employment rates of mothers have increased. Across the UK, the percentage of married or cohabiting mothers with dependent children, in employment, has risen from 67% in 1996 to 72% in 2013. There has also been an increase from 43% to 63% in the employment rate of lone mothers over the same period. Although similar local statistics are not available, the percentage of working age females in employment has been increasing in Rhondda Cynon Taf - from 62.6% in March 2008 to 64.1% in March 2014.
- 8.29 The patterns of work, both in terms of hours in employment and employment sectors, continue to be different for men and women. For instance, across Wales, 90% of men in employment work full-time compared to 57% of women in employment. Additionally, 42% of women's full-time work in Wales takes places in the occupational areas of Sales, Administration and Personal Services compared to an average of 3.46% of men's full-time employment. When put together with Elementary occupations, these occupational areas make up 75% of women's part-time work.
- 8.30 One of the reasons for these statistics is that mothers are still less likely to work than women without children and they are far more likely to work part-time. For instance, when compared with other European countries, the UK falls furthest behind in employment rates for women with children aged 3-5 years old.
- 8.31 There are numerous reasons for this. One study suggests childcare affordability is the biggest barrier for mothers with young children to working more. The second biggest barrier, according to working mothers, was a lack of employer flexibility. For non-working mothers, the second most common reason for not working is the desire to be at home with their children.
- 8.32 Although this study was UK-wide, the findings, coupled with Consultation responses, suggest that, should the Proposal be agreed, the provision of affordable childcare will be a key element in mitigating the potential impact on females and their employment patterns in Rhondda Cynon Taf.
- 8.33 Women are also far more likely to be lone parents than men. Local statistics are not available, but nationally, 92% of lone parents were women in 2011. In total, there were 13,927 lone parents in Rhonda Cynon Taf at the time of the 2011 Census; less than half of these were classed as being economically active (5,464).
- 8.34 Being a lone parent can mean it is more difficult to be in employment and to raise children. Across the UK, for lone mothers with children aged up to 3 years old, 39% were in work in 2013, compared with 65%

of couples with children in the same age group. For mothers whose youngest child were primary school age (4-10 years old), employment rates were higher at 61% for lone parents and 74% of couples.

- 8.35 In Rhondda Cynon Taf, of those lone parents who were economically active, the majority were working part-time (5,130 in 2011). There were 3,770 lone parents who were economically inactive in 2011; the main reason cited for this was 'looking after home or family'.
- 8.36 Therefore, the Proposal will disproportionately impact on women's employment patterns; whether they are lone parents or in couple families. Academic research, statistics and consultation responses suggest that it is most likely to be women who do not return to work full-time unless they can secure affordable half-day childcare, make appropriate arrangements to transport their child, and/or make alternative arrangements for informal care.
- 8.37 These issues would be mitigated by any 'wraparound' care provision provided through schools, allowing mothers (in this case) to drop their child off in the morning and collect them at the end of the working day.
- 8.38 Academic research and Consultation results suggest that the level of affordability for any 'wraparound' service, or registered childcare provider, would also need careful consideration to allow women to continue working or training for work. The Council through the EYFSS and its partners would continue to support and signpost families to benefit entitlement services, working with families, particularly those in the most deprived areas, to ensure they are receiving the correct benefits and financial support. EYFSS officers have established that the average hourly cost for wraparound care in Blaenau Gwent is £4.42. Caerphilly CBC average hourly rate is £3.35. So, since most wraparound sessions are usually around 3 hours in duration, the average cost per session is £13.26 in Blaenau Gwent and £10.05 in Caerphilly.
- 8.39 If the Proposal is agreed and this causes an increased need for informal care, the working patterns of grandmothers may also be impacted in that they will be less able to work full-time, due to caring responsibilities.
- 8.40 It is worth noting that the survey that supported the Childcare Sufficiency Audit highlighted that whilst 70% of respondents considered that "childcare is too expensive" 21.6% considered that "childcare is a barrier to me accessing employment". Furthermore, of those respondents that did not use childcare 18.2% stated that the reason for not using childcare was that "childcare was too expensive".
- 8.41 Members should note that the process for registering childcare with CSSIW can take up to 6 months so should Members proceed with implementation of the Proposal EYFSS would, as they do now, work

with those parties interested in registering such childcare to assist them in completing this process in anticipation of the proposed September 2015 implementation date.

- 8.42 Following Cabinet's decision to initiate the Consultation the question whether the Proposal would enable the Council to continue to meet its "childcare sufficiency" duty was given further consideration by officers.
- 8.43 Taking into account the key themes emerging from the Consultation officers have investigated, as best as they are able to, what childcare needs would be created by the Proposal; and what provision is either in place to meet them now, or could be put in place (and within what timeframe it could be put in place).
- 8.44 Clearly the Council's CSA, Childcare Development Delivery Plan and the results of the Consultation have informed this process together with discussions held with local childcare providers and schools.
- 8.45 In addition officers of the EYFSS undertook consultation with a sample of childcare providers across the County Borough. The detail and outcome of this consultation can be found attached to Appendix 2 and Members should review the responses. A variety of different providers were contacted including childminders, full day care and sessional/full day providers. The definitions of what childcare provision those providers provide are outlined in that appendix.
- 8.46 Of those childcare providers consulted with 64.8% were already registered with CSSIW.
- 8.47 As can be seen at paragraph 6.14 of Appendix 2 officers have mapped (using the postcode information consultees provided) the areas where consultees cited in their response lack of childcare/wraparound provision in their area as a specific issue. This was then broken down into wards by officers. As referenced above the Council contacted a sample of headteachers during the Consultation and posed a series of questions to them. As part of the methodology for selecting the headteachers used in the sample the headteachers of schools in those areas where lack of childcare had been identified as an issue were targeted.
- 8.48 Of those headteachers who proposed recommending a change to part-time provision 13 out of 18 considered there would be a demand for 'wraparound childcare provision' and a majority indicated they had already consulted with parents regarding possible demand.
- 8.49 As referred to earlier, officers have defined 'wraparound care' provision as sessional care that starts immediately before or after the part-time school session, but during the normal school day. Wraparound care childcare providers can be based on school sites or can be based in

their own settings and can drop off or pick up children before or after their school nursery session.

- 8.50 Of those headteachers sampled 8 out the 18 headteachers indicated that if there was demand the School would offer wraparound care provision either on the School Site or through a local childcare provider. Some of the headteachers indicated there were no or limited facilities or space available on site for this provision and therefore a local childcare provider would have to offer this facility at their own setting in order for wraparound care provision to be available.
- 8.51 Headteachers were also asked “if they were considering offering childcare provision onsite whether they had considered when this could be put in place by?” A proportion indicated they would require additional information in this regard and clearly the EYFSS could make contact with these headteachers to assist them with this process if required. A number of headteachers also indicated they would like to receive further information generally as regards childcare provision and the EYFSS would make contact with these headteachers should Cabinet decide to implement the Proposal.
- 8.52 It is considered that this particular exercise has demonstrated that schools have consulted with parents as regards to whether there would be a demand for wraparound care provision in light of possible changes to provision of nursery education and that some schools would offer such a facility onsite if possible.
- 8.53 Also as outlined at paragraphs 7.32 – 7.34 there is a possibility that schools may continue to offer full-time provision which would have the effect of reducing the demand for childcare in any particular area but at this time it is unknown what percentage of schools this would be.
- 8.54 The majority of those providers contacted were in fact already registered with CSSIW. As noted above as part of the Council’s childcare sufficiency duties it is being able to access registered provision that forms a critical part of ensuring the Council’s compliance with those duties. Furthermore a number of those who were not currently registered were in the process of completing their application to CSSIW. Once submitted they would likely be registered in the next 6 months.
- 8.55 Those contacted were also asked whether they would be interested in exploring wraparound care provision and a large majority indicated they would be.
- 8.56 Those consulted were also given the opportunity to provide open feedback. As part of that feedback again a large majority indicated they were either planning on providing wraparound care provision or would do so subject to interest/demand. Other themes emerged from the open feedback. Some providers indicated any decisions they may take

regarding future provision were not, or only partly, influenced by any decision Cabinet may take in relation to the Proposal. Others viewed it as a business opportunity or were waiting to see what happens with the Proposal.

- 8.57 From the sample of childcare providers contacted 94.4% of respondents stated that they were interested, or either possibly interested, in exploring wraparound care provision. 72.2% of these said they were planning to offer or would probably offer wraparound care provision. Attached to Appendix 2 is a table which lists which schools the respondents would consider offering wraparound provision to.
- 8.58 As has been noted at paragraph 8.47 a number of responses to the Consultation indicated a lack of childcare provision in specific areas. Part of the information requested from consultees was their postcode. This was done to assist officers more readily identify any pattern in the responses and gaps (perceived or otherwise) in the market. Also attached to Appendix 2 is a review of those areas compared against the responses from the childcare provider consultation where it had been indicated that there could be provision or that they may be interested in offering wraparound care provision.
- 8.59 This exercise has helped highlight possible areas or gaps where there was no obvious provider who was offering or may be interested in offering wraparound provision. It is therefore these areas EYFSS officers, in accordance with the Council's statutory duties, could target should the Proposal be implemented to help address such gaps should they appear.
- 8.60 The EYFSS also note that there was a market reaction following the January 14 Decision and that they were contacted by local childcare providers and schools requesting assistance with setting up childcare provision prior to the outcome of the judicial review. It is anticipated therefore that there would be a similar market reaction should Cabinet decide to implement the Proposal.
- 8.61 As stated in the [report to Cabinet on 23 June 2014](#): "currently Rhondda Cynon Taf is well placed with its existing childcare provision to meet the needs of most working parents". However this report and the CSA were clearly completed when the Council, as it does now, funds schools so that they are able to provide full-time Nursery Education. The report identifies gaps in provision and how these will be filled. It must be appreciated that the demand and the market for childcare are not static, and given that it is a mainly commercial market, the Council cannot guarantee that in each electoral ward the supply of places will meet the demand. As outlined above the Council must ensure that at a community level, it is taking strategic action with its partners to address gaps in childcare. Officers consider the measures already being undertaken by the Council in this regard, together with those

highlighted in this report to address such gaps will ensure the Council continues to meet its statutory duties in respect of childcare.

- 8.62 Against the above background, it is clear the Proposal would change the market for childcare across the Council's area by raising the demand for childcare places both because of reduced school hours for some children, and because the Council has increased the number of hours of funded childcare from 10 hours to 15 hours for those children that cannot secure a childcare place at a suitable local school. At this point, officers' best assessment is that the Council would nevertheless be able to meet its duty under section 22 of the 2006 Act, if the Proposal were to proceed, based on the following matters:
- i. As stated in paragraphs 8.55-8.57 a very high proportion of providers are interested in providing wrap-around care. A large majority of the childcare providers consulted indicated they were either planning on providing wraparound care provision or would do so subject to interest/demand. From the sample of childcare providers contacted 94.4% of respondents stated that they were interested in exploring wraparound care provision. 72.2% of these said they were planning to offer or would probably offer wraparound care provision.
 - ii. Schools also appear to be working with parents to address the demand for wraparound care (paragraph 8.48), and the numbers of schools either willing to provide wraparound care themselves, or to offer it through a local childcare provider as referred to in paragraph 8.50 highlights this. The survey has demonstrated that schools have consulted with parents as regards to whether there would be a demand for wraparound care provision in light of possible changes to provision of nursery education and that some schools would offer such a facility onsite if possible.
 - iii. At least a substantial minority of schools (and potentially, a majority of schools) are likely to continue to provide full-time education for 3-year-olds, even if it is not funded by the Council. The best estimate at this stage about how many schools are likely to continue to provide full-time education (as highlighted in paragraphs 7.32-7.35 above), is between 40% and 60% based on (i) the decision schools took following the January 2014 Decision and (ii) the results of the Council's headteacher's survey.
 - iv. EYFSS is able to identify and target those areas where there appears to be no obvious provider at present who is offering or may be interested in offering wrap-around provision. In these areas, further work will be undertaken by EYFSS to find suitable providers/solutions to address the childcare needs of those areas and/or individual schools. This may include advertising opportunities for providers to establish new provision via an 'Expression of Interest' application process or by offering support and advice to existing providers in neighbouring areas.

- v. It is acknowledged that the Proposal will alter the number of parents who need to find childcare. However, the relatively low proportion of respondents to the Council's CSA that presently consider childcare is a barrier to them accessing employment (approximately one quarter of respondents to the CSA had children of nursery age) offers some reassurance that the Council is starting from a relatively good position in seeking to secure sufficient childcare for its area.

- 8.63 It would of course be necessary for officers to keep the position stated above under review, and to report back to Cabinet should their views on childcare sufficiency change in light of further information. Officers also recognise that there is an issue with the affordability of childcare for some parents. Officers would ensure that the EYFSS addressed problems with affordability, as far as practicable. The Council has also addressed issues of affordability, so far as reasonable, by increasing the numbers of funded childcare hours from 10 to 15 for those children who cannot secure a childcare place at a suitable local school. It is not considered practicable to provide further funding for childcare provision without undermining the costs savings sought to be made by the Proposal.

In order for the Council to continue to meet its statutory responsibilities in respect of the provision and sufficiency of childcare the Council has to currently produce an annual Childcare Sufficiency Audit refresh. The next refresh is due to be completed in April 2015. This refresh will therefore be published shortly after any decision Members may take in respect of the Proposal, and prior to the proposed implementation of it. Therefore it is unlikely to reflect the complete picture of the effect of implementation of the Proposal on childcare provision across Rhondda Cynon Taf. Clearly however, at the same time, it presents Members with a timely opportunity to receive an update as to the initial consequences and effects of any decision they may take as regards childcare provision. In addition, when appropriate data and evidence becomes available officers would report back to Members, for example through the Cabinet and Scrutiny monitoring process, in order to inform them of the outcomes and effects of the Proposal following implementation, particularly in respect of the issues raised in the Consultation and EIA as regards the Council's childcare sufficiency duties under the 2006 Act.

9. THE COUNCIL'S DUTY IN RESPECT OF CHILDREN IN NEED

- 9.1 The Council also has duties under section 17 and 18 of the Children Act 1989 ('the 1989 Act'). It is the duty of this Council to (a) safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need; and (b) so far as is consistent with that duty, to promote the upbringing of such children by their families, by providing a range and level of services appropriate to those children's needs.

- 9.2 For the purposes of the 1989 Act “children in need” are defined as follows:

A child shall be taken to be in need if-

- (a) He/She is unlikely to achieve or maintain, or to have the opportunity of achieving or maintaining, a reasonable standard of health or development without the provision for him/her of services by a local authority;
- (b) His/Her health or development is likely to be significantly impaired, or further impaired, without the provision for him/her of such services, or
- (c) He/She is disabled.

- 9.3 Under section 18 of the 1989 Act the Council must provide such day care for children in need within their area who are (a) aged five or under; and (b) not yet attending schools, as is appropriate. In particular regard must be had to the duty under section 18(5) to provide for children in need within its area, who are attending any school, such day care or supervised activities as is appropriate outside school hours.

- 9.4 Any change in provision of nursery education from full-time to part-time would clearly create an extra need for day care and/or supervised activities for children in need for the remainder of the day.

- 9.5 EYFSS currently runs a Holiday Fun Time scheme to offer respite care during holiday periods, with an aim to offer 2 x 3 hour sessions, per week for children with additional needs years and 2 x 6 hour sessions per week for children at risk of family breakdown. Attendance is via referrals from the families' Social Workers and the scheme is open to children and young people 0 - 14 years. The scheme is provided from childcare settings and play provider settings through the commissioned Open Access Play Schemes and by network childminders

- 9.6 The Council currently fulfils both the target duty under section 17 of the 1989 Act, and its duty under section 18 of the 1989 Act, to provide “appropriate” day care for children in need, through a range of services which identify children that are in need within its area, and provide care for them. For instance: -

- (1) Where a child resides in a designated Flying Start area they would have access to the Council’s Flying Start programme from birth (including enhanced health visiting, parenting support and early language development support). From the term following a child's 2nd birthday to the term following a child's 3rd birthday they are

entitled to a funded, high quality childcare place. The core Flying Start childcare offer is made available to parents of all eligible 2-3 year olds for 12.5 hours per week, 39 weeks of the year. In addition, there are a minimum of 15 sessions of flexible childcare provided for the child and family during the school holidays. Where a child has exceptional needs, consideration is given to offering an early placement to a child, i.e. before the beginning of the term after their second birthday.

The Council commissions private businesses and 3rd sector organisations to deliver Flying Start childcare provision as well as offering the provision through four of the five Council run day nurseries. EYFSS works closely with the Council's Procurement, Planning and Corporate Estates services to ensure that the most appropriate provider is commissioned to deliver the service in the most suitable and easily accessible location.

- (2) Children who are assessed to be at risk may have an agreed amount of childcare purchased on their behalf from the Council's budget to meet its duties under section 17 of the 1989 Act. The Council's Early Years and Family Support Service will find placements for children on request from social workers amongst a range of childcare providers.
- (3) Four of the five Council run day nurseries also offer Flying Start provision, with one nursery (Tonyrefail) also being a Registered Education Provider. Three are situated within the 100 most deprived Lower Super Output Areas in Rhondda Cynon Taf (out of 152). The Council also provides specific support to children with communication difficulties or an emerging diagnosis of autism in two Sure Steps childcare provisions and one Sure Steps Plus education provision.
- (4) There is also a wide range of additional services available within the Council's area to meet the needs of pre-school "children in need", including specific day care needs.

9.7 The care needs of individual families with children in need will inevitably be affected by their particular circumstances at any given point in time and by the particular local services available to them at that point. The Council works with these individual families to identify the specific needs of any child determined to be in need at that point in time.

9.8 In this way the Council will continue to meet its statutory duties under the 1989 Act and the Council does not envisage any further risk to children due to a reduction of hours in current nursery education provision. The services being provided, such as health visiting, social care etc., will continue to build on families strengths and abilities and help them to maintain an appropriate level of independence with a

suitable level of care and support. This will be further enhanced through community services including Communities First and 'Team Around the Family' where appropriate.

10. ERADICATING CHILD POVERTY & THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF A CHILD

10.1 Under the Children and Families (Wales) Measure 2010 the Council must: -

(a) prepare and publish a strategy for contributing to the eradication of child poverty which the Council has done through the adoption of the Single Integrated Plan. Cabinet Members will, of course, be familiar with the content of this plan and its predecessor, the Children and Young People's Plan 2011 - 2014; and

(b) take all reasonable steps to perform the actions and functions set out in the strategy for the eradication of child poverty. The actions and functions, and the steps the Council has done and will take to perform them, are again set out in the Single Integrated Plan.

10.2 It is a priority of the Council, and its partner organisations of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Service Board, to engage with families who have any additional needs as early as possible to support them to make the most of family life and reach their full potential.

10.3 Further consideration of the effect of the Proposal for issues of child poverty and social deprivation are explored as part of the EIA (as set out at Appendix 3).

10.4 The Council has also used as a basis for developing its priority of ensuring that the future generations of Rhondda Cynon Taf live in a safe, healthy and prosperous County Borough the shared set of rights for children and young people set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child. A link to a summary of these rights is provided below: -

[Summary of United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child](#)

10.5 In order to further assist Members and ensure compliance with the Council's duty the rights of children have been specifically considered in respect of the Proposal and this assessment forms part of the EIA annexed at Appendix 3 to the report.

11. DIVERSITY AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Cabinet Members will of course be fully aware and mindful of the general equality duty introduced by the Equality Act 2010 (the "Equality

Act”) and the specific public sector equality duties applicable to the Council as a local authority in Wales.

11.2 In accordance with the Equality Act, the Council (and consequently Cabinet) when exercising its functions has a general duty to have due regard to the need to:-

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

11.3 The duty covers the following eight protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. Public authorities also need to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination against someone because of their marriage or civil partnership status.

11.4 The Equality Act outlines that having due regard for advancing equality involves:

- removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics;
- taking steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these are different from the needs of other people; or
- encouraging people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low.

11.5 In addition to the general duty the Council must:

- assess the likely impact of proposed policies and practices on its ability to comply with the general duty;
- assess the impact of any policy which is being reviewed and of any proposed revision;
- publish reports of the assessments where they show a substantial impact (or likely impact) on an authority’s ability to meet the general duty; and
- monitor the impact of policies and practices on its ability to meet that duty.

11.6 Members will be aware that the Welsh language has official status in Wales which means that the Welsh language should not be treated less favourably than the English language in Wales. The EIA considers the potential impact of the Proposal on the Welsh language. Members

should also have regard to the Council's Welsh In Education Strategic Plan 2014-2017.

- 11.7 In accordance with the Council's duties the EIA as attached at Appendix 3 has been prepared alongside and supported by the Consultation for the Proposal.
- 11.8 The EIA considers the potential impact of the Proposal on the designated protected groups and identifies any potential mitigation either in place or which can be put in place.

12. **CONCLUSION**

- 12.1 In order for a fully informed decision to be taken on the Proposal it is now for Cabinet to review all the available information in respect of it particularly that information contained in this report, its appendices and the Consultation itself, including the Consultation responses Members have reviewed and decide on whether or not, and if so how, it wishes to proceed with the Proposal.
- 12.2 It is also recommended that Cabinet reflect the decision taken within the overarching 2015/16 Budget Strategy due to be presented to Council on the 4th of March 2015. If appropriate, any savings achievable in 2015/16 should be used to reduce the level of Transitional Funding (i.e. use of the Medium Term Financial Planning and Service Transformation Reserve) needed to deliver a balanced budget for that year.

APPENDIX 1A – ADMISSIONS MATRIX INITIAL LONG LIST

Option		3rd Birthday By:	Pre Nursery			Nursery			Reception		
			Age 3 In Year			Age 4 In Year			Age 5 In Year		
			Sept	Jan	Apr	Sept	Jan	Apr	Sept	Jan	Apr
1	Status Quo (Current) FT day after 3	Dec	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
2	FT term after 3	Dec	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
3	PT term after 3 FT Nurs Sept	Dec	NO	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	NO	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
4	PT term after 3 PT Nurs Sept FT Rec Sept	Dec	NO	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT
5	PT term after 3 FT term after 4 FT Rec Sept	Dec	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT
6	PT term after 3 PT Nurs FT term after 5	Dec	NO	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT
7	FT Sept after 3	Dec	NO	NO	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	NO	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	NO	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
8	PT Sept after 3 FT Rec Sept	Dec	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT
9	PT Sept after 3 FT Year 1	Dec	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT
		Mar	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	FT
		Aug	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT

NO = No admission

PT = Part Time

FT = Full Time

This page is left Blank.

APPENDIX 1B

INITIAL LONG LIST OF OPTIONS

Option		Advantages	Disadvantages	Recommended Option Yes/No
1	Status Quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Parents are able to return to work full-time in the term during their child's third birthday ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs ○ Early access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a positive impact on well-being ○ Access to home to school transport would encourage regular attendance at school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some disruption to the Class due to continuous entry of three year olds throughout the year ○ Staffing levels may not remain constant as there may be a need to appoint additional support staff during the academic year 	No

2	Full time the term after the Child's 3 rd birthday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Parents are able to return to work full-time the term following their child's third birthday ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs ○ Early access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a positive impact on well-being ○ Access to home to school transport would encourage regular attendance at school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some disruption to the Class due to termly entry of three year olds throughout the year ○ Staffing levels may not remain constant as there may be a need to appoint additional support staff during the academic year 	No
3	Part time (half day) the term after the Child's 3 rd birthday and Full time Nursery from September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Some parents may be able to return to work part-time the term following their child's third birthday. All parents can return to work from September. Early identification of children with additional learning needs ○ Early access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a positive impact on well-being ○ Access to home to school transport would encourage regular attendance at school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some disruption to the Class due to termly entry of three year olds throughout the year ○ Pre-nursery children who are entitled to free school meals and home to school transport would not be able to access them until they commence Nursery in the September Term 	No

<p>4</p>	<p>Part time (half day) the term after the Child's 3rd birthday and Part time (half day) Nursery from September and Full time Reception</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Some parents may be able to return to work part-time the term following their child's third birthday. Early identification of children with additional learning needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Nursery children who are entitled to free school meals would not be able to receive them ○ Nursery children who are entitled to home to school transport would not be able to access it ○ Children "at risk" may face greater risk at home due to not being in school full-time until Reception Year. ○ Parents may not be able to return to work prior to the reception year unless they can access childcare (or additional childcare). 	<p>No</p>
<p>4a</p>	<p>Part time (half day) the term after the Child's 3rd birthday and Part time (half day) Nursery from September and Full time Reception Plus half day Play funded by Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Parents can return to work full-time basis the term following their child's third birthday ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs ○ Early access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a positive impact on well-being ○ Access to home to school transport would encourage regular attendance at school ○ Opportunity for children to remain in same environment for whole day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disruption of teaching staff from morning to afternoon ○ Some schools may decide not to offer the Play facility and would cause an inequitable spread across the Authority ○ Place an administrative burden on the School/Authority to run the play facility ○ Place additional responsibility on School/Authority for registering the play setting to CSSIW and regular inspections etc 	<p>No</p>

<p>4b</p>	<p>Part time (half day) the term after the Child's 3rd birthday and Part time half day) Nursery from September and Full time Reception. Plus half day play charged to the parent.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Parents who can afford childcare can return to work full time. Parents who cannot afford childcare may be able to return to work part-time the term after their child's third birthday. ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs ○ Early access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a positive impact on well-being ○ Access to home to school transport would encourage regular attendance at school ○ Opportunity for children to remain in same environment for whole day ○ Revenue / income opportunity for School/Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disruption of teaching staff from morning to afternoon ○ Some schools may decide not to offer the Play facility and would cause an inequitable spread across the Authority ○ Place an administrative burden on the School/Authority to run the play facility ○ Place additional responsibility on School/Authority for registering the play setting to CSSIW and regular inspections etc ○ Placing an additional financial burden on the parent for the half day play facility which may result in many children not using the facility due to parents affordability ○ Parents may not be able to return to work prior to the reception year unless they can access childcare (or additional childcare). 	<p>No</p>
------------------	--	--	---	-----------

<p>5</p>	<p>Part time (half-day) the term after the Child's 3rd birthday and full time the term after the child's 4th birthday</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Some parents may be able to return to work part-time the term following their child's third birthday. ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some disruption to the Class due to termly entry of three year olds throughout the year and the existing pupils becoming full time during the year ○ Nursery children who are entitled to free school meals would not be able to receive them until the term after their 4th birthday ○ Nursery children who are entitled to home to school transport would not be able to access it until the term after their 4th birthday ○ Children "at risk" may face greater risk at home due to not being in school full-time until the term after their 4th birthday ○ Parents may not be able to return to work prior to the term following their child's fourth birthday unless they can access childcare (or additional childcare). 	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Part time (half day) the term after the Child's 3rd birthday, part time (half day) Nursery and part time (half day) Reception until the term after the child's 5th birthday</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Some parents may be able to return to work part-time the term following their child's third birthday. ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delayed access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a negative impact on well-being ○ Delayed access to home to school transport would not assist and/or encourage regular attendance at school ○ Reduction in the hours of schooling may have a negative impact on the pace of learning, progress and achievement 	<p>No</p>

			<p>especially in respect of the new Statutory Literacy and Numeracy Framework which starts at Reception</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Standards in Welsh medium schools may be compromised if the opportunity for education provision is limited, the expected level of Welsh Literacy by the end of Foundation Phase may not be achieved. ○ Parents may not be able to return to work prior to the term following their child's fifth birthday unless they can access childcare (or additional childcare). 	
7	Single point admission in September - Full time Nursery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Parents are able to return to work full-time the September following their child's third birthday ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs ○ Early access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a positive impact on well-being ○ Access to home to school transport would encourage regular attendance at school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not offering a pre Nursery would delay children commencing school and may have a negative impact on progress. ○ Children "at risk" may face greater risk at home due to a delayed start in school 	No

8	Single point admission in September - Part time nursery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Some parents may be able to return to work part-time the term following their child's third birthday. ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delayed access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a negative impact on well-being ○ Delayed access to home to school transport would not assist and encourage regular attendance at school ○ Parents may not be able to return to work unless they can access childcare (or additional childcare). 	No
9	Single point admission in September - Part time (half day) nursery and reception with phased full-time reception the term after children turn 5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early establishment of relationships between parents and the school impacts on pupils well-being, progress and achievement ○ Some parents may be able to return to work part-time the term following their child's third birthday. ○ Early identification of children with additional learning needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delayed access to free school meals for vulnerable children would have a negative impact on well-being ○ Delayed access to home to school transport would not assist and encourage regular attendance at school ○ Reduction in the hours of schooling may have a negative impact on the pace of learning, progress and achievement, especially the new Statutory Literacy and Numeracy Framework which starts at Reception. ○ Standards in Welsh medium schools may be compromised if the opportunity for education provision is limited, the expected level of Welsh Literacy by the end of Foundation Phase may not be achieved. ○ Parents may not be able to return to work unless they can access childcare (or additional childcare). 	No

This page is left Blank.

APPENDIX 2

This page is left Blank.



Funding for Nursery Education Consultation Report

February 2015

Consultation Team

SIAL£NS 
CYLLID
Rhondda Cynon Taf

Rhondda Cynon Taf 
BUDGET
CHALLENGE

CONTENTS

Section		Page
	Executive Summary	4
1	Introduction	7
2	Background	8
3	Methodology	9
4	Proposal – Funding for Nursery Education	16
5	The Need for Service Change	17
6	General Views	19
7	Parent/Carer Feedback	27
8	School Council Consultation	41
	Appendix 1 – Summary of Responses	44
	Appendix 2 – Consultation Materials	49
	Appendix 3 – Headteacher Analysis	49
	Appendix 4 – Childcare Analysis	54

List of figures

Figure		Page
1	Responses by Postcode where provided	15
2	Council need for reduction in services	17
3	Agreement with review of Council services	18
4	Funding for nursery education agreement	19
5	Protecting current full-time provision users	19
6	Implementation date	20
7	Full-time provision starting terms	20
8	Agreement with overall proposal	20
9	Areas where lack of childcare provision concerns were expressed	21
10	Nursery education attendees	27
11	Relationship to child	27
12	Level of attendance	28
13	Single parent	28
14	Impact on single parents	29
15	Welsh language setting attendance	30
16	Welsh language impact on Families	30
17	Disability	31
18	Disability impact on family	31
19	Part-time sufficiency	32
20	Sufficient Nursery Education	32
21	Impact of family and children	32
22	Need for childcare	34
23	Part-time nursery funding impact on work / training / education	34
24	Impact on ability to work/train/education	35
25	Working pattern	36
26	Impact on working pattern	36
27	Help to work / complete training / education	37
28	Reasons why impact upon family	37
29	Protected Characteristics	38
30	Protected Characteristic impact	39

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This section outlines a summary of the main issues and themes raised during the consultation process.
- This report sets out the key issues and themes that have arisen as part of the consultation process. This along with access to the full responses received will provide the Cabinet with the materials needed to assist in the final decision making process on the proposal. The consultation results will need to be considered in conjunction with the Equality Impact Assessment and any other information that is available on the proposed service changes.
- The Council is facing an unprecedented financial challenge over the next 3 years and all services and their delivery must be assessed. This consultation report relates to the proposal that was put before Cabinet on 10th October, 2014 entitled, School Admission Arrangements – Funding for the provision of Nursery Education. The proposal is outlined in more detail in section 4. If implemented, the proposals contained in this report would deliver £2.166M of savings per year for the Council (full year savings).
- At the 10th October meeting, Cabinet agreed to proceed to a formal consultation on the proposals. The consultation began on the 21st October and was due to end on the 16th December, 2014. However, after the consultation had begun, a Supreme Court ruling in Haringey Council meant that the Council decided to issue further information on the alternative options which had been considered when putting the proposal together. As a result of this, the consultation was extended until the 30th January 2015.
- The consultation has been conducted in-house. Before beginning the consultation, discussions were held between officers on the most effective approach to take to ensure that everyone who was potentially affected by the service changes would be able to have their say. The consultation process and materials were agreed by the Council's Corporate Management Team. The consultation materials were considered to provide clear information in an appropriate and understandable format.
- This report attempts to provide a readable summary of the main responses received. No attempt at recommendations are made; the document has been put together impartially and will be presented to Cabinet to aid decision making.
- The following number of responses were received;
 - 679 online/paper questionnaires
 - 40 emails (including attachments, such as letters)
 - 8 letters

Total 727

- Questionnaire respondents recognised that there was a need for service change and a review of all existing services, when seen in the context of the budget savings that need to be made by the Council. 73.9% of respondents stated that they understand why the Council needs to reduce services. 51.1% of respondents agreed that the Council should be reviewing all services and the way in which they are provided and that it was a reasonable approach to take.

Summary of Responses

- Open responses in relation to the proposal (general Question 7, letters, emails) were received from 496 individuals. The number of views expressed totalled 1455.
- A number of themes emerged from the analysis of the proposal as follows;
 - General Lack of Sufficient Childcare
 - Need to stop or reduce work, training or education
 - Negative Impact on Learning and Education
 - Negative Impact on social skills
 - Impact on Deprived communities
 - Impact on working families
 - Financial Impact Personal/Wider economy
 - Impact on Vulnerable Children/ Children with a Disability
 - Ample notice should be given
 - Cuts should be made elsewhere
- **679 questionnaires were received.**
- From the 659 responses to question 3, 574 (87.1%) of respondents stated that they generally disagreed with the proposal on funding for nursery education.
- There was overwhelming support for protecting children who are already receiving full-time provision, with 95.9% of respondents agreeing that this was important.
- The majority of respondents felt that, if the proposal was implemented, September 2015 was not an appropriate implementation date. (83.5%).
- 86.2% of respondents thought that, if implemented, full-time provision should be effective from the term following a child's 4th birthday.
- 79.4% of respondents to the questionnaire currently had a child or children that attended nursery education or would have in the future.
- 77.5% of respondents to the questionnaire (who had child(ren) in nursery education or would have in the future) were the child or children's mother.

-
- 32.6% of respondents stated that they currently had child(ren) in full- time/ full day nursery education, with 24.5% stating that they will be attending full-time soon.
 - 11.2% of respondents were single parents.
 - 28.5% of respondents stated that they attend a Welsh nursery or childcare setting.
 - 2.8% of respondents reported that their child(ren) have a disability that requires special support.
 - 7.5% of respondents to the questionnaire felt that part-time nursery education was sufficient for their child(ren).
 - 86.9% of respondents stated that they currently use or will shortly need childcare to help them to work.
 - 51.4% of respondents would need to find a childcare provider, 37.5% suggest that they might have to give up work, training or education to undertake childcare.
 - 23.6% of respondents said they worked shifts or unusual hours.

Next Steps

- This report will be presented to Cabinet for consideration, Cabinet have also had the opportunity to review the filed responses which are available, before any final decisions on the proposal for Funding for Nursery Education are made.
- The consultation results, although an important part of the decision making process, are not the only consideration to take into account. The Cabinet will also need to consider other information available alongside the consultation responses (for example the results of the Equality Impact Assessment).

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report presents the consultation findings for the Council's service change proposal – Funding for Nursery Education.
- 1.2 Section 2 provides some brief background information on the budget gap faced by the Council.
- 1.3 Section 3 provides detail of the methodology used.
- 1.4 Section 4 outlines the details of the proposed service change to the funding of nursery education.
- 1.5 Section 5 shows the need for service change responses.
- 1.6 Section 6 provides a summary of the general views.
- 1.7 Section 7 provides a summary of the views of parents and carers.
- 1.8 Section 8 shows the results of a number of engagement exercises with School Councils.
- 1.9 Appendix 1 outlines a detailed summary of responses.
- 1.10 Appendix 2 provides the consultation materials that were used.
- 1.11 Appendix 3 shows an analysis of headteacher views.
- 1.12 Appendix 4 outlines the results of a survey with childcare providers.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Council is facing a significant financial challenge into the medium term and all services and their delivery must be assessed.
- 2.2 On the 29th October 2014, Council received a report on the implications of the provisional local government settlement for 2015/16, as announced on the 8th October 2014. This confirmed that the Council was facing an initial budget gap for 2015/16 of £30.450M, which after taking into account decisions already made during 2014/15 would reduce to £22.646M.
- 2.3 On the 22nd January 2015 the Cabinet agreed a draft budget strategy for 2015/16 which included the implications of the final settlement, a recommended 3.8% Council Tax increase, an increased tax base, plus a number of base budget updates. The resultant budget gap was £16.526M for 2015/16.
- 2.4 The draft budget strategy includes a number of proposals to deal with the budget gap, including the use of £6.592M from the Medium Term Financial Planning and Service Transformation Reserve, reducing the balance of this reserve to £0.5M.
- 2.5 In respect of the medium term forecast, the draft strategy indicated that a remaining projected budget gap to 2017/18 of £46M still needed to be addressed.
- 2.6 Given the size of the budget gap faced and the timescale requirements for any implementation of service changes, Cabinet agreed to receive reports on potential service change / cut proposals as soon as these become available.
- 2.7 This consultation report relates to the proposal that was put before Cabinet on 10th October, 2014 entitled, School Admission Arrangements – Funding for the provision of Nursery Education. The proposal is outlined in more detail in section 4. If implemented, the proposals contained in this report would deliver £2.166M of savings per year for the Council.
- 2.8 At the 10th October meeting, Cabinet agreed to proceed to a formal consultation on the proposals. The consultation began on the 21st October and was due to end on the 16th December, 2014. However, after the consultation had begun, a Supreme Court ruling in Haringey Council meant that the Council decided to issue further information on the alternative options which had been considered when putting the proposal together. As a result of this, the consultation was extended until the 30th January 2015.
- 2.9 The following section outlines the methodology used in the consultation.

3. METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 The consultation has been conducted in-house. Before beginning the consultation, discussions were held between officers on the most effective approach to take to ensure that everyone who was potentially affected by the service changes would be able to have their say. The process was designed to be open and transparent.

Consultation Materials

- 3.2 The questionnaire and consultation materials were prepared working closely with the appropriate service managers and a working group met on a regular basis.
- 3.3 The consultation process and materials were agreed by the Council's Corporate Management Team. The consultation materials were considered to provide clear information in an appropriate and understandable format.
- 3.4 The questionnaire was piloted internally. The questionnaire allowed opportunity to provide free text, allowing any comment/view to be expressed. The questionnaire is found in Appendix 2, along with the consultation booklets.
- 3.5 The questionnaire included a section on protected characteristics. The Council is required to consider people with these protected characteristics as part of their obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and the resultant Public Sector Equality Duties.

The Consultation

- 3.6 The consultation began on the 21st October 2014 and was due to end on the 16th December, 2014. However, after the consultation had begun, a Supreme Court ruling at Haringey Council, meant that the Council decided to issue further information on the alternative options which had been considered when putting the proposal together. As a result of this, the consultation was extended until the 30th January 2015.

Distribution

- 3.7 The materials were printed in house and the distribution of materials was undertaken by Council couriers. The following lists the approximate number of booklets that were distributed;
- Schools (A copy for every parent/carer)
 - 94 Primaries including 3 Welsh Units – 18930
 - 14 Welsh Schools – 3910
 - Secondary Schools 13330
 - 4 Welsh Medium – 3030

- Special Schools/ PRU - 590
- 1 Nursery – 40
- Registered Childcare providers – 106
- Flying Start – 3000
- Looked After Children (LAC) – 300
- School Governors – 1600
- Headteachers (email)

- Doctor's Surgeries - 2650
- Libraries – 650
- Leisure Centres – 220
- Communities First Offices – 200
- Main Receptions – 200
- One4All Centres – 200
- Contact Centre on request – 200
- Spares held in Clydach – 200

- 3.8 This equates to over 45,000 copies in total.
- 3.9 Anyone, whether an individual or an organisation in Rhondda Cynon Taf, could take part in the consultation, including employees of the Council.
- 3.10 The consultation was promoted to the press via press releases and the coverage included Wales Online, the Rhondda Leader, Cynon Valley Leader and Pontypridd Observer, South Wales Echo and BBC website. There was also coverage on local radio station GTFM.
- 3.11 Welsh copies were made available, as well as the option for other formats on request.
- 3.12 An online web page was created along with the option of an online survey. A web logo box was placed on the front of the website for ease of access. The online survey was sent out to over 400 Citizens' Panel members with email addresses.
- 3.13 A link to the online page was placed on Social Media. Twitter advertised the consultation, to the Council's 6,400 followers. The Leader of the Council undertook a live session via twitter that allowed people to ask questions about the service change proposal.
- 3.14 A dedicated telephone number was set up in the Council's Contact Centre to deal with any queries on this proposal, as well as the proposal for the Council Funded Music Service and to distribute materials as necessary. 61 calls were received and callers were issued with consultation packs where requested. In addition the One4aLL centres issued packs on request.
- 3.15 A dedicated email address and free post address were also provided.

- 3.16 All correspondence was dealt with as quickly and efficiently as possible, this included acknowledging comments when requested, passing on questions to the relevant services and passing on and working with the complaints department to ensure a fast response and turnaround.
- 3.17 A number of Councillors provided verbal comments at the Cabinet meeting of the 10th October, 2014. These were noted at the meeting and have been included in the consultation process.
- 3.18 Local Engagement sessions were held across the Borough to discuss and share views on the proposal as follows;
- Monday 10th November (4pm-7pm) Trerhondda Chapel, Ferndale
 - Monday 17th November (4pm-7pm) Sobell Leisure Centre, Aberdare
 - Thursday 20th November (4pm-7pm) Tonyrefail Leisure Centre
 - Wednesday 3rd December (4pm-7pm) Cynon Valley Indoor Bowls, Mountain Ash
 - Thursday 4th December (4pm-7pm) Training room 2, YMCA Pontypridd
 - Wednesday 10th December (4pm-7pm) Rehearsal room, Coleg y Cymoedd, Rhondda
 - Thursday 15th January (1-5pm) Abercynon Leisure Centre
 - Monday 26th January (1-7pm) Ystrad Sports Centre
 - Tuesday 27th January (1-7pm) Llantrisant Leisure Centre
- 3.19 Representatives from both the Council's Education and Early Years and Family Support Service ('EYFSS') Departments were present at each session, along with a Finance Officer.
- 3.20 A number of sessions were held with young people via School Councils. The young people were given the opportunity to complete the consultation during focus groups held within school times.
- 3.21 The 2015/16 Budget Challenge Consultation school sessions were held throughout November and December 2014 and included 6 focus groups of pupils with the School Councils at the following schools:
- Ysgol Llanhari;
 - Treorchy Comprehensive School;
 - Ysgol Gynradd Gymraeg Aberdar;
 - St John Baptist CIW High School;

- Maesybryn Primary School;
 - Cŵm Clydach Primary School.
- 3.22 Sessions were held during lesson time at each school. A total of **91** pupils took part, 17 from Llanhari and 19 from Treorchy, 11 from Ysgol Aberdar, 12 from St John Baptist, 17 from Maesybryn and 15 from Cwm Clydach. The pupils ranged from age 7-11 years old (**n=43**) and 12-18 years old (**n=48**). Pupils ranged from key stage 2 (Primary Juniors) up to and including key stage 5 (6th Form).
- 3.23 In order to engage with young people the consultation process was similar to the approach used as part of the main consultation, but tailored specifically for children and young people.
- 3.24 In addition to this main consultation report, a survey of a sample of Headteachers was undertaken, to consider their views on the service change proposals. The results are found in Appendix 3
- 3.25 Also in addition to the main consultation report, a consultation was undertaken with a sample of childcare providers, by the Early Years and Family Support Service. The aim was to investigate the childcare needs that might result from the proposal.

Analysis and Report Writing

- 3.26 The analysis of the quantitative data (from the questionnaire) was undertaken using SNAP survey software.
- 3.27 The analysis of the qualitative data was undertaken by using a standardised coding template, which was developed in line with the main themes identified when reviewing responses as they were received.
- 3.28 All responses were allocated a unique reference number upon receipt. They were then read and coded against the template, using as many codes as necessary. Once coded they were input into a database to record and capture all responses against the coded themes. The hard copies were then ordered and filed.
- 3.29 Internal Audit has undertaken a walkthrough review of the consultation exercise and internal quality assurance processes.
- 3.30 The report attempts to provide a readable summary of the main issues identified in the responses received. No recommendations are made, the document has been put together impartially and is presented to Cabinet to aid decision making.

Note: Where % respondents are referred to in the tables in the report, it refers to the % of base respondents who answered that particular question.

Note: Where totals do not add up to 100% this is due to rounding and where respondents were able to choose more than one answer.

Responses Received

3.31 There was a large response to the consultation, with the following number of responses received;

- 679 online/paper questionnaires
- 40 emails (including attachments, such as letters)
- 8 letters

Total 727

3.32 The list below shows some of the stakeholder groups that submitted written submissions to the consultation;

Political Groups

- Plaid Cymru – The Party of Wales

Voluntary/Community Groups/Special interest/Schools

- Parents Against the Cuts to Education in RCT
- Governing Body of Parc Primary School
- RhAG - Rhieni Dros Addysyg Gymraeg – Parents for Welsh medium Education
- Gwaunmeisgyn Primary School

Assembly Members (AMs)

- Leanne Wood AC/AM - Plaid Cymru - South Wales Central Assembly Member
- Eluned Parrott - Assembly Member for South Wales Central

Local Authority Councillors

- Cllr Shelley Rees-Owen
- Cllr Mike Powell
- Cllr Pauline Jarman

Trade Unions

- UCAC - National Union of Teachers of Wales
- RCT NUT

3.33 The map on the following page shows the distribution of the respondents across Rhondda Cynon Taf by postcode (figure 1)

- 3.34 The Cabinet will be able to view all of the online and hard copy filed responses, as well as considering the report findings, before any final decisions are made. It is useful to note that the consultation results, although an important part of the decision making process, are not the only consideration to take into account. The Cabinet will also need to consider other information available alongside the consultation responses (for example, the results of the Equality Impact Assessment).




Figure 1 - Responses by Postcode where provided

4. Proposal – Funding for Nursery Education

- 4.1 It is proposed that we seek to amend the way in which school entry arrangements (subject to school capacity) are funded across all of our schools.
- 4.2 The proposed funding arrangement should be based on:
- Part-time (half day) (15 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 3rd birthday (pre-nursery and nursery);
 - Full-time (30 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 4th birthday (nursery and reception); and
 - Funding up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary or independent registered education providers from the term following the child's third birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school (n.b. in this context 'suitability' shall relate to the availability of a place at a school which, in the Council's opinion, is within a reasonable radius of the child's ordinary place of residence i.e. where those with parental responsibility for the child live).
- 4.3 Under the proposal children already in receipt of full-time nursery provision (during the 2014 - 2015 academic year) would continue to be funded for full-time provision i.e. they would not be affected by the Proposal.
- 4.4 Whilst actual arrangements for initial school entry are effectively a matter for individual headteachers under the Local Management of Schools Scheme, it is proposed that the way in which the Council funds schools would be in line with the above criteria.
- 4.5 The proposal would see the removal of the provision of home to school transport and school meal provision for part-time pupils.
- 4.6 It is proposed that should Cabinet subsequently decide to proceed with the proposal that implementation take effect from 1st September 2015.
- 4.7 If implemented, the proposals contained in this report would deliver £2.166M of savings per year for the Council.

5. THE NEED FOR SERVICE CHANGE

- 5.1 As documented in the remainder of this report, there is wide spread opposition to the changes proposed. However, most of the respondents recognised that there was a need for service change and a review of all existing services, when set against the context of the budget savings that need to be made by the Council.
- 5.2 A series of general questions on the service change proposals as a whole were included in the questionnaire.
- 5.3 73.9% of respondents who completed the questionnaire stated that they understand why the Council needs to reduce services.

Do you understand why the Council needs to reduce services?




Figure 2 – Council need for reduction in services

- 5.4 51.1% of respondents who completed the questionnaire agreed that the Council should be reviewing all services and the way in which they are provided and that it was a reasonable approach to take.

The Council is reviewing all of its services and the way in which they are provided. Do you agree this is a reasonable approach?




Figure 3 – Agreement with review of Council services

6. GENERAL VIEWS

- 6.1 This section provides a summary of the general feedback received on the proposal. It includes letters, emails and the responses submitted as part of the online survey and from the returned paper surveys.
- 6.2 As stated in the methodology, all responses were considered, coded, input and filed. All of the open responses received have been numbered and filed.
- 6.3 This approach will hopefully provide a document that is accessible to the reader, as a summary of the main points taken from a wide range of often extensive submissions.
- 6.4 **679 questionnaires were received.**
- 6.5 From the 659 responses to question 3, 574 (87.1%) of respondents stated that they generally disagreed with the proposal on funding for nursery education.

Do you generally agree with the proposal on funding for nursery education?	
Base	659
Yes	12.9%
No	87.1%

Figure 4– Funding for nursery education agreement

- 6.6 There was overwhelming support for protecting children who are already receiving full-time provision, with 95.9% of respondents agreeing that this was important.

Do you agree that protecting children already receiving full-time provision is important?	
Base	660
Yes	95.9%
No	4.1%

Figure 5 – Protecting current full-time provision users

6.7 The majority of respondents felt that, if the proposal was implemented, September 2015 was not an appropriate implementation date. (83.5%).

Do you agree that, if implemented, September 2015 is an appropriate implementation date?	
Base	654
Yes	16.5%
No	83.5%

Figure 6 – Implementation date

6.8 86.2% of respondents thought that, if implemented, full-time provision should be effective from the term following a child’s 4th birthday.

Do you think that, if implemented, full-time provision should be effective from:	
Base	530
a)The term following a child’s 4th birthday	86.2%
b)The September following a child’s 4th birthday	10.4%
c)The term following a child’s 5th birthday (ie compulsory school age)	3.4%

Figure 7 – Full-time provision starting terms

6.9 **Open responses (from question 7, letters and emails) were received from 496 individuals. The number of views expressed totalled 1455.**

6.10 In addition to the 87.1% who do not agree with the proposal in the questionnaire (see 6.5), the following shows a summary of the open comments received in question 7 and via emails and letters.

	Agree	Disagree
Overall Proposal	9	434

Figure 8 – Agreement with overall proposal

6.11 As shown above there were a small number of responses in support of the proposed changes, including;

“Very few countries in Europe have a policy of all children starting school permanently at 3. A number of countries have later starting ages

such as the scandinavian stats and Germany and they have far better education levels.”

“If people can't afford them they shouldn't have them!”

6.12 However, the vast majority of respondents are against the proposal.

6.13 The following are the main themes/concerns to emerge from the consultation on the proposal overall, based on the open responses, in letters, emails and question 7 in the questionnaire.

- General Lack of Sufficient Childcare (number = 101)
- Need to stop or reduce work, training or education (number = 65)
- Negative Impact on learning and education (number = 93)
- Negative Impact on social skills (number = 82)
- Impact on Deprived communities (number = 83)
- Impact on working families (number = 86)
- Financial Impact personal (number = 66) / Wider economy (number = 28)
- Ample notice should be given (number = 40)
- Cuts should be made elsewhere (number = 83)

Some further detail and a selection of comments received are outlined below. Many of the themes are interrelated and can be considered together.

6.14 General Lack of Sufficient Childcare (number = 101)

101 open responses from all questions received indicated that there were was not enough alternative provision of childcare or wrap around childcare in the area that the respondents lived. The table below shows those areas where this was reported by postcode.

Respondents Stating That Lack of Childcare/Wraparound Provision is An Issue

Ward	PostCode	Total
Aberaman South	CF44 6	1
Aberdare West/ Llwydcoed	CF44 8	1
Beddau	CF38 2	2
Brynna	CF72 9	6
Church Village	CF38 1	2
	CF38 2	1
Cilfynydd	CF37 4	2
Cwmbach	CF44 0	1
Cymmer	CF39 9	2
Ferndale	CF43 4	2
Graig	CF37 1	1
Hirwaun	CF44 9	2

Llanharan	CF72 9	1
Llanharry	CF72 9	4
Llantrisant Town	CF38 2	1
	CF72 8	3
Llantwit Fardre	CF38 2	4
Maerdy	CF43 4	1
Penrhiwceiber	CF45 3	1
Pen-y-graig	CF40 1	3
Pen-y-waun	CF44 9	1
Pont-y-clun	CF72 8	8
	CF72 9	3
Pontypridd Town	CF37 2	2
Porth	CF39 0	1
	CF39 9	2
Rhondda	CF37 1	3
	CF37 2	2
Taffs Well	CF15 7	1
Ton-teg	CF38 1	2
Tonypanyd	CF40 1	1
Tonyrefail East	CF39 8	4
Tonyrefail West	CF39 8	9
	CF40 1	2
Trallwng	CF37 4	1
Trealaw	CF40 2	1
Treorchy	CF42 6	2
Tyn-y-nant	CF38 2	1
Ynysybwl	CF37 3	1
Ystrad	CF41 7	2
No PostCode		11
TOTAL		101

Figure 9 – Areas where lack of childcare provision concerns were expressed

“There simply isn’t enough provision for childcare outside of school hours if children are expected to be on part time schooling. There needs to be a realistic assessment on whether there are enough childminders/crèches both in the public and private sector than can not only meet the new demand for part time childcare and even its logistics such as transport of children from school to said providers.”

“Childcare provision is unsuitable at the current time across certain areas in RCT for part time education to be sustainable particularly in the Welsh medium sector. We are constantly referred to other neighbouring counties where part time is offered, however these areas have greater childcare provision. The timescale proposed does not give childcare

providers the opportunity of rectifying the lack of provision in time for the proposed stat of the reduced nursery provision and therefore there will be a distinct lack of childcare available.”

“There is no wrap around care provisions in the area for this to be a realistic option!”

6.15 Need to stop or reduce work, training or education (number = 65)

A number of respondents (65) indicated that the proposal could lead to parents having to give up their jobs to look after children, or stop training or education that they were currently participating in.

“Will there be enough help with child care? I will have to give up my job if my son doesn't go to school full time sept 2015 or if we don't have help with child care costs”

“I do not agree with the proposal at all. There should be full time education from when a child turns three. Your proposal will have a massive impact on their education and on family lives where parents will have to leave full time jobs etc you will be putting more families in poverty.”

“This would be a disaster for me and my family I'd have to give up work u have no idea how much stress and worry this is putting on parents of young children”

6.16 Negative Impact on Learning and Education (number = 93)

93 respondents were concerned that there would be a negative impact on educational standards as a result of the proposal.

“I am concerned about the impact on the educational needs of the children affected, if cuts are made to education, who ensures that the 'quality' you refer too will be in each school to replace quantity?.....”

“Education is one of the most important aspects of a child's growth and development. Removing this opportunity from our children will mean a drop in the standard of our children's school ability. Having worked in schools and seeing the difference in children having been at nursery from 3 and those starting at 4 there is a huge difference in ability which shows throughout their schooling.....”

“U are taking away my child's right to learn and develop when he is at an age where he is like a sponge. He will be at a disadvantage compared to other areas”

6.17 Negative Impact on social skills (number = 82)

Linked to the impact on learning and development outlined above and often reported together was a perceived negative impact on the social

skills of young people, including confidence building, development of social skills and children becoming independent.

"I think nursery provision should remain as full time from the age of 3 as having this is so beneficial to a child's development. Children thrive on being in school to enhance their social mental and behavioural skills. I am dead against the proposal to cut nursery provisions and surely there is money that can be saved elsewhere"

".....His educational and social development and that of other children in his nursery class who had similar childcare is far ahead of those children whose parents chose not to work and care for their children instead...."

6.18 Impact on Deprived communities (number = 83)

83 respondents suggested that in areas of deprivation there was a need for extra support for families and children and that the suggested proposal would take away a level of support that would ultimately lead to a negative impact on the young people in those deprived communities.

"Education is vital for children. Early education especially so here in deprived RCT. It's a tragedy that this is being considered ahead of more basic issues....."

"full time provision should stay available for children following the term after their 3rd birthday. with low levels of literacy & numeracy in rct & deprived areas it is important that children gain access to full time education from age 3....."

"We live in a deprived area where children come from tough back grounds. By starting school at 3 schools are able to help children who may present with SEN early enough to start them on the right educational path."

"rct is a deprived area and i feel that vulnerable children will be put at more risk by being left out of school till a later age!"

"In a deprived area such as RCT, we see children now entering school with less and less of the social and educational skill upon which they can develop through their time in school. By delaying their entry into full time education, surely this will only add to an already growing problem in our area."

6.19 Impact on working families (number = 86)

Respondents reported a disproportionate impact on working families as a major concern and links with some of the other themes reported, such as the potential need to give up work, training or education and the perceived lack of sufficient childcare.

“..... I am currently in a full working family constantly struggling to afford full time crèche fees for my two young children. Yet RCT now feel it the right move to engulf a raise in school age with no thought to full working families who will not benefit with part time schooling up until the age of five.....”

“..... The council must also think of the working parents out there who need to cover child care costs in which we get no help as we work.....Start thinking about your average working family.”

**6.20 Financial impact personal (number = 66)
Wider economy (number = 28)**

Respondents reported that the proposal could result in parents suffering financially due to childcare costs and the potential for a reduction in working hours that may need to be made. In addition a number of respondents were concerned about the impact on the wider economy as a result of increasing unemployment and a potential increase in benefit payments.

“Working mother, will have to reduce my hours at work, which means my annual income will reduce and I will be unable to afford my monthly outgoings. My employer may not authorise a reduction in hours and I will have to find alternative work to suit the part-time school provision. I am unable to afford child care as wrap around service.”

“fulltime. As a mother who works fulltime I would be better off at home and not paying extortionate fees for childcare. This would only encourage mothers to stay away from work for longer”

“Cutting nursery education is not only going to have a profound affect on children but also working parents and those working in education. Which will then result in a loss of many jobs. This will then result in a big increase of benefit claims!”

6.21 Ample notice should be given (number = 40)

As shown in section 6.7, 83.5% of respondents did not agree that September 2015 was an appropriate implementation date. Linked to this, a number of respondents suggested that if the proposal was to be taken forward, adequate time was needed to plan for the potential impacts that have been described elsewhere. As mentioned previously, there was a recognition of the budget challenge that the Council faces, the views expressed here outlined the need for time to implement proposals.

“ As we said above, we completely understand that budgets have been cut, but could you please speak to the Assembly on our behalf and make decision makers aware that making last minute changes puts both families and employers in a stressful situation and is surely not good for the overall economy”

"..... I feel that September 2015 is perhaps too early to implement the change and families need more notice."

"This does not give parents reasonable time to arrange suitable follow on child care arrangements for the 3 year old children who are due to start full time nursery in September 2015. If the proposed idea is agreed this needs a later implementation date to allow the future years nursery children and parents time to make the necessary child care arrangements."

6.22 Cuts should be made elsewhere (Number = 83)

Respondents suggested that cuts should be made elsewhere. Most of the comments did not directly offer alternatives, with the most common responses relating to Councillor and officer pay and expenses.

"Education should not be affected by these budget cuts, perhaps the council should be looking at cutting the number of councillors that do very little for their wage!"

"Education and nursery provision is very important and cuts should not be made to this area!"

"Maybe you should look at reducing big bosses wages instead of taking our children's right to education away from them they are our future!!"

"Keep it as it is find the cuts in other places. Education the most important provision for future success in RCT."

6.23 The other themes emerging from the responses to the proposal were;

- Provision should be consistent (Number = 44)
- Impact on Vulnerable Children/ Children with a Disability (number = 28)
- Provision should be flexible (Number = 16)
- Historical reasons (Number = 44)
- Discrimination against Welsh/Faith schools (Number = 14)
- Transport issues (Number = 14)
- Negative impact on health and wellbeing (number = 22)
- Welsh Language impact (number = 24)
- Negative Impact on staff (number = 12)
- Child would not be able to go part time (number = 17)

7. PARENT/CARER FEEDBACK (Questionnaires)

- 7.1 Section 7 provides a summary of responses received from parents and carers in section 2 of the questionnaire.

PART A – RESPONDENT PROFILE

- 7.2 79.4% of respondents to the questionnaire currently had a child or children that attended nursery education or would have in the future.

Does your child(ren) currently attend nursery education or will he / she be attending nursery in the future?	
Base	679
Yes	79.4%
No	19.0%
No response	1.6%

Figure 10 – Nursery education attendees

- 7.3 77.5% of respondents to the questionnaire were the child(ren)s mother.

Are you the child(rens)'s:	
Base	546
Mother	77.5%
Father	16.3%
Step-mother	0.4%
Step-father	0.4%
Carer	0.5%
Grandparent	3.5%
Foster Carer	0.5%
Other	0.9%

Figure 11 – Relationship to child

- 7.4 32.6% of respondents stated that they currently had child(ren) in full-time/ full day nursery education, with 24.5% stating that they will be attending full-time soon.

Does your child(ren) attend nursery education:	
Base	515
Part-time / half day	8.0%
Full-time / full day	32.6%
Will be attending part-time soon	9.9%
Will be attending full-time soon	24.5%
Other	25.0%

Figure 12 – Level of attendance

Other responses included;

- *1 full day week - self funded*
- *Attending in the future*
- *attends a welsh meithrin*
- *Depend on decision, September 2015 intake.*
- *due to start september 2015 hopefully full time*
- *how do we know whether they will be attending full or part-time soon, this is what is being decided!*
- *I am pregnant with my first child*
- *My child is not old enough to attend nursery.*
- *Not yet attending*
- *private preschool nursery*
- *Will be attending full time in the future*

PART B – Questionnaire Parent/Carer Responses

Single parents

7.5 11.2% of respondents were single parents.

Are you a single parent?	
Base	535
Yes	11.2%
No	88.8%

Figure 13 – Single parent

7.6 A number of additional comments were received for the question on what impact the proposal could have on single parents. Responses were received from 50 individuals, who expressed 111 views. As can be seen the most reported impact was the reported need to stop/reduce/delay work or training as a result of the proposal (number = 31).

Category / theme	Single Parent – Impact of proposal
Would need to stop/reduce/delay work/training as a result	31
Would have a financial impact (either due to need to stop/reduce work or additional/unaffordable childcare costs)	20
Will (generally) have a disproportionate effect on working families	7
Negative impact on local economy	4
Negative impact on learning and educational standards	3
Provision should be flexible	3
Not enough wraparound provision	3
Having to rely on other family members/friends for help	2
Transport Issues	2
Negative impact on social skills/ Independence / development / confidence etc.	1
Sibling Issues - e.g. One sibling starting school later than other, or in different schools	1
Cuts should be made elsewhere	1
Deprived areas need extra support	1
Impact on Special Needs/SEN/disability/vulnerable	1
Child would not be able to go part time	1

Figure 14 – Impact on single parents

“I am currently on income support. My daughter will be three in oct 2015. If the proposal is implemented for full time education not starting for her until jan 2016 i won’t be able to get a job until then. As things stand at the moment i will be able to get a job in jan 15. Single mums like myself will be seriously hampered from rejoining the labour market due to children not going to school full time at 3”

“The proposals will have a massive impact on me as a full time working single parent. I will have to find child care provision for the afternoon, which is easier said than done, plus it is a significant financial burden on myself.”

“Im a single parent, i’d lose my job due to no childcare, have no money, eventually lost my rented home”

Welsh Language

7.7 28.5% of respondents stated that they attend a Welsh nursery or childcare setting.

Does your child(ren) attend a Welsh language nursery education or childcare setting? (This may include day nursery, playgroup or Meithrin settings)?	
Base	530
Yes	28.5%
No	71.5%

Figure 15 – Welsh language setting attendance

7.8 A number of additional comments were received for the question on what impact the proposal could have on the family in terms of Welsh Language development. Overall 116 respondents stated this as a concern. A breakdown of the full comments are summarised below, as can be seen, the main concern reported was there would be less exposure to the language and this would impact on development (number = 45).

Comment / Category	
Less exposure to Welsh / Would lose socialising opportunities (which helps Welsh development)	45
Easier to learn Welsh at younger age	34
Will impact on Language development as they come from English speaking background / family	28
Starting Welsh language would be delayed	23
Sibling Impact, such as developing at different speeds / being left behind	16
Parents will send children to English speaking schools	11
No impact	10
General negative impact on Welsh language / Potentially lost	10
Negative Impact (with no further details/explanation)	10
Lack of Transport would be an issue	8

Figure 16 –Welsh language impact on families

“Less exposure to Welsh would have a negative impact upon their development.”

“It will mean that he will not be offered the wonderful opportunity that his siblings were offered and so will be significantly further back in language development.”

“Personally as we speak welsh at home it won't make a big impact, however those children that will be attending welsh language school who's homelife is predominantly English will find the transition harder and will take longe to absorb the Welsh language.”

Children with a Disability

7.9 2.8% of respondents reported that their child(ren) have a disability that requires special support.

Does your child(ren) have a disability that requires special support?	
Base	533
Yes	2.8%
No	97.2%

Figure 17 – Disability

7.10 A number of comments were received for the question on what impact the proposal could have on child(ren) with a disability and the impact that this could have on their family. Overall 10 respondents stated this as a concern that could impact upon families. A breakdown of the full comments are summarised below:

Category / theme	Disability – Impact of proposal
Historical reasons - it's been there in the past / other children (incl siblings) have been entitled	1
Negative impact on learning and educational standards	3
Negative impact on social skills/ Independence / development / confidence etc.	4
Impact on Special Needs/SEN/disability/vulnerable	2
Would need to stop/reduce/delay work/training as a result of the proposals	1
Transport Issues	1
Personal financial impact	1

Figure 18 – Disability impact on family

Sufficient Nursery Education

7.11 7.5% of respondents to the questionnaire felt that part-time nursery education was sufficient for their child(ren).

Do you feel that Part-time (half day) (15 hours per week) nursery education is sufficient for your child(ren)?	
Base	537
Yes	7.5%
No	92.5%

Figure 19 – Part-time sufficiency

7.12 The respondents that stated “no” were asked what they would consider sufficient for children aged 3-4 years old. The following table outlines a summary of the responses received and as can be seen the majority of responses suggest that only full time is perceived as sufficient.

Comment / Category	Count
Full time (30 hours or 6 hours daily)	430
Same as it always has been / the status quo	29
When the child is ready / Whatever is suitable for child	6
At least 20 hours (4 hours daily)	13
Part time, but full days over 2 or 3 days	7
Part time, but full days over 3 or 4 days	2

Figure 20 – Sufficient Nursery Education

Impact on Family/children

7.13 A number of comments were received for the question on what impact the proposal could have on your family/child(ren). Overall 483 respondents stated this as a concern. A breakdown of the main comments are summarised in the table below:

7.14 As can be seen the main impact reported on the family and child(ren) was that it would lead to people needing to reduce, stop or delay work or training as a result of the proposals (number = 222), followed and closely linked, to a perceived financial impact that the proposals could have on people (number = 191).

Category / theme	Impact on family
Would need to stop/reduce/delay work/training as a result of the proposals	222
Would have a financial impact (either due to need to stop/reduce work or additional/unaffordable childcare costs)	191
Negative impact on learning and educational standards	120

Negative impact on social skills/ Independence / development / confidence etc.	104
Historical reasons - it's been there in the past / other children (incl siblings) have been entitled	83
Will (generally) have a disproportionate effect on working families	59
There's not enough alternative provision / wraparound childcare	31
Child would not be able to go part-time	22
Sibling Issues - e.g. One sibling starting school later than other, or be in different schools	20
Will have a negative impact on the general local economy e.g. Increase in unemployment, increase in benefits, less money to spend etc.	20
Transport Issues - Would be unable/it would be difficult to pick up/drop off child part time due to lack of transport	18
Having to rely on other family members/friends for help	14
Negative Impact on Welsh language	14
Deprived areas need extra support	8
Proposals is discriminatory against certain schools - i.e. Welsh, Faith	8
Provision should be consistent e.g. All children should start at the same time etc.	6
Ample notice should be given so people can plan their families / childcare / finances around school starting ages or, not enough notice given	6
Impact on Special Needs/SEN/disability/vulnerable	5
Cuts should be made elsewhere	5
Provision should be flexible	3

Figure 21 – Impact of family and children

“I would have to consider my current employment as unable to collect my daughter in the middle of the day as I work in Swansea.”

“Delayed entry to education will mean me not returning to work for another year, it will put my child at a disadvantage as I will be unable to afford any childcare / mythr in so they will not learn to associate with other children and will not progress educationally as my eldest had the opportunity to”

“Hours in work wil have to change as wilk have to leave work to fetch my daughter and take her to day nursery for the afternoon before returning to work”

“This proposal is already having an impact on our family, it is stressful not knowing what situation we're going to be in next year if our son cannot go to full time. I do not see that part time is going to be workable logistically, my wife and I both work full time so would not be able to pick up half way through the day. We are potentially going to have to reconsider the decision to school our children in welsh, as I do not believe the necessary welsh medium childcare is available in this area, and that is heart breaking”

Work, Training or Education

- 7.15 Linked to the above and the perceived impact on family and child(ren), 466 individuals stated that they currently use or will shortly use childcare. Of these, 86.9% of respondents stated that they currently use or will shortly need childcare to help them to work.

Do you currently use or will shortly need childcare for any of the following reasons:	
Base	466
To help you to work?	86.9%
To help you look for a job?	5.8%
To undertake training or education to help you to work in the future?	9.9%
Other	7.3%

Figure 22 – Need for childcare

- 7.16 Respondents were asked what impact nursery education being funded part time, half day, 15 hours per week would have on their ability to work, undertake training or education. As can be seen in Figure 23 below, from the 512 respondents who answered this multiple response question, 51.4% will need to find a childcare provider and 37.5% suggest that they might have to give up work, training or education to undertake childcare.

If nursery education for 3 year olds is funded Part-time (half day) (15 hours per week), what impact (if any) will this have on your ability to work, undertake training or education?	
I will need to find a childcare provider	51.4%
I will use family and friends to provide childcare	18.0%
I will arrange childcare around current work / training / education	13.3%
I / my partner will give up work / training / education to undertake childcare	37.5%
I / my partner will work part-time to fit around childcare	22.3%

I / my partner will find alternative employment to fit around childcare	9.4%
Not applicable to me	7.0%

Figure 23 – Part-time nursery funding impact on work / training / education

- 7.17 In addition to the impacts identified in the closed question, an analysis of the open responses found that overall 175 respondents were concerned about the impact on the ability to work, undertake training or education.
- 7.18 A number of comments were received for the question on ability to work, undertake training or education and the main ones are summarised below. Once again respondents suggested that it would lead to people needing to reduce, stop or delay work or training as a result of the proposals (number = 108), followed and closely linked to a perceived financial impact that the proposals could have on people (number = 74)

Category / theme	Impact on ability to work/train/education
Would need to stop/reduce/delay work/training as a result of the proposals	108
Would have a financial impact (either due to need to stop/reduce work or additional/unaffordable childcare costs)	74
There's not enough alternative provision / wraparound childcare	24
Other comments	21
Child would not be able to go part-time	15
Will (generally) have a disproportionate effect on working families	10
Will have a negative impact on the general local economy e.g. Increase in unemployment, increase in benefits, less money to spend etc.	9
Having to rely on other family members	9
Transport Issues	7

Figure 24 – Impact on ability to work/train/education

“I will have no choice but to give up work as I have no childcare.”

“I will need to approach my employer for more flexible hours but as my job is in Cardiff this may prove too impractical and so I may require alternative employment!”

“I will try to find childcare but these days it's so expensive that I may have to give up my job”

- 7.19 As part of the need to assess the likely impact of the proposal on people who work, respondents were asked if they worked shifts or unusual hours and if they did what impact the proposal would have on them.
- 7.20 23.6% of respondents said they did work shifts or unusual hours.

Do you work shifts or unusual hours?	
Base	534
Yes	23.6%
No	76.4%

Figure 25 – Working pattern

- 7.21 A number of comments were received for the question on what impact the proposal could have on those people who work shifts or unusual hours. Overall, 102 respondents stated this as a concern that could impact upon them. A breakdown of the main comments are summarised below:

Category / theme	Shifts / Unusual hours – Impact of proposal
Would need to stop/reduce/delay work/training as a result of the proposals	51
Would have a financial impact (either due to need to stop/reduce work or additional/unaffordable childcare costs)	25
Other comments	21
There's not enough alternative provision / wraparound childcare	13
Child would not be able to go part-time	12
Will (generally) have a disproportionate effect on working families	6
Having to rely on other family members/friends for help	6

Figure 26 – Impact on working pattern

“Big as I would have to look in to paying for child minder witch that means paying out more money”

“We work unpredictable and long hours and moving to part time education would not work for our family.”

“Unable to work all shifts as expected”

“I would have to arrange alternative child care around my shifts, child minder or family members”

7.22 Respondents were asked what would help them to stay in work or complete training or education for work. As can be seen in Figure 27 below, the majority of responses suggested to continue as present with full time education (411 respondents expressed 462 views).

Comment / Category	
Full time education / Continue as present	318
Other comments	39
Subsidised/cheaper childcare facilities	28
Childcare / wraparound (No mention of cost)	26
Free childcare facilities provided by the Council	14
Paid for Childcare / wraparound childcare	13
Breakfast club	9
Part time over fewer days (e.g. Over 2-3 days 6 hrs per day)	8
Transport to and from school	7

Figure 27 – Help to work / complete training / education

Other Reasons for Impact

7.23 The questionnaire gave parents and carers the opportunity to outline any other reasons why the proposal could impact upon them, their family or child(ren). The table below summaries the main comments raised.

Category / theme	Impact on family
Would have a financial impact (either due to need to stop/reduce work or additional/unaffordable childcare costs)	77
Would need to stop/reduce/delay work/training as a result of the proposals.	65
Negative impact on learning and educational standards	46
Historical reasons - it's been there in the past / other children (incl siblings) have been entitled	40
Negative impact on social skills/ Independence / development / confidence etc.	39
Will (generally) have a disproportionate effect on working families	19
Provision should be consistent	11
There's not enough alternative provision / wraparound childcare	10
Will have a negative impact on the general local economy e.g. Increase in unemployment, increase in benefits, less money to spend etc.	10

Negative Impact on welsh language	8
Proposals is discriminatory against certain schools - i.e. Welsh, Faith	7
Sibling Issues - e.g. One sibling starting school later than other, or be in different schools	7
Transport Issues - Would be unable/it would be difficult to pick up/drop off child part time due to lack of transport -	6
Having to rely on other family members/friends for help	6
Deprived areas need extra support	5
Cuts should be made elsewhere	5
Ample notice should be given so people can plan their families / childcare / finances around school starting ages or, not enough notice given	8
Other comments noted, including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconvenience of travelling back and forth to school for the sake of a couple of hours • Employers won't be flexible with the picking up and dropping off of children • Issues with childcare rather than lack of it for some comments – childminders aren't flexible enough 	

Figure 28 – Other Reasons why impact upon family

Impact by Protected Characteristic

7.24 Respondents were asked if they felt that the proposals would have more of an impact upon them, because of a number of factors. These factors are protected characteristics and the Council is required to consider people with these characteristics as part of their obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and the resultant Public Sector Equality Duties.

7.25 The following table shows the number of responses that considered that the proposal would have an impact on the protected characteristics. Further detail will be shown in the Equality Impact Assessment.

Protected Characteristics

You are male/female	108
Your age	49
Your ethnicity	11
Your are disabled	9
Your sexuality	7
Your religion or belief	14
Your gender identity	8

You are single/married/cohabiting/in a civil partnership/divorced	119
You are pregnant	28
The language you prefer to communicate in	55

Figure 29 – Protected Characteristics

7.26 The questionnaire gave parents and carers the opportunity to outline any reasons why the proposal could impact upon them, due to a protected characteristic. The table below summarises the main comments raised.

Equality Comments	
Base	102
Affect on employment / further education / college (e.g. having to leave halfway through a course)	27
As women generally deal with childcare/ take break from career for maternity leave	20
Other comments	18
Discrimination -Against Welsh Schools/Welsh Language	16
Have no support / single parent	10
Working household / family	8
Financial implications / expense	7
Travelling / accessibility issues	5
Discrimination (excl Welsh schools - Theme 19)	4
Pressure / stress / time is an issue	4
Economy impact	3
Change to routine / purpose in life	2

Figure 30 – Protected Characteristic impact

7.27 The following are a selection of comments received;

It will impact us significantly because we are working parents.”

“As older parents our own parents are not able to help us with childcare due to their age”

“You discriminate against the population of RCT, especially the young, old and vulnerable.”

“it will effect women and families more”

“because as a female I am the one expected to sort childcare”

“As a single mum all the childcare falls to me so I have to fit work around the children”

“As a female of child bearing age, it will be my career that takes a hit should I have another child.”

“impact on me as a mother, and discriminates on basis of age of children.”

8. School Council Consultation

- 8.1 This section outlines the findings of a number of youth engagement events with School Councils
- 8.2 A number of sessions were held with young people via School Councils. The young people were given the opportunity to complete the consultation during focus groups held within school times.
- 8.3 The 2015/16 Budget Challenge Consultation school sessions were held throughout November and December 2014 and included 6 focus groups of pupils with the School Councils at the following schools:
- Ysgol Llanhari;
 - Treorchy Comprehensive School;
 - Ysgol Gynradd Gymraeg Aberdar;
 - St John Baptist CIW High School;
 - Maesybryn Primary School;
 - Cŵm Clydach Primary School.
- 8.4 Sessions were held during lesson time at each school. A total of **91** pupils took part, 17 from Llanhari and 19 from Treorchy, 11 from Ysgol Aberdar, 12 from St John Baptist, 17 from Maesybryn and 15 from Cwm Clydach. The pupils ranged from age 7-11 years old (**n=43**) and 12-18 years old (**n=48**). Pupils ranged from key stage 2 (Primary Juniors) up to and including key stage 5 (6th Form). *Note:* where figures do not add up to 91, it is due to young people not taking part in that specific question.
- 8.5 In order to engage with young people the consultation process was similar to the approach used as part of the main consultation, but tailored specifically for children and young people.

Results

8.6 What services do the Council provide?

In order for the participants to get an understanding of what the Council does, they were asked to write on post it notes, what services they think the Council provide. Results were varied, however, encompassed many different services that the participants would see on a daily basis, such as:

Transport, schools, street lighting, refuse and recycling, community buildings, libraries, grass cutting, leisure centres, social care etc.

A total of **283** responses were received.

8.7 Nursery Proposal Agreement.

The participants were given an introduction to the proposal and asked to stand on a continuum to display how much they agreed with the proposal.

The results were as below:




Figure 31 – Nursery Proposal Agreement

As we can see from the diagram above, there was a good spread across the continuum with the majority (**51%**, 46 responses) stating they agreed (including those that agreed / unsure), 19 were unsure (**21%**) and 25 leaning towards disagree (**28%**).

8.8 Effect on participants and family.

Participants were asked if they thought these proposed changes to education would have an effect on either themselves or their families.

The results were as below:




Figure 32 – Effects on participants and family

From the results we can see that, the majority thought that these changes would have no effect on them with 43 responses (**48%**), 22 responses were unsure (**24%**) and the remaining 25 responses (**28%**) thought they would be effected.

8.9 Comments on Nursery Education

Agreement:

“I think it’s appropriate for 3 hours for 3 year olds, rising to a full day once 4”

“Will give an opportunity to ease into education and develop during early years”

“1/2 a day will be sufficient as children will get tired”

“Equal opportunity for all”

“Gives children more time to spend with their parents”

Disagreement:

“Hinders social development and making friends”

“Twice as long means you’ll learn more”

“It will hit single parents the hardest”

“Learn essential skills at this stage, need more time in school”

“Better education in schools than in childcare”

8.10 What services would you change?

The participants were then asked “what would they change or cut if they were making decisions on the Council’s budget?”

Responses included:

- Less grass cutting
 - Reduce councillor expenses
 - Turn street lights off at night
 - Less free parking
 - Less libraries
 - Cutting benefits to unemployed
 - Less road maintenance
 - Spend less on redoing buildings
-

Appendix 1 - Summary of Responses

Themes	Total of General (Q7), Letters, E-mails & Comment Cards	Question 10 - Single Parent (Impact of Proposal)	Question 15 - Disability (Impact of Proposal)	Question 17 - Impact of Proposal on Family	Question 19 - Ability to Work, Undertake Training or Education	Question 20 - Shifts / Unsocial Hours (Impact of Proposal)	Question 22 - Any Other Impact
Agree with proposal	9	0	0	4	0	1	1
Disagree / do not support the proposal	434	23	3	182	50	35	80
Provision should be consistent e.g. All children should start at the same time etc.	44	0	0	6	0	0	11
Provision should be flexible e.g. Choice of 2 full days per week instead of 5 1/2 days, choice of school/non-maintained settings etc.	16	3	0	3	1	0	0
There's not enough alternative provision / wraparound childcare	49	3	0	31	24	13	10
Historical reasons - it's been there in the past / other children (incl siblings) have been entitled	44	0	1	83	1	0	40

Deprived areas need extra support	83	1	0	8	0	2	5
Ample notice should be given so people can plan their families / childcare / finances around school starting ages or, not enough notice given	40	0	0	6	3	0	8
Proposals is discriminatory against certain schools - i.e. Welsh, Faith	14	0	0	8	1	0	7
Too Young - Children do not need to /should not start education at 3.	4	0	0	2	0	0	1
Agree that the Council should be more in line with other local authorities in Wales, remaining above the statutory minimum	4	0	0	1	0	0	2
Negative impact on learning and educational standards	93	3	3	120	0	0	46
Negative impact on social skills/ Independence / development / confidence etc.	82	1	4	104	1	1	39
Negative impact on health and wellbeing (free school meals, hot meals, nutrition, dental education etc).	22	0	0	1	0	1	1

Would reduce / limit choice of school	7	0	0	2	1	0	1
Impact on special needs/ special education needs / disabilities / vulnerable children	28	1	2	5	0	0	7
Would need to stop/reduce/delay work/training as a result of the proposals	65	31	1	222	108	51	65
Transport Issues - Would be unable/it would be difficult to pick up/drop off child part time due to lack of transport	14	2	1	18	7	3	6
Would have a financial impact (either due to need to stop/reduce work or additional/unaffordable childcare costs)	66	20	1	191	74	25	77
Will (generally) have a disproportionate effect on working families (note - if the response specifically says that they will stop/reduce work/training then this should be coded to theme 17)	86	7	0	59	10	6	19

Sibling Issues - e.g. One sibling starting school later than other, or be in different schools (note - This code only applies where there is an issue with siblings. If the comment means they won't receive the same education then this should be coded to theme 6)	3	1	0	20	2	2	7
Having to rely on other family members/friends for help	5	2	0	14	9	6	6
Negative impact on staff (Teachers and/or learning assistants)	12	0	0	1	0	0	1
Negative impact on Welsh Language (note this is specifically relating to the language and not generally Welsh schools, which should be coded to theme 9)	24	0	0	14	0	0	8
Will have a negative impact on the general local economy e.g. Increase in unemployment, increase in benefits, less money to spend etc.	28	4	0	20	9	3	10
Cuts should be made elsewhere	83	1	0	5	0	0	5
Other comments	79	7	0	40	21	21	39

Child would not be able to go part-time, including because parents are unable to pick child up as a result of part-time hours (may mention due to work/training , but does not say they would have to stop/reduce or delay work/training).	17	1	0	22	15	12	9
--	----	---	---	----	----	----	---

Appendix 2 – Consultation Materials

(see separate attachment)

Appendix 3 - School Head Teacher Consultation Feedback

1. Methodology

18 schools were selected as a sample, using the following criteria;

- The areas identified during the public consultation, where there were potential gaps in provision.
- Schools the Council met with when the proposal was initially considered and those who requested further information on wraparound solutions.
- As a result of the childcare provision mapping exercise that was completed in EYFSS.
- Schools that have over 40 nursery children on the roll.

Note: totals may not equal 100% exactly due to rounding.

2. Key Messages

- 55.6% would recommend to the governing body to change to part time nursery provision in line with the proposals.
- 50% would decide the level of provision on annual basis.
- 44.4% said there would be a demand for wraparound provision.
- 72.2% said there was a demand for wraparound provision, after consultation with parents
- 50% of respondents said they would like more information about all the alternatives

3. Results

(a) If the Council’s Cabinet agreed to change the funding arrangements for Nursery provision (and the School’s budget then revised in line with this), what would be your proposed recommendation to the Governing Body in terms of Nursery provision from September 2015 (continue with full time or change to part time)?

Proposed recommendation	Number	%
Base	18	100%
Change to part time in line with the proposals (see comments below)	10	55.6
Where possible full time	7	38.9
Where possible full time – due to transport issues	1	5.6

Other comments (included / counted in table):

Change to part time in line with the proposals – as long as the school can offer morning and afternoon sessions (n=1)

Change to part time in line with the proposals, but will need to see the budget first (n=1)

(b) If your proposed recommendation is to continue with full time provision, for what period do you anticipate this would be in place for into the future e.g. one year, more than one year / on a continuous basis

Future plans	Number	%
Base	18	100%
Decide on an annual basis	9	50
N/A	9	50

(c) If your proposed recommendation is to change to part time, do you think there will be demand for wraparound childcare provision?

Demand for provision (part-time)	Number	%
Base	18	100%
Yes there is demand (see comments below)	8	44.4
N/A as hoping to continue full time	5	27.8
No demand / Not aware of any demand, but have not consulted with parents	2	11.1
Have not spoken to the parents	1	5.6
Nothing available on the area, which is why the school will continue to provide	1	5.6
Only a small minority of the parents would want it	1	5.6

Other comments (included / counted in table):

Yes , have not consulted this year but did last year (n=1)

Yes there is demand but a new Head so will need advice (n=1)

Yes there is demand but have not consulted (n=1)

(d) Have you consulted with parents regarding possible demand? If so, what has the feedback been?

Feedback from parent consultation	Number	%
Base	18	100%
There is demand (see comments below)	13	72.2
Waiting for the outcome of the decision first / Have not consulted with parents. / not yet	3	16.7
Very limited feedback with the parents making alternative arrangements.	1	5.6
N/A	1	5.6

Other comments (included / counted in table):

Consulted parents in April/May 14 and yes there was demand for wrap around childcare. (n=1) (but it will depend on the expense. (n=1))

Have not consulted this time, but did previously and yes there was demand. (n=1)

New Head, hence has not consulted with the parents, but previous Head did and yes there is demand. (n=1)

Not consulted the parents, waiting for the consultation period to end. Did consult previously and parents did want the wrap around care provision. (n=3)

Parents want full time in school. (n=1) (mainly due to the transport. (n=1))

Yes there is demand for wrap around care. (n=1)

Yes and parents want full time provision (n=2) (from the day after the children are 3. (n=1))

(e) If there is likely to be demand, have you thought about offering the provision on the school site or through a local childcare provider?

Possibility of providing provision	Number	%
Base	18	100%
Want to provide it internally on the school site by the school, would not want to provide it through a local childcare provider / Yes on the school site	4	22.2
Not thought / No	3	16.7
No facilities available / No space on the site for this provision / Limited space on site	3	16.7
Would like additional information before making a decision / Would need more information before making a decision	2	11.1

The Meithrin will provide childcare on the premises / Would be looking to offering provision off site through the Clych Meithrin	2	11.1
Will probably be through a local childcare provider / Yes and parents happy to pay.....	2	11.1
N/A	1	5.6
Have not consulted with parents	1	5.6

(f) If you are considering offering on the school site, have you:

- Considered who would provide this childcare?
- When it could be put in place by?

Consideration of school providing provision	Number	%
Base	18	100%
Would like to receive additional information / Would need more information before making a decision. / Do not know yet	5	27.8
N/A	4	22.2
No	3	16.7
No facilities available / There is not enough space in the building.	2	11.1
Have already met with a private care nursery	1	5.6
Would provide it internally using the school staff, but on different contracts. Main problem is capacity with the school.	1	5.6
Yes on site and XXXX will cover the lunch time session. It will be put in place as soon as possible.	1	5.6
Yes the Meithrin by Sept 2015.	1	5.6

(g) If Cabinet agree to implement the decision, would you like more information around:

- The practical and legal requirements of setting up childcare on the school site?
- Current childcare provision close to your school?
- Details of local childcare providers that could possibly offer a pick up service from the school to take the children back to their settings?
- Any other information?

Further information required	Number	%
Base	18	100%
Yes would like more information about all the alternatives. / Would like additional advice as the school does have the provision on site. / Would need information and advice on space/ capacity.	9	50
No (see comments below)	4	22.2
No as want to provide it through the school.	2	11.1
Did attend the meetings previously but not viable.	1	5.6
Have spoken to EYFSS but have decided to make provision internally.	1	5.6
N/A	1	5.6

Other comments (included / counted in table):

Do not additional information. (n=1)

No as there is no demand. (n=1)

No, as have already met with an alternative provider. (n=1)

Appendix 4

Consultation with Childcare Providers

Methodology

A sample of childcare providers were contacted by Officers from the Early Years and Family Support Service (EYFSS). The aim was to further investigate the childcare needs that might result from the Funding for Nursery Education proposal.

The following number of providers took part:

- 22 childminders (out of 107)
- 10 day nurseries (out of 31)
- 8 out of school clubs (out of 31)
- 14 sessional care providers (out of 61)

Note:

Definitions:

Childminder

Childminders are registered with the Care Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSIW) to care for children in their own home. Typically, they can care for up to 6 children under the age of 8 years. They are self employed and decide their own working hours. They are able to offer a flexible service and can offer early morning, evenings, weekend and sometimes overnight care.

Full Day Care

Full Day Care settings are usually Day Nurseries. They are registered with CSSIW to provide care for children under the age of 8 years on specially adapted premises for a continuous period of four hours per day or more.

OOS Care

Out of School Care includes breakfast clubs, after school and holiday clubs. They typically cater for children between 3 years and 11 years of age, although some can offer care for secondary aged children. If the total period of care in any one day totals more than two hours per day, they must register with CSSIW.

Sessional Care

These are settings that offer care for children under 8 years of age, for not more than four hours per day on non-domestic premises. They are typically Playgroups and Cylchoedd Meithrin for children aged 3 – 4 years, although some do accept children from 2 years onwards. Where two sessions are offered in any one day, there must be a break between sessions with no children in the care of the provider.

Sessional / Full Day

These are typically providers who offer Sessional (Playgroup) sessions for 3 – 4 year olds but have registered with CSSIW as Full Day Care providers so that they have the flexibility to offer care for longer than four hours per day if required.

Wraparound Care

Wraparound Care is sessional care that starts immediately before or after school, but during the normal school day. Wraparound Care childcare providers can be based on school sites or can be based in their own settings and can drop off or pick up children before or after their school nursery session.

Results

1. Overall

Categories of Respondents;

Childminder	22
Full Day	10
OOS Care	8
Sessional	12
Sessional/Full Day	2
	54

Area of Response;

Cynon	11
Taff	27
Rhondda	14
All RCT	1
Bridgend (top of Gilfach)	1
	54

Currently Registered?

		%
Yes	35	64.8
Not yet	15	27.8
No	4	7.4
	54	100

Interested in exploring wraparound provision?

		%
Yes	39	72.2
No	3	5.6
Possibly	12	22.2
	54	100

2. Open Comment Feedback

The following provides a summary of the main themes recorded from the open feedback responses;

	Number	% of all responses
Planning to offer wraparound provision	18	33.3
Probably offer wraparound/if there is interest	21	38.9
Currently finishing registration process to become a childminder	20	37.0
Decision not influenced by the proposal	9	16.7
Decision partly influenced by the proposal	6	11.1
Seen as a business opportunity/career move	5	9.3
Waiting to see what happens	4	7.4
Already had an impact on business	1	1.9
Perception of a lack of childcare in the area	1	1.9
Offer or would consider a pick-up service	15	27.8
Not able to offer	2	3.7

Schools where childcare providers may provide wraparound provision.

As shown above 94.4% of respondents stated that they were interested in exploring wraparound provision.

72.2% said that they were planning to offer or would probably offer wraparound provision. The following table lists the schools which respondents would consider offering wraparound provision to:

Potential schools that providers consulted could offer a wraparound service to	Number of providers consulted who are planning to offer wraparound	Number of providers consulted who will probably offer wraparound / interested in offering / will if required
Abercerdin Primary (Bridgend County)	1	
Aberdare CinW Primary Abernant Primary Caradog Primary St Margaret's RC Primary YGG Aberdar	1	
Aberdare Park Primary Caradog Primary Aberdare Town CinW Primary		1
All Welsh medium schools	1	1
Caergarw Primary Darran Las Primary		1
Coedpenmaen Primary		1
Cwmbach Primary Cwmbach CinW Primary	1	
Cwmlai Primary		1
Darran Las Primary Miskin Primary		1
Dolau Primary	1	
Dolau Primary Brynna Primary Llanharan Primary		1
Gelli Primary	1	1
Heol y Celyn Primary	1	
Llanharan Primary		1
Llanharry Primary and Ysgol Llanhari		1
Llanitud Faerdref Primary YGG Gartholwg Gwauncelyn Primary?		1
Llantrisant Primary Pontyclun Primary Cwmlai Primary		1
Llwyncrwn Primary Gwaunmeisgyn Primary YGG Castellau Maesybryn Primary?		1
Maesybryn Primary		1
Penrhiwceiber Primary		1
St Michaels Primary		1
Ton Infants	1	1
Tonysguboriau Primary		1

Tonysguboriau Primary Penygawsi Primary	1	
Trealaw Primary Ynyscynon Early Years Centre Pontrhondda Primary	1	
Treorchy Primary	1	
Treobart Primary Cefn Primary Craig yr Hesg Primary	2	
Treobart Primary YGG Pont Sion Norton Cefn Primary Craig yr Hesg Primary	1	
YGG Bronllwyn	1	
YGG Evan James Parc Lewis Primary Gwauncelyn Primary	1	
YGG Llwyncelyn		1
YGG Tonyrefail		1
YGG Ynyswen Penpych Primary		1
	18	21

3. Reported Lack of Childcare provision against Childcare Consultation Responses

A number of responses to the main consultation indicated there was a lack of childcare provision in specific areas, by postcode.

The following table shows these areas against those responses from the childcare provider consultation that indicated that there would be provision or that they may be interested in offering wraparound provision.

In the main Consultation - Is Lack of Childcare Provision identified as an Issue?		Yes	Schools within each ward	Providers from the consultation who are/may be interested in offering wraparound/pick up service
Ward	PostCode	Total		
Aberaman South	CF44 6	1	Cwmaman Infants Glynhafod Juniors Capcoch Primary	0
Aberdare West/ Llwydcoed	CF44 8	1	Llwydcoed Primary Aberdare Park Primary Cwmdar Primary	3

			YGG Aberdar	
Beddau	CF38 2	2	Llwynocrwn Primary YGG Castellau	2
Brynnau	CF72 9	6	Brynnau Primary Dolau Primary	2
Church Village	CF38 1	2	Llanitud Faerdref Primary YGG Gartholwg	2
	CF38 2	1		
Cilfynydd	CF37 4	2	Cilfynydd Primary YGG Pont Sion Norton	1
Cwmbach	CF44 0	1	Cwmbach Primary Cwmbach CinW Primary	1
Cymmer	CF39 9	2	Cymmer Infants Hafod Primary	0
Ferndale	CF43 4	2	Ferndale Infants Darran Park Primary YGG Llyn y Forwyn	1
Graig	CF37 1	1	Trehopcyn Primary Maesycoed Primary	1
			YGG Evan James (All in Rhondda Ward)	
Hirwaun	CF44 9	2	Hirwaun Primary	2
Llanharan	CF72 9	1	Llanharan Primary	2
Llanharry	CF72 9	4	Llanharry Primary Ysgol Llanhari	1
Llantrisant Town	CF38 2	1	Llantrisant Primary Penygawsi Primary	2
	CF72 8	3		
Llantwit Fardre	CF38 2	4	Maesybryn Primary	1
Maerdy	CF43 4	1	Maerdy Primary	0
Penrhiwceiber	CF45 3	1	Perthcelyn Primary Penrhiwceiber Primary	1
			Miskin Primary Penguelan Primary	
Pen-y-graig	CF40 1	3	Penygraig Infants Ysgol Yr Eos	0
Pen-y-waun	CF44 9	1	Hirwaun Primary	0
Pont-y-clun	CF72 8	8	Pontyclun Primary YGGG Llantrisant	1
	CF72 9	3		
Pontypridd Town	CF37 2	2	Coedylan Primary	0

Porth	CF39 0	1	Porth Infants	1
	CF39 9	2	Llwynceilyn Infants YGG Llwynceilyn	
Rhondda	CF37 1	3	Trehopcyn Primary Maesycloed Primary YGG Evan James	1
	CF37 2	2		
Taffs Well	CF15 7	1	Ffynon Taff Primary	1
Ton-teg	CF38 1	2	Gwauncelyn Primary	2
Tonypandy	CF40 1	1	Tonypandy Primary SS Gabriel & Raphael RC Primary	0
Tonyrefail East	CF39 8	4	Tonyrefail Primary Tref y Rhyg Primary Cwmlai Primary YGG Tonyrefail	5
Tonyrefail West	CF39 8	9	Williamstown Primary	0
	CF40 1	2		
Trallwng	CF37 4	1	Trallwng Infants Coedpenmaen Primary	2
Trealaw	CF40 2	1	Alaw Primary Trealaw Primary	1
Treorchy	CF42 6	2	Parc Primary Treorchy Primary YGG Ynyswen	2
Tyn-y-nant	CF38 2	1	Gwaunmeisgyn Primary	2
Ynysybwl	CF37 3	1	Trerobart Primary	3
Ystrad	CF41 7	2	Gelli Primary Bodringallt Primary YGG Bronllwyn YGG Bodringallt	3
No PostCode		11	N/A	N/A
TOTAL		101		46

APPENDIX 2 (2)



STRONG HERITAGE | STRONG FUTURE
RHONDDA CYNON TAF
TREFTADAETH GADARN | DYFODOL SICR

Service Change Consultation - Funding For Nursery Education

Proposal: Funding for Nursery Education

This proposal would amend the way in which school entry arrangements (subject to capacity) are funded across all of our schools.

The proposed funding arrangement would be based on:

- Part-time (half day, 15 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 3rd birthday (pre nursery and nursery);
- Full-time (30 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 4th birthday (nursery and reception); and
- Up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary or independent registered education providers from the term after a child's 3rd birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school.

The proposal would see the removal of home to school transport and school meal provision for part-time nursery pupils. Children already in receipt of full-time nursery provision during the 2014/15 academic year would continue to be funded for full-time provision, ie **they will not be affected by the proposal**. The proposal would impact on new admissions from September 2015 and onwards.

Whilst the Council would fund schools in line with the proposal, initial school entry arrangements are effectively a matter for individual headteachers and governing bodies and some schools may decide to continue to offer and fund full-time nursery provision from within their allocated budget (as was the case when the decision was taken previously).

Overall Saving £2.166 million per year

The Council would like your views on the proposed changes.

Section 1 - General

Q1 Do you understand why the Council needs to reduce services?

- Yes
 No

Q2 The Council is reviewing all of its services and the way in which they are provided.

Do you agree this is a reasonable approach?

- Yes
 No

Q3 Do you generally agree with the proposal on funding for nursery education?

- Yes
 No

Q4 Do you agree that protecting children already receiving full-time provision is important?

- Yes
 No

Q5 Do you agree that, if implemented, September 2015 is an appropriate implementation date?

- Yes
 No

Q6 Do you think that, if implemented, full-time provision should be effective from:

- a)The term following a child's 4th birthday
 b)The September following a child's 4th birthday
 c)The term following a child's 5th birthday (ie compulsory school age)

Q7 Please make any other general comments you would like to make with regard to the proposals for funding for nursery education.

Section 2 - Parent/Carer Feedback

Q8 Does your child(ren) currently attend nursery education or will he / she be attending nursery in the future?

- Yes (please go to question 9)
 No (please see below)

This survey is aimed at parents and carers. If you are not a parent or carer your views are still important to us. Please email Nurseryconsultation@rctcbc.gov.uk

Or write to us with your views:
Freepost RSBU-HJUK-LSSS
Research & Consultation
Public Relations & Strategy
The Pavilions
Cambrian Industrial Park
Clydach Vale
Tonypandy
CF40 2XX

Visit www.rctcbc.gov.uk/budgetchallenge for details of local engagement events

About You

Q9 Are you the child(rens)'s:

- Mother
 Father
 Step-mother
 Step-father
 Carer
 Grandparent
 Foster Carer
 Other

Please state which 'Other'

Q10 Are you a single parent?

Yes

No

If 'Yes', how do you feel the proposal could impact upon you?

Q11 Does your child(ren) attend nursery education:

Part-time / half day

Full-time / full day

Will be attending part-time soon

Will be attending full-time soon

Other

Please state which 'Other'

Q12 Please tell us which nursery they do / will attend.

Q13 Does your child(ren) attend a Welsh language nursery education or childcare setting? (This may include day nursery, playgroup or Meithrin settings)?

Yes

No

Q14 If 'Yes', how do you feel that the proposal could impact upon your family in terms of language development?

Q15 Does your child(ren) have a disability that requires special support?

Yes

No

If 'Yes', how do you feel that the proposal could impact upon your family?

Q16 Do you feel that Part-time (half day) (15 hours per week) nursery education is sufficient for your child(ren)?

Yes

No

If no, what would you consider sufficient for children aged 3-4 years old?

Q17 What impact (if any) do you feel that the proposal could have on your family / your child(ren) / you?

The Council has a duty to make sure (as far as it is reasonably practicable) that there is sufficient childcare to meet the requirements of parents in the area to enable them to work, undertake training or education that will help them to work in the future. The Council does not have to be the provider of this childcare, it can be a private or voluntary organisation. We would like to understand how the proposal could impact on the childcare arrangements you have / you plan to have in place.

Please tell us:

Q18 Do you currently use or will shortly need childcare for any of the following reasons:

To help you to work?

To help you look for a job?

To undertake training or education to help you to work in the future?

Other

Please state which 'Other'

Q19 If nursery education for 3 year olds is funded Part-time (half day) (15 hours per week), what impact (if any) will this have on your ability to work, undertake training or education? (please tick all that apply)

- I will need to find a childcare provider
- I will use family and friends to provide childcare
- I will arrange childcare around current work / training / education
- I / my partner will give up work / training / education to undertake childcare
- I / my partner will work part-time to fit around childcare
- I / my partner will find alternative employment to fit around childcare
- Not applicable to me

Comments:

Q20 Do you work shifts or unusual hours?

- Yes
- No

If 'Yes', how do you feel the proposal could impact upon you?

Q21 What would help you to stay in work or complete training or education for work?

Q22 Please outline any other reason why the proposal could impact upon you / your family / your child(ren):

Q23 Under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duties, the Council has a legal duty to look at how its decisions impact on people because they may have particular characteristics.

Please tell us if you think these proposals will affect you specifically because of any of the following:

- You are male / female
- Your age
- Your ethnicity
- You are disabled
- Your sexuality
- Your religion or belief
- Your gender identity
- You are single / married / cohabiting / in a civil partnership / divorced
- You are pregnant
- The language you prefer to communicate in

Please provide your reason/s:

The contact details section is optional, but we are interested in how the proposal could impact upon people in different areas.

We would be grateful if you could provide your post code as a minimum.

Q24 Postcode

Q25 Name

Q26 Email

Q27 Telephone number

Q28 Address

Q29 If you are happy to be contacted further to discuss your response to this survey and are happy for us to contact you with future surveys regarding this topic, please tick the box:

I am happy to be contacted

Thank you for taking part in this consultation. The deadline is Tuesday 16th December 2014 at 5pm.

Please send your completed survey to:
Freepost RSBU-HJUK-LSSS
Research & Consultation
Public Relations & Strategy
The Pavilions
Cambrian Industrial Park
Clydach Vale
Tonypandy
CF40 2XX

Visit www.rctcbc.gov.uk/budgetchallenge for details of local engagement events.

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council will process the information you have provided in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The information may be used for statistical purposes but all personal details will be anonymous.



Ymgynghoriad ar Newid Gwasanaethau - Cyllid ar gyfer Addysg Feithrin

Cynnig:

Cyllid ar gyfer Addysg Feithrin

Byddai'r cynnig hwn yn diwygio'r ffordd y mae trefniadau mynediad/derbyn disgyblion i ysgolion (yn amodol ar gapasiti) yn cael eu hariannu ar draws pob un o'n hysgolion.

Byddai'r trefniant ariannu arfaethedig yn seiliedig ar:

- Darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) (15 awr yr wythnos) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed (cyn-feithrin a meithrin);
- Darpariaeth amser llawn (30 awr yr wythnos) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 4 oed (meithrin a derbyn); a
- Hyd at 15 awr yr wythnos (yn amodol ar gapasiti) o ddarpariaeth feithrin gyda darparwyr addysg cofrestredig preifat, gwirfoddol neu annibynnol o'r tymor ar ôl i'r plentyn droi'n 3 oed lle nad oes argaeledd addas mewn ysgol.

Byddai'r cynnig yn gweld dileu'r trefniadau cludiant ysgol a darpariaeth pryddau ysgol ar gyfer disgyblion meithrin rhan-amser.

Byddai plant sydd eisoes yn derbyn addysg feithrin amser llawn yn ystod y flwyddyn academaidd 2014/15 yn parhau i gael eu hariannu ar gyfer darpariaeth amser llawn, hynny yw, fydd y cynnig dan sylw ddim yn effeithio ar y plant hynny. Byddai'r cynnig yn effeithio ar drefniadau derbyn disgyblion newydd o fis Medi 2015 ac ymlaen.

Tra byddai'r Cyngor yn ariannu ysgolion yn unol â'r cynnig, mae trefniadau mynediad cychwynnol i ysgol, i bob diben, yn fater ar gyfer penaethiaid a chyrff llywodraethu unigol. Hwyrach byddai rhai ysgolion yn penderfynu parhau i gynnig ac ariannu darpariaeth feithrin amser llawn o'u cyllideb (fel oedd yn wir pan gafodd y penderfyniad ei wneud yn flaenorol).

Arbedion cyfan o £2.166 miliwn y flwyddyn

Hoffai'r Cyngor gael gwybod eich barn ar y newidiadau arfaethedig.

Adran 1 - Cyffredinol

- Q1 *A ydych chi'n deall pam mae angen i'r Cyngor gwtogi ar wasanaethau?*
- Ydw
- Nac ydw
- Q2 *Mae'r Cyngor yn adolygu ei wasanaethau i gyd, a'r ffordd maen nhw'n cael eu darparu.*
- A ydych chi'n cytuno bod hwn yn ddull rhesymol?*
- Ydw
- Nac ydw
- Q3 *Yn gyffredinol, a ydych chi'n cytuno â'r cynnig ar gyfer cyllid ar gyfer addysg feithrin?*
- Ydw
- Nac ydw
- Q4 *A ydych chi'n cytuno bod amddiffyn plant, sydd eisoes yn derbyn addysg feithrin amser llawn, yn rhesymol?*
- Ydw
- Nac ydw
- Q5 *Os bydd y cynnig yn cael ei roi ar waith, a ydych chi'n cytuno bod mis Medi 2015 yn ddyddiad priodol i'w roi ar waith?*
- Ydw
- Nac ydw
- Q6 *Os bydd y cynnig yn cael ei roi ar waith, a ydych chi'n credu y dylai darpariaeth amser llawn fod ar waith yn dechrau:*
- a) tymor yr ysgol sy'n dilyn pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 4 oed
- b) mis Medi sy'n dilyn pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 4 oed
- c) tymor yr ysgol sy'n dilyn pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 5 oed (sef oedran ysgol gorfodol)
- Q7 *Nodwch unrhyw sylwadau cyffredinol eraill yr hoffech chi eu gwneud o ran y cynigion ar gyfer cyllid ar gyfer addysg feithrin.*

Adran 2 - Adborth Rhieni/Cynhalwyr/Gofalwyr

Q8 *A ydy'ch plentyn/plant yn mynychu addysg feithrin ar hyn o bryd, neu a fydd eich plentyn/plant yn mynychu addysg feithrin yn y dyfodol?*

- Ydy (ewch i gwestiwn 9)*
 Nac ydy (gweler isod)

Mae'r arolwg yma ar gyfer rhieni a chynhalwyr/gofalwyr. Os dydych chi ddim yn rhiant neu'n gynhaliwr/gofalwr, mae eich barn yn dal i fod yn bwysig i ni. Anfonwch neges e-bost i

YmgynghoriadMeithrin@rhondda-cynon- Taf.gov.uk

*neu anfonwch eich sylwadau i:
Rhadbost RSBU-HJUK-LSSS
Ymchwil ac Ymgynghori
Strategaethau a Chysylltiadau Cyhoeddus
Y Pafiliynau
Parc Hen Lofa'r Cambrian
Cwm Clydach
Tonypandy
CF40 2XX*

I gael gwybod am achlysuron ymgysylltu lleol, ewch i www.rctcbc.gov.uk/sialenscyllid

Amdanoch chi

Q9 *Beth yw'ch perthynas â'r plentyn/plant?*

- Mam*
 Tad
 Llysfam
 Llystad
 Cynhaliwr/Gofalwr
 Mam-gu/Tad-cu
 Gofalwr maeth
 Arall

Nodwch eich ateb 'Arall'

Q10 *A ydy'ch chi'n rhiant sengl?*

- Ydw
 Nac ydw

Os 'Ydw', beth yw eich barn ar sut y gallai'r cynnig effeithio arnoch chi?

Q11 *A ydy'ch plentyn/plant yn mynychu addysg feithrin...?*

- Rhan-amser / hanner diwrnod
 Amser llawn / diwrnod llawn
 Bydd yn mynychu'n rhan-amser cyn bo hir
 Bydd yn mynychu'n amser llawn cyn bo hir
 Arall

Nodwch eich ateb 'Arall'

Q12 *Nodwch enw'r feithrinfa mae/bydd eich plentyn/plant yn ei mynychu.*

Q13 *A ydy'ch plentyn/plant yn mynychu addysg feithrin neu leoliad gofal plant trwy gyfrwng y Gymraeg (gall hyn gynnwys meithrinfa ddydd, cylch chwarae neu leoliadau Meithrin)?*

- Ydy
 Nac ydy

Q14 *Os 'Ydy', beth yw eich barn ar sut y gallai'r cynnig effeithio ar eich teulu o ran datblygiad ieithyddol?*

Q15 *A oes gan eich plentyn/plant anabledd sydd angen cymorth arbennig?*

- Oes
 Nac oes

Os 'Oes', beth yw eich barn ar sut y gallai'r cynnig effeithio ar eich teulu?

Q16 *A ydych chi o'r farn bod addysg feithrin ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) (15 awr yr wythnos) yn ddigonol ar gyfer eich plentyn/plant?*

- Ydw
 Nac ydw

Os 'Nac ydw', beth fyddech chi'n ei ystyried yn ddigonol ar gyfer plant 3-4 oed?

Q17 *Yn eich barn chi, pa effaith (os o gwbl) y gallai'r cynnig ei chael ar eich teulu / ar eich plentyn/plant / arnoch chi?*

Mae dyletswydd gan y Cyngor i wneud yn siŵr (cyn belled ag y bo'n rhesymol ymarferol) bod gwasanaeth gofal plant digonol ar gael i fodloni gofynion rhieni yn yr ardal i'w galluogi nhw i weithio, i gyflawni hyfforddiant neu addysg a fydd yn eu helpu nhw i weithio yn y dyfodol. Does dim rhaid i'r Cyngor ddarparu ei wasanaeth gofal plant ei hun; gall gwasanaeth gofal plant gael ei ddarparu gan sefydliad preifat neu wirfoddol. Byddem ni'n hoffi deall sut y gallai'r cynnig effeithio ar y trefniadau gofal plant sydd ar waith gennych chi yn barod / rydych chi'n bwriadu eu rhoi ar waith.

Rhowch wybod i ni:

Q18 *A ydych chi'n defnyddio gofal plant ar hyn o bryd, neu a fydd angen hwn arnoch chi cyn bo hir, ar gyfer unrhyw rai o'r rhesymau canlynol:*

- Eich helpu chi i weithio?*
 Eich helpu chi i chwilio am waith?
 Cyflawni hyfforddiant neu addysg i'ch galluogi chi i weithio yn y dyfodol?
 Arall

Nodwch eich ateb 'Arall'

Q19 *Os bydd addysg feithrin ar gyfer plant 3 oed yn cael ei hariannu'n rhan-amser (hanner diwrnod) (15 awr yr wythnos), pa effaith (os o gwbl) y bydd hyn yn ei chael ar eich gallu i weithio neu i gael hyfforddiant neu addysg? (Ticiwch bob blwch sy'n berthnasol)*

- Bydd angen i mi ddod o hyd i ddarparu gofal plant*
- Bydda i'n defnyddio teulu a ffrindiau i ddarparu gofal plant*
- Bydda i'n trefnu gofal plant o amgylch gwaith/hyfforddiant/addysg presennol*
- Bydda i / Bydd fy mhartner yn rhoi'r gorau i'r gwaith/hyfforddiant/addysg i ymgymryd â gofal plant*
- Bydda i / Bydd fy mhartner yn gweithio'n rhan-amser i gyd-fynd â gofal plant*
- Bydda i / Bydd fy mhartner yn dod o hyd i waith arall i gyd-fynd â gofal plant*
- Ddim yn berthnasol i mi*

Sylwadau:

Q20 *A ydych chi'n gweithio sifftiau neu oriau anarferol?*

- Ydw*
- Nac ydw*

Os 'Ydw', beth yw eich barn ar sut y gallai'r cynnig effeithio arnoch chi?

Q21 *Beth fyddai'n eich helpu chi i aros yn y gwaith neu i gwblhau hyfforddiant neu addysg ar gyfer y gwaith?*

Q22 *Nodwch unrhyw reswm arall dros sut y gallai'r cynnig effeithio ar eich teulu / ar eich plentyn / arnoch chi.*

Q23 *Dan Ddeddf Cydraddoldeb 2010 a Dyletswyddau Cydraddoldeb y Sector Cyhoeddus, mae gan y Cyngor ddyletswydd gyfreithiol i ystyried sut mae ei benderfyniadau yn effeithio ar bobl oherwydd gall nodweddion penodol fod ganddyn nhw.*

Rhowch wybod i ni a ydych chi o'r farn y bydd y cynigion hyn yn effeithio arnoch chi yn benodol oherwydd unrhyw un o'r canlynol:

- Eich bod chi'n wryw / yn fenyw*
- Eich oedran*
- Eich ethnigrwydd*
- Eich bod chi'n anabl*
- Eich rhywioldeb*
- Eich crefydd neu'ch cred*
- Eich hunaniaeth o ran rhywedd*
- Eich bod chi yn sengl / yn briod / yn cyd-fyw / mewn partneriaeth sifil / wedi ysgaru*
- Eich bod chi'n feichiog*
- Eich dewis iaith*

Nodwch eich rheswm/rhesymau:

Mae'r adran manylion cyswllt yn ddewisol, ond mae diddordeb gennym ni o ran sut gallai'r cynnig effeithio ar bobl mewn ardaloedd gwahanol.

Byddem ni'n ddiolchgar pe baech chi, o leiaf, yn nodi eich côd post.

Q24 *Côd post*

Q25 *Enw*

Q26 *E-bost*

Q27 *Ffôn*

Q28 *Cyfeiriad*

Q29 *Os ydych chi'n fodlon i ni gysylltu â chi er mwyn trafod eich ymateb i'r arolwg yma, a'ch bod chi'n fodlon i ni gysylltu â chi er mwyn i chi gael llenwi arolygon yn y dyfodol ynglŷn â'r pwnc yma, ticiwch y blwch:*

- Rydw i'n fodlon i chi gysylltu â mi*

Education & Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee Agenda - 24 February 2015
Diolch i chi am gymryd rhan yn yr ymgynghoriad.
Y dyddiad cau yw dydd Mawrth, 16eg Rhagfyr am 5 pm.

*Anfonwch eich arolwg i:
Rhadbost RSBU-HJUK-LSSS
Ymchwil ac Ymgynghori
Strategaethau a Chysylltiadau
Cyhoeddus Y Pafiliynau
Parc Hen Lofa'r Cambrian
Cwm Clydach
Tonypandy
CF40 2XX*

Bydd Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Rhondda Cynon Taf yn prosesu'r wybodaeth rydych chi wedi ei nodi yn unol â Deddf Diogelu Data 1998. Mae'n bosibl y bydd yr wybodaeth yn cael ei defnyddio i ddibenion ystadegau, ond fydd neb yn cael ei enwi.



**HAVE
YOUR DWEUD
SAY EICH
DWEUD**

Ymgynghoriad ar Newid Gwasanaethau **DWEUD EICH DWEUD!** Service Change Consultation **HAVE YOUR SAY!**

Mae'r ymgynghoriad yn dechrau:

The **consultation starts** on:

**21 HYDREF
OCTOBER**

Ac yn **dod i ben am 5pm** ar:
and will **close at 5pm** on:

**16 RHAGFYR
DECEMBER**

Bydd Achlysuron Ymgysylltu Lleol yn cael eu cynnal yn y gymuned. Bydd manylion ar y wefan o'u cadarnhau.

Local Engagement Events will be held in the community. Details will be placed on the website when confirmed.

I gael rhagor o wybodaeth:

www.rctcbc.gov.uk/sialenscyllideb

bydd modd i chi gael manylion am y cynigion a llenwi arolwg.

For further information please visit:

www.rctcbc.gov.uk/budgetchallenge

where you can find out the detail of the proposals and fill in a survey.

☎ **01443 425014**

✉ ymgynghoriadgwasanaethcerdd@rctcbc.gov.uk
ymgynghoriadmeithrin@rctcbc.gov.uk
musicconsultation@rctcbc.gov.uk
nurseryconsultation@rctcbc.gov.uk

✉ RHADBOST RSBU-HJUK-LSSS
Ymchwil ac Ymgynghori,
Y Pafiliynau, Cwm Clydach, CF40 2XX
FREEPOST RSBU-HJUK-LSSS
Research & Consultation, The Pavilions,
Clydach Vale, CF40 2XX

2014



Mae pob Cyngor yng Nghymru'n parhau i wynebu gostyngiadau sylweddol yn eu cyllidebau o ganlyniad i lymder Llywodraeth San Steffan.

Mae Cyngor Rhondda Cynon Taf yn wynebu diffyg yn ei adnoddau (bwloch yn ei gyllideb) o dros £70.7miliwn dros y 3 blynedd nesaf, sy'n cynnwys blwch o £31.2miliwn y flwyddyn nesaf (2015/16).

Er mwyn mynd i'r afael â'r bwloch yma, mae rhaid i'r Cyngor ystyried opsiynau i gwtogi ar wariant trwy aildrefnu, torri neu ostwng lefel y gwasanaethau rydyn ni'n eu darparu.

Rhan bwysig o'r broses hon ydy clywed barn ein preswylwyr, staff a rhanddeiliaid allweddol ar ein cynigion.

Manteisiwch ar y cyfle hwn i ddweud eich dweud, da chi.

All councils in Wales continue to be affected by significant reductions to their funding as a result of the austerity measures put in place by the UK Government.

Rhondda Cynon Taf CBC is facing an estimated shortfall in resources (budget gap) over the next 3 years of £70.7M, with a gap next year (2015/16) of £31.2M.

To deal with this budget gap the Council is reviewing all services and considering options to reduce expenditure by reconfiguring, cutting or reducing the services we provide.

An important part of this process is to gauge the views of our residents, staff and key stakeholders on our proposals.

Please take this opportunity to have your say.

Cynnig:

Cyllid ar gyfer addysg feithrin

Byddai'r cynnig hwn yn diwygio'r ffordd y mae trefniadau mynediad/derbyn disgyblion i ysgolion (yn amodol ar gapasiti) yn cael eu hariannu ar draws pob un o'n hysgolion.

Byddai'r trefniant ariannu arfaethedig yn seiliedig ar:

- Darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) (15 awr yr wythnos) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed (cyn-feithrin a meithrin); a
- Darpariaeth amser llawn (30 awr yr wythnos) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 4 oed (meithrin a derbyn); a
- Hyd at 15 awr yr wythnos (yn amodol ar gapasiti) o ddarpariaeth feithrin gyda darparwyr addysg cofrestredig preifat, gwirfoddol neu annibynnol o'r tymor ar ôl i'r plentyn droi'n 3 oed lle nad oes argaeledd addas mewn ysgol.

Byddai'r cynnig yn gweld dileu'r trefniadau cludiant ysgol a darpariaeth prydau ysgol ar gyfer disgyblion meithrin rhan-amser.

Byddai plant sydd eisoes yn derbyn addysg feithrin amser llawn yn ystod y flwyddyn academaidd 2014/15 yn parhau i gael eu hariannu ar gyfer darpariaeth amser llawn, h.y. **fydd y cynnig dan sylw ddim yn effeithio ar y plant hynny.** Byddai'r cynnig yn effeithio ar drefniadau derbyn disgyblion newydd o fis Medi 2015 ac ymlaen.

Tra byddai'r Cyngor yn ariannu ysgolion yn unol â'r cynnig, mae trefniadau mynediad cychwynnol i ysgol, i bob diben, yn fater ar gyfer penaethiaid a llywodraethu cyrff unigol. Hwyrach byddai rhai ysgolion yn penderfynu parhau i gynnig ac ariannu darpariaeth feithrin amser llawn o'u cyllideb (fel eoedd yn wir pan gafodd y penderfyniad ei wneud yn flaenorol).

Arbedion cyfan o

£2.166 miliwn y flwyddyn

Proposal:

Funding for Nursery Education

This proposal would amend the way in which school entry arrangements (subject to capacity) are funded across all of our schools.

The proposed funding arrangement would be based on:

- Part-time (half day, 15 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 3rd birthday (pre nursery and nursery);
- Full-time (30 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 4th birthday (nursery and reception); and
- Up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary or independent registered education providers from the term after a child's 3rd birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school.

The proposal would see the removal of home to school transport and school meal provision for part-time nursery pupils.

Children already in receipt of full-time nursery provision during the 2014/15 academic year would continue to be funded for full-time provision, ie **they will not be affected by the proposal.** The proposal would impact on new admissions from September 2015 and onwards.

Whilst the Council would fund schools in line with the proposal, initial school entry arrangements are effectively a matter for individual headteachers and governing bodies and some schools may decide to continue to offer and fund full-time nursery provision from within their allocated budget (as was the case when the decision was taken previously).

Overall Saving

£2.166 million per year

Cynnig: Gwasanaeth Cerdd dan nawdd y Cyngor

Ysgolion sy'n gyfrifol am ddarparu gwersi cerdd mewn perthynas â'r cwricwlwm a gwersi offerynnol / lleisiol o fewn eu hadnoddau presennol. Ar hyn o bryd mae rhai ysgolion yn defnyddio gwasanaeth cerdd sy'n cael ei ariannu gan RhCT i fodloni'r cyfrifoldeb hwn, ac mae rhai ysgolion yn defnyddio cwmnïau cerdd neu unigolion annibynnol eraill.

Mae 28% o'r holl ysgolion yn defnyddio gwasanaeth cerdd Rhondda Cynon Taf ar gyfer addysgu cwricwlwm tra bod 66% yn defnyddio'r gwasanaeth ar gyfer gwersi offerynnol / lleisiol.

Y cynnig yw peidio cynnal gwasanaeth cerdd y Cyngor sy'n cael cymhorthdal, a rhoi'r cyfrifoldeb i'r ysgolion i drefnu athrawon /darpariaeth amgen ar gyfer addysgu'r cwricwlwm a gwersi offerynnol / lleisiol.

Mae'r gwasanaeth hefyd yn cynnal gweithgareddau allgyrsiol eraill ar sail Bwrdeistref Sirol gyfan a heb unrhyw gost i'r rhieni / cynhalwyr (gofalwyr).

Dyw'r cynnig ddim yn bwriadu diwygio'r cyllid sy'n cael ei ddarparu i ysgolion.

Mater i'r ysgolion unigol fydd penderfynu a ydyn nhw eisiau gofyn i'r rhieni / cynhalwyr i ysgwyddo rhai neu'r cyfan o'r costau am wersi.

**Arbedion cyfan o
£0.474 miliwn y flwyddyn**

Proposal: Council Funded Music Service

Schools are responsible for the provision of music tuition in respect of both curriculum and instrumental / vocal lessons from within their allocated resources. Currently some schools use the RCT Council funded Music Service to meet this responsibility and some schools use alternative independent music tuition companies or individuals.

28% of all schools use the RCT Music Service for curriculum teaching whilst 66% use the service for instrumental / vocal lessons.

The proposal is to discontinue the Council run and subsidised Music Service and it will be for schools to source alternative music teachers and instructors to cover curriculum teaching and instrumental / vocal lessons.

The current service also runs extra-curricular activities on a county borough wide basis and at no cost to parents / carers.

The proposal does not seek to cut the funding which is provided to schools.

It will remain for individual schools to decide whether they wish to pass some or all of the costs of lessons on to parents / carers.

**Overall Saving
£0.474 million per year**

I gael rhagor o wybodaeth ar y cynigion, cysylltwch â:
For more information on these proposals contact:

 www.rctcbc.gov.uk/sialenscyllid

 ymgynggori@rctcbc.gov.uk

 www.rctcbc.gov.uk/budgetchallenge

 consultation@rctcbc.gov.uk

Ariannu Addysg Feithrin - Y ffeithiau moel

Funding for Nursery Education - What you need to know

C. Beth sy'n cael ei gynnis?

Gwneud newidiadau i'r ffordd mae'r Cyngor yn darparu cyllid ar gyfer Addysg Feithrin i'r graddau lle bydd modd i blant fanteisio ar ddarpariaeth ran amser (hanner diwrnod, 15 awr yr wythnos), o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd yn 3 oed, a darpariaeth amser llawn yn y tymor nesaf ar ôl iddyn nhw droi'n 4 oed.

Q. What is being proposed?

To make changes to the way in which the Council provides funding for Nursery Education to a level which supports children accessing part time (half day, 15 hours per week) provision from the term after their 3rd birthday and full time provision from the term after their 4th birthday.

C. Pam ydych chi'n ystyried hyn eto pan mae'r cynnis wedi'i wrthdroi unwaith yn barod?

I osgoi dryswch, nodwyd yn y dyfarniad barnwrol y dylai gwybodaeth ychwanegol fod wedi cael ei chyflwyno i'r Cabinet fel rhan o'r broses dod i benderfyniad. Doedd y cynnis ynglŷn â darparu addysg feithrin ran-amser ar gyfer plant 3 blwydd oed ddim yn cael ei ystyried yn anghyfreithlon ynddo'i hun, ond yn hytrach y broses ar gyfer dod i'r penderfyniad hwn oedd yn cael ei hystyried yn anghyfreithlon. Mae'r Cyngor yn wynebu bwloch o £31 miliwn yn ei gyllideb ar gyfer y flwyddyn nesaf, gan gynyddu i dros £70 miliwn dros y 3 blynedd nesaf, ac felly mae rhaid iddo edrych ar yr holl wasanaethau er mwyn dod o hyd i arbedion. Yn anffodus, mae'n anochel y bydd gostyngiad yn y gwasanaethau dewisol megis darpariaeth feithrin amser llawn yn gorfod cael eu hystyried os ydyn ni i gau'r bwloch hwn yn ein cyllideb a phennu cyllideb fantoleddig – rhywbeth sy'n rhwymedigaeth gyfreithiol arnom ni i'w wneud.

Q. Why are you considering this again when it has already been overturned once?

To be clear, the judicial review judgment identified that additional information should have been presented to Cabinet as part of the

decision making process. The provision of part time nursery education for 3 year olds was not in itself deemed unlawful, it was the process which was followed in making this decision which was ruled unlawful. The Council faces a £31m budget gap for next year, rising to over £70m over the next 3 years and therefore must look at all services to find savings.

Unfortunately, reductions to discretionary services such as full time nursery provision will inevitably have to be considered if we are to be able to close this budget gap and set a balanced budget – something which we are legally obliged to do.

C. Beth mae darpariaeth ran-amser yn ei olygu?

Y cynnis yw bydd plant yn cael cynnis darpariaeth hanner diwrnod (15 awr yr wythnos).

Q. What does part time provision mean?

It is proposed that children will be offered half day (15 hours per week) provision.

C. Fydd darpariaeth ran-amser yn cael ei darparu Llun-Gwener 9am-12pm?

Yr ysgolion unigol fydd yn penderfynu sut byddan nhw'n trefnu darpariaeth ran-amser.

Q. Will part time provision be delivered Monday-Friday 9am-12pm?

It will be up to individual schools to determine how they will deliver part time provision.

C. Fydd rhai ysgolion yn gallu cynnis darpariaeth amser llawn neu ofal cofleidiol?

Bydd hyn yn benderfyniad i'r ysgolion unigol. Os caiff hyn ei gymeradwyo, bydd yr arian a gaiff yr ysgolion yn lleihau yn unol â'r cynnis. Serch hynny, efallai bydd ysgolion yn penderfynu defnyddio arian yn eu cyllideb i barhau i ddarparu addysg feithrin amser llawn. Pan gafodd hyn ei benderfynu'r tro diwethaf, nododd tua 60% o ysgolion y bydden nhw'n ceisio gwneud hyn. Caiff ysgolion hefyd ystyried darpariaeth gofal cofleidiol.

Q. Will some schools be able to offer full time provision or wrap around care?

This will be up to individual schools to decide. If approved the amount of funding schools receive will be reduced in line with the proposal.

Schools may however decide to use money from elsewhere in their budget to continue to provide full time nursery education and when this decision was taken previously approximately 60% of schools indicated they would look to do so. Schools may also consider wrap around care provision.

C. Dw i'n gweithio amser llawn a fydda i ddim yn gallu nôl fy mhleintyn yn ystod y dydd, pa gymorth fydd ar gael i mi?

Mae Archwiliad o Ddigonolrwydd Gofal Plant y Cyngor yn awgrymu bod digon o ddarpariaeth i ateb y galw o ran gofal plant. Mae'r archwiliad hwn yn cael ei gynnal bob blwyddyn i sicrhau bod darpariaeth yn parhau'n ddigonol a bydd gwaith adolygu ychwanegol yn cael ei gynnal yn ystod y cyfnod ymgynghori.

Q. I work full time and would not be able to pick my child up during the day, what support will be available to me?

The Council's Childcare Sufficiency Audit suggests there is sufficient provision to meet childcare demands. This audit is refreshed annually to ensure provision remains sufficient and additional review work will be carried out during the consultation period.

C. Mae fy mhleintyn yn cael addysg amser llawn yn barod, fydd y cynnig hwn yn effeithio arno fe?

Na fydd. Os caiff ei gymeradwyo, bydd y cynnig yn dod i rym o fis Medi 2015 a bydd yr holl blant sy'n cael darpariaeth amser llawn ar hyn o bryd yn parhau i'w chael.

Q. My child is already in full time education, will this proposal affect them?

No, if approved this will come into effect from September 2015 and all children already in full time provision will remain so.

C. Fydd y gostyngiad mewn oriau yn cael effaith ar gyrhaeddiad addysgol fy mhleintyn yn y dyfodol?

Mae tystiolaeth yn awgrymu mai ansawdd nid maint yr addysg sy'n cael yr effaith fwyaf ar gyrhaeddiad ac mae hyn yn faes rydyn ni'n llwyddo'i wella o'r Cyfnod Sylfaen hyd at Gyfnod Allweddol 5. Yn ogystal â hyn, mae nifer o'n hawdurdodau lleol cyfagos ni sydd â lefelau tebyg o amddifadedd yn cynnig darpariaeth feithrin ran-amser, ac maen nhw'n cyflawni'n well na RhCT ar hyn o bryd yn nhermau cyrhaeddiad, sy'n cadarnhau'r angen am ddarpariaeth o'r safon orau.

Q. Will the reduction in hours have an impact on the future educational attainment of my child?

Evidence suggests it is the quality not quantity of education that has the biggest impact on attainment and this is an area we are successfully improving from the Foundation Phase through to Key Stage 5. Also many of our neighbouring local authorities with similar levels of deprivation as RCT offer part time nursery provision and currently perform better than RCT in terms of attainment reinforcing the need for high quality provision.

C. Fydd cludiant ysgol a chinio ysgol yn cael eu heffeithio yn sgîl plant 3 oed yn mynd yn rhan-amser?

Bydd - os bydd y cynnig yn cael ei gymeradwyo. Fydd cludiant i'r ysgol ac yn ôl a phrydau ysgol ddim yn cael eu darparu ar gyfer disgyblion rhan-amser.

Q. Will home to school transport and school meal provision be affected by 3 year olds becoming part time?

Yes, if approved, home to school transport and school meals will not be provided for part time pupils.

C. Mae fy mhlentyn yn troi'n 3 oed ym mis Medi 2015. Pryd bydden nhw'n dechrau yn yr ysgol, a phryd bydden nhw'n mynd i'r ysgol yn llawn amser?

Byddai plentyn sy'n troi'n 3 oed ym mis Medi 2015 yn dechrau'r ysgol ar sail ran-amser y tymor canlynol (h.y. Ionawr 2016) ac wedyn byddai e/hi'n cael addysg amser llawn y tymor nesaf ar ôl troi'n 4 oed, sef ym mis Ionawr 2017. Mae'r tabl isod yn rhoi manylion ynglŷn â phryd byddai plant yn dechrau darpariaeth rhan amser ac amser llawn, gan ddiwyddu ar ddyddiad eu pen-blwydd:

Q. My child turns 3 in September 2015 when would they start school and when would they go to school full time?

A child who becomes 3 in September 2015 would start school on a part time basis the following term (ie January 2016) and would then become full time the term following their 4th birthday which would be January 2017. The table below details when children would access part and full time provision dependent on when their birthday is:

Troï'n 3 oed erbyn:	Cyn-feithrin			Meithrin			Derbyn		
	3 oed yn:			4 oed yn:			5 oed yn:		
	Medi	Ionawr	Ebrill	Medi	Ionawr	Ebrill	Medi	Ionawr	Ebrill
Rhagfyr	Dim	Rh.Ams	Rh.Ams	Rh.Ams	Llawn	Llawn	Llawn	Llawn	Llawn
Mawrth	Dim	Dim	Rh.Ams	Rh.Ams	Rh.Ams	Llawn	Llawn	Llawn	Llawn
Awst	Dim	Dim	Dim	Rh.Ams	Rh.Ams	Rh.Ams	Llawn	Llawn	Llawn

DIM = Dim darpariaeth. Rh Ams = Rhan amser. Llawn = Amser llawn

3rd Birthday by:	Pre Nursery			Nursery			Reception		
	Age 3 in Year			Age 4 in Year			Age 5 in Year		
	Sept	Jan	April	Sept	Jan	April	Sept	Jan	April
December	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT
March	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT
August	NO	NO	NO	PT	PT	PT	FT	FT	FT

NO = No Admission. PT = Part Time. FT = Full Time.

Gwasanaeth Cerdd dan nawdd y Cyngor - Y ffeithiau moel

Council Funded Music Service - What you need to know

Education & Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee Agenda - 24 February 2015

C. Beth sy'n cael ei gynnig?

Y cynnig ydy tynnu'r cymhorthdal o £0.474m sy'n cael ei roi i'r Gwasanaeth Cerdd ar hyn o bryd, a chau'r gwasanaeth.

Q. What is being proposed?

The proposal is to remove the subsidy currently being given to the Music Service of £0.474m and discontinue the service.

C. Ydy hyn yn golygu na fydd modd i blant a phobl ifainc fanteisio ar wersi cerdd yn y cwricwlwm a gwersi offerynnol / lleisiol?

Nac ydy, fydd y cynnig ddim yn effeithio ar gyllidebau'r ysgolion, felly byddan nhw'n parhau i gael yr un faint o arian ar gyfer trefnu darparwyr ar gyfer yr hyfforddiant yn y cwricwlwm a'r gwersi offerynnol / lleisiol. Mae'r cynnig hwn yn golygu y bydd raid i'r ysgolion sy'n gwneud hyn drwy'r Gwasanaeth Cerdd ar hyn o bryd i wneud trefniadau eraill.

Q. Does this mean children and young people will no longer be able to access music curriculum tuition and instrumental / vocal lessons?

No, school budgets will not be affected by this proposal so they will still have the same amount of money to hire in providers for curriculum tuition and instrumental / vocal lessons. This proposal means that schools who currently do this via the RCT Music Service will have to make alternative arrangements.

C. Ydy'r holl ysgolion yn prynu'r gwasanaeth trwy Wasanaeth Cerdd RhCT?

Nac ydyn, ac mewn gwirionedd mae llawer o ysgolion eisoes yn prynu'u gwasanaeth oddi wrth ddarparwyr allanol.

Q. Do all schools currently buy in from the RCT Music Service?

No, in fact many schools in RCT already hire in from external providers.

C. Fydd hyn dan sylw yn golygu rhagor o gostau i'r rhieni/cynhalwyr (gofalwyr)?

Na fydd, ddim o reidrwydd – does dim polisi gan y Cyngor ynglŷn â ph'un ai codi tâl ar rieni neu beidio. Mae rhai ysgolion ar hyn o bryd yn gofyn i rieni i dalu rhai neu'r cyfan o'r costau. Dyw rhai ysgolion eraill ddim yn gwneud hynny o gwbl, a bydd hynny'n parhau. Bydd pob ysgol yn unigol yn penderfynu ar y dull y maen nhw eisiau'i ddilyn.

Q. Will what is being proposed cost more for parents/carers?

Not necessarily – there is no Council policy on whether or not parents should be charged. Some schools currently pass some or all of the costs onto parents whereas some do not and this will continue to be the case and will be for each individual school to decide on the approach they wish to take.

C. Beth am offerynnau gan fy mod i'n llogi un oddi wrth y Gwasanaeth Cerdd ar hyn o bryd?

Bydd cyfle o hyd i logi'r offerynnau sydd o eiddo'r Cyngor.

Q. What about instruments as I currently hire one from the Music Service?

The Council owned instruments will continue to be made available to hire.

C. Sut gallwch chi fod yn siŵr y bydd darparwyr allanol o'r un ansawdd â'r rheini a gyflogir ar hyn o bryd drwy Rondda Cynon Taf?

Mae rhai awdurdodau lleol yng Nghymru yn gweithredu modelau eraill, ac mae ysgolion ledled Cymru yn prynu gwasanaethau gan amrywiaeth o ddarparwyr annibynnol, nid dim ond y rhai o du'r awdurdod lleol.

Q. How can you be sure that external providers will be of the same quality as those currently employed through RCT?

Some local authorities in Wales operate alternative models, and schools across Wales buy services from a range of independent music providers, not just those provided by the local authority.

C. Fyddai'r Cyngor yn cefnogi datblygu menter gymdeithasol i ddarparu gwasanaeth cerdd yn ysgolion RhCT?

Yn bendant – rydyn ni wedi bod yn glir iawn y byddwn ni'n cefnogi unigolion a/neu grwpiau sy'n mynegi diddordeb mewn cynnal cyfleuster neu wasanaeth na all y Cyngor fforddio'i gynnal mwyach. Dyma rywbeth y bydden ni'n awyddus i'w ystyried drwy'r broses ymgynghori.

Q. Would the Council support a social enterprise being developed to provide music services to schools in RCT?

Absolutely – we have made clear that we will support individuals and/or groups of individuals who express an interest in operating a facility or service which the Council can no longer afford to sustain and this is something we would be keen to explore via the consultation process.



HAVE
YOUR SAY
DWEUD
EICH
DWEUD

Service Change Consultation HAVE YOUR SAY!

Supplementary Information for Funding for Nursery Education and Council Funded Music Service Extended Consultation

The **Consultation started** on: **21 OCTOBER 2014**
and will **close at 5pm** on: **30 JANUARY 2015**

Local Engagement Events will be held in the community.
Details will be placed on the website when confirmed.

For further information please visit:
www.rctcbc.gov.uk/budgetchallenge
where you can find out the detail of the
proposals and fill in a survey.

-  01443 425014
-  musicconsultation@rctcbc.gov.uk
nurseryconsultation@rctcbc.gov.uk
-  FREEPOST RSBU-HJUK-LSSS,
Research & Consultation, The Pavilions,
Clydach Vale, CF40 2XX



On the 21st October 2014, the Council began a Consultation on proposed changes to Funding for Nursery Education and to the Council Funded Music Service. The Consultation process was due to close on the 16th December.

Since the commencement of the Consultation process, a Supreme Court ruling has meant that the Council has decided to issue further information on the alternative options which were considered.

This supplementary information is now being made available to consultees as part of the overall Consultation process. The Consultation period is also being extended and will now end on the **30th January 2015 (at 5.00pm)**. **This supplementary information should be read in conjunction with the Consultation materials already available.**

To deal with a budget gap the Council is reviewing all services and considering options to reduce expenditure and / or increase income by reconfiguring, cutting or reducing the services we provide. An important part of this process is to gauge the views of our residents, staff and key stakeholders on our proposals.

Please take this opportunity to have your say.

Supplementary Information

Funding for Nursery Education

As part of developing the preferred option for Consultation, a number of alternative options were considered and commentary on these alternatives is now provided below. This supplementary information is now being made available to consultees as part of the overall Consultation process. The Consultation period is also being extended and will now end on the **30th January 2015 (at 5.00pm)**. **This supplementary information should be read in conjunction with the Consultation materials already available.**

Option Number 1

Status Quo i.e. retain the current level of provision.

Not proposed because this option would continue to fund a historic level of provision, which is above the level provided by most Councils in Wales and considered to be unaffordable going forward. There is no evidence to substantiate the educational and attainment benefits from the current full time (nursery) education provision as opposed to part-time provision.

No financial savings delivered from this option.

Option Number 2

Full time provision from the term after the child's 3rd birthday.

Not proposed because this option would continue to fund a historic level of provision, which is above the level provided by most Councils in Wales and considered to be unaffordable going forward. There is no evidence to substantiate the educational and attainment benefits from full time (nursery) education provision from the term after a child's 3rd birthday as opposed to part-time provision.

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £0.093M per year.

Option Number 3

Part time (half day) provision from the term after the child's 3rd birthday and full time nursery from the following September.

Not proposed because this option would continue to fund a historic level of provision, which is above the level provided by most Councils in Wales and considered to be unaffordable going forward. There is no evidence to substantiate the educational and attainment benefits from full time (nursery) education provision from the September following a Child's 3rd Birthday.

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £0.313M per year.

Option Number 4

Part time (half day) provision from the term after the child's 3rd birthday and part time (half day) nursery from the following September and then full time reception.

Not proposed because this option would result in inequitable provision across the County Borough in that children born in Autumn term will not be funded for full time until the September following, as opposed to children born in the summer term who would be funded for full time from the following term.

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £3.292M per year.

Option Number 4A

Part time (half day) provision from the term after the child's 3rd birthday and part time (half day) nursery from the following September and then full time reception. Plus half day play funded by Council.

Not proposed because the funding and direct 'wraparound' childcare provision is not wholly the responsibility of the School/Council although the Council has a duty to secure sufficient childcare for its area, so far as reasonably practicable ('it's childcare sufficiency duty').

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £1.125M per year

Option Number 4B

Part time (half day) provision from the term after the child's 3rd birthday and part time (half day) nursery from the following September and then full time Reception. Plus half day play charged to the parent.

Not proposed because the option of providing chargeable 'wraparound' childcare provision would be available as a local decision which would be best made based on local knowledge of supply and demand issues and which the Council can support through its Early Years and Family Support Service. Parents may already have childcare arrangements in place which would impact on the viability of any particular facility offering 'wraparound' provision.

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £3.136M per year.

Option Number 5

Part time (half-day) provision the term after the child's 3rd birthday and full time provision from the term after the child's 4th birthday.

PROPOSED PREFERRED OPTION

This option provides an equitable funding basis (subject to capacity) and does not

disadvantage children based on where their birthday falls in an academic year (i.e. which term) with all children being funded for 3 terms part time.

It provides an effective phased introduction to full time education and has been deemed by Council officers to be “sufficient” nursery education provision to meet the needs of nursery aged children in Rhondda Cynon Taf.

Children already in receipt of full time nursery provision during 2014/15 academic year would continue to be funded for full time provision (i.e. they would not be affected). The option would impact on new admissions from September 2015 and onwards.

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £2.166M per year.

Option Number 6

Part time (half day) provision from the term after the child’s 3rd birthday, and part time (half day) nursery and part time (half day) reception until the term after the child’s 5th birthday.

Not proposed because this option would result in funding for a phased introduction at reception year which is not considered to be in the best interests of children at that stage of education.

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £4.862M per year.

Option Number 7

Single point admission in September - Full time nursery.

Not proposed because this option would remove funding for pre-nursery provision in LEA maintained schools and would involve providing funding to other registered education providers.

No savings due to cost of providing funding to other registered education providers.

Option Number 8

Single point admission in September - Part time nursery.

Not proposed because this option would remove funding for pre-nursery provision in LEA maintained schools and would involve providing funding to other registered education providers.

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £2.377M per year.

Option Number 9

Single point admission in September - Part time (half day) nursery and reception with phased full-time reception the term after children turn 5.

Not proposed because this option would remove funding for pre-nursery provision in LEA maintained schools and would involve providing funding to other registered education providers.

This option would also result in funding for a phased introduction at reception year which is not considered to be in the best interests of children at that stage of education.

If implemented, this option would deliver savings of £3.888M per year.

Note. Savings figures quoted for each option are based on a reduction in the funding provided to schools which is linked to the estimated number of pupils and the amount of time which they would be in school (full time or part time) for each option adjusted for ancillary proposals, such as charges to parents, removal of free school meals etc.

Supplementary Information Council Funded Music Service

As part of developing the preferred option for Consultation, a number of alternative options were considered and commentary on these alternatives is now provided below.

This supplementary information is now being made available to consultees as part of the overall Consultation process. The Consultation period is also being extended and will now end on the **30th January 2015 (at 5.00pm)**. **This supplementary information should be read in conjunction with the Consultation materials already available.**

Option Number 1A

Discontinue the Music Service

PROPOSED PREFERRED OPTION

The discontinuation of the Council run and subsidised Music service would still leave individual schools with the same level of resources to engage independent providers.

This option would deliver savings of £0.474M per year.

Option Number 1B

Discontinue the Music Service and centrally commission music tuition from other providers.

Not proposed because this option would introduce administration costs with little evidence to demonstrate the value added that such an arrangement could provide and at a cost of £0.203M.

This option would deliver savings of £0.271M per year.

Option Number 2

Employ all staff on Local Pay and Conditions excluding curriculum teachers.

Not proposed because this option would potentially introduce significant staff turnover with lack of continuity issues.

This option would deliver savings of £0.093M per year.

Option Number 3

Employ all staff on Local Pay and Conditions & cease to offer curriculum teaching.

Not proposed because this option would potentially introduce significant staff turnover with lack of continuity issues as option 2 plus a mix of providers (where schools seek curriculum teaching from other providers) could introduce greater inconsistencies.

This option would deliver savings of £0.112M per year.

Option Number 4A & B

Re-launch Music Service paying staff an hourly rate term time only.

Not proposed because this option would increase the risk of staff turnover and the ability to engage sufficient resources to provide the service would present a significant risk to the Council which option 1 removes.

This option would deliver savings of £0.368M per year (with payment of travelling expenses) or £0.378M per year (with no payment of travelling expenses).

Option Number 5

Re-launch Music Service as an agency for Approved Music Tutors.

Not proposed because this option requires management of an agency arrangement with additional cost implications and would not represent good value for money for the Council.

This option would deliver savings of £0.200M per year.

Option Number 6

Reduce the subsidy of the Music Service (thereby increasing charge to schools).

Not proposed because the increased charge to schools would result in an uncompetitive service which schools could obtain at a lower cost from other providers.

The savings from this option would be dependent upon the level of increased charge.

Option Number 7

Independent management structure review.

Not proposed because with this option there would still be a required management role for the Council and savings achievable (against a current management cost of £0.115M) would be likely to be marginal as compared to option 1.

Option Number 8

Introduce a charge to parents for extra-curricular activities.

Not proposed because this option would only deliver savings of £0.021M per year.

Option Number 9

Cease to run extra-curricular activities.

Not proposed because this option would only deliver savings of £0.021M per year.

Option Number 10

Consideration of Partnership working.

Not proposed because this option would require a longer lead-in time to deliver the savings and most likely be outside of the current financial planning timeframes.

Savings would need to be determined.

Note. Savings figures quoted for each option are based on reduced employee costs and / or additional income as appropriate.



HAVE
YOUR SAY
DWEUD
EICH
DWEUD

Ymgynghoriad ar Newid Gwasanaethau **DWEUD EICH DWEUD!**

Gwybodaeth ychwanegol ar gyfer
Cyllid ar gyfer Addysg Feithrin a'r Gwasanaeth Cerdd dan nawdd y Cyngor
Ymgynghoriad Estynedig

Dechreuodd yr Ymgynghoriad: 21 HYDREF 2014
Bydd yn **dod i ben am 5pm ar: 30 IONAWR 2015**

Bydd Achlysuron Ymgysylltu Lleol yn cael eu cynnal yn y gymuned.
Bydd manylion ar y wefan o'u cadarnhau.

I gael rhagor o wybodaeth:
www.rctcbc.gov.uk/sialenscyllideb
bydd modd i chi gael manylion am y
cynigion a llenwi arolwg.

☎ 01443 425014

✉ YmgynghoriadGwasanaethCerdd@rctcbc.gov.uk
YmgynghoriadMeithrin@rctcbc.gov.uk

📄 RHADBOST RSBU-HJUK-LSSS,
Ymchwil ac Ymgynghori, Y Pafiliynau,
Cwm Clydach, CF40 2XX



Ar 21 Hydref 2014, dechreuodd y Cyngor ymgynghoriad ar gynigion i newid Cyllid ar gyfer Addysg Feithrin a'r Gwasanaeth Cerdd dan nawdd y Cyngor. Roedd disgwyl i'r broses ymgynghori ddod i ben ar 16 Rhagfyr.

Ers dechrau'r broses ymgynghori, mae dyfarniad gan y Goruchaf Lys wedi golygu bod y Cyngor wedi penderfynu cyhoeddi rhagor o wybodaeth am yr opsiynau eraill a gafodd eu hystyried.

Erbyn hyn, mae'r wybodaeth ychwanegol hon ar gael i ymgynghoreion yn rhan o'r broses ymgynghori gyffredinol. Mae cyfnod yr ymgynghoriad hefyd yn cael ei estyn, a bydd hwn yn dod i ben ar **30 Ionawr 2015 (5.00pm)**. **Dylai'r wybodaeth ychwanegol hon gael ei darllen ar y cyd â'r deunyddiau ymgynghori eraill sydd eisoes ar gael.**

Er mwyn mynd i'r afael â bwloch yn y gyllideb, mae'r Cyngor yn adolygu pob gwasanaeth ac yn ystyried opsiynau i gwtogi ar wariant ac/neu i gynyddu incwm trwy aildrefnu, torri neu ostwng lefel y gwasanaethau rydyn ni'n eu darparu. Rhan bwysig o'r broses hon ydy clywed barn ein preswylwyr, staff a rhanddeiliaid allweddol ar ein cynigion.

Manteisiwch ar y cyfle hwn i ddweud eich dweud.

Gwybodaeth ychwanegol Cyllid ar gyfer Addysg Feithrin

Wrth ddatblygu'r opsiwn mwyaf ffafriol ar gyfer yr ymgynghoriad, cafodd nifer o opsiynau eraill eu hystyried. Mae esboniad o'r opsiynau eraill hyn wedi ei nodi isod. Erbyn hyn, mae'r wybodaeth ychwanegol hon ar gael i ymgynghoreion yn rhan o'r broses ymgynghori gyffredinol. Mae cyfnod yr ymgynghoriad hefyd yn cael ei estyn, a bydd hwn yn dod i ben ar **30 Ionawr 2015 (5.00pm)**. **Dylai'r wybodaeth ychwanegol hon gael ei darllen ar y cyd â'r deunyddiau ymgynghori eraill sydd eisoes ar gael.**

Opsiwn 1

Y sefyllfa bresennol, sef cynnal lefel y gwasanaeth fel mae ar hyn o bryd.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn parhau i ariannu lefel hanesyddol o ddarpariaeth. Mae'r lefel hon yn uwch na'r hyn mae'r rhan fwyaf o Gynghorau eraill Cymru yn ei darparu ac yn cael ei ystyried yn anfforddiadwy yn y dyfodol. Does dim tystiolaeth i gadarnhau bod darpariaeth addysg feithrin amser llawn yn cynnig manteision o ran addysg a chyrhaeddiad, o'i chymharu â darpariaeth ran-amser.

Fyddai'r opsiwn hwn ddim yn sicrhau unrhyw arbedion ariannol.

Opsiwn 2

Darpariaeth amser llawn o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn parhau i ariannu lefel hanesyddol o ddarpariaeth. Mae'r lefel hon yn uwch na'r hyn mae'r rhan fwyaf o Gynghorau eraill Cymru yn ei darparu ac yn cael ei ystyried yn anfforddiadwy yn y dyfodol. Does dim tystiolaeth i gadarnhau bod darpariaeth addysg feithrin amser llawn yn cynnig manteision o ran addysg a chyrhaeddiad, o'i chymharu â darpariaeth ran-amser.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £0.093m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 3

Darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed a darpariaeth amser llawn o'r mis Medi dilynol.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn parhau i ariannu lefel hanesyddol o ddarpariaeth. Mae'r lefel hon yn uwch na'r hyn mae'r rhan fwyaf o Gynghorau eraill Cymru yn ei darparu ac yn cael ei ystyried yn anfforddiadwy yn y dyfodol. Does dim tystiolaeth i gadarnhau bod darpariaeth addysg feithrin amser llawn o'r mis Medi ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed yn cynnig manteision o ran addysg a chyrhaeddiad.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £0.313m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 4

Darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed a darpariaeth feithrin ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r mis Medi dilynol, yna amser llawn mewn dosbarth derbyn.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arwain at ddarpariaeth annheg ar draws y Fwrdeistref Sirol; fyddai plant wedi eu geni yn ystod tymor yr Hydref ddim yn cael eu hariannu ar gyfer darpariaeth amser llawn tan y mis Medi dilynol, ond byddai plant wedi eu geni yn ystod tymor yr haf yn cael eu hariannu ar gyfer darpariaeth amser llawn o'r tymor dilynol.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £3.292m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 4A

Darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed a darpariaeth feithrin ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r mis Medi dilynol, yna amser llawn mewn dosbarth derbyn. Yn ogystal â hanner diwrnod o chwarae wedi ei ariannu gan y Cyngor.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd dydy ariannu a darpariaeth gofal plant 'gofleidiol' uniongyrchol ddim yn gyfrifoldeb yr Ysgol / y Cyngor yn llwyr, ond mae dyletswydd ar y Cyngor i sicrhau darpariaeth gofal plant ddigonol ar gyfer ei ardal, cyn belled ag y bo'n rhesymol ymarferol ('ei ddyletswydd digonolrwydd gofal plant').

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £1.125m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 4B

Darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed a darpariaeth feithrin ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r mis Medi dilynol, yna amser llawn mewn dosbarth derbyn. Yn ogystal â hanner diwrnod o chwarae i'w dalu gan y rhiant.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn i ddarparu darpariaeth gofal plant 'gofleidiol' daladwy ar gael ar sail penderfyniad lleol a fyddai'n well ei wneud ar sail gwybodaeth leol ynglŷn â materion cyflenwad a galw a gall y Cyngor ei gefnogi trwy ei Wasanaeth y Blynyddoedd Cynnar a Chymorth i Deuluoedd. Mae'n bosibl bod trefniadau gofal plant gan rieni yn barod, a byddai hynny'n effeithio ar hyfywedd unrhyw gyfleuster penodol sy'n cynnig darpariaeth 'gofleidiol'.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £3.136m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 5

Darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed a darpariaeth amser llawn o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 4 oed.

Y CYNNIG MWYAF FFAFRIOL

Mae'r opsiwn hwn yn cynnig sail ariannu teg (yn amodol ar gapasiti) ac nid yw'n rhoi plant dan anfantais ar sail pryd mae eu pen-blwydd yn ystod y flwyddyn academaidd (hynny yw, ym mha dymor) – byddai'r plant i gyd yn cael eu hariannu ar gyfer tri thymor, rhan-amser.

Mae'n cynnig cyflwyno plant yn raddol, mewn modd effeithiol, i addysg amser llawn. Mae swyddogion y Cyngor o'r farn bod yr opsiwn hwn yn cynnig darpariaeth addysg feithrin “ddigonol” o ran diwallu anghenion plant oed meithrin yn Rhondda Cynon Taf.

Byddai plant sydd eisoes yn derbyn addysg feithrin amser llawn yn ystod y flwyddyn academaidd 2014/15 yn parhau i gael eu hariannu ar gyfer darpariaeth amser llawn (hynny yw, fyddai'r cynnig dan sylw ddim yn effeithio ar y plant hynny). Byddai'r opsiwn yn effeithio ar drefniadau derbyn disgyblion newydd o fis Medi 2015 ac ymlaen.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £2.166m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 6

Darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) o'r tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 3 oed, a darpariaeth feithrin ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) a darpariaeth ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) mewn dosbarth derbyn hyd at y tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 5 oed.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arwain at ariannu cyflwyno plant yn raddol i'r dosbarth derbyn, a dydy hynny ddim yn cael ei ystyried o fudd i blant ar y cam hwnnw yn eu haddysg.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £4.862m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 7

Derbyn y disgyblion i gyd ym mis Medi – addysg feithrin amser llawn.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn dileu ariannu darpariaeth cyn-feithrin mewn ysgolion sy'n cael eu cynnal gan yr Awdurdod Addysg Lleol ac yn golygu darparu cyllid i ddarparwyr addysg cofrestredig eraill.

Dim arbedion oherwydd cost darparu cyllid i ddarparwyr addysg cofrestredig eraill.

Opsiwn 8

Derbyn y disgyblion i gyd ym mis Medi – addysg feithrin ran-amser.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn dileu ariannu darpariaeth cyn-feithrin mewn ysgolion sy'n cael eu cynnal gan yr Awdurdod Addysg Lleol ac yn golygu darparu cyllid i ddarparwyr addysg cofrestredig eraill.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £2.377m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 9

Derbyn y disgyblion i gyd ym mis Medi – addysg feithrin a derbyn ran-amser (hanner diwrnod) a chyflwyno plant yn raddol i'r dosbarth derbyn amser llawn y tymor ar ôl pen-blwydd y plentyn yn 5 oed.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn dileu ariannu darpariaeth cyn-feithrin mewn ysgolion sy'n cael eu cynnal gan yr Awdurdod Addysg Lleol ac yn golygu darparu cyllid i ddarparwyr addysg cofrestredig eraill.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn hefyd yn arwain at ariannu cyflwyno plant yn raddol i'r dosbarth derbyn, a dydy hynny ddim yn cael ei ystyried o fudd i blant ar y cam hwnnw yn eu haddysg.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £3.888m y flwyddyn.

Noder: Mae'r arbedion sydd wedi eu nodi ar gyfer pob opsiwn yn seiliedig ar ostyngiad o ran y cyllid a fyddai'n cael ei ddarparu i ysgolion, sy'n gysylltiedig ag amcan nifer y disgyblion a faint o amser y bydden nhw'n ei dreulio yn yr ysgol (amser llawn neu ran-amser), ac wedi eu haddasu ar gyfer cynigion ategol, megis codi tâl ar rieni, dileu prydau ysgol am ddim ac ati.

Gwybodaeth ychwanegol

Gwasanaeth Cerdd dan nawdd y Cyngor

Wrth ddatblygu'r opsiwn mwyaf ffafriol ar gyfer yr ymgynghoriad, cafodd nifer o opsiynau eraill eu hystyried. Mae esboniad o'r opsiynau eraill hyn wedi ei nodi isod.

Erbyn hyn, mae'r wybodaeth ychwanegol hon ar gael i ymgynghoreion yn rhan o'r broses ymgynghori gyffredinol. Mae cyfnod yr ymgynghoriad hefyd yn cael ei estyn, a bydd hwn yn dod i ben ar **30 Ionawr 2015 (5.00pm)**. **Dylai'r wybodaeth ychwanegol hon gael ei darllen ar y cyd â'r deunyddiau ymgynghori eraill sydd eisoes ar gael.**

Opsiwn 1A

Dod â'r Gwasanaeth Cerdd i ben

Y CYNNIG MWYAF FFAFRIOL

Byddai peidio â chynnal y Gwasanaeth Cerdd, sy'n cael ei gynnal a'i ariannu gan y Cyngor, yn golygu y byddai gan ysgolion unigol yr un lefel o adnoddau er mwyn manteisio ar ddarparwyr annibynnol.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £0.474m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 1B

Dod â'r Gwasanaeth Cerdd i ben a chomisiynu hyfforddiant cerdd yn ganolog gan ddarparwyr eraill.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn cyflwyno costau gweinyddu a phrin yw'r dystiolaeth i ddangos y gwerth y gallai trefniant o'r fath ei gynnig, a hynny am gost o £0.203m.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £0.271m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 2

Cyflogi'r holl staff ar Gyflogau ac Amodau Lleol ac eithrio athrawon cwricwlwm.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn, o bosibl, yn cyflwyno trosiant sylweddol o staff a materion diffyg parhad.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £0.093m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 3

Cyflogi'r holl staff ar Gyflogau ac Amodau Lleol a rhoi'r gorau i gynnig addysgu cwricwlwm.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn, o bosibl, yn cyflwyno trosiant sylweddol o staff a materion diffyg parhad, fel Opsiwn 2, a gallai cymysgedd o ddarparwyr (pan fyddai ysgolion yn ceisio darparwyr eraill i addysgu'r cwricwlwm) gyflwyno rhagor o anghysonderau.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £0.112m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 4A a B

Ail-lansio'r Gwasanaeth Cerdd a thalu staff fesul awr yn ystod y tymor yn unig.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn cynyddu risg trosiant staff a byddai'r gallu i sicrhau digon o adnoddau i ddarparu'r gwasanaeth yn cyflwyno risg sylweddol i'r Cyngor sy'n cael ei ddileu gan Opsiwn 1.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £0.368m y flwyddyn (gan gynnwys talu costau teithio) neu £0.378m y flwyddyn (heb dalu costau teithio).

Opsiwn 5

Ail-lansio'r Gwasanaeth Cerdd fel asiantaeth ar gyfer tiwtoriaid cerddoriaeth wedi'u cymeradwyo.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn golygu bod angen rheoli trefniant asiantaeth â goblygiadau ychwanegol o ran cost, ac ni fyddai'n cynrychioli gwerth da am arian y Cyngor.

Byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed £0.200m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 6

Lleihau cymhorthdal y Gwasanaeth Cerdd (a thrwy hynny, godi tâl uwch ar ysgolion).

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai codi tâl uwch ar ysgolion yn arwain at gynnig gwasanaeth anghystadleuol a byddai modd i'r ysgolion ei gael gan ddarparwyr eraill am gost is.

Byddai'r arbedion a ddaw yn sgil yr opsiwn hwn yn dibynnu ar lefel y tâl uwch.

Opsiwn 7

Adolygiad o'r strwythur rheoli annibynnol.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn gosod dyletswydd reoli ofynnol ar y Cyngor a byddai'r arbedion posibl (yn erbyn cost reoli o £0.115m ar hyn o bryd) yn debygol o fod yn isel iawn o'u cymharu ag Opsiwn 1.

Opsiwn 8

Cyflwyno tâl i'r rhieni ar gyfer gweithgareddau allgyrsiol.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd fyddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed dim ond £0.021m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 9

Peidio â chynnal gweithgareddau allgyrsiol.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd fyddai'r opsiwn hwn yn arbed dim ond £0.021m y flwyddyn.

Opsiwn 10

Ystyried gweithio mewn partneriaeth.

Heb ei gynnig oherwydd byddai'r opsiwn hwn yn cymryd rhagor o amser i sicrhau arbedion ac mae'n debygol iawn y byddai tu allan i'r amserlenni cyfredol o ran cynllunio ariannol.

Byddai angen pennu'r arbedion.

Noder: Mae'r arbedion sydd wedi eu nodi ar gyfer pob opsiwn yn seiliedig ar ostyngiad o ran costau cyflogaion ac/neu incwm ychwanegol, fel y bo'n briodol.



RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNCIL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**Medium Term Service Planning:
Service Change Proposals**

**Proposal: School Admission
Arrangements - funding for provision
of nursery education**

Equality Impact Assessment

Proposal: School Admission Arrangements

1. Background and Purpose of the Initiative

- 1.1 The Council is facing a significant financial challenge into the medium term and all services and their delivery must be assessed.
- 1.2 On the 29th October 2014, Council received a report on the implications of the provisional local government settlement for 2015/16, as announced on the 8th October 2014. This confirmed that the Council was facing an initial budget gap for 2015/16 of £30.450M, which after taking into account decisions already made during 2014/15 would reduce to £22.646M.
- 1.3 On the 22nd January 2015 the Cabinet agreed a draft budget strategy for 2015/16 which included the implications of the final settlement, a recommended 3.8% Council Tax increase, an increased tax base, plus a number of base budget updates. The resultant budget gap was £16.526M for 2015/16.
- 1.4 The draft budget strategy includes a number of proposals to deal with the budget gap, including the use of £6.592M from the Medium Term Financial Planning and Service Transformation Reserve, reducing the balance of this reserve to £0.5M.
- 1.5 In respect of the medium term forecast, the draft strategy indicated that a remaining projected budget gap to 2017/18 of £46M still needed to be addressed.
- 1.6 The changes outlined in this proposal are required as part of the Council's Medium Term Service Planning arrangements (specifically to reduce spend and enable the Council to fulfil its statutory responsibility and set a balanced budget into the medium term).

2. The General Duty

- 2.1 Under the Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010), public authorities must, in the exercise of their functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

3. Introduction: Proposal on School Admission Arrangements

- 3.1 The proposal agreed by Cabinet on the 10th October 2014 for public consultation was to base the funding arrangement on:

- Part-time (half day) (15 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 3rd birthday (pre-nursery and nursery);
 - Full-time (30 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 4th birthday (nursery and reception); and
 - Funding up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary or independent registered education providers from the term following a child's 3rd birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school (N.B. in this context, 'suitability' shall relate to the availability of a place at a school, which, in the Council's opinion is within a reasonable radius of the child's ordinary place of residence i.e. where those with parental responsibility for the child live).
- 3.2 Under the proposal, children already in receipt of full-time nursery provision (during the 2014-15 academic year) would continue to be funded for full-time provision. It is proposed that only those new starters from September 2015 would commence on a part-time basis.
- 3.3 Details relating to the statutory responsibilities of the Council, the operation and the cost of the service can be found in the Cabinet report, dated 10th October 2014.
- 3.4 The proposal sets out that children who attend part-time provision would not be entitled to Home to School Transport or free school meals.
- 3.5 This equality impact assessment considers the potential impact on protected groups of the proposal to amend funding for nursery education in Rhondda Cynon Taf.
- 3.6 A separate Child's Rights Impact Assessment has been produced, in line with good practice, attached at Appendix I.

4. What evidence is there to suggest the potential impact of the proposal on protected groups?

4.1 Consultation & Engagement

4.1.1 Following Cabinet approval, a public consultation was launched on the 21st October 2014, which was initially to be closed on the 16th December 2014. This consultation period was subsequently extended to the 30th January 2015.

4.1.2 A separate consultation report on the methodology and outcomes of the consultation has been produced and is attached with these papers.

4.1.3 The main themes arising from the consultation were:

- General lack of sufficient childcare;
- Need to stop or reduce work, training or education;
- Negative impact on learning and education;
- Negative impact on social skills;
- Impact on deprived communities;

- Impact on working families;
- Financial impact personal/wider economy;
- Impact on vulnerable children/ children with a disability;
- Ample notice should be given;
- Cuts should be made elsewhere.

4.1.4 With specific reference to the potential negative impacts on protected groups, the consultation asked respondents if they felt that the proposals would have more of an impact upon them because of a protected characteristic.

4.1.5 The majority of respondents to this question stated that they felt the proposal would impact disproportionately on them because of their gender and their marital status, with a significant number also stating that the proposal would impact upon them due to age or the language they prefer to communicate in. The following table shows the number of responses that considered that the proposal would have an impact on the protected characteristics.

Characteristic	No. of responses
You are male / female	108 responses
Your age	49 responses
Your ethnicity	11 responses
You are disabled	9 responses
Your sexuality	7 responses
Your religion or belief	14 responses
You are single / married / cohabiting / in a civil partnership / divorced	119 responses
You are pregnant	28 responses
The language you prefer to communicate in	55 responses

4.1.6 Parents and carers responding to the survey were also given the opportunity to outline any reasons why they felt the proposal would impact on them because of a protected characteristic. In this case, the comments received were mixed but:

- 27 responses noted that the proposal could affect them disproportionately due to its possible affect on employment / further education / college / training (e.g. having to leave halfway through a course).
- 20 responses noted that it is 'women generally dealing with childcare / taking a break from their career for maternity leave'.
- 16 responses stated discrimination against Welsh schools or the Welsh language.

4.1.7 Where recurring themes relate to groups of the population potentially being disproportionately affected by the proposal, this theme has been considered in preparing this Equality Impact Assessment to meet the duty (as set out in Section 2).

4.2 Other evidence gathered

4.2.1 Evidence has been gathered from a number of sources, including academic research papers, Government policies, statistical bulletins and local data.

4.2.2 The evidence has been used to, firstly, determine the level of relevance the proposal has to the protected groups covered by the equality duty and, secondly, explore the potential impacts of the proposal further, having due regard to the need to promote equality and minimise any possible adverse impacts.

4.2.3 In line with feedback from the consultation, and other evidence gathered, the following assessment has been taken:

4.3 Could the proposal impact on protected groups covered by the general duty?¹

Protected Group	Could this proposal impact on this group differently from others in RCT?	Could this proposal promote equal opportunities for this group?
<i>Age</i>	Yes	No
<i>Disability</i>	No	No
<i>Gender assignment</i>	No	No
<i>Marriage / civil partnership</i>	Yes	No
<i>Pregnancy / maternity</i>	No	No
<i>Race</i>	Yes	No
<i>Religion / belief</i>	No	No
<i>Sexual orientation</i>	No	No
<i>Sex (gender)</i>	Yes	No

4.3.1 The following sections consider the potential impacts the proposal could have on protected groups covered by the general duty, using evidence gathered through engagement, consultation and research.

¹ (Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010)

What potential impacts could the proposal have on protected groups covered by the general duty? ¹

5. Protected Group: Age

5.1 POTENTIAL IMPACT ON CHILDREN

- 5.1.1 The equality duty covers the protected characteristic of age, which refers to a person having a particular age (for example, 32 year olds) or being within an age group (for example, 18-30 year olds). This includes all ages, including children and young people. As outlined above, the proposed preferred option is likely to have an impact on children aged 0-4 years old, living in Rhondda Cynon Taf.
- 5.1.2 The United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child recommends that all countries that ratify the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) undertake a children's rights impact assessment on all decisions related to children. The Welsh Government adopted the UNCRC in 2004 and on the 1st May 2014, a new duty on Welsh Ministers came into effect to have due regard to the UNCRC when exercising any of their Ministerial functions. As such, there is no legal duty on Local Authorities to undertake Child's Rights Impact Assessments, but in line with good practice, an assessment has been carried out in relation to this proposal, attached at Appendix I.
- 5.1.3 Based on data collected in January 2014 (the latest validated information), 617 children could be affected by this proposal, as they were attending pre-nursery education full-time. 54 children were attending pre-nursery part-time. With regards to nursery education, 2,742 children were in attendance full-time and 5 part-time at that point.
- 5.1.4 Although this proposal will clearly affect those children aged 0-4 years old living in Rhondda Cynon Taf, it is difficult to determine whether the affects of the proposal will be positive, negative or neutral. This is due to conflicting evidence on whether attending nursery education on a full-time basis (30 hours per week) has clear benefits for all children aged 3-5 years old.

a) Potential impact on learning and educational standards

- 5.1.5 Through consultation, many parents / carers expressed concern that the proposal could impact negatively on the level of educational standards and learning of young children. Consultation respondents felt that children who are not educated full-time (30 hours per week) from the age of 3 years old would have lower levels of attainment as they progress through the education system.
- 5.1.6 On a local level, there is no evidence to suggest that the current arrangements are having a positive impact on pupil attainment and attendance. As set out in Appendix 2 of the Cabinet report on the 10th October, many local authorities in Wales achieve better educational outcomes than Rhondda Cynon Taf, despite having a lower offer of funding for nursery provision in schools.
- 5.1.7 The educational outcomes for Rhondda Cynon Taf are also lower, on average, than those in England. This is despite most children attending nursery education on a part-time basis. English Local Authorities are required (by UK Government

policy) to secure only 15 hours per week for every child from the term following their 3rd birthday, until the child reaches compulsory school age, which is the beginning of the term following a child's 5th birthday.

- 5.1.8 This argument is supported by a widely recognised European study into the impact of nursery education on children and young people. The Effective Provision of Pre-school Education (EPPE) study found that attending full-time provision from the age of 3 years old does not have any significant positive impact compared to attending full-time provision when it is statutory at the age of 5 years old. Much of the evidence supports the theory that attending pre-school is important at an early age, but the length of time spent there has no significant effect (EPPE, 2004).
- 5.1.9 Other academic studies suggest that the quality of the home learning environment i.e. the activities that parents or carers undertake with pre-school children, has a more significant effect on a child's cognitive and learning development² than formal childcare or pre-school. There is also little evidence to suggest that children are substantially disadvantaged or advantaged by being looked after informally e.g. by grandparents or other informal childcarers.³
- 5.1.10 Some of those who disagreed with the proposal suggested that the changes would impact more negatively on the learning of those children from a deprived area of the County Borough. Many people commented that deprived areas require more support in this respect.
- 5.1.11 However, with regards to educational attainment, many of the authorities that are ranked higher for educational outcomes have similar levels of deprivation to Rhondda Cynon Taf⁴, yet lower levels of nursery provision.
- 5.1.12 Additionally, there is conflicting evidence around whether attending nursery education on a full-time basis is advantageous for children from more disadvantaged backgrounds. Loeb (2005) found that children in low-income households did make some progress in maths and language development. However, Heckman (2008) suggests that "*Schooling plays a minor role in creating or perpetuating gaps (in achievement)*", stating that achievement and socio-emotional development is based on a combination of genes and environment. Heckman's study advocates more intensive parenting programmes aimed at early years' children, rather than nursery education.⁵
- 5.1.13 Studies also suggest that the quality of the home learning environment is only moderately associated with levels of deprivation i.e. it is more important what parents or carers do with their children than their occupation or level of qualifications⁶.
- 5.1.14 A mitigation to these concerns is that there are over 2,000 children entitled to the Welsh Government's Flying Start programme in Rhondda Cynon Taf. This is targeted at children up to the age of 4 in deprived areas, providing free, part-time childcare for 2-3 year olds, an enhanced Health Visitor service, access to parenting programmes and early years development. Other interventions provided

² See, for example, EPPE (2004); Melhuish (Scottish Government Research 2010); ESRC (2013).

³ Bryson, C. et al. (2012) "*The role of informal care in childcare*" (Nuffield Foundation, IFS).

⁴ Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation (2011).

⁵ Heckman, J. (2008) "*Schools, Skills and Synapses*." National Bureau of Economic Research.

⁶ EPPE (2004) and Bryson (2012).

by the Council include the Team Around the Family model, providing multi-agency assessment and a key worker to families that require support.

5.1.15 In terms of mitigating against any potential negative impact towards children's educational and learning development, the Local Authority has a number of services dedicated to children and young people living in poverty and / or underachieving at school. For example, the recent service changes to Youth Services in Rhondda Cynon Taf are intended to have a positive impact on the attainment of future generations. The new Youth Engagement and Participation Service is more targeted at those young people who need intervention the most, such as children on the Child Protection Register, young carers and pupils with poor attendance.

5.1.16 Should the proposal be agreed, the educational attainment and attendance data of children and young people will continue to be monitored through the Cabinet and Scrutiny processes of the Council. Any subsequent impact of the proposal should be acted upon accordingly.

b) Potential impact on social skills / independence / confidence / development.

5.1.17 Consultation respondents raised concerns that children attending nursery education on a part-time basis (15 hours per week) from the age of 3 until the term after their 4th birthday could have a negative impact on social skills, independence, development and confidence. Most parents / carers stated that, in their view, full time (30 hours) would be a sufficient amount of provision.

5.1.18 The academic evidence for this theory is mixed. For instance, Loeb (2005) found that for those children from low-income families, additional hours of pre-nursery were associated with some progress in reading and maths, and few detrimental effects on social development. Children in high-income families displayed gains in pre-reading and maths when attending for 15-30 hours per week (part-time), but no cognitive gains and substantially greater behavioural problems were associated with increased attendance.⁷

5.1.19 Studies in favour of children starting school early tend to emphasise that it is the quality of the setting rather than the quantity (hours per day / week) that make a difference to the child's development.⁸

5.1.20 Many of the arguments for children beginning pre-nursery at a young age are based on the early relationships that parents build with school settings and the social skills and cognitive abilities that children develop, which is still the case when children attend for less time during the day / per week (ibid.).

5.1.21 With regards to potential impact on social skills, independence, confidence and development, the Local Authority provides a number of services that can mitigate against any potential negative consequences. The Access and Wellbeing service within the Local Authority will continue to offer support to young children to establish good attendance routines and solve any early issues around going to

⁷ See, for example, Loeb, S. et al. (2005) "How much is too much? The Influence of Preschool Centres on Children's Social and Cognitive Development." (National Bureau of Economic Research) or Stein, A. et al. (2013).

⁸ See, for example, Siraj-Blatchford (2011); Sylva, K. et al. (2008).

school. In the areas eligible, Flying Start provision provides a number of initiatives, including speech and language development.

- 5.1.22 The Special Educational Needs (SEN) of children will continue to be identified, recorded, assessed and met as early as possible as set out in the Rhondda Cynon Taf 'Starting School' booklet.⁹

c) Potential impact on attendance and wellbeing.

- 5.1.23 Schools will no longer receive the Council funding to provide pre-nursery and nursery children (3-4 year olds) with 'Free School Meals'. At present, families in receipt of certain benefits can apply for children aged 3 and above to receive 'Free School Meals'. Up to the statutory age for education of 5 years old, these are funded by the Council, with the Welsh Government providing the grant thereafter (for 5-18 year olds). As at January 2014, 237 pre-nursery pupils were entitled to this provision.
- 5.1.24 The consultation results have picked up that this is a potential negative impact for the wellbeing of young children who may not receive a hot meal at home. The impact of this would need to be monitored on an on-going basis.
- 5.1.25 Parents / carers have expressed that transporting their children from school to a childcare setting during the day would be difficult for them due to work / training commitments; access to transport; and cost. This could impact on the attendance of children to part-time provision.
- 5.1.26 Car ownership in Rhondda Cynon Taf is relatively low in comparison to other areas in Wales¹⁰, and it may be difficult for some parents / carers to transport children on public transport at particular times of the day and on certain routes. A complete absence of pre-school education could have a negative impact on the child's development.
- 5.1.27 Children attending part-time nursery education are not eligible for 'Home to School' transport i.e. transportation to and from school. The Council's current Learner Travel Policy, which is published in its Starting School booklet states at Section 3 '*The provision of free school transport shall be arranged to coincide with the start and end of the normal school day only, not at lunchtimes and shall be provided during the school term time.* At January 2015, there were 25 children receiving 'Home to School' transport for pre-nursery provision. 285 children were receiving 'Home to School' transport for nursery provision. Therefore, the decrease in the number of children eligible for 'Home to School' transport impacts upon a relatively small proportion of children. (Those children with Special Educational Needs will continue to receive transport, if required). It is also noted that under the Learner Travel (Wales) Measure 2008, the Council has discretion to provide Home to School transport for part-time pupils. When the Council makes use of its discretionary powers it must ensure that the policy applies to all learners in similar circumstances living in the Council's area.

⁹ <http://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/en/educationlearning/schoolscolleges/schoolplaces-admissions/schooladmissionsinformationandadvice.aspx>

¹⁰ National Statistics: statistical bulletin 100/2013 "*People and Licensing and Vehicle Ownership, 2012*" (Census data 2011) <http://wales.gov.uk/docs/statistics/2013/131022-people-vehicle-licensing-vehicle-ownership-2012-en.pdf>

- 5.1.28 The impact of this is difficult to determine due to the possible mitigating factors that could occur following a decision by Cabinet. Should the proposal be agreed, schools will no longer receive funding to provide full-time nursery education for children from the age of 3 years old. But, there is a possibility that schools will have the capacity to continue to offer free full-time education to children from the term following their 3rd birthday. It is also possible that a childcare provider could provide 'wraparound' childcare services at the school or in partnership with the school, thereby providing transport to the childcare setting. In addition, it would be possible to accommodate part-time nursery pupils (subject to available places) at the start and end of the school day as they represent a relatively small proportion of pupils on existing contracted vehicles. However there would be certain practicalities associated with arranging transport provision for those children who would be in receipt of part-time nursery provision under the Proposal. Providing lunch time transport for part time pupils for example would require new contracts to be put in place with resultant additional cost implications. In both circumstances noted above, issues around transporting children would be significantly mitigated.
- 5.1.29 A sample of local primary schools were contacted during the recent public consultation period (October 2014 - January 2015) to discuss what plans they will put in place, should the proposal be agreed. A number of the schools were considering either continuing to provide full-time provision (despite a lack of funding) or exploring options for 'wraparound' childcare onsite or with local childcare providers.
- 5.1.30 Overall, should the proposal be agreed, any offers made by schools to continue to provide full-time education (30 hours per week) for pre-nursery pupils or to provide a 'wraparound' childcare service would minimise the potential negative impacts raised through consultation.
- 5.1.31 It is not anticipated that children will be at additional risk because of the reduction in hours to the current provision. The Local Authority's duty to encourage parents / carers to enrol children for nursery provision prevails, and it will continue to fulfil its duty through a number of services, such as the Family Information Service, Schools Admission Service, Flying Start and Generic Health Visiting Services. This will continue to support early identification of special educational needs and identify children at risk. It will also continue to have a positive impact on children's learning and development (including through the medium of Welsh).

5.2 **POTENTIAL IMPACT ON ADULTS.**

5.2.1 Clearly, the proposal could also have an impact on the parents and carers of the children affected. Any change to the educational provision in Rhondda Cynon Taf will affect the childcare needs of those with parental responsibility. Under the Equality Act, therefore, parents / carers of average age will be affected disproportionately by this proposal more than other groups of the population.

5.2.2 In 2011, the average age at birth for mothers in Rhondda Cynon Taf was 25-29 years old. The figure below shows, therefore, that this proposal could impact on mother who are, on average, between the ages of 20 and 39 years old.

Figure: Average age at birth (females): 2011

Under 20	20 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 39	40 and over
251	754	958	671	319	54

5.2.3 Data on the average age at birth for fathers in Rhondda Cynon Taf is unavailable, but it can be assumed that fathers will be in a similar age group to mothers (the national average age for fathers at birth of a child was 32.6 years old in 2011).¹¹

5.2.4 Similarly, there is no data available on average age of grandparents or other carers for young children in Rhondda Cynon Taf, but it can be assumed that this group will also be disproportionately affected by the proposal. The average age of grandparents in England is 68 years old¹², but in making assumptions on the average age at birth of mothers in Rhondda Cynon Taf, grandparents are likely to be younger in the County Borough than in other parts of the UK.

a) Potential impact on formal childcare and employment / training.

5.2.5 Under section 22 of the Childcare Act 2006, the Local Authority has a duty to "secure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that the provision of childcare (whether or not by it) is sufficient to meet the requirements of parents in their area who require childcare in order to enable them (a) to take up, or remain in work; or (b) to undertake education or training which could reasonably be expected to assist them to obtain work."

5.2.6 It is not the duty of the Local Authority to meet the individual childcare needs of every working family, but to ensure that at a community level, strategic action is taken with partner organisations to address any gaps in childcare. The duty also states that this must be done "so far as is reasonably practicable", taking into account the Council's resources and capabilities to intervene in the childcare market.

5.2.7 Many parents and carers disagreed with the proposal on the grounds that it could inhibit them (and others in their position) from working or returning to work following maternity / paternity leave. Some respondents stated transport issues as the main reason for this (see paragraph 5.1.25), whereas others stated that

¹¹ ONS (2013)

¹² Glaser, K. et al. (2013) "Grandparenting in Europe." (Grandparents Plus).

there was not sufficient childcare in their area or that the childcare available is too expensive.

- 5.2.8 The true impact of this proposal on parents' and carers' ability to work / undertake training is difficult to assess. There are a number of factors that could affect this assessment, including parents' / carers' work patterns; proximity of their workplace to the child's school and childcare provider; availability and affordability of childcare; and availability of informal childcare i.e. from family / friends.
- 5.2.9 As set out above, the Local Authority has a duty towards parents / carers taking up or remaining in employment, or undertaking education or training. This means that, at a community level, the Council takes strategic action with its partners to address gaps in childcare. The childcare needs of the community are assessed on a triennial basis to form a 'Childcare Sufficiency Audit'. The most recent audit reflects the position before the proposal was consulted upon and found that sufficient childcare is available in Rhondda Cynon Taf (this is attached with Cabinet papers). Council officers consider that the Council should also be able to meet its childcare duty if the proposal is implemented, for reasons explained in paragraph 8.62 of the Cabinet report.
- 5.2.10 However, consultation respondents have expressed concerns over specific areas of Rhondda Cynon Taf, where they feel sufficient childcare is not available and that the Local Authority is failing its duty. In some cases, respondents claim that childcare does not exist in deprived areas because residents would not be able to afford it. Many of these areas are covered by Flying Start provision, which aims to mitigate against affordability of childcare and provide opportunities for families with less income.
- 5.2.11 As mitigation to these points raised through consultation around childcare sufficiency, a piece of work has been undertaken to look more closely at the areas raised by respondents to assess sufficiency of childcare. Information on this is included within the Cabinet report.
- 5.2.12 It can also be assumed that, should the proposal be agreed, the market for childcare would adjust itself accordingly if gaps are identified in certain communities. Where this would not be the case, the Council would have a duty (under section 22 of the Childcare Act 2006) to intervene in the market and ensure a form of provision is available.
- 5.2.13 Parents and carers have also commented on the affordability of childcare and the ability to move a child from a school setting to a childcare setting during the day, particularly if they are in employment. Should parents / carers have no other option than to enrol their child in pre-nursery education (provided in the morning, for example) and pay for different formal childcare in the afternoon at a separate location with no available transportation, this will have a negative impact on their ability to work full-time.

b) Potential impact on informal childcare.

- 5.2.14 The proposal could lead to a much heavier reliance on informal childcare within Rhondda Cynon Taf. Consultation respondents echoed that, should the proposal be agreed, parents and carers will need to rely much more heavily on family and

friends to provide transportation and care to young children that would otherwise be in full-time (30 hours per week) nursery education.

5.2.15 The Childcare Sufficiency Audit 2014-17 found that this is already the favoured form of childcare in Rhondda Cynon Taf. Many parents are choosing to return to work on reduced hours rather than full-time, looking after their child some of the time and relying on grandparents or friends to care for their child while they are at work.

5.2.16 A recent study demonstrated that 63% of grandparents in Britain provide care to their grandchildren under the age of 16 without the child's parents being there.¹³ Other studies have found that this is most likely to be grandmothers, in the 50-69 year old age group, providing care to younger grandchildren.¹²

5.2.17 However, grandparents in the UK are also more likely to be in paid employment than in other European countries (approximately one in four in England, compared to one in seven in other European countries)¹², and considering grandparents in Rhondda Cynon Taf are likely to be younger than the English average of 68 years old (due to the average age at birth for mothers outlined above), it is likely that even more grandparents in the County Borough are still in paid work. This could have an impact on the availability of informal care.

5.2.18 Again, the true impact of the proposal on parents and carers is dependent on the actions of schools and childcare providers. A separate piece of work has been undertaken to understand their intentions and this is included within the Cabinet report.

¹³ Wellard, S. (2011) *Doing it all? Grandparents, childcare and employment: an analysis of British Social Attitudes Survey Data from 1998 and 2009*. London: Grandparents Plus.

6. Protected Group: Marriage / civil partnership

- 6.1 Consultation respondents stated that they felt the proposal would impact upon them disproportionately due to their marital status i.e. whether they were single, cohabiting, married or in a civil partnership.
- 6.2 When asked for the reasons parents / carers thought they would be impacted more due to a protected characteristic, the majority of people responded due to an impact on "employment / further education / college (e.g. having to leave halfway through a course". A smaller cohort mentioned the fact they were a "single parent / have no support".
- 6.3 As women are far more likely to be lone parents than men, the impact on this group is explored further in the section on 'gender'. Local statistics are not available, but nationally, 92% of lone parents were women in 2011.¹⁴ In total, there were 13,927 lone parents in Rhonda Cynon Taf at the time of the 2011 Census; less than half of these were classed as being economically active (5,464).
- 6.4 Being a lone parent can mean it is more difficult to be in employment and to raise children. Across the UK, for lone mothers with children aged up to 3 years old, 39% were in work in 2013, compared with 65% of couples with children in the same age group. For mothers whose youngest child were primary school age (4-10 years old), employment rates were higher at 61% for lone parents and 74% of couples.¹⁹
- 6.5 In Rhondda Cynon Taf, of those lone parents who were economically active, the majority were working part-time (5,130 in 2011). There were 3,770 lone parents who were economically inactive in 2011; the main reason cited for this was 'looking after home or family'.¹⁵ Therefore, should the proposal be agreed, it could provide further barriers to employment or training for lone parents if no other childcare or nursery options were available for that family.
- 6.6 In a similar way to other groups of the population, the impact of the proposal on lone parents could be mitigated if they can use alternative childcare, such as informal childcare, Flying Start or if 'wraparound' provision is provided in their area.

¹⁴ [ONS](#) (2012)

¹⁵ ONS (2013) DC1601EW1a - Family status by number of parents working by dependent children in family by economic activity

7. **Protected Group: Race**

7.1 The consultation on this proposal suggested that a reduction in funding to schools to provide nursery education would disproportionately impact on children of Gypsy and Traveller heritage and the Welsh language.

a) Potential impact on Gypsy and Traveller children.

7.2 Evidence gathered in 1996 and 1999 led the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) to report that Gypsy and Traveller pupils have the lowest level of attainment of any ethnic minority group, describing these pupils as “the group most at risk in the education system.”¹⁶ This research also found that there was an estimated 10,000 Gypsy and Traveller children of secondary school age that were not registered and did not attend school.¹⁷

7.3 In Rhondda Cynon Taf, local data suggests there are very small numbers of people who define themselves as Gypsy / Travellers. There is a specific grant awarded to the Attendance and Wellbeing service to provide support for Gypsy Children and Traveller Children. Data gathered from April-September 2014 for this specific grant states that 20 Gypsy Traveller children / young people received support during the period. The majority of these are primary school age and none of the children supported during the period were of nursery age.

7.4 Although there are small numbers of Gypsy and Traveller children and young people, the proposal could have the negative impact of disengaging a group which the evidence suggests is already quite difficult to engage in statutory services.

7.5 However, the service now has an awareness of the Gypsy and Traveller families living in the County Borough and the grant allows for use of monies to assist with specific issues, if required.

b) Potential impact on the Welsh language.

7.6 The consultation responses suggest that Welsh schools, the Welsh language and the Welsh language skills of children and young children will be disproportionately impacted upon by the proposal.

7.7 The consultation questionnaire asked parents / carers whether their child attended a Welsh language nursery or childcare setting. 28.5% of people who answered the question said “yes”. When asked how they felt the proposal could impact upon their family in terms of language development, the most common answer was around children getting “less exposure to Welsh / would lose socialising opportunities (which helps Welsh development)” The second most common theme was “Welsh was easier to learn at a younger age”. A number of people also commented on the “impact on language as (child) comes from English speaking background / family” and commented that “starting Welsh language would be delayed.” (Full details are included within the Consultation Report.)

¹⁶ Office for Standards in Education (1999). “*Raising the Attainment of Minority Ethnic Pupils: School and LEA Responses*”. London: Ofsted.

¹⁷ Office for Standards in Education (1996) “*The education of Travelling Children.*” London: Ofsted.

- 7.8 Respondents argue that if children are spending less time in a Welsh language educational setting, they may begin to lose their skills in the language, which could have a future negative impact on the prevalence of the language in Rhondda Cynon Taf.
- 7.9 Children in part-time provision are not eligible for 'Home to School' transport and a small number of respondents (8 out of 116 responses) spoke about the lack of transport to the nearest Welsh school being a problem.
- 7.10 In January 2014 (the latest validated information), 54 children were in Welsh medium pre-nursery school provision. 579 children were in nursery provision full-time, with 1 child attending part-time. Potentially, the proposal could impact approximately 54 children, with respect to the Welsh language, in the next academic year.
- 7.11 There is little evidence available on what impact attending full-time or part-time nursery has specifically on Welsh language skills, but it can be assumed that the research above (on general attainment) would also apply.
- 7.12 According to Census information (2001 and 2011), Rhondda Cynon Taf has one of the lowest number and proportion of people over the age of 3 years old able to speak Welsh. But positively, over the decade between Census collection, the County Borough saw one of the lowest decreases in Welsh speakers in Wales: in 2001, 12.5% of people stated they could speak Welsh, compared to 12.3% in 2011.
- 7.13 In order to make a judgement on the potential impact of part-time nursery education provision could be on the Welsh language skills of children, the average attainment of pupils in two other Local Authorities with similar deprivation levels and a similar percentage of people who speak Welsh have been studied.

Figure: Comparison across Local Authorities of the percentage achieving the expected level (L4+) at Key Stage 2 (aged 11)

Local Authority	Percentage of people, aged 3 and over, able to speak Welsh by LA (2011 Census) %	Percentage achieving the expected level at Key Stage 2 in Welsh (academic year 2013/14) %	Current nursery provision provided to 3 and 4 year olds
Rhondda Cynon Taf	12.3	88.4	Schools funded to provide full-time (30 hours per week) nursery provision to pupils the term during or following their third birthday, depending on the school. Proposal is to amend the funding to part-time (15 hours per week).
Caerphilly	11.2	88.9	Schools funded to provide part-time

			(12.5 hours per week) of nursery provision, available to children the term following their third birthday.
Neath Port Talbot	15.3	87.7	(Same provision as Caerphilly Council)
Welsh average	19.0	88.1	N/A

7.14 The table suggests that, in areas of similar deprivation and with similar levels of the Welsh language being spoken, children are achieving similar levels at Key Stage 2 in Welsh. The two Local Authorities used as comparators also provide part-time (12.5 hours per week, in this case) of nursery provision. This would suggest that the amount of time spent in nursery education is not a key determinant of Welsh language skills at Key Stage 2.

7.15 Although evidence to prove a negative impact on the Welsh language with regards to this proposal is not available, the provision of 'wraparound' care or childcare provided by another registered Welsh language provider would mitigate any impact of children not being in full-time Welsh language nursery provision. If alternative provision is agreed (in a school or through another registered provider), it is likely that parents will be able to choose to place their child in English or Welsh language provision, as is currently the case.

8 **Protected Group: Sex (gender)**

8.1 **POTENTIAL IMPACT ON WOMEN.**

- 8.1.1 Evidence gathered through consultation and academic research suggests that any change to education provision relating to young children is likely to impact on females disproportionately to males, due to the traditional model of familial childcare responsibilities. According to 2011 Census information, 119,775 members of the population are female compared to a total population of 234,410 in Rhondda Cynon Taf.
- 8.1.2 77.5% of respondents to the consultation questionnaire defined themselves as the child or children's mother. The consultation results, therefore, outlined many specific reasons that the proposal will impact negatively on females, which can be broadly categorised as issues relating to employment and childcare responsibilities. These are explored in further detail below.
- 8.1.3 The comments gathered during consultation and academic research suggest that there is a division of labour in Rhondda Cynon Taf, which is typical of British society. For instance, in Rhondda Cynon Taf in 2011, there were 5,155 more women than men classed as 'economically inactive looking after home or family'.¹⁸ This demonstrates that women are more likely to assume the caring responsibilities for children or other relatives. Men in Rhondda Cynon Taf are, therefore, more likely to be economically active than women.
- 8.1.4 Despite this, the employment rates of mothers have increased. Across the UK, the percentage of married or cohabiting mothers in employment, with dependent children, has risen from 67% in 1996 to 72% in 2013. There has also been an increase from 43% to 63% in the employment rate of lone mothers over the same period.¹⁹ Although similar local statistics are not available, the percentage of working age females in employment has been increasing in Rhondda Cynon Taf - from 62.6% in March 2008 to 64.1% in March 2014.²⁰
- 8.1.5 The patterns of work, both in terms of hours in employment and employment sectors, continue to be different for men and women. For instance, across Wales, 90% of men in employment work full-time compared to 57% of women in employment. Additionally, 42% of women's full-time work in Wales takes places in the occupational areas of Sales, Administration and Personal Services compared to an average of 3.46% of men's full-time employment. When put together with Elementary occupations, these occupational areas make up 75% of women's part-time work.²¹
- 8.1.6 One of the reasons for the difference between men and women's employment patterns is that mothers are still less likely to work than women without children and they are far more likely to work part-time. For instance, when compared with other European countries, the UK falls furthest behind in employment rates for women with children aged 3-5 years old.

¹⁸ ONS (2013) DC1601EW1a - Family status by number of parents working by dependent children in family by economic activity

¹⁹ ONS Report (September 2013) *Women in the Labour Market*.

²⁰ Annual Population Survey, [ONS](#)

²¹ WAVE (2014) *Working Patterns in Wales: Gender, Occupations and Pay*.

- 8.1.7 There are numerous reasons for this. One study²² suggested childcare affordability is the biggest barrier for mothers with young children to working more. The second biggest barrier, according to working mothers, was a lack of employer flexibility. For non-working mothers, the second most common reason for not working is the desire to be at home with their children.
- 8.1.8 Therefore, the proposal will disproportionately impact on women's employment patterns; whether they are lone parents or in couple families. Academic research, statistics and consultation responses suggest that it is most likely to be women who do not return to work full-time unless they can secure affordable half-day childcare, make appropriate arrangements to transport their child, and / or make alternative arrangements for informal care.
- 8.1.9 The findings of academic studies coupled with consultation responses suggest that, should the proposal be agreed, the provision of affordable childcare will be a key element in mitigating the potential impact on females and their employment patterns in Rhondda Cynon Taf.

An equality impact assessment does not normally consider information relating to the affordability of services, but some responses to the consultation have stated that the provision of childcare coupled with part-time nursery education provision would still not enable some parents to work, because of the cost of such childcare. The cost of any "wraparound" childcare, "pickup" childcare service of registered childcare provider would need careful consideration to allow women to continue working or training for work, and it cannot be guaranteed that every parent with a 3-year-old in the Council's area will be able to find childcare that is affordable for them.

The Council and its partners will continue to support and signpost families to benefit entitlement and money advice services, which will work with families, particularly those in the most deprived areas, to ensure they are receiving the correct benefits and financial support. But these issues would be mitigated by any future arrangements made by schools, either to continue to fund full-time nursery education or to make arrangements for affordable childcare provision, allowing mothers (in this case) to drop their child off in the morning and collect them at the end of the working day.

- 8.1.10 The Local Authority has a duty to ensure, so far as reasonably practicable, that the provision of childcare is sufficient to meet the requirements of parents in its area who require childcare in order to take up or remain in work, or to undertake education/training which could reasonably be expected to help them obtain work (the "childcare sufficiency duty"). The Childcare Sufficiency Audit (attached with the Cabinet papers) sets out the childcare position at the present time, and shows (as stated in the report to Cabinet on 23 June 2014) that the Council is currently well-placed with its existing childcare provision to meet the needs of most working parents. Council officers consider at this point that the Council should also be able to meet its childcare sufficiency duty if the Proposal is implemented, for reasons explained in paragraph 8.62 of the Cabinet report. A supplementary piece of work has been undertaken to explore particular areas

²² Mumsnet 'Resolution Foundation' (Jan 2014) *Careers and Carers: Childcare and maternal labour supply*. This represents the findings of a survey of just under 2000 mothers with children under 10 across the UK, conducted in Nov 2013.

that were identified through consultation as not having sufficient childcare places for children.”

8.1.11 An alternative to schools arranging for childcare provision is the existence of informal care. Where informal care is available to families, it is most likely to be grandparents providing the majority. Studies show that grandmothers are also more likely to be the main care-givers than grandfathers and therefore, the proposed preferred option may affect women in this way more than men as well.¹²

8.1.12 As set out in section 5, the grandmothers providing care are more likely to be in the younger age group of 50-69 years old, and overall, grandparents are more likely to be in employment in the UK than elsewhere in Europe. If the proposal is agreed and this causes an increased need for informal care, the working patterns of grandmothers may also be impacted in that they will be less able to work full-time, due to caring responsibilities for their grandchildren.

9. Conclusion

9.1 In line with the General Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010), this Equality Impact Assessment has:

- Assessed specific differential impacts that have been identified for each of the protected characteristics;
- Stated where actions can be considered to minimise or remove any potential negative impacts relating to the proposals;
- Provided opportunities, where applicable, to advance equality and good relations between different groups.

9.2 As such, this Equality Impact Assessment has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that due regard has been given to the ‘duty’ placed on the Council in this respect and set out any grounds based on equality considerations that should be considered as part of the decision on service change proposals in respect of school admission arrangements.

9.3 If a decision is taken to implement some or all of the options put forward within the proposal, implementation arrangements will need to have full regard to equality planning requirements, thus ensuring every effort is made to minimise any negative impacts and promote equality.

Appendix I**Child's Rights Impact Assessment**

This assessment uses "*The SCCYP Model*" Copyright ©
 SCCYP, 85 Holyrood Road, Edinburgh. EH8 8AU www.sccyp.org.uk

1. IDENTIFY <i>Name of proposal</i>
School Admission Arrangements - funding for provision of nursery education.
2. MAP <i>Describing what is being proposed, its consequences and goals.</i>
2.1 What is being proposed? <p>The Council is considering a proposal to amend the way school entry arrangements are funded, based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Part time (half day) (15 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 3rd birthday (pre-nursery and nursery); - Full-time (30 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 4th birthday (nursery and reception); and - Funding up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary or independent registered education providers from the term following a child's 3rd birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school (N.B. in this context, 'suitability' shall relate to the availability of a place at a school, which, in the Council's opinion is within a reasonable radius of the child's ordinary place of residence i.e. where those with parental responsibility for the child live).
2.2 What is the aim of the proposal? <p>The aim of the proposal is to reduce spend and enable the Council to meet its statutory duties with regards to setting a balanced budget. The proposal also aims to introduce consistency to school admission arrangements.</p>
2.3 Who initiated the proposal? <p>The Director, Education & Lifelong Learning; Group Director, Corporate and Front Line Services and Service Director, Children's Services. Cabinet have agreed to public consultation on the proposal.</p>
2.4 Who will be responsible for implementing the proposal? <p>Council officers across the three directorates named above.</p>
2.5 What is the legal, police and practice context of the proposal? <p>As outlined in the Cabinet report (10th October), the following legislative framework applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School Standards and Framework Act 1998. - Childcare Act 2006; - Children Act 1989; - Children and Families (Wales) Measure 2010. - United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

2.6 Which articles of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) are relevant?

- Article 3: All organisations concerned with children should work towards what is best for them.
- Article 12: Children have the right to say what they think should happen when adults are making decision that affect them, and to have their opinions taken into account.
- Article 28: Children have a right to an education.

2.7 Has a UNCRC analysis been undertaken when developing the proposal?

The rights of children and young people, particularly the UN seven core aims, have been taken into account.

2.8 What are the resource implications of the proposal?

Should the proposal be agreed, the Council will make gross annual savings of £1,330,000 in Year 1 and £836,000 in Year 2.

This assumes that the proposal is 'phased in'.

3. GATHER

Pulling together relevant information and evidence.

3.1 What relevant information or evidence is available internally?

- Figures are available on the number of children likely to be affected by the proposal.
- The Childcare Sufficiency Audit provides information on the number of childcare places and vacancies.
- Evidence of the Phase 1 consultation and of the recent revised consultation results.

3.2 What relevant information or evidence is available externally?

- Academic research has been utilised to make a judgement on the impact of part-time nursery provision for the area.
- Academic research has been used to make a judgement on the potential impact of the proposal on protected groups.
- Case law has been used to ensure the proposal is lawful.

3.3 Is further information or evidence required?

No.

4. CONSULT

Asking children and young people their views.

4.1 Have children and young people or any other stakeholders been consulted in the development of the proposal?

A public consultation was first initiated on the 4th November 2013. During this consultation, 3500 booklets were distributed to primary schools, with letters sent to Headteachers asking that they alert parents through letter, text services and Moodle. (For those with literacy problems, it was advised that they contacted a One4All centre or the school). Similarly, 900 booklets were sent to secondary schools. As well as this, booklets were distributed throughout the community, equating to over 20,000 copies in total. A young person's version was also

produced. The number of views expressed specifically on school admission arrangements totalled over 8,000 in open responses, 4 petitions were received and 3 versions of a pre-completed questionnaire was submitted. 2,448 responses were received to the online and paper questionnaires.

This consultation informed the Council decision on the 8th January 2014, which was later 'quashed' during a judicial review process. This revised proposal has taken into account the grounds for which that decision being quashed and some of the specific concerns raised during the initial consultation.

4.2 Is consultation necessary or appropriate?

Yes, consultation is both necessary and appropriate.

4.3 If yes to the above, who should be consulted?

A separate consultation report with this detail included has been produced, attached with these papers.

4.4 Should particular groups of children and young people be consulted for their views?

A separate consultation report with this detail included has been produced, attached with these papers.

4.5 What format should the consultation take?

A separate consultation report with this detail included has been produced, attached with these papers.

4.6 What questions should be asked?

A separate consultation report with this detail included has been produced, attached with these papers.

5. ANALYSE

Assessing the proposal for its impact on children and young people's rights.

5.1 What impact might the proposal have on the rights of children and young people? (positive or negative)

The articles identified as relevant to this proposal are:

- Article 3: All organisations concerned with children should work towards what is best for them.
- Article 12: Children have the right to say what they think should happen when adults are making decision that affect them, and to have their opinions taken into account.
- Article 28: Children have a right to an education.

Although this proposal represents a change in funding arrangements for nursery education, children will still have the right to an education. As the Cabinet report states, funding will be provided for part-time (half-day) (15 hours per week) nursery provision the term after a child's 3rd birthday (up to the term after a child's 4th birthday when the Council will fund a full-time

nursery place). This level of provision is considered to be 'sufficient' in accordance with the Local Authority's duty under section 118 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998. Therefore, this proposal will have little impact on a child's right to an education.

With regards to Article 12, children and young people will be consulted once more on this proposal and their views will be taken into account.

5.2 Will the rights of one group in particular of children be affected?

The children affected will be of ages 0-4 years in particular, but their rights are not affected.

5.3 Are there competing interests between groups of children, or between children and other groups?

No.

5.4 How does the proposal relate to, promote or inhibit the provisions of the UNCRC, other relevant international treaties and standards or domestic law? (please refer to section 2.6)

Please see response to 5.1.

5.5 How does the proposal relate to the Concluding Observations of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child on the implementation of the UNCRC?

The UN Committee's Concluding Observations and their implementation are applicable to the Welsh Government (further information is available here):

<http://www.childcomwales.org.uk/en/uncrcconcludingobservations/>

5.6 How does the proposal contribute to the achievement of national goals for children and young people?

The Welsh Government have adopted the seven core aims of the UNCRC as the national goals for children and young people. These are:

1. have a flying start in life
2. have a comprehensive range of education and learning opportunities
3. enjoy the best possible health and are free from abuse, victimisation and exploitation
4. have access to play, leisure, sporting and cultural activities
5. are listened to, treated with respect, and have their race and cultural identity recognised
6. have a safe home and a community which supports physical and emotional wellbeing
7. are not disadvantaged by poverty.

These aims are adopted locally in Local Authority decision-making processes and the proposal does relate to Aims 1 and 2.

5.7 Is there disagreement as to the likely impact of the proposal on the rights of

children and young people?

The consultation on this proposal has identified that some members of the public feel this proposal could impact on the learning and development of children. Research has been referenced within the Cabinet report and the Equality Impact Assessment that would suggest a lack of evidence on this point.

5.8 Is the proposal the best way of achieving its aims, taking into account children's rights?

In order to meet its statutory duty of setting a balanced budget, the Council must bridge a budget gap. Given the scale of this, every service area (that is not statutory) is being reviewed for potential service changes or cuts.

There is also a need to introduce a more consistent approach to admission arrangements.

5.9 Can alternatives to the proposal be suggested?

Alternatives to the proposals can be suggested and will be considered by Cabinet when they come to their decision.

5.10 What compensatory measures may be needed to avoid / mitigate a negative impact?

The proposal is that the change will be phased in, providing a mitigation to those children already in nursery education during the 2014-15 academic year. Only those children who are 'new starters' will be part-time from September 2015, until the term following their 4th birthday. It is intended that this will minimise disruption.

5.11 What overall impact will the proposal entail for other policy areas or agendas, or other professionals or groups in their work with children?

Schools and childcare providers will also be affected by this proposal. In initial engagement with some providers, they indicated that this would be of benefit to them as they would be able to expand their business to accommodate more children and on a more frequent basis.

6. RECOMMEND

Drawing together conclusions and making recommendations.

6.1 What overall conclusions have been reached?

- This proposal relates predominantly to 3 Articles of the UNCRC.
- This proposal relates predominantly to Aims 1 and 2 of the national seven core aims.
- Academic research and internal evidence and information has been used to make a judgement on what is 'sufficient' provision of the area and to judge the impact of this proposal on children and young people and other protected groups (see Cabinet report and Equality Impact Assessment).
- No impact on children's rights has been identified.

6.2 What recommendations should be made?

Recommendations include:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet members should consider this assessment in making their decision on the proposal. • Cabinet members should consider the consultation carried out with children and young people on the proposal. • Should the proposal be implemented, the educational achievement of children be monitored through Cabinet and Scrutiny processes, given the views expressed by some members of the public in consultation.
<p>6.3 Who should be informed of the recommendations?</p> <p>Elected members and officers have been informed of these recommendations.</p>
<p>6.4 Does the assessment have any gaps in information, data collection or expertise?</p> <p>No.</p>
<p>6.5 Is further research or consultation required?</p> <p>No.</p>
<p>6.6 Are there any other relevant issues?</p> <p>No, these are included in the Equality Impact Assessment.</p>
<p>7. PUBLICISE <i>Making the results of the impact assessment known.</i></p>
<p>7.1 Should the assessment be made available publicly?</p> <p>Yes, the assessment will be made available publicly as part of papers provided to Cabinet when they come to make their decision on the proposal.</p>
<p>7.2 Should particular individuals or groups be made aware of the assessment?</p> <p>Yes, both Elected members and officers will be made aware of the assessment. The papers will be made available to the public, also.</p>
<p>7.3 Has the assessment and feedback been provided to those who were consulted with?</p> <p>Yes, the feedback is provided on the Council's website and publicised to those who took part in the consultation.</p>
<p>8. MONITOR <i>Monitoring and evaluation of the proposal.</i></p>
<p>8.1 Is follow-up evaluation and monitoring of the proposal required?</p> <p>Yes. As part of regular monitoring processes within the Local Authority, the impact of the proposal should be monitored, in terms of educational achievement and admission rates.</p>
<p>8.2 Have the recommendations made as a result of the assessment been</p>

considered or acted upon?

The recommendations will be considered by Elected members when they come to make their decision.

8.3 Is research required to assess the proposal's impact on children and young people, once implemented?

See above.

This page is left Blank.

APPENDIX 4

A Paper to enable the Council's Cabinet to consider whether the proposal as outlined below and in the report would comply with the Council's legal duty in respect of section 118 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998

Introduction

The legislative framework in respect of this proposal is set out at paragraph 7 of the Cabinet report. Of particular relevance to this paper is the Council's duty to comply with section 118 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (the 'Act'). The duty set out in the Act is detailed at paragraphs 7.2 – 7.4 of the Cabinet report and repeated below.

Section 117 of the Act defines 'nursery education' as full-time or part-time education suitable for children who have not attained compulsory school age (whether provided at schools or elsewhere).

In accordance with section 118 of the Act (and regulations made thereunder) the Council must secure that the provision (whether or not by it) of nursery education for children from the term after their third birthday, is **sufficient for its area**.

In determining whether the provision of such education is sufficient for its area the Council:-

- (a) may have regard to any facilities which they expect to be available outside their area for providing such education; and
- (b) shall have regard to any guidance given from time to time by the National Assembly for Wales.

Current position

In Rhondda Cynon Taf Nursery provision for the majority of 3 year olds is provided in schools either part time or full time depending on local school arrangements. Where there is no suitable availability within a school in the local area the Council funds 10 hours of provision in private, voluntary or independent registered providers from the term following their third birthday.

The proposal

The Council is proposing to change the way in which it funds nursery provision (English and Welsh medium) as follows:

- Three year olds – fund 15 hours per week of nursery provision from the term following their third birthday, in school based nursery provision;
- Four year olds – fund 30 hours per week of nursery provision from the term following their fourth birthday, in school based nursery provision, where there is capacity in a school to do so; and
- Fund up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary or independent registered education providers from the term following their third birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school (n.b. in this context ‘suitability’ shall relate to the availability of a place at a school which, in the Council’s opinion, is within a reasonable radius of the child’s ordinary residence i.e. where those with parental responsibility for the child live).

The key **issue** this paper seeks to address is whether the **above** nursery provision is sufficient for Rhondda Cynon Taf.

For the purposes of fulfilling the Council’s duty under section 118 of the Act, as Director of Education and Lifelong Learning, I consider the Council should adequately address the following questions:

- i. Are there “sufficient” nursery education places across the County Borough to meet the demand for nursery places?;
- ii. Is the entitlement of 15 hours of nursery provision per week, and 30 hours per week from the term following a fourth birthday, over no fewer than 38 weeks of the year, up to the date a child reaches compulsory school age, “sufficient” to meet the educational needs of nursery aged children in Rhondda Cynon Taf?; and
- iii. Is the nursery provision available “sufficient” in terms of quality?

There is no definition of “sufficient” set out in the Act.

(i) Are there “sufficient” nursery education places across the County Borough to meet the demand for nursery places?

It is important for Members to note that nursery education is not compulsory for children and they do not have to start school until the term following their 5th birthday. Therefore, attendance between the age of 3 to the term following the child’s 5th birthday is at the discretion of the parents (Section 8 of the Education Act 1996).

A child becomes of compulsory school age at one of the three dates in the year following their 5th birthday (Start of Compulsory School Age Order 1998 S.I. 1998 No. 1607). Figure 1 depicts when a child would start school depending on the month of their birthday:

Figure 1

Child's Date of Birth	Compulsory Date to Start School
1 April – 31 August	1 September
1 September – 31 December	1 January
1 January – 31 March	1 April

Within Rhondda Cynon Taf there are currently mixed full time/part time admissions arrangements being adopted across infant and primary schools depending upon available capacity in the school maintained sector. The common admission arrangements for English and Welsh medium provision are as follows:

- start School the day after their 3rd birthday.
- start School the Term after their 3rd birthday.
- start School in the September following their 3rd birthday.

Based on current pupil rolls, there are approximately 2,800 children per year group in our primary schools and the Council currently provides a total of 3,315 full-time nursery places in our schools. According to the January 2014 Pupil Level Annual School Census, there were 3,454 nursery aged pupils on roll, utilising 139 surplus places in the statutory education provision of the school; this figure is higher than the capacity quoted above as many schools use surplus capacity available in their buildings to cater for additional nursery aged children.

There were almost 5,000 surplus places at Primary schools across the County Borough in January 2014. Although the majority of our schools are able to meet all demand for nursery places in their local area, there are some parts of the County Borough, in particular the southern area and the 'M4 corridor' where school capacity in general is limited.

Where nursery places are not available at a school because its capacity has been reached, parents can access places with registered, non-maintained (private) nursery providers. Within Rhondda Cynon Taf there are 19 such registered nursery education providers in the private, voluntary and independent sector (PVI) who can also offer 400 part-time places, with the Council currently funding a maximum of 10 hours per week.

Currently the Council can provide nursery education provision, primarily in the school, across the County Borough that is “sufficient” to meet the required supply of nursery provision for both English and Welsh medium provision.

If the Council were to consider changing the current provision from funding full time provision (approximately 30 hours per week) to funding part-time, 15 hours per week, this would have no adverse impact on the availability of nursery education places in the County Borough. This was evident from the effect of the January 2014 decision of the Council’s Cabinet to reduce the funding of full-time nursery places to part-time, 15 hours per week only, where schools, which are the majority provider, continued to maintain the number of nursery places available.

If the Council was **to fund nursery provision for a maximum of 15 hours per week**, the Council could ensure that it can provide nursery education provision across the County Borough that is “sufficient” to meet the required supply of nursery places.

(ii) Is the entitlement of 15 hours of nursery provision per week, and 30 hours per week from the term following a child’s fourth birthday, over no fewer than 38 weeks of the year, up to the date a child reaches compulsory school age, “sufficient” to meet the educational needs of nursery aged children in Rhondda Cynon Taf?

Current UK policy

Research across the world indicates that pre-school (pre-compulsory) education improves all children’s development. Children with no pre-school experience had poorer cognitive attainment, sociability and concentration when they started primary school. Furthermore, research tells us that high quality early years provision can help to narrow the attainment gap between disadvantaged children and their more affluent peers.

Since devolution in 1999, Welsh Government’s early years focus has been on:

- childcare provision for 2 year olds in areas of high deprivation (Flying Start); and
- the introduction of the Foundation Phase Curriculum for 3 to 7 year olds.

There has been little policy development on nursery education in Wales. In 1999/2000 the former Welsh Office published guidance which set out guiding principles and targets for early years education. Although the guidance was for the year 1999/2000, it has not since been superseded. The guidance at that time made it clear that the target was to provide “free, at least half-time, good quality” education. “Half-time” meant a minimum of 10 hours a week for around the same number of weeks as the normal school year.

However, the UK Government has been considerably more proactive in developing the entitlement to nursery education provision in England. English local authorities are required by legislation to:

“secure early years education places offering 570 hours a year over no fewer than 38 weeks of the year (15 hours per week) for every child in their area, from the term following their third birthday, until the child reaches compulsory school age (the beginning of the term following their fifth birthday).”

This entitlement is prescribed and local authorities must provide it. In England the “sufficiency” element of section 118 of the Act has been repealed. In prescribing the 15 hours per week, the UK Government has taken away the LEA’s judgement as to what is “sufficient” and has determined on their behalf what it considers is “sufficient” for children resident in England.

Since the introduction of Section 7 of the Childcare Act 2006 (and the regulations made thereunder), which places a duty on English local authorities to secure the 15 hours of nursery education provision, the UK Government has not sought to increase the prescribed hours of provision but to increase the number of children that receive free nursery provision.

In December 2013 it determined that all English local authorities are required by legislation to:

“secure early education places offering 570 hours a year over no fewer than 38 weeks of the year (15 hours per week) for every eligible child in their area, from the term following their second birthday, where a child is eligible if they are looked after by the local authority or they come within the criteria used to determine eligibility for Free School Meals.

This new development (which came into force on 1st September 2014) coupled with the prescribed 15 hours for three and four year olds forms a strong evidence base that the 15 hours of nursery education provision is “sufficient” to meet the specific education nursery needs of children in England including vulnerable groups.

Research conclusions

A key piece of independent research carried out in 2004, which UK national governments have used in developing their early years policies, is “The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project” undertaken by the Universities of Oxford, London and Nottingham. The key findings of this report are as follows:

- pre-school (nursery) experience, compared to none, enhances all round development in children;
- duration of attendance (in months) is important; an earlier start (under 3 years) is related to better intellectual development;
- full time attendance led to no better gains for children than part-time provision;

- disadvantaged children benefit significantly from good quality pre-school experiences, especially when they are with a mixture of children from different social backgrounds.

The EPPE project was the first major longitudinal study of a sample of young children's development (intellectual and social/behavioural) between the ages of 3 and 7 years. The project has become well known for its contribution to "evidence based policy" in early years education and care. Its findings are robust and widely used because they are based on sound and innovative research methods.

A different study in the US¹ has concluded that full-time nursery attendance leads to some gains in reading and maths for children from lower-income families, and few detrimental effects in social development. However: (i) this is a study of outcomes in the US, rather than the UK; and (ii) the same study also concluded that full-time attendance led to no cognitive gains and negative behavioural impact for children from higher-income families.

Local Context - understanding the needs of the child population of Rhondda Cynon Taf, education performance and comparisons with other neighbouring councils with similar child needs

To better understand the key factors affecting children in Rhondda Cynon Taf this paper makes use of the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation – Child Index (the 'Child Index'). The Child Index is the official measure of relative deprivation for small areas in Wales for children. The indicators included in the Child Index are focused on the child population and the types of deprivation which might be expected to affect them.

The Child Index refers to the different types of deprivation, and seven types of deprivation are included: income; education; health; community safety; geographical access to services, housing and physical environment.

The Child Index defines the most deprived local authority as the authority with the greatest fraction of its lower super output areas (LSOAs) in the most deprived 10% of all LSOAs in Wales. The local authorities with the highest percentage of LSOAs in the most deprived 10% in Wales, as determined by the Child Index (2011), are:

- Cardiff – 22.2%
- Newport – 18.1%
- Merthyr Tydfil – 16.7%
- Rhondda Cynon Taf – 15.8%

Of the local authorities that have the greatest proportion of the area considered to be deprived, measured as those local authorities having the

¹ "How much is too much? The influence of preschool centers on children's social and cognitive development", Loeb and ors, 2005.

highest percentage of their LSOAs in the most deprived 50% in Wales, the results are as follows:

- Merthyr Tydfil – 77.8%
- Blaenau Gwent – 72.3%
- Rhondda Cynon Taf- 67.8%
- Neath Port Talbot – 61.5%
- Caerphilly – 60.9%

If we consider the Education domain of the Child Index, which considers five indicators associated with education performance across Key Stages 2 - 4 and attendance, the most deprived local authorities in the education domain are:

- Merthyr Tydfil – 22.2%
- Cardiff 19.7%
- Rhondda Cynon Taf 19.1%
- Newport 17.0%

However, when you consider the extent of the deprivation in an area, measured as those local authorities having the highest percentage of their LSOAs in the most deprived half in Wales for the Education domain, the results are as follows:

- Caerphilly – 83.0%
- Merthyr Tydfil – 80.6%
- Rhondda Cynon Taf – 73.7%
- Blaenau Gwent – 66.4%
- Torfaen – 63.3%
- Neath Port Talbot – 61.5%

The Child Index highlights a consistent number of local authorities that have significant areas of deprivation equivalent to the levels of deprivation in Rhondda Cynon Taf. The local authorities, who have similar factors of deprivation, are:

- Blaenau Gwent;
- Caerphilly;
- Cardiff;
- Merthyr Tydfil;
- Neath Port Talbot;
- Newport.

This analysis shows that Rhondda Cynon Taf is not unique in terms of the Child Index and it would not be unreasonable to assume that the impact of an educational policy change on the population of one local authority would have the same impact on another based on the list above.

The educational performance of these local authorities based on the most recent Foundation Phase educational outcomes for 2014 and the Key Stage 4 indicator for the Level 2 threshold (5 A*-C or equivalent) including English/Welsh and mathematics for 2014 are as follows:

Local authority	Foundation Phase Indicator %	Rank in Wales for the Foundation Phase Indicator	Level 2 threshold (5 A*-C or equivalent) including English/Welsh and mathematics %	Rank in Wales for the Level 2 threshold (5 A*-C or equivalent) including English/Welsh and mathematics	Current Nursery Provision provided to 3 and 4 year olds
Blaenau Gwent	83.4	19	41.8	22	Part-time (12.5 hrs), term following third birthday, with some full-time provision where a school has space.
Caerphilly	88.5	6	50.9	20	Part-time (12.5 hrs) term following the third birthday
Cardiff	83.8	18	54.0	13	Part-time (12.5 hrs) term following the third birthday
Merthyr Tydfil	81.2	22	48.9	21	Part or full time term following the third birthday depending on school limitations
Neath Port Talbot	84.2	15	55.8	9	Part-time (12.5 hrs) term following the third birthday
Newport	87	8	52.8	17	Part-time (12.5 hrs) term following the third birthday
Rhondda Cynon Taf	81.8	21	50.5	19	Full time places in the term of third birthday or term following third birthday depending on school
Wales average	85.2	n/a	52.7	n/a	n/a

The table shows that Rhondda Cynon Taf and Merthyr Tydfil offer the greatest number of hours of nursery provision across their administrative boundaries but have some of the worst educational outcomes. The extensive nursery provision offered by Rhondda Cynon Taf appears to have not had an educational benefit over and above that of part-time provision provided by other local authorities. Indeed, for local authorities with higher proportion of their area in the top 50% of LSOA's in Wales, such as Caerphilly and for a local authority with over 60% of its LSOA's in the top 50% most deprived

LSOA's in Wales, Neath Port Talbot, part-time provision has not been an obstacle to high performance, irrespective of the levels of deprivation in a community.

This local data provides more evidence to substantiate the EPPE research, which concluded that “full time attendance led to no better gains for children than part-time provision”.

What is a “sufficient” number of funded hours of nursery provision for the children of Rhondda Cynon Taf?

Rhondda Cynon Taf currently funds approximately 30 hours of nursery education per week for 38 weeks for three year olds and four year olds. This compares favourably with:

- The vast majority of other local authorities in Wales;
- The majority of local authorities with similar levels of deprivation in Wales, measured by the Child Index;
- The nursery provision offered in England, which currently comprises 15 hours per week for every child in their area, from the term following their third birthday, until the child reaches compulsory school age (the beginning of the term following their fifth birthday).

Furthermore:

- Recognised and respected EPPE research evidences that “full time (nursery) attendance led to no better gains for children than part-time provision”; and
- An analysis of the educational outcomes of Rhondda Cynon Taf pupils evidences that there has been no noticeable benefit of providing full-time nursery provision over part-time.

Based on the evidence and analysis within this report, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed revised nursery funding of 15 hours per week is a “sufficient” number of hours of nursery provision for the children of Rhondda Cynon Taf.

(iii) Is the nursery provision available “sufficient” in terms of quality?

Evidence shows that high quality education nursery provision has greater development benefits for children, particularly the most disadvantaged.

The recently published Nuffield Foundation report “Quality and Inequality – Do three and four year olds in deprived areas experience lower quality early years provision?” that undertook its research in England identified that:

- LEA maintained schools located in disadvantaged areas and serving disadvantaged children offered quality education for three and four year olds that was comparable with schools serving the more advantaged;
- Within the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector quality for three and four year olds was lower in settings located in deprived areas;
- Within the PVI sector, settings with a graduate member of staff scored more highly on all quality measures;
- However, only graduate leadership was associated with a narrower quality gap between PVI settings located in deprived and more advantaged areas.

The research found that LEA maintained schools are doing a good job in meeting the needs of the most vulnerable children. Children from deprived backgrounds tended to be clustered in the maintained sector with schools providing early years education for larger proportions of disadvantaged children than PVI settings. This is the case in Rhondda Cynon Taf, with all but 400 places (10% of the places available) for 3 and 4 year olds being provided by the local primary school.

Furthermore, the Council has nearly 5,000 surplus places in the primary sector and it has the capacity to provide school based nursery education to every child that could be entitled to free school meals. Free school meals eligibility is higher in the parts of the County Borough that are officially classed as 'deprived'; these areas also correlate quite closely to those areas where we have surplus capacity in our schools. The large majority of children resident in these areas and who are entitled to school meals therefore should have no problem in accessing a nursery place at a local school.

All the primary schools in Rhondda Cynon Taf are inspected by Estyn, at least once every six years. Of those schools inspected up until September 2014, close to 50% are considered to be at least good in terms of educational standards, and with all but two of the rest being adequate ("strengths outweigh weaknesses"). Both of the schools have since closed.

The 19 PVI registered nursery providers are also inspected by Estyn under the same inspection cycle and 95% are considered to be at least good for the current provision, with 95% judged to have promising prospects for improvement and no provider has been judged as being less than adequate.

Therefore, if the current nursery admission arrangements remain or whether they are changed to fund the 15 hours part-time provision for three year olds, the quality of the provision is "sufficient" and is supported by a robust regulatory system.

Conclusion

This paper has considered whether the following nursery provision is “sufficient” for the nursery aged children of Rhondda Cynon Taf:

- Three year olds – fund 15 hours per week of nursery provision from the term following their third birthday, in school based nursery provision, where there is capacity in a school to do so;
- Four year olds – fund 30 hours per week of nursery provision from the term following their fourth birthday, in school based nursery provision, where there is capacity in a school to do so; and
- Fund up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary, and independent registered education providers from the term following their third birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school (n.b. in this context ‘suitability’ shall relate to the availability of a place at a school which, in the Council’s opinion, is within a reasonable radius of the child’s ordinary residence i.e. where those with parental responsibility for the child live).

There is no clear definition of “sufficient”. For the purposes of fulfilling the Council’s duty under S118 of the Act as Director of Education and Lifelong Learning I consider that the Council should adequately address the following questions:

- i. Are there “sufficient” nursery education places across the County Borough to meet the demand for nursery places?;
- ii. Is the entitlement of 15 hours of nursery provision per week, and 30 hours from the term after a child’s fourth birthday, over no fewer than 38 weeks of the year, up to the date a child reaches compulsory school age, “sufficient” to meet the educational needs of nursery aged children in Rhondda Cynon Taf?; and
- iii. Is the nursery provision available “sufficient” in terms of quality?

Based on the research and data analysis contained within this paper, as Director for Education & Lifelong Learning, I consider that the proposed nursery provision is “sufficient” to meet the needs of the nursery aged children in Rhondda Cynon Taf.

It is however Cabinet’s responsibility to consider this paper, and any other information available to them, to form their own collective opinion on whether the proposal for funding nursery provision is “sufficient” to meet the needs of Rhondda Cynon Taf.

APPENDIX 5A AND 5B
CSA AND ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX 5 (A)

CONTENTS

Content

1. CSA summary document – also known as a Gap Analysis
2. Factors affecting demand and ability to pay
3. Analysis of supply – Provider Consultation
4. Understanding the needs of parents/carers
5. Consultation with employers
6. Consultation with children and young people
7. Consultation with other agencies

1 The CSA Summary Document

The Childcare Act 2006 underpins the Welsh Assembly Government's Childcare Strategy "Childcare is for Children" published in November 2005 and enshrines in law:

- Parents' legitimate expectations of accessible high quality childcare for children and their families
- Local Authorities responsibilities for providing information to parents and prospective parents to support their parenting role (*Childcare Act 2006, Section 22 and 26 consultation document 2007 p.2*)

The Childcare Act sets out the statutory duty of Local Authorities and in Wales this is:

- Local Authorities have the lead role in facilitating the childcare market to ensure it meets the needs of working parents; in particular, those on low incomes, those with disabled children, or those who wish their child to attend Welsh medium provision.
- To ensure people have access to the full range of information they need as a parent/carer.

The vision set for local Authorities by the Childcare Act 2006 Section 22 is to secure, as far as is reasonably practicable, sufficient childcare to meet the requirements of parents in their area who require childcare in order to work, or to undertake training or education or to prepare for work.

Childcare sufficiency assessments should have a section or standalone document which summarises the key findings of the childcare sufficiency assessment.

Executive Summary

This is the third full Childcare Sufficiency Assessment that has been carried out by Rhondda-Cynon-Taf. The outcomes of the three yearly Assessment and annual reviews are regarded critical to the effective planning and delivery of the diverse range of childcare services in Rhondda-Cynon-Taf. The information gathered provides the evidence base for the forward planning of childcare but also provides valuable information to inform the Families First agenda.

The CSA for Rhondda Cynon Taf identifies a continuing growth in the demand for one to one support for disabled children to attend out of school childcare, i.e. afterschool provision or holiday care. Without this support the children are unable to access out of school care due to their high level needs. This provision was funded in part by the Out of School Childcare grant during 2013 and we plan to use the 2014/2015 OOSCG to support disabled children's holiday care needs in the year ahead.

We know there are many out of school providers who are not registered with CSSIW as they operate under two hours but we will continue to actively encourage providers to register and this will be a priority for the coming year. Proposed changes to the nursery education provision in RCT has led to a growth in demand for sessional and wrap around care and the authority is currently funding a childcare and schools support officer for a year, to ensure all schools are supported to meet the childcare needs of families. Officers from The Early Years and Family Support Services Department are working with the Education Department, Head Teachers and third sector organisations in order to meet the increase in the demand for childcare created by the potential reduction in nursery hours. This is likely to lead to an increase during the year ahead in the number of sessional childcare places available in RCT.

The development of holiday care is slow due to provider's uncertainty about longer term sustainability. This concern could be alleviated if WG allocated the Out of School Childcare grant for a period of three years. There would undoubtedly be an increase in interest from potential service providers to establish these much needed services. The first two to three years are the most difficult and financial support is needed until the settings become established.

In the last report we said that many childcare provisions faced financial hardship. This continues to be the case with Mudiad Meithrin reporting that the Welsh Medium groups, even in more affluent areas, are struggling with rising costs and trying to keep childcare costs to a minimum.

The Family Information Service (FIS) is going through a period of change. It is acknowledged that having Outreach Officers has proved beneficial to the service however, the staff are not permanent and this could be a challenge in the future. Accessing accurate up to date information from providers continues to prove difficult in spite of reminders and follow up telephone calls from the Outreach Officers. The FIS has purchased a new database system and the software is in the process of being adapted which will lead to much greater accuracy in the data available.

Providers who responded to the request for information identified an increase in the number of vacancies again this year. Parents continue to use family/friends to meet their childcare needs. The increase in childcare costs and an increase in the number of full

day care provisions that are being established when there is clearly no identified need for new provision in most areas contributes to the challenges. We are also aware that there is an over concentration of day nurseries in some areas causing an oversupply of places and a subsequent financial risk to new and existing child care providers.


The category titles now used by the regulatory body Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSIW) to register settings do not allow easy transition of the information for the purpose of the CSA as the categories are too broad. The registration for Out of School Childcare for the purpose of the CSA needs to identify whether it is breakfast care, afterschool care and or holiday care, when the information is received from CSSIW. The term Out of School childcare provision broadly covers breakfast care, afterschool care, holiday care and open access play. Identifying which element within the category approved for registration would enable the Authority to gather specific information regarding the number of services and childcare places available.

The Childcare Act 2006 stipulates that local authorities “Will need to map the supply of childcare, so that they can identify any gaps. We endeavor to measure accurately the supply of all types of formal childcare, including unregistered provision but the new system will improve the assessment of the current level of provision of each type of care, in terms of hours of opening, the number of places offered by each provider, the age group it caters for and the cost per hour, day and week.” *2.43 P 16 The Childcare Act 2006*. There are still significant gaps in the data received from CSSIW and we have been informed that this is a generic problem not only one that is being experienced by RCT. Therefore there is an element of data that is missing and unless this becomes a regulatory requirement, providers are not and will not volunteer the information. Data therefore, has identified gaps and provider response rate is poor.

An appropriate level of affordable childcare is critical to support parents into employment and in turn this will lead to a reduction in the number of children living in poverty. However given the local shortage of full time paid employment, any increase in demand for childcare is likely to be for part time places which may create additional sustainability challenges for providers.


1.1 Gap analysis

Number of Childcare Vacancies per Ward Identified from Provider Responses.



As can be seen above the thematic map highlighting childcare vacancies shows that most vacancies are located within the Taf valley in the south of RCT. Specifically the wards of Llanharan, Llantrisant Town, Beddau, Llantwit Fardre and Church Village. It is worth noting that of the 20 wards with 0 vacancies, there were 9 wards which had no completed provider surveys returned.

1.1.2 Provider Distribution



Analysis of the data from the returned questionnaires shows that *Penrhiwceiber* has 32 children within the ward but only 6 registered childcare places exist. However, there is currently a provider in the process of registering with CSSIW to provide 20

Flying Start childcare places. The allocation will be for 10 children in the morning and 10 children in the afternoon session. The Analysis shows that this was the largest differentiation in the number of children in comparison to childcare places of all the wards. It also had the 6th highest number of births during the 2011-12 academic year.


The Provider data submitted for the CSA was low in comparison to previous years


Other data sources identify that there are registered childcare places available in addition to the providers who responded in some of these areas.

- Aberdare West/Llwydcoed
- Brynna
- Cwm Clydach*
- Cwmbach
- Cymmer
- Ferndale*
- Glyncoch*
- Hirwaun
- Llanharry
- Mountain Ash West
- Penrhiwceiber
- Penygraig
- Penywaun*
- Rhigos*
- Talbot Green*
- Treforest*
- Treherbert
- Tonypandy

*zero childcare providers recorded within these wards according to respondents.

1.1.3 Provider and Parent Analysis



 <p>STRONG HERITAGE STRONG FUTURE RHONDDA CYNON TAF TRISTODDETH GADDEIN DYFODOL BŶR</p>	<p>Drawing Title Provider and Parent Comparison</p>	<p>Date 23/10/2013</p>	<p>Scale</p>
	<p>Location e: 000000, n: 000000</p>		
	<p>(C) Crown copyright. All rights reserved. LA 100023458. 2006</p>		
	<p>(C) Hawlfreint y Goron. Cedw'r pob hawl LA 100023458. 2006</p>		

Analysis of the *'Provider and Parent Comparison'* (Illustration 3) we see that the wards to the central south of RCT have several providers. The thematic map shows high levels of childcare vacancies in these areas.

However, wards in the far south west of the authority (7 Brynna and 20 Llanharry) demonstrate good rate of response from parents. Analysis demonstrates vacancies in the mid-ranges.

Only a small sample of parents and providers returned, completed surveys, so the maps may not be illustrative of the true ratio of children to childcare providers in each ward.

The data evidenced that the Rhondda ward has the third largest number of registered places and the second highest number of providers. The parent survey returned zero children within Rhondda but despite this the 7 providers only identified 4 vacancies.

1.2 Ethnicity of parents (parent respondents)

The questionnaire asked parents to identify their ethnic group and also if their child accessed free childcare through Flying Start. 13 Respondents stated that their ethnic group was English/Welsh/Scottish and their child attended a Flying Start Setting, with 24 stating that their ethnic group was English/Welsh/Scottish stated that their child did not access Flying Start Childcare

1.3 Income Gaps

1.3.1 Financial Support

Only **21** parents stated they claim the childcare element of the Working Tax Credit/Universal credit. **109** said they do not claim and **10** said they did not know. The most common reason given for not claiming the childcare element was *'I know that I am not eligible'* with **68** (63%) parents giving this reason. The joint second most common reasons given were *'I am unsure whether I am eligible'* **18** (16.7%) and *'I do not pay for the childcare that I use'* **18** (16.7%). It is worth noting that more than one parent said they did not claim due to children in foster care via the optional text box.

Other financial help given to parents include *'Childcare vouchers'* received by **16** parents. **3** were given *'Employer contribution'* while the majority (**83**) stated *'No financial help received'*.

Parents were consulted about their use of childcare and their reasons for using it or not using it. 48% of respondents stated that they used family, partner or friends to look after their children and 32% gave the reason that childcare was too expensive.

1.4 Specific Needs Gap

Of 121 valid responses there were **11 (9.1%)** providers who did not offer places to children with a disability. Only **1** provider did not offer places to children with additional needs. Questions did not allow for analysis of gaps in provision for particular faiths or community groups.

16 (10.7%) parents said they had a child / children with a disability or life limiting illness.

We know from experience that most childcare providers have the facilities to meet the needs of disabled children but many disabled children need additional support through a one to one worker and the extra cost to parents is prohibitive. Full time childcare for a disabled child could amount to as much as £400 per week.

We know from analysis of statistics collated for other purposes within RCT that there are just over 8000 children/young people with additional needs in RCT. Of these, over 600 meet the threshold of need that qualifies them for support from the Disabled Children's Team.

The LSOA with the highest number of children with additional needs is Penrhiwceiber 1 with 80 children aged **0 – 17 years** having additional needs.

The top four LSOA's with the highest number of children registered disabled are *Brynna 2, Hawthorn 2, Mountain Ash West 2, Pentre 4*

(PSA 2012/2013 Appendix 1).

1.5 Time Gaps

This section indicates where there is a shortage of childcare at a time that parents wish to use it.

92 providers stated they offer childcare during school holidays. Of these 92, **50%** stated they offer childcare during the Christmas period. Whereas **85% or above** offered childcare during the other school holiday periods.

7 providers stated they offer weekend care.

When asked if they are able to meet the needs of parents requiring irregular childcare hours the majority (**59.2%**) said no. **27** were able to offer childcare on weekday evenings, **9** on Saturday day and **7** on Sunday day , reducing to **4** providers during weekend evenings. **24** gave a text response, some examples are listed below:

“I try to provide as flexible as possible service”

“Will consider subject to demand”

“Some parents work different hours every week so they inform me the week before”

We can conclude from the responses that childminders are as flexible as possible in order to meet the childcare needs of parents particularly those who work shifts. This is more challenging however with day nursery provision because of the higher number of children and staff required.

‘There is no childcare available at the times I need it’ was selected by **6%** of parents. The time periods identified were *7.30am to 9am* and *3.30pm to 6pm*.

70% of parent respondents stated that they would be looking for part time provision, with 30% of respondents stating they would look for full time childcare.

1.6 Age Gaps

There were **101** valid responses for the question; *Can you meet local demand for places in your setting for the following age groups?* As seen below most providers offer childcare for children aged 3-4 years old and fewest for children aged 2 years or below.

Age	Yes	No	N/A
Birth – 1	71	18	16
1 – 2 years old	72	18	16

2 – 3 years old	89	8	10
3 – 4 years old	99	3	4
4 – 5 years old	92	8	6
5 – 8 years old	84	9	9
Over 8 years old	75	10	16

70% of the valid responses indicated that they could offer places for children 2 years old or below. However the above table illustrates that the greatest number of places are available for children between the ages of 2 – 8 years. This could be due to the fact that the highest number of provider respondents were childminders and quite possibly offer before and after school provision for this age group of children.

The analysis evidenced that parents who were expecting children, therefore on maternity leave, **11 (64.7%)** said they would be looking to use childcare when their child is '*24-36 months*'. This would indicate that there would be little if any demand for childcare for babies under the age of 1 year. However, this is not what the providers are evidencing. In recent months there has been an increase in the number of young babies being placed in childcare settings.

The number of children and the number of providers both drop above the age of 8 years old. While both peak between 3 and 7 years old.

1.7 Type gaps

This section indicates where there is a shortage in the type of childcare for which parents may be expressing a preference

On comparison of the language preference and language capacity, by setting suggests there is no gap. Fewest parents preferred Welsh medium (**6.7%**) and fewest provider respondents were Welsh medium (**4.9%**). Most parents stated they would use an English medium setting (**48.9%**) and most providers offer services in the English medium (**33.3%** are English medium while **50.4%** are predominantly English with some use of Welsh, a total of **83.7%**). In the last 12 months a Welsh Medium Day nursery has closed despite the Council's efforts to support two different providers to make the setting viable. Even though there is a demand for Welsh Medium Education parents are not choosing to place their children in Welsh Medium Childcare, further research is needed in to the reasons behind these decisions.

Next year will need further childcare development to meet the needs of Flying Start childcare. It has been identified that with the expansion of Flying Start there is insufficient childcare providers or places in certain areas. The Local Authority continue to monitor this situation and tenders are out for interested providers to apply.

Term-time

Parents were asked what type of childcare they used during term time. The main type of childcare used is '*Family or friends*' (**28.9%**) with '*Free Breakfast Club*' (**18.5%**) second with the third preference being '*Day Nursery*' (**16.8%**). Only **1** child had a '*Nanny/Au pair*' suggesting that this form of childcare is least popular.

School Holidays

Parents were asked what type of childcare they used during school holiday periods, which in the past Assessments and Refreshes have been more challenging for them. The main type of childcare used is '*Family or friends*' (**53.5%**) followed by '*Playscheme*' (**13%**) and '*Day Nursery*' (**11.2%**). Similarly to term-time only **1** child had a '*Nanny/Au pair*'.

74.2% (92) providers are open during school holidays

Holiday Period	No. of Providers	% of Providers
Easter Holidays	84	91.3%
Spring Break (Whitsun)	78	84.8%
Summer Holidays	90	97.8%
Autumn Half Term	82	89.1%
Christmas	46	50.0%
February Half Term	80	87.0%

7 (5.6%) of the 124 providers offer weekend care. It was noted that in the CSA Refresh 2013, the figure was 10%. The majority of the provider responses were received from childminders, however, parents report using childminders 303 fewer hours altogether per week during term-time than using day nurseries. Parents with a total of 30 children surveyed use childminders during term-time. The data would suggest that there are at least 2 childminders for each child, signifying a surplus in supply. However the surveys' audiences and distribution must be kept in mind.

Providers were asked if they opened during school holiday periods. Obviously breakfast and afterschool provisions close as do a small number of childminders. Day nursery and some sessional care groups remain open.

The Local Authority works with third sector organisations supporting them in the development of holiday care schemes which, has increased the availability of holiday provision to parents over the last two years. Development of further provision is needed and this work will continue in the coming year.

1.8 Conclusions / Next steps

The responses have identified that in the main parents would prefer to use their partner/family or friend to look after their children rather than formal childcare, and the cost being too expensive. This could possibly be the reason for the increase in vacancy levels evidenced by providers. 109 respondents stated that they knew they were not entitled to claim Working Tax Credit as they were not eligible. It is clear that many find the cost of childcare too expensive; however, with the rising cost of living it is difficult for providers to keep costs low. When the average cost for a 10 hour day of childcare provision is £2.81 - £3.28 per hour. The third reason for not using formal childcare was that there was no service available when needed. Parent responses identified these areas as being Beddau, Hirwaun and Pontyclun.

Zero contract hours are presenting challenges to parents in relation to finding childcare. Parents cannot afford to pay a retainer fee to keep the child's place in the childcare setting open.

The conclusion is therefore that parents would prefer to use family/friends over formal, paid for childcare. Parents feel that childcare is too expensive.

2 Factors affecting demand and ability to pay

2.1 Population of children (by Welsh Assembly Government age ranges)

Area code	Area name	All categories: Age	Age under 1	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	Age 5	Age 6
W92000004	WALES	3,063,456	36,464	35,493	35,658	35,825	34,861	34,230	32,768
	Rhondda Cynon								
W06000016	Taf	234,410	3,048	2,859	2,948	2,815	2,779	2,869	2,632

Area code	Area name	Age 7	Age 8	Age 9	Age 10	Age 11	Age 12	Age 13	Age 14
W92000004	WALES	32,431	31,518	32,132	33,392	34,590	35,667	36,366	37,733
	Rhondda Cynon								
W06000016	Taf	2,633	2,528	2,478	2,541	2,721	2,824	2,857	2,942

2.2 Projected changes in the child and young people population

The table below (Appendix 5) taken from the 2011 Census identifies that the projected population for 2013 for Rhondda Cynon Taf is slightly higher than the actual recorded live births for the same period.

Education & Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee Agenda - 24 February 2015

	Age	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Rhondda Cynon Taf	All below 18	53,103	53,033	53,014	53,081	53,169	53,041
	All below 16	47,158	47,243	47,343	47,233	47,349	47,419
	0	3,037	2,985	2,976	2,969	2,962	2,946
	1	2,865	3,032	2,981	2,971	2,964	2,958
	2	2,978	2,847	3,013	2,962	2,953	2,946
	3	2,869	2,983	2,852	3,018	2,967	2,958
	4	2,755	2,868	2,983	2,851	3,018	2,967
	5	2,837	2,751	2,864	2,978	2,847	3,014
	6	2,727	2,830	2,744	2,857	2,971	2,840
	7	2,612	2,715	2,818	2,732	2,845	2,959
	8	2,578	2,610	2,713	2,815	2,730	2,843
	9	2,477	2,582	2,613	2,717	2,819	2,734
	10	2,545	2,475	2,580	2,611	2,715	2,817
	11	2,615	2,542	2,472	2,576	2,608	2,711
	12	2,825	2,607	2,534	2,464	2,568	2,599
	13	2,788	2,819	2,601	2,528	2,458	2,562
	14	3,012	2,783	2,814	2,597	2,523	2,454

2.3 Live Birth Rates for Rhondda-Cynon-Taf *(Source Health Board Statistics)*

Ward	Births 2012 - 13	Ward	Births 2012 - 13
Aberaman North	67	Penrhiwceiber	58
Aberaman South	53	Pentre	51
Abercynon	94	Penygraig	67
Aberdare East	64	Penywaun	38
Aberdare West/Llwydcoed	91	Pontyclun	68
Beddau	64	Pontypridd Town	26
Brynna	62	Porth	54
Church Village	84	Rhigos	17
Cilfynydd	39	Rhondda	68
Cwm Clydach	42	Rhydfelin	74
Cwmbach	50	Taffs Well	51
Cymmer	65	Talbot Green	21
Ferndale	56	Tonteg	32
Gilfach Goch	38	Tonypandy	51
Glyncoch	34	Tonyrefail East	73
Graig	30	Tonyrefail West	70
Hawthorn	56	Trallwng	40
Hirwaun	47	Trealaw	65
Llanharan	56	Treforest	33
Llanharry	65	Treherbert	50
Llantrisant Town	54	Treorchy	64
Llantwit Fardre	66	Tylorstown	68
Llwynypia	27	Tyn-y-Nant	46
Maerdy	49	Ynysbwl	54
Mountain Ash East	25	Ynyshir	36
Mountain Ash West	51	Ystrad	63

Totals / Averages	2767		
--------------------------	-------------	--	--

Live Birth Rates for Rhondda-Cynon-Taf (Source: Cwm Taf UHB)

Live Births for RCT January 2013 – December 2013 = 2.544

2.4 Number of vulnerable children in RCT

As at the 31st January 2014 there were - 640 looked after children,
477 children on the Child Protection Register.
As at 31st December 2013 there were 1579 children in need in Rhondda Cynon Taf.

2.5 Number of disabled children

The total number of disabled children supported by the disabled children team are, 612 but the overall figure exceeds 8000
The number of cases and the ages of the children are stated below:

132	-	under 5years
223	-	5 to 11 years inclusive
213	-	12 to 16 years inclusive
44	-	17 and 18 yr olds

2.6 Demographic Data

2.6.1 Review of Local Development Plan (LDP)

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council to prepare a Local Development Plan (LDP) for the County Borough outside the Brecon Beacon National Park. The LDP will provide the development strategy and spatial policy framework for the LDP area over a fifteen-year period to 2021. The Plan will be used by the Council to guide and control

development, providing a basis for consistent and appropriate decision-making. The northern most part of the County Borough lies within the Brecon Beacons National Park. This area is subject to a separate development plan that is the responsibility of the National Park Authority.

The Local Development Plan is an extremely important document for Rhondda Cynon Taf and provides the framework for decisions to be made up until 2021 on how land is used in the County Borough, for example what type of development is appropriate or desirable and how best to protect the environment. It is the culmination of a major piece of work that has included engaging with the community, stakeholders, and councillors over a number of years and its completion and adoption by the Council is a big milestone for Rhondda Cynon Taf. It is believed that the LDP provides a focus for sustainable regeneration and high quality development that will make Rhondda Cynon Taf a better place to live, work and play. Having the right planning policy in place is a key part of how the Council are trying to move the County Borough forward. It means that everyone can have a sense of confidence and reliability in terms of what it will look like in the future and will enable this policy and framework to be applied consistently to planning decisions that can affect everyone, depending on the development in question. The next ten years promise to be a very exciting period for Rhondda Cynon Taf and the LDP will contribute to achieving further progress and benefits for the residents and County Borough.

The Northern Strategy Area has suffered significant decline since the widespread closure of the collieries in the South Wales Coalfield in the mid 1980's. The Strategy Area has suffered from high indices of deprivation, unemployment, dereliction, loss of services and inevitably depopulation. A poor internal road network, low house building rates and a lack of meaningful inward investment have exacerbated the situation.

The Strategy Area does however, have a strong sense of community pride, many towns and villages with fine architectural history and a spectacular landscape that rivals that of the adjoining Brecon Beacons National Park.

The LDP will provide a policy framework that seeks to secure regeneration and create sustainable communities in the Northern Strategy Area. Through the provision of new housing, employment opportunities, improvements in accessibility and the implementation of large-scale regeneration proposals the Council will seek to halt depopulation and the process of decline.

The Southern Strategy Area has experienced considerable growth in recent years. The Strategy Area has seen significant new house building and inward investment that has transformed the economy of the area. The ability of the Southern Strategy Area to absorb further growth at existing rates, without social and environmental degradation, is being tested.

The key location of the Southern Strategy area means that it has a vital role to play in ensuring the future economic prosperity of Rhondda Cynon Taf. Economic growth however, must be carefully managed in order to ensure that the social and environmental needs of the Strategy Area are fully addressed.

The LDP will seek to manage residential and commercial growth in the Southern Strategy Area in a manner that seeks to balance the economic potential of the area with environmental capacity.

Policy CS 3 - Strategic Sites

In order to promote sustainable growth within Rhondda Cynon Taf the following sites are allocated for the development of a mixture of large-scale residential, employment, retail and recreational purposes:

- 1. Former Maerdy Colliery Site, Rhondda Fach (Policy NSA4);*
- 2. Former Fernhill Colliery Site, Blaenrhondda (Policy NSA5);*
- 3. Former Phurnacite Plant, Abercwmboi (Policy NSA6);*
- 4. Land at Robertstown / Abernant, Aberdare (Policy NSA7);*
- 5. Land South of Hirwaun (Policy NSA8);*
- 6. Cwm Colliery and Coking Works / Tyn-y-Nant (Policy SSA7);*
- 7. Mwyndy / Talbot Green Area (Policy SSA8), and*
- 8. Former OCC Site Llanilid, Llanharan (Policy SSA9).*

Proposals for the development of the Strategic Sites must have regard to the indicative concept plans identified on the proposals map.

(Not included in this Audit for further information refer to reference source)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <i>1. Former Maerdy Colliery Site,
Rhondda Fach</i> | <i>Employment (1 hectare)
Informal Recreation Space</i> |
| <i>2. Former Fernhill Colliery Site,
Blaenrhondda</i> | <i>350 – 400 Dwellings</i> |
| <i>3. Phurnacite Plant Site,
Abercwmboi</i> | <i>500 Dwellings Employment (5.9
hectares) Informal Recreation Space</i> |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 4. <i>Land at Robertstown /
Abernant</i> | <i>500 - 600 Dwellings
Employment / Leisure (3.7 hectares)</i> |
| 5. <i>Land South of Hirwaun</i> | <i>400 Dwellings
Employment (36 hectares)</i> |
| 6 <i>Former Cwm Colliery and
Coking Works, Tyn-y-Nant</i> | <i>800-950 Dwellings
Employment (1.9 hectares)</i> |
| 7. <i>Mwyndy /
Talbot Green Area</i> | <i>500 Dwellings
Employment (15 hectares)
Retail (23,400 m2 net)
Leisure (10,000 m2 net)</i> |
| 8. <i>Former OCC Site Llanilid,
Llanharan</i> | <i>1950-2100 Dwellings</i> |

(RCT Local Development Plan up to 202. p32,p33.)

2.7 Lone Parent Households with dependent children

2.7.1 KS107EW - Lone parent households with dependent children

ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 14 April 2014]

geography Rhondda, Cynon, Taff
time 2011

Family Type	Rural Urban Total	
	value	percent
All lone parent households with dependent	8,907	100.0

children		
Lone parent in part-time employment: Total	2,696	30.3
Lone parent in full-time employment: Total	2,065	23.2
Lone parent not in employment: Total	4,146	46.5
Male lone parent: Total	799	9.0
Male lone parent: In part-time employment	83	0.9
Male lone parent: In full-time employment	400	4.5
Male lone parent: Not in employment	316	3.5
Female lone parent: Total	8,108	91.0
Female lone parent: In part-time employment	2,613	29.3
Female lone parent: In full-time employment	1,665	18.7
Female lone parent: Not in employment	3,830	43.0

(Source: [nomis](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011) official labour market statistic <http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011>)

2.8 Index of multiple deprivation

2.8.1 Local authority analysis

The table below shows, for WIMD 2011, the percentage of small areas (LSOAs) in each local authority which are in the most deprived 10% (ranks 1 – 190), 20% (ranks 1 – 380), 30% (ranks 1 – 570) and 50% (ranks 1 – 950) LSOAs in Wales.

In this analysis, the most deprived local authority is defined as the authority with greatest fraction of its LSOAs in the most deprived 10% of all LSOAs in Wales. This method can be seen as identifying the concentration of the most deprived areas in a local authority, rather than an average level of deprivation.

The most deprived local authority is Merthyr Tydfil, with 25.0% of its LSOAs in the most deprived 10% in Wales, followed by Blaenau Gwent (23.4%) and Rhondda Cynon Taff (17.8%).

Blaenau Gwent has 87.2%, Merthyr Tydfil 77.8% and Rhondda Cynon Taf 73.7% of their LSOAs in the most deprived 50% in Wales.

The least deprived local authorities are Ceredigion and Monmouthshire, with no LSOAs in the most deprived 10% in Wales. In general, the Valleys and urban local authorities tend to be more deprived than those which are largely rural.

(Statistical Publication Unit, Welsh Government. Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation 2011 p15, 2011)

□ **2.9 Worklessness**

Meetings held with Lone Parent Advisors from Job Centre Plus indicated that their clients are experiencing difficulty finding childcare because they are being offered zero hour contracts. This means that they can be called to work at any time on short notice. The hours of work will not be set or regular, and in some cases after 6.00pm.

The challenge for providers with this type of contract is that the providers are unable to keep the vacancy for the child open on the possibility that the parent will be offered work. The parent is unable to pay a retainer fee to keep the placement open as they would not be in receipt of a wage unless they are working. Understandably the providers are unable to guarantee a place and therefore finding childcare at short notice is challenging if not impossible. This type of arrangement also raises concerns regarding continuity of care for the children if parents have to use different child care providers.

3 Analysis of supply

3.1.1 Introduction

CSA Questionnaires sent to Providers: **991** . The questionnaires were distributed in the following ways:
(30 x Schools (10x Rhondda, 10x Cynon, 10x Taf), 21x FS Settings, 600 to Team Around


CSA Questionnaires returned by Providers: **124** [131 responses in 2012]

Providers

A total of **991** questionnaires were distributed to childcare providers within RCT. Schools within Rhondda, Cynon and Taf were sent 10 per district, 21 were sent to Flying Start settings. They were sent to the Team Around the Family (TAF) coordinators to

distribute and well as various Play Providers. A total of **124** completed questionnaires were returned; approximately 13% of those sent out.

The distribution of childcare provider types is similar to the previous year. The majority of providers were childminders. Over 90% of the providers were CSSIW registered.



Responses identified that there were many more providers who said that they were part of the local authority this year compared to last year . However this is not the case and it can only be assumed that the question was misunderstood. **7** (5.6%) of the 124 providers offer weekend care compared to 10% of those identified the previous year.


3.2 CSA 2013 - Provider Summary

3.2.1 Type of Provider

Providers were asked to identify what type of childcare provision they operate. The majority of childcare providers were Childminders (65, 52.4%) In addition 20 playgroup and 18 day nursery responses were received. The graph below demonstrates the number of providers who responded to the Assessment and the type of childcare provision they operate.


Of those who responded **92.4%** (110) were CSSIW registered, there were **7.6%** (9) non-registered schemes offering between them **1954** places.

No questionnaires were returned from the following wards; Cilfynydd, Cwm Clydach, Ferndale, Glyncoch, Penywaun, Rhigos, Talbot Green, Trallwng or Treforest.



3.2.2 Language of the setting

Of the providers who returned a questionnaire **33.3%** were *'English'* medium while **50.4%** were *'Predominantly English with some use of Welsh'*. **4.9%** stated they provide childcare through the medium of Welsh.



3.2.3 Sector

49.2% of respondents were within the *'Private'* sector, **28.2%** in *'Local authority'* and **8.1%** in the *'Voluntary'* sector. **8.1%** did not know which sector they were in. It would appear that there has been a significant shift from the private sector to local authority providers this is not the case however, and it can only be assumed that providers have misunderstood the question.

Sector	2012	2013	% Pt. Change
Private	73.8% (93)	52.6% (61)	- 21.2
Local Authority	11.1% (14)	30.2% (35)	19.1
Voluntary	9.5% (12)	8.6% (10)	-0.9
Don't Know	5.6% (7)	8.6% (10)	3

3.2.4 The data collected evidenced that the number of vacancies providers had was a total of **572** vacancies with an average of **6** vacancies per provider. Anecdotal evidence from providers throughout RCT has identified that there are vacancies in the majority of settings as parents are not choosing to place their children in childcare full time. Some Text responses from providers who have evidenced increased vacancy rates are listed below:

- “Parents change of circumstance, no longer required day care”
- “2 other settings in the area offering free places”
- “lack of money”
- “change in child’s family circumstances. Kept on as occasional care.”
- “Local extended family”

31.5% of providers reported ‘*More vacancies*’ compared to the previous year. **24.2%** of providers reported ‘*Fewer vacancies*’ whereas **40.3%** reported little change in vacancies.

Reason for more vacancies	No. of Providers	% of Providers
Parents unemployed	21	42.0%
Other	16	32.0%
Family members unemployed	12	24.0%

Increase in childcare settings in the area	10	20.0%
Don't Know	8	16.0%
Increase in childcare costs	4	8.0%
Opening hours not suitable	1	2.0%

One Parent response for not using formal childcare was that breakfast and afterschool provision was not available on an informal basis. The cost is too expensive and would prefer a pay as you use afterschool club.

3.2.5 Cost of Childcare

The averages of the cost of childcare given by providers are detailed in the table below.

	Min Charge	Max Charge	2012 Avg
Full Day	£28.13	£32.38	£33.30
Full Week	£140.21	£158.96	£155.50
Half Day	£15.95	£18.35	-
Hourly Rate	£4.39	£4.98	£4.35

Compared to data collected for the 2012 CSA we can see that the cost of childcare has changed very little.

36 providers (30% compared to 18% in 201) require a deposit. The average cost of deposits was **£49.32** while the minimum was **£10** and the maximum was **£160**.

Providers were asked if they would accept payment through Childcare Vouchers and 93 confirmed that they did. Providers were asked if any parents were in receipt of certain benefits. Results were as follows: **60.7%** 'Childcare Vouchers', **56.3%** 'Child Tax Credit', **55.4%** 'Working Tax Credit', **33%** 'Working Tax Credit Childcare Element'.

90.9% (110) of provider respondents said they offer places to children with a disability.

99.2% (122) of provider respondents said they offer places to children with additional needs.

40.8% (49) of providers said they are able to provide to parents requiring irregular childcare hours.

When asked if they are able to meet the needs of parents requiring irregular childcare hours 40.8% stated that they did. **27** were able to offer childcare on weekday evenings, **9** on Saturday and **7** on Sunday both reducing to **4** providers during weekend evenings. **24** gave a text response with the majority of responses being that they already provide childcare outside typical office hours and that they offer flexible childcare. One provider stated that if a parent has the need for childcare outside of the hours provided that the request will be considered.

The conclusion is that the majority of childminders are flexible with the hours they provide childcare and for this reason the Local Authority have been supporting the development of childminding provision in areas where there is identified need. This will continue for the year ahead.

3.3 The Local Childcare Market

Providers were asked their opinion regarding the local childcare market the chart below highlights that they felt the quality of provision to be good to excellent. The opinion regarding the range of or the choice of childcare was good. The best rated was 'Quality of provision'.

	Very Poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Don't Know
Quality of provision	1	2	18	51	26	17
Range of, or choice in, providers	3	10	21	51	18	14
Number of places	4	7	20	44	11	29
Affordability	3	10	25	34	18	24
Flexibility of provision and sessions	2	4	37	32	14	23
Suitability of opening times	1	3	29	42	16	23
Location and accessibility of childcare	1	5	24	43	22	20
Bilingual/Welsh provision	2	6	32	31	10	34

There were **101** valid responses to the question; *'Can you meet local demand for places in your setting for the following age groups?'* As seen below most providers offer childcare for children aged 3-4 years old and fewest for children aged 2 years or below.

Age	Yes	No	N/A
Birth – 1	71	18	16
1 – 2 years old	72	18	16
2 – 3 years old	89	8	10
3 – 4 years old	99	3	4
4 – 5 years old	92	8	6
5 – 8 years old	84	9	9
Over 8 years old	75	10	16

70% of the valid responses indicate they can offer places for children 2 years old or below.

The childcare provision for '*Working families*' was rated the highest overall with a total of **56** providers rating it either '*Good*' or '*Excellent*'. The lowest rated provision was for '*Disabled children*' however this also had **43** providers ticking the '*Don't know*' option.

	Very Poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Don't Know
Low income families	3	12	26	26	9	39
Disabled children	4	12	22	27	7	43
Working families	1	4	28	42	14	27
Families seeking work	2	9	21	33	9	41
Those who require bilingual/Welsh childcare	2	5	30	26	8	43

Providers were asked what improvements they thought could be put in place for working families. Help with costs, funding opportunities, extra childcare grant, childcare element payments made to families should go to the nursery not the families. Help with running costs of the setting was also identified together with the cost of childcare is too high for many families and this can prevent them working.

3.4 Your Future Plans

100 providers expected to continue to provide childcare for more than 5 years. **3** expected to discontinue within the next 12 months.

The following figures indicate how many providers said they have plans in place for the next 18 months:

- Expand number of places: **16**
- Significantly increase fees: **9**
- Improve provision for disabled children: **13**
- Extend opening hours: **13**
- Meet the needs of shift workers or those who work outside typical office hours: **7**
- Expand number of Welsh medium places / change linguistic nature of support: **5**

- Expanding to different geographical areas: **9** (25 chose 'Yes, maybe')

Analysis the support needed by providers shows that '*Staff Training*' is the area most commonly requiring support.

Only **2** providers indicated they require a lot of support in '*Staff recruitment and retention*'.

Below, each area has been ranked by how many stated they require '*A lot of support*'.

	None	A little	A lot
C9b Staff training	45	32	18
C9e Building alterations	66	19	12
C9h Working with the local authority	47	38	11
C9i More involvement in local planning of childcare provision	56	29	11
C9c Marketing support / advice	56	33	10
C9j Welsh language support	52	34	9
C9k Advice on needs of specific groups of children	61	20	9
C9f Inspection / registration support / advice	61	26	5
C9g Support to network with other providers	60	29	5
C9d Business support / advice	57	34	4
C9a Staff recruitment and retention	78	11	2
C9l Other	43		2

3.4.1 Work Force Development

The Early Years Training Centre is committed to ensuring all early years practitioners within the authority have access to subsidised, high quality training opportunities to support their ongoing professional development. We continue to commission training from a wide range of organisations in order for practitioners to meet their statutory training requirements in addition to ensuring they are kept up to speed with the latest research, best practices and standards so the quality of early years services provided continually improves. Regular evaluation and consultation with practitioners ensures that individuals have opportunities

for learning, which provides them with the skills and confidence to progress with their careers. Further information is available at www.rctcbc.gov.uk/eyfsstrainingcentre

The Early Years Training Centre is a City and Guilds Approved Centre who offer a range of professional qualifications in order to meet the local early years and childcare workforce demands. Our award winning centre offers a range of Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF) qualifications from Level 1 – Level 5 which helps individuals choose a qualification at an achievable at a level for them. Every learner is offered flexible, high quality training provision with bespoke assessor support to overcome any barriers to learning and ensure qualification success. Further information on the QCF is available at www.cityandguilds.com/qcf.html

3.5 Early Years Entitlement

Providers were asked a question regarding Early Years Education and asked to identify if they were registered education providers. From the responses received it appears that providers have no or little information about the Early Years education entitlement. Whereas we know that there are 17 registered education providers amongst third sector providers in RCT, who between them support an average 400 children per year to access Foundation Phase nursery education. A further 5 settings are progressing through the registration process currently.

3.6 Analysis of supply

3.6.1 Numbers of Registered Childcare Places in Rhondda-Cynon-Taf, taken from the Family Information Service Data Base.

Rhondda: - Full Day Care	285 places
Sessional Care	232
Childminding	152 from 28 providers
Out of School Care	84
Open Access play	30

Total number of registered places in Rhondda - 783

Cynon: -	Full Day Care	262 places
	Sessional Care	110
	Childminding	128 from 24 providers
	Out of School	9
	Open Access play	101
	Creche	9
	Total number of registered places in Cynon - 619	

Taf: -	Full Day Care	574
	Sessional Care	520
	Childminding	577 from 101 providers
	Out of School	233
	Open Access Play	279
	Creche	9
	Total number of registered places in Taf - 2203	

Total number of registered childcare places in RCT - 3,605
Decrease since the 2013 Refresh of 434 places.

Total number of unregistered Breakfast Clubs - places not known as these are not collated but we do know the number of providers in each area:

Rhondda - 41 providers
Cynon - 24 providers
Taf - 31 providers

The number of registered childcare provision has decreased since the 2013 Childcare Sufficiency Refresh. There is a loss of 30 registered childminders and three day nurseries, namely the Welsh Medium provision in Abercynon and English medium day

nurseries in Ferndale and Aberdare. However, data is showing an increase of 6 childminders in Beddau, one new day nursery in Aberdare and one in Mountain Ash.

Previous discussions with childminders have suggested that there is not enough demand for them to remain operational and they can earn higher salaries working in their local supermarkets. Day nurseries are experiencing sustainability challenges with the continuing reduction in the demand for full time places.

The table below is a record of the childcare providers in RCT taken from the Family Information Service (FIS) data base. It identifies the areas where there is childcare provision. It can be seen that the Provider, Registration and Review forms (P & R forms) which have been returned by the provider differ from the registered CSSIW settings. There are a number of reasons for this 1. The setting has de-registered, therefore, is not on the CSSIW list but the provider has not informed FIS. 2. The settings do not meet registration requirements as they operate under two hours in one day. Therefore FIS rely solely on the provider to inform them that the provision is operational. 3. New provision has opened but the updated CSSIW list has not been received and input on to the system.

It is also noted that the number of provisions on the data base far exceeds the number of provider questionnaires received for the Audit. This unfortunately leaves gaps in the information related to the number of childcare places available and the number of vacancies each provider is currently evidencing. Each provider has a choice of providing the information to FIS, it is not a statutory requirement.

Therefore, vacancies and places available are based on provider responses to this Assessment and CSSIW data. The number of childcare places in RCT will therefore be greater than those recorded due to the fact that unregistered provision has not been included. However as stated in previous Assessments unregistered provision does meet the childcare needs of some parents even though they would not be able to claim any tax credits.

Discussions have taken place with the FIS Manager in order for the data to be collected as far as reasonably practical from unregistered and registered providers for the next Assessment, which will portray more accurately the current childcare status

Brynna			1		1	8											1	
Church Village		1	2		5	14		2			1		1				1	
Cilfynydd						1												
Gilfach Goch			1			3		1				1	1	1			1	
Glyncoch			1		1	1								1				
Graig						1						1	1				1	
Hawthorn			1			1												
Llanharan			2		4	5		2	1	1			1			1	1	
Llanharry	1	1	1		4	6						1						
Llantrisant	1	1	2		1	4	1	3	1									
Llantwit Fardre			1		4	10			2		1	2				1		
Pontyclun			1		2	10	1				1	1				1		
Pontypridd	4		3		4	10	1	1	5		1	1	2					
Rhydyfelin	4		3			1	1	1	2		1	1	1	1				
Taffs Well			1			1						1						
Talbot Green	1		1		1	1	1	2					1	1				
Tonteg	1		1		1	3												
Tonyrefail East	2	1	2		1	2	1	1	1				1	1	1			
Tonyrefail West					2	4					1	1						
Trallwng	1	1	2			1							1					
Treforest	1		1				2	3	1									
Tyn-y-nant			1			3												
Ynysybwl			2		2	2	1				1	1						
<i>Totals</i>	16	6	31	0	35	101	10	15	16	1	6	11	10	9	4	1	0	5

Cwm Clydach	1		1				1	2					1		1			
Cymer	1		2					1	1						1			
Ferndale	2		3						1		1		1					1
Llwynypia	2	1	3				2	2	2				1		1	1		
Maerdy	1		1		1	2									1	1		

Pentre	2		4		2	6	1	1	1				3	1				
Penygraig	2		4		2	2				1			4					
Porth	1		6		2	7		1	1		1	1						
Rhondda		1				2												
Tonypandy	1		2		1	1												
Trealaw	1		2		1	2			1				1		1	1		
Treherbert	1		2		2	2			1		1	1	1		1			
Treorchy	2	1	3		1	1	1	1	2		2	2	2	1				1
Tylorstown			2		2	2	1	1					1	1	2	1		
Ynyshir	2		2			1			2		1	1	1		1			
Ystrad	1		4				1				1	1	2					
<i>Totals</i>	20	3	41	0	14	28	7	9	12	0	8	6	18	3	9	4	1	1

3.6.3 Information provided from FIS (provider responses to the questionnaire)

Ward	Providers	No. of places	Places / Provider	Vacancies	Ward	Providers	No. of places	Places / Provider	Vacancies	
Aberaman North	1	32	32	0	Penrhwi-ceiber	1	6	6	1	
Aberaman South	2	12	6	4	Pentre	6	99	17	44	
Abercynon	4	41	10	6	Penygraig	2	6	3	0	
Aberdare East	5	86	17	44	Penywaun	0	0		0	
Aberdare West/Llwydcoed	1	4	4	2	Pontyclun	5	56	11	5	
Beddau	7	180	26	35	Pontypridd Town	2	12	6	0	
Brynna	4	18	5	4	Porth	5	72	14	20	
Church Village	6	94	16	22	Rhigos	0	0		0	
Cilfynydd	0	0		0	Rhondda	7	176	25	4	
Cwm Clydach	0	0		0	Rhydfelin	5	162	32	83	
Cwmbach	1	5	5	1	Taffs Well	2	84	42	40	
Cymmer	1	0		0	Talbot Green	0	0		0	
Ferndale	0	0		0	Tonteg	1	5	5	2	
Gilfach Goch	3	12	4	2	Tonypanyd	1	4	4	0	
Glyncoch	0	0		0	Tonyrefail East	1	16	16	0	
Graig	1	26	26	10	Tonyrefail West	2	10	5	5	
Hawthorn	2	34	17	13	Trallwng	0	0		0	
Hirwaun	1	6	6	5	Trealaw	1	6	6	0	
Llanharan	3	97	32	17	Treforest	0	0		0	
Llanharry	1	4	4	1	Treherbert	1	0		4	
Llantrisant Town	8	182	23	67	Treorchy	4	27	7	8	
Llantwit Fardre	7	62	9	25	Tylorstown	3	37	12	4	
Llwynypia	2	80	40	11	Tyn-y-Nant	1	4	4	1	
Maerdy	1	6	6	0	Ynysbwl	2	30	15	0	
Mountain Ash East	1	24	24	10	Ynyshir	1	5	5	2	
Mountain Ash West	1	0		0	Ystrad	1	24	24	0	
					Totals / Averages		117	1846	16	502

3.7 Number of providers

From Summary – Provider Responses (breakdown of provision by age ranges)

Age	Yes	No	N/A
Birth – 1	71	18	16
1 – 2 years old	72	18	16
3 – 4 years old	99	3	4
4 – 5 years old	92	8	6
5 – 8 years old	84	9	9
Over 8 years old	75	10	16

3.8 Free part time education places for 3- 4 year olds

3.8.1 Description of data used

The information below was provided by Early Years Advisory Teacher colleagues in our team.

Playgroup Name	Number of three year olds	Welsh/English Medium
Little Folk Playgroup, Church Village	14	English
Little Stars Playgroup, Llantwit Fardre	28	English
St. Paul's Church, Pontyclun	30	English
University of Glamorgan, Treforest	0	English
Cylch Meithrin Porth, Porth	11	Welsh
Cylch Meithrin, Ynyshir/Wattstown	7	Welsh
Cylch Meithrin, Ty newydd	7	Welsh
Cylch Meithrin Nant Dyrys, Ynyswen	9	Welsh

Talbot Green Playgroup	16	English
Little Inspirations Day Nursery Llantrisant	16	English
Cylch Meithrin Aberdar, Aberdare	36	Welsh
Giggles Playgroup, Beddau	14	English
Genesis Day Nursery, Tonyrefail	0	English
Meithrinfa Garth Olwg, Pontypridd	12	Welsh
Cylch Meithrin Thomastown, Thomastown	7	Welsh
Cylch Meithrin Ynysybwl, Ynysybwl	13	Welsh
Cylch Meithrin Efail Isaf, Efail Isaf	8	Welsh

3.8.2 Registered Education Providers in the Non-Maintained Sector

The table identifies settings in the non-maintained sector that are registered education providers. The number of three year olds, are the children currently receiving funding for the Spring Term 2014.

Parents were asked if they take up their entitlement to 10 hours free Early Years education per week. They were also asked if their child had a disability or long-term limiting illness. The responses recorded were as follows: 11 stated they did with one parent having a child with a disability; 27 stated that they did of which 2 stated that they had a child with a disability. There were 45 responses to this question in total.

3.8.3 Location

The areas where the non maintained settings are situated are:

Welsh Medium: Porth, Ynyshir/Wattstown, Ty Newydd, Ynyswen - Rhondda .

Welsh Medium: Aberdare, Ynysybwl - Cynon

Welsh Medium: Pontypridd, Thomastown, Efail Isaf - Taf

English Medium: Church Village, Treforest, Llantwit Fardref, Pontyclun, Talbot Green, Llantrisant, Beddau, Tonyrefail - Taf

3.9 Flying Start

3.9.1 Description of data used

The data below is taken from the *Flying Start Term 1 and Term 2 Submission to Welsh Government 2013-14*.

3.9.2 Profile of children taking up a place

	New Offers made	Sessions attended
Girls	223	22,492
Boys	234	22,471
children from ethnic minority families Minority	7	695
children from families where Welsh is the first language	1	192
children from families where English or Welsh is not the first language	2	190
children with a disabled parent/carer	17	1749
children with a disability	10	724

3.9.3 Flying Start Places by Type of Setting

The type of childcare provision supplying Flying Start childcare is as follows:

- 3 Local Authority Providers, all of which are day nurseries
- 4 Private Providers, 1 of which is a day nursery and 3 childminders
- 15 Voluntary Providers, which are a mixture of day nurseries and playgroups, including 4 Welsh Medium settings.

3.10 Location of Flying Start places

	Childcare Places
Aberaman	23
Aberllechau	16
Cwm Clydach	20
Cymmer/Rhiwgarn	32
Gilfach Goch	40
Glenboi	12
Glyncoch	36
Hirwaun	4
Maerdy	32
Penrhys	12
Penywaun	40
Perthcelyn	12
Pontrhonna	24
Rhydyfelin	20 Welsh 20 Bilingual 12 English
Tonyrefail	24
Trealaw	24
Treherbert	12 English 16 Welsh
Tylorstown	40
Ynysboeth	28

3.10.1 Where children take up their places

The majority of children who take up their Flying Start Childcare entitlement, do so at the setting closest to them. 16 of the children who took up their childcare entitlement did so at an alternative setting, some of the reasons being:

- Requested Welsh Medium Setting
- Parental preference
- They were due to move into the area.
- There was no childcare in the Flying Start area in which they lived
- Grandparents who cared for the child while parents lived in that area.

There is limited request for Welsh Medium provision.

Parents were asked if their child had a disability or life limiting illness and also if their child accessed the free Flying Start childcare. Two parents replied yes to both questions.

3.10.2 The Table below identifies the Flying Start areas and the number of places for FS Childcare.

Period 2014 - 2015

Flying Start Settings

Rhondda	Commissioned
Aberllechau Flying Start	12
Cylch Meithrin Ynyshir & Wattstown	8
Cylch Meithrin Nant Dyrus	12
Genesis Community Day Nursery Tylorstown	16
Growing Together Maerdy	32
Growing Together Penrhys	12
Growing Together Tylorstown	24
Penpych	12
Sunshine Corner Day Nursery	20
Trealaw Flying Start	32

Ynyscynon Early Years Centre	24
Cynon	
Genesis Community Day Nursery Aberaman	18
Growing Together Bryncynon	28
Growing Together Glenboi	20
Growing Together Perthcelyn	12
Penywaun Flying Start	32
Penrhiwceiber	20
Hirwaun	<i>covered by childminders</i>
Ynysboeth	28
Taff	
Cylch Meithrin Rhydyfelin	40
Cylch Meithrin Ynysybwl	12
Genesis Community Day Nursery Tonyrefail	16
Glyncoch Playzone	24
High Street	24
Little Inspirations	12
Messy Monsters	32
Rhiwgarn Flying Start	32
Giggles Playgroup Ty Nant	12
Cylch Meithrin Llanharry	16
Cylch Meithrin Pentre Eglwys	20
Genesis Day Nursery Pontypridd	20

Rhondda - 204
Cynon - 158
Taf - 260

Total of 622 Flying Start childcare places.


4 Understanding the needs of parents/carers

4.1 Your Children

The children of the parents who returned a survey have an age distribution as follows:

<i>Birth – 36 months:</i>	67
<i>3 – 4 years old:</i>	77
<i>5 – 7 years old:</i>	81
<i>8 – 10 years old:</i>	41
<i>11 – 14 years old:</i>	22
<i><u>14 – 18 years old:</u></i>	<u>23</u>
<i>Total:</i>	311

How many children do you have in the following age ranges?



The distribution of the children peaks at '5 and 7 years old' before sharply falling. This figure almost halves for the age range above this (8-10 yrs old) and then almost halves again for then next age range, 11-14 years old.

Of the parents who completed the question, **10.7%** (16) said they have a child with a disability or life limiting illness. **11** of these had 'Learning difficulties', **6** 'Speech Impaired', **4** 'Hearing Impaired', and **3** 'Visually Impaired' and **3** 'Mobility Impaired'. Further detail has been given within the text responses (1c – Text Responses - Parent) which include ADHD and deafness amongst others. When asked if they use formal childcare for any of their children **49** replied 'No', **34** 'Yes, for some of my children' and **66** 'Yes, for all my children'.

4.2 Summary

4.2.1 Parents

There were a total of **2056** questionnaires sent out to parents within RCT. The bulk of these were distributed to schools; 500 in each of the districts, Rhondda, Cynon and Taf. Others were sent to Flying Start settings, the Disabled Children's Team and Clwbiau Plant Cymru. A total of **152** completed questionnaires were returned; approximately 7% of those sent out.

The children of the parents who returned a questionnaire are mostly aged 7 years old or below. There are almost three times as many children aged from birth to 7 than from 8 to 18 years old. The ages of the children of parents matches with the number of providers for each age group. The number of children and the number of providers both drop above the age of 8 years old. While both peak between 3 and 7 years old.

The three main reasons stated for not using childcare are '*My partner/family/friend look after my children*' (**27.3%**), '*Myself or my partner are a stay at home parent and I have no need for childcare*' (**22.7%**) and '*Childcare is too expensive*' (**18.2%**).

From this we can see that parents are likely to look after their children themselves, ask family members or friends to look after. This may or may not be linked with the third most common reason of childcare being too expensive.

In contrast reasons for using childcare mainly include '*I go to work*' and '*Social or learning benefits for my child*'.

Over **70%** of parents agree that childcare is of a high quality, caters for their needs and that they are satisfied with provision during term time. Over **70%** also agree that childcare is too expensive.

Although **75%** of parents are satisfied with childcare during term time, this falls to **54%** of parents for childcare during school holidays. Further responses also suggest that school holiday provision is not as established as childcare during term-time.

Due to the lack of responses to the sections on the entitlement to Early Years education and Flying Start childcare suggested that parents have limited knowledge about either of these. This is backed-up by the answers and text responses given.

Comparison of data from term-time and school holidays show that childcare is used for more hours in an average week during the school holidays than during term-time. Further to this, childcare during term-time is more varied where parents utilise breakfast

clubs, after school clubs, etc. Hence one possible conclusion is that during term-time, children are in different types of childcare throughout the week for shorter periods of time.

4.2.2 Profile of respondents

The children of the parents who returned a survey have an age distribution as follows:

<i>Birth – 36 months:</i>	67
<i>3 – 4 years old:</i>	77
<i>5 – 7 years old:</i>	81
<i>8 – 10 years old:</i>	41
<i>11 – 14 years old:</i>	22
<i>14 – 18 years old:</i>	23
<i>Total:</i>	311

Half (**45**) of the parents who answered and who work usually '*Work office hours 9-5*'. There were **32** parents who chose the '*Other*' option for the time of day they usually work. Upon analysis of the text responses given, parents either work shifts, shorter or different hours than 9-5 or work school hours.

The majority of parents - 140 (95.2%) stated they were '*English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British*'. There was **1** parent in each of these following categories: '*Irish*', '*White and Black African*', '*White and Asian*', '*Pakistani*', '*Bangladeshi*' and **2** in '*Any other White background*'.

The religious beliefs of parents were split into two main categories; '*No religion or belief*' (**59.5%**) and '*Christian (all denominations)*' (**37.8%**). **1** parent was '*Jewish*' and **2** were '*Muslim*'.

95.2% of parents' main language were '*English*' while only **3.4%** were '*Welsh*'. Other main languages stated include '*Portuguese*' and '*Hebrew*'.

While only **5** parents chose Welsh as their main language more than this use or can use Welsh to some extent. The number of parents and their ability of Welsh are broken down as follows:

<i>Understand spoken Welsh</i>	36	24.8%
<i>Speak Welsh</i>	25	17.2%
<i>Read Welsh</i>	32	22.1%
<i>Write Welsh</i>	22	15.2%
<i>None of these</i>	102	70.3%

Parents were asked to describe their households; **110** chose the option, *'I share responsibility for my children with someone I live with'* (73.3%), **31** chose *'I have sole responsibility for my children'* (20.7%) and **8** chose *'I share responsibility for my children with someone I do not live with'* (5.3%). None of the parents chose the option, *'I am a parent to be'*.

A total of **25** parents stated that either they or their partner have a long term illness or health problem. **14** said they or their partner has a disability.

4.2.3 Current use of childcare

Term-time

	English			Welsh			Bilingual			Overall %	Total		
	Children	Hours	Hours / Child	Children	Hours	Hours / Child	Children	Hours	Hours / Child		Children	Hours	Hours / Child
Childminder	28	214	7.64	0	0		2	20	10.00	8.7%	30	234	7.80
Day Nursery	53	448	8.45	2	46	23	3	43	14.33	16.8%	58	537	9.26
Breakfast Club	12	34	2.83	3	19.5	6.5	1	4.5	4.50	4.6%	16	58	3.63
Free Breakfast Club	53	168.9	3.19	7	24.3	3.47	4	19	4.75	18.5%	64	212	3.32
Wrap Around	2	4.5	2.25	1	32.3	32.30	2	2	1.00	1.4%	5	39	7.76
After School Club	34	160.5	4.72	6	15.5	2.58	1	10	10.00	11.8%	41	186	4.54
Nanny/Au pair	1	0	0.00	0	0		0	0		0.3%	1	0	0.00
Playgroup	12	109.25	9.10	1	2	2.00	3	21	7.00	4.6%	16	132	8.27
Clych Meithrin	3	23	7.67	3	32.5	10.83	2	15.5	7.75	2.3%	8	71	8.88
Family or friends	96	810	8.44	2	28	14	2	18	9.00	28.9%	100	856	8.56
Other	7	55	7.86	0	0		0	0		2.0%	7	55	7.86
Totals	301	2027.15	6.73	25	200.10	8.00	20	153.00	7.65		346	2380	6.88
Percentage	87.0%			7.2%			5.8%						

School Holidays

	English			Welsh			Bilingual			Overall %	Total		
	Children	Hours	Hours / Child	Children	Hours	Hours / Child	Children	Hours	Hours / Child		Children	Hours	Hours / Child
Childminder	13	203.5	15.65	0	0		2	30	15	7.0%	15	234	15.57
Day Nursery	21	486	23.14	2	46	23	1	4	4	11.2%	24	536	22.33
Holiday childcare club	23	465.5	20.24	0	0		0	0		10.7%	23	466	20.24
Playscheme	23	385.5	16.76	0	0		5	60.5	12.1	13.0%	28	446	15.93
Nanny/Aupair	1	0	0.00	0	0		0	0		0.5%	1	0	0.00
Family or friends	91	1461.5	16.06	18	16	0.89	6	173	28.83	53.5%	115	1651	14.35
Other	8	38.5	4.81	0	0		1	7.5	7.5	4.2%	9	46	5.11
Totals	180	3040.50	16.89	20	62.00	3.10	15	275.00	18.33		215	3378	15.71

Percentage	83.7%		9.3%		7.0%				
------------	-------	--	------	--	------	--	--	--	--

4.2.4 Types of childcare used

The main type of childcare used is ‘*Family or friends*’ (**28.9%**) with ‘*Free Breakfast Club*’ (**18.5%**) and ‘*Day Nursery*’ (**16.8%**). Only **1** child had a ‘Nanny/Au pair’.

4.2.5 Hours per week of childcare used


During term-time children of the respondents are in;

- **English** medium childcare for a total of **2027** hours per week;
- **Welsh** medium childcare for a total of **200** hours per week;
- **Bilingual** medium childcare for a total of **153** hours per week;
- A total of **2380** hours per week; an average of almost **7** hours at each type of childcare per week per child.

4.2.6 Location of childcare used

87% of children use English medium childcare (of the providers who returned a questionnaire 33.3% are English medium while 50.4% are predominantly English with some use of Welsh. **7.2%** Welsh, **5.8%** Bilingual).

4.2.7 Parent Distribution Map



4.3 Meeting the needs of parents / carers

4.3.1 Do childcare arrangements meet need?

During term-time **83** (72.8% of 114 valid responses) parents said that childcare arrangements fully meet their needs. This reduces to **51** (50% of 102 valid responses) parents for childcare arrangements during school holidays.

Only **3** parents said that term-time childcare arrangements did not meet their needs at all. This rises to **14** parents for school holiday arrangements.

Parents were asked if childcare had been a barrier to accessing employment or training? The responses identified that (**49.1%**) disagreed that childcare was a barrier to accessing employment or training. There were **21.6%** who agreed it was a barrier. Discussions have taken place with Job Centre Plus Lone Parent advisers and they stated that due to zero contract hours finding childcare was challenging.

Uptake of, and barriers to accessing financial support (including childcare element of working tax credit)

Only **21** parents stated they claim the childcare element of the Working Tax Credit/Universal credit. **109** said they do not claim it and **10** said they did not know if they claim it or not.

The most common reason given for not claiming the childcare element was '*I know that I am not eligible*' with **68** (63%) parents giving this reason. The joint second most common reasons given were '*I am unsure whether I am eligible*' **18** (16.7%) and '*I do not pay for the childcare that I use*' **18** (16.7%).

Providers of childcare were asked if any parents were in receipt of certain benefits. Results were as follows: **60.7%** Childcare Vouchers, **56.3%** Child Tax Credit, **55.4%** Working Tax Credit, **33%** Working Tax Credit Childcare Element.

4.3.2 Views on the childcare market

The following shows what percentage of parents agree or disagree with each of the statements. Where percentages do not total 100% the gap indicates those parents who either did not know or felt it was not applicable.

	Agree %	Disagree %
I am satisfied with my childcare in term time	75.4	4.9
Childcare caters for my children's needs	73	6.1
The quality of childcare is high	72.9	3.4
Childcare is too expensive	70.3	16.1
Childcare is well located	58.1	12.8
I am satisfied with my childcare in school holidays	54.2	15.8
I know where to find out information about childcare	44.9	30.5
I would prefer to use family/friends for childcare	41	37.6
There is a good choice of childcare in RCT	32.5	23.3
I know where to find out information on financial assistance for childcare	30.5	42.4
I would like my child to attend more registered childcare	25.2	29.6
Childcare is a barrier to me accessing employment or training	21.6	49.1
I have a problem with childcare arrangements that breakdown	18.1	40.5
There is enough Welsh language childcare	14.4	21.2

As can be seen above, over **70%** of parents agree that childcare is of a high quality, caters for their needs and that they are satisfied with provision during term time. Over **70%** also agree that childcare is too expensive.

Although **75%** of parents are satisfied with childcare during term time, this falls to **54%** of parents for childcare during school holidays. The percentage of parents disagreeing rises by **10.9** percentage points.

Parents views on childcare identified that 14% felt that there was enough Welsh medium childcare, 21% disagreed and 47% stated that they didn't know a further 18% evidenced that the question was not applicable to them.

The highest percentage of parents (**49.1%**) disagreed that childcare is a barrier to accessing employment or training. There were **21.6%** who agreed it was a barrier.

4.3.3 Improvements

There were 5 out of the 14 text responses mentioned the lowering of costs to help improve childcare arrangements to meet the needs of parents

The top two improvements suggested by parents for childcare during term-time are *Available before school 7.30-9.00 (46.2%)* and *After school 3.30-6.00 (34.6%)*. Further research in to this has identified that parents want cheaper costs. Lower costs – some schools provide afterschool and breakfast clubs free. Parent would like to see Clwb Haf open for every day of every school holiday and after school club to be open Fridays

4.4 Analysis of focus groups with parents / carers

4.4.1 Reasons for using (and not using) childcare

Fathers, Work and Childcare

The following section has taken the fathers view point in relation to childcare. The Early Years and Family Support Services Department Flying Start Dad Matters Parent Worker stated that from the point of view of the men can find it difficult to strike a balance between work and home life.

Regarding individuals in employment; although maternity/paternity can now be shared between parents, stereotypically it will still be the mother who acts as primary care giver to a child. This often leaves fathers chasing time to see their children outside of work hours and in between their sleep routines. Insecurities surrounding strong mother-child bonds, lack of contact with their child and resentment towards their employer can often arise from this. On a positive note some parents find employment a welcome respite from home life, gaining social distraction before returning to their role as a parent feeling recharged. However if both parents are unemployed this can alleviate some of the pressures mentioned above.

If both parents return to work then often either childcare or appropriate family support needs to be sourced. Due to the obvious financial constraints of accessing professional childcare, more and more parents are opting to utilise family support or a blend of both in an effort to cut costs. Therefore childcare is still widely accessed by those in employment but whereas with family a relationship and mutual trust already exists, parental engagement with a nursery or childminder can prove problematic for some.

The flexibility and understanding of an employer is vital for parents trying to forge relationships with their childcare provider and who need to be available for their child should arrangements change last minute. Unfortunately, evidence has indicated that the employers of mothers are far more likely to be sympathetic to flexible working around childcare than that of fathers. This can leave a lot of the responsibility for accessing childcare and emergency arrangements with the mother. Such circumstance can lead to tension in their partnership, leave dad with little or no relationship with the childcare provider and throw up further barriers between father and child contact/relationships.

It is worth noting the difference between flexibility and time off in this situation. Often fathers are offered unpaid or annual leave to deal with these occurrences which can add to already existing financial and emotional stress. Flexibility on the other hand offers the ability to make time up elsewhere or to possibly work from home. There are employers who already offer such support, in the form of 'flexi-time' etc, however these can be few and far between.

5 Consultation With Employers

5.1 Employers

A total of **100** questionnaires were sent to a range of employers around RCT. Employers included Flying Start settings, Play providers, out of schools clubs and various large chain stores. A total of **12** completed questionnaires were returned; 12% of those sent out.

The low number of respondents may not give an accurate representation of the full population of employers within RCT. Hence caution must be taken when reading the results.

Employers' views on how childcare can be improved are mainly focussed on more affordable childcare and childcare that is available at different times. This matches the views expressed in the responses to the parent questionnaire.

Comments about childcare within RCT were given at the end of the employer questionnaire. In general the comments portray a need for further information and financial assistance for both parents and providers of childcare.

5.2 Introduction

Consultation with employers is an important factor in this Assessment. In order for the Authority to understand the demand for childcare information regarding possible barriers to employees taking up employment, employees not attending work due to childcare issues are required. However for the past 6 years it has been difficult to engage with employers. Raising employers awareness regarding childcare provision, demand and employees childcare needs will be a targeted action for the year ahead.

5.3 Methodology

Questionnaires were sent to 100 identified employers throughout Rhondda Cynon Taf. There was a low response rate 12 employers replied. Follow on telephone calls were made by the Family Information Service to engage with employers but to no avail.

5.4 Employers characteristics

The largest employer to return a survey had a total of **285** employees. The remaining 11 employers had an average of **6** employees between them. For this reason the analysis has been split to avoid any possible distortion of figures.

99% of employees were female

58% of employees were parents

Most employers offer '*Part-time*' and '*Term-time/school hours*' to their employees (**10/12** and **9/12** respectively). **1** employer offered '*Voluntary reduced working time*' and **1** offered a '*Career break*'.

5.5 Childcare benefits offered to staff

This section asked about the childcare benefits offered by the employer and the take-up of these by staff.

Half of the employers (**6**) stated they offer an '*On-site nursery*'. This was the most common benefit to be offered. Of these, **3** employers said there was a '*High*' level of take-up for the on-site nursery.

The second most common benefit was '*Childcare vouchers*' which were offered by **4** of the 12 employers, Childcare vouchers used to be offered by **1** of the respondents and **1** employer is '*Thinking about providing*'. The take-up of these vouchers was reported to be '*Low*' by **4** employers.

Similarly, there were **4** employers that offered '*Information about working tax credits*'. The level of take-up had a mixed response with **2** employers reporting '*Low*', **1** '*Medium*' and **3** said '*High*'.

There were **0** employers that stated they offer '*Financial assistance towards childcare*'.

Text responses were given for factors that may affect the take-up of benefits. These include; cost, not enough funding, parents not entitled to the benefits and family members used for childcare.

Further comments about childcare within RCT were given. In general the comments portray a need for further information and financial assistance for both parents and providers of childcare.

5.6 Recruitment & Retention

4 of the 12 employers experience slight problems with employees taking up employment or continuing to work with their organisation. The remaining employers either thought they had not experienced any problems (**6**) or felt it was not applicable to themselves (**2**).

'To what extent has childcare been a factor in preventing an employee taking-up employment with you or continuing to work in your organisation?' **6** employers found this statement to be *Slightly* true and **1**, a *lot*.

5.7 Improvements

Employers were asked for their opinion on what improvements to childcare they thought would help with recruitment and retention of staff. The majority of employers (**8**) chose '*More affordable*' to be the main improvement needed. The second top improvement was '*Available at different times*' said by **5** of the 12 employers. This matches the responses from the parent survey concerning improvements.

6 Consultation with children & young people

6.1 Introduction

Clybiau Plant Cymru Development Officers carried out the consultation with Children and Young People in four different after school provisions.

6.2 Methodology

Consultation was carried out at four different settings. The officers adapted the process according to the age and ability of the children attending. Some of the children did not answer all of the questions and some were a little too young to answer. The consultation process gave children the option of placing stickers on a sheet or to write. It was found to be an enjoyable exercise and the children participated freely. Below are the findings from the consultation.

6.3 Frequency of attending this and other provision

	YES	NO	UNSURE
	33		
Do you go to After School Club?	73		
Do you go to Holiday Club?	50		
Do you attend club 1 day a week?	5		
Do you attend club 2 days a week?	3		
Do you attend club 3 days a week?	36		
Do you attend club 4 days a week?	4		
Do you attend club 5 days a week?	23		2
Do you attend because your parent works?	50		QUESTION
Do you attend to be with friends?	11		Do you go to breakfast club?
Do you attend because your parent is at college?	1		
Do you attend for any other reason?	3		
Do you enjoy the snacks you have in club and are they healthy?	64	1	
Would you play outside if you were not in club	20	24	6
Would you be at home if not in club	11		20
Would you be at a family member's house or friend if not in club	17		15
Do you play outside at club	37	11	
Do you choose what you want to do in club	64		

Do you attend club 1 day a week?	5		
Do you attend club 2 days a week?	3		
Do you attend club 3 days a week?	36		
Do you attend club 4 days a week?	4		
Do you attend club 5 days a week?	23		2

6.4 Reasons for attending provision

Do you attend because your parent works?	50		
Do you attend to be with friends?	11		
Do you attend because your parent is at college?	1		
Do you attend for any other reason?	3		

6.5 Conclusions

The majority of providers consult with children via observations and use the observations to influence the planning for the setting and also for the individual children in order to both meet the child's needs and to provide a stimulating environment for the children.

7 Consultation with other agencies

7.1 Armed Forces

There are no Armed Forces bases in RCT. The nearest identified Barracks is in Maindy, Cardiff. If there were any families living in RCT that have a partner in the Armed Forces and they have completed a questionnaire, their childcare needs have been included in the Parent consultation results.

7.2 Jobcentre Plus barriers to take-up of employment

Analysis of barriers to take-up of employment

Childcare as a barrier

Jobcentre Plus Lone Parent Advisors discuss the barriers to employment with their clients and there are a range of misconceptions as well as genuine reasons given:

- No childcare in my area
- Flying Start is not available to everybody (restricted to certain postcodes/ deprived areas)
- Childcare during school periods is not available nurseries and crèches will deal with pre-school age, 3yrs plus not accepted.
- The reliance on childminders who may ask for retainers to secure places.

Further discussion led to Advisors querying whether or not anything could be done to utilise vacant (during school holidays) school premises. They had identified that there are some play schemes during holiday period but most only last 2 hrs.

RCT continues to promote the development of play/care schemes which reduces the cost of holiday care considerably.

They also stated that childcare did not always start early enough to encourage parents to consider working in, e.g. Cardiff. Crèches are available for younger children, but limited cover for the older children before school. Further detail on areas and the ages of children is needed to address this query.

Child care providers in some cases charge parents a full session when occasionally parents only require childcare for an hour or two. Advisors stated that they found inconsistencies in the delivery, eligibility and availability of Breakfast clubs and After School provision but this is reflective of a very mixed range of provision – some of which was not intended as childcare provision.

They reported that the majority of the Lone Parent customers tend to work in the care or retail sector, which could cause childcare issues if required to work shifts/etc. They continued to say that the loss of the Genesis project has resulted in less provision within the borough for help with Childcare costs/ loss of flexible programme.


7.3 Meetings with Lone Parent Advisors from Job Centre Plus have indicated that their clients are experiencing difficulty finding childcare because they are being offered zero hour contracts. This means that they can be called to work at any time on short notice. The hours of work will not be set or regular, and in some cases after 6.00pm.

7.4 Gypsy and Travelling Families.

The RCT Liaison Officer regularly consults with the Gypsy and Travelling families. Discussions with people on the site identified that there remains no unmet childcare needs with the families. They are fully aware of the childcare provision that is available in the area.


The Draft Gypsy and Travellers Study (2007) indicate that much of the need for additional accommodation is located in the Southern Strategy Area. In order to meet this need Policy SSA 27 of the plan allocates land at Beddau Caravan Park for the development of an 8 – pitch Gypsy and Travellers site. The Council considers that the Beddau Caravan Park site would meet the needs identified in the Draft Gypsies and Travellers Study. However, the Council intends to keep the requirement for the provision of Gypsies and Travellers sites in Rhondda Cynon Taf under review. An assessment of the needs of this group will be looked at in more detail as part of review of the Housing Market Assessment. This criteria-based policy will allow for the provision of needs, which cannot reasonably be accommodated at the Beddau Caravan Park site.

Age Attendance Categorisation




- The majority of people responding to the survey at the Teddy Bears Picnic Event had children aged 3 – 4 years.

Childcare Usage




- 48 people (36.4%) surveyed said they do use formal childcare such as playgroup, day nursery, Cylch Meithrin, wrap around, child minder, breakfast club, after school club, holiday club, holiday play schemes, nanny or au pair)

Reasons for Childcare usage



- The majority of respondents said that they use childcare because they go to work 65.3%, 40.8% said that the main reason they use childcare was so their child could benefit from the social and learning opportunities.



- 26.60% of respondents reported that their child takes up their entitlement of 10 hours free Early Years education per week.
- 27.70% admitted they didn't know or were unaware of what the 10 hours of free early years education was

Do you live in a Flying Start area?	
48 (37.5%)	Yes
34 (26.6%)	No
46 (35.9%)	Don't know

- 37.5% of respondents said they lived in a flying start area
- 35.9% of respondents didn't know whether or not they lived in a Flying Start area

If yes, does your child access free childcare through Flying Start?	
22 (28.6%)	Yes
33 (42.9%)	No
22 (28.6%)	Don't know

- Of those who said they lived in a Flying Start area, 42.9% of respondents said that their child did not access free childcare through Flying Start
- 28.6% of respondents said that they did access the free childcare through Flying Start
- 22.3% of respondents said that they would like to take part in the full childcare questionnaire that was on offer by the Family Information Service Team
- 51.2% said they'd like to receive the questionnaire via the post and 48.8% said they'd like to receive the questionnaire online

Conclusion

In order to obtain as much information as possible for the CSA it was decided that the parent questionnaire be condensed in order for the Early Years Team to be able to target as many parents as possible on this successful annual event. The responses identified that over 65% of the parents used childcare in order for them to go to work. 51% stated that they would like to receive the questionnaire via the post or on line and this needs to be considered in preparation for the next full CSA. However, face to face interviews are more productive and this also needs to be taken forward.

APPENDIX 5 (B)

Childcare Sufficiency Assessment
Childcare Development Delivery Plan
April 2014 – March 2015

Priority	Actions Required	By Whom	P.I.'s	Timescales	Outcomes	Progress against action
1. Childcare Sufficiency Audit 3 year full audit to be carried out and submitted to WG.	Meet with PMI Unit to set and agree timescales for completing the Full Childcare Sufficiency Audit	Childcare Manager to lead PMI Unit staff	Time scales and actions agreed Questionnaire format set. Distribution dates set, input of data dates set, date set for analysis and report	March 2014	Draft CSA completed and awaiting Cabinet approval.	Action completed
	Training Manager to collect data specific to work force development and FIS information	FIS, RCT Training Centre and Childcare Manager	Number of available childcare places unregistered and registered in RCT Number of early years practitioners accessing and completing qualifications and CPD training	Ongoing monitoring to inform service development. Whole workforce Training needs are assessed every two years.	Workforce training is planned and meets the identified needs of the childcare sector.	Annual Training Programme was distributed in March and training courses are underway

<p>2. To ensure there is sufficient, affordable childcare available to meet the needs of working / training parents and those wishing to return to work including those in minority and ethnic groups.</p>	<p>Early Childhood and Play Partnership (ECAPP) review CSA and support the development of additional childcare services in accordance with the results of the CSA and within available resources, taking account also of the issues of over -supply.</p> <p>Grant criteria reviewed and agreed</p> <p>All childcare settings receive information about the new grant criteria.</p>	<p>The ECAPP and the Early Years & Family Support Service.</p> <p>Childcare Manager to lead</p> <p>ECAPP grants group</p> <p>EYFSS and Family Information Service</p>	<p>Agreed set of new priorities in place.</p> <p>Number of new childcare places created.</p> <p>Number of grant applications received and processed to aid sustainability and new development.</p> <p>Zero complaints received about lack of available childcare;</p>	<p>April 2014</p> <p>March 2015</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Existing childcare is sustainable and additional childcare is created in areas where it is needed only.</p> <p>All parents are able to access high quality and affordable childcare to meet their needs.</p> <p>Equality of provision</p>	<p>On target</p> <p>On Target</p> <p>On Target</p> <p>Working relationship established</p>
<p>3. Ensure there is sufficient Welsh medium childcare in areas where there is an expressed and unmet need.</p>	<p>Work with Mudiad Ysgolion Meithrin and Menter Iaith to ensure demand for Welsh medium provision is met.</p>	<p>Childcare Development Team</p>	<p>Number of Welsh Medium childcare places available by type.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Equality of provision</p>	<p>Working relationship established</p>

<p>4. To improve collaboration with the Planning Department as to the development of childcare facilities in the County Borough.</p> <p>5. Work collaboratively with Job Centre Plus to ensure lack of childcare is not a barrier to employment.</p>	<p>Establish network group for Childcare Providers</p> <p>EYFSS to be included as a consultee by the Planning Department regarding applications for new nurseries to ensure the appropriate development of childcare facilities in response to fluctuating demand within the County Borough</p> <p>Establish bi monthly meetings with JCP officer</p> <p>FIS to collect enquiry data and</p>	<p>Childcare team, FIS and 3rd sector organisations</p> <p>ECAPP and EYFSS</p> <p>Childcare Manager, FIS manager and Officers</p>	<p>Bi monthly meetings established.</p> <p>The sustainability of sufficient childcare provision across the County Borough</p>	<p>Ongoing work</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Strong working relationship with third sector providers.</p> <p>Up to date information on the perceived barriers to</p>	<p>Network group established and meet ½ termly. Childcare providers from all sectors attend. Childcare providers actively contributing to CSA and service development</p>
--	--	--	---	------------------------------------	--	---

<p>6. Increase the number of childcare settings registered with CSSIW</p>	<p>direct to the necessary childcare provider</p> <p>Provide support to the non-registered sector to help them through the registration process</p>	<p>Childcare Team and ECAPP</p>	<p>Existing non registered providers become registered with CSSIW.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>childcare in preventing people returning to work are shared and addressed</p> <p>Plenty of choice available to meet the needs of working and training parents and the childcare needs of the unemployed as far as we are able More childcare provision is registered with CSSIW thus enabling families to claim working family tax credits.</p> <p>Information</p>	<p>Access to grants is only available to those who are CSSIW registered.</p>
<p>7. Improve the quality of information held on the FIS database about</p>	<p>Discuss and agree mechanisms to improve the</p>	<p>ECAPP and</p>				

<p>available childcare</p> <p>8. Ensure there is sufficient integrated childcare for disabled children, or those with additional emotional learning needs.</p>	<p>submission and collation of relevant data.</p> <p>FIS system kept up to date in order to provide information for CSA Refresh</p> <p>Provide additional training to the early years sector about anti – discriminatory practice and integration in community based childcare settings.</p>	<p>EYFSS in partnership with CSSIW</p> <p>ECAPP and EYFSS.</p>	<p>Increase in settings registered on FIS database.</p> <p>Information available is more detailed, accurate and comprehensive.</p> <p>Number of children with additional needs supported in childcare settings.</p> <p>Number of disabled children and children ‘in need’, accessing integrated holiday care schemes.</p>	<p>Training will be rolled out throughout 2014 with ongoing refresher training thereafter.</p>	<p>for 2014-2015 Refresh is available in more detail</p> <p>All forms of childcare are fully accessible to all children who require it.</p>	<p>Temporary FIS outreach workers have significantly improved the quality and quantity of information held on database.</p> <p>Training organised for autumn 2014.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---	--

<p>9. Children have their needs met within high quality childcare provision</p>	<p>Work collaboratively with training team to identify childcare training required by providers.</p> <p>Develop and introduce Quality Assurance scheme for RCT to drive up standards beyond minimum requirements.</p> <p>Half termly meetings in place.</p>	<p>Training Unit</p> <p>Childcare Manager to lead EY and CC Quality and Grant Group</p>	<p>6 settings completed and awarded the RCT QA within the first year 2013 pilot year.</p>	<p>Pilots completed by Oct 2013</p> <p>Roll out from July 2014</p>	<p>Improved quality childcare throughout RCT</p> <p>6 RCT Quality Assurance awards completed</p> <p>Quality of provision is monitored and maintained</p>	<p>July 2014</p> <p>On target</p>
---	---	---	---	--	--	-----------------------------------

<p>10. Children entitled to Flying Start are able to access the childcare component within their local community</p>	<p>Work collaboratively with Flying start colleagues to assess projected needs over the three next years to ensure there is adequate supply of high quality childcare to meet the demand</p>	<p>Childcare staff in Early Years and Family Support and Flying Start</p>	<p>Adequate levels of childcare available to meet growth in Flying Start.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Sufficient childcare to meet the roll out of Flying start</p>	<p>October 2014</p>
<p>11. Pre-school childcare providers are engaged in and delivering the Healthy Pre-Schools Initiative</p>	<p>Work collaboratively with Public Health to ensure the Healthy Pre-school scheme is embedded in childcare provisions</p>	<p>Flying Start Coordinator and ECAPP</p>	<p>Number of pre-school settings working towards achieving the Healthy Schools award.</p>	<p>June 2013 ongoing</p>	<p>Improved quality of childcare settings. Improved health and well – being of children accessing the service.</p>	<p>Additional resources secured via Flying Start grant so that all FS settings can be supported to achieve the award.</p>

This page is left Blank.

Appendix B



RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

RECORD OF DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

DECISION MADE BY: Cabinet DATE DECISION MADE: 12th February 2015.

Agenda Item 2

SUBJECT:

Medium Term Service Planning – School Admission Arrangements – Funding for Provision of Nursery Education.

**Cabinet Members Present
County Borough Councillors:**

A.Morgan (Chairman), P.Cannon, R.Bevan, A.Crimmings, M.Forey,
E.Hanagan, G.Hopkins, K Montague and M.Webber

**Other Members in Attendance
County Borough Councillors:**

S. Bradwick, P. Griffiths, B. Morgan, P. Jarman, T. Leyshon, R
Lewis, M. Powell, K. Morgan, S. Rees-Owen E. Webster and M
Weaver.

1. DECISION MADE:

Agreed –

- 1.1 To note that in officers' opinion the Council would be acting in compliance with its relevant statutory duties (as outlined in the report together with its appendices) should Cabinet proceed with implementation of the proposal as set out in paragraph 4 of the report.
- 1.2 That implementation of the proposal would ensure the provision of nursery education for children from the term after their third birthday is sufficient for the children of Rhondda Cynon Taf.
- 1.3 That following consideration of the outcomes of the Consultation, the Equalities Impact Assessment and further information collated by officers during the Consultation to implement the proposal as outlined below:-
 - That the funding arrangement for the provision of Nursery Education for Rhondda Cynon Taf be based on:-
 - Part time (half day) (15 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 3rd Birthday (pre-nursery and nursery);
 - Full time (30 hours per week) provision from the term after a child's 4th Birthday (nursery and reception)
 - Funding up to 15 hours per week (subject to capacity) of nursery provision in private, voluntary or independent registered education providers from the term following the child's third Birthday where there is no suitable availability within a school (n.b. in this context 'suitability' shall relate to the availability of a place at a school which, in the councils opinion, is within a reasonable radius of the child's ordinary place of residence i.e. where those with parental responsibility for the child live).
 - That children already in receipt of full time nursery provision (during the 2014-2015 academic year) will continue to be funded for full time provision i.e. they will not be affected by implementation of the proposal.
 - That the provision of funding for Free School Meals is to continue for those children eligible and in receipt of either part time or full time nursery provision (reducing the saving by £0.105M in a full year which equates to £0.071M part year impact in 2015/16).
 - That the provision of Home to School Transport continue in line with the Council's current Learner Travel Policy and in accordance with that policy, transport would only be arranged to coincide with the start and end of the normal school day and not at lunchtimes.
- 1.4 That implementation of the decision taken in respect of the proposal, as outlined in 1.3 above, takes effect from 1st September, 2015, delivering full year savings of £2.061M which equates to £1.259M part year impact in 2015/16.

- 1.5 That the Group Director, Corporate & frontline Services updates the draft 2015/16 budget strategy to reflect the financial implications of the decision taken, prior to Council on the 4th March 2015 and as part of this update, any savings achievable in 2015/16 should be used to reduce the level of transitional funding (i.e. use of the Medium Term Financial Planning and Service transformation Reserve) needed to deliver a balanced budget for that year.

N.B – with the permission of the Chairman, County Borough Councillors P. Jarman, K. Morgan and M. Powell addressed the Cabinet on the proposal before Cabinet Committee.

2. REASON FOR THE DECISION BEING MADE:

- The need to consider service change proposals as part of the Council's medium Term Service Planning arrangement, specifically in the context of the need to reduce spend and enable the Council to fulfil its statutory responsibility and set a balanced budget from 2015/16 onwards.
- The need to consider all the documentation before Cabinet and information provided by Officers following additional queries at the meeting, including the results of the consultation exercise, additional information collated by officers during the consultation and the Equalities Impact Assessment.

3. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN PRIOR TO DECISION BEING MADE:

- As outlined within section 5 of the report, a consultation exercise was initiated by Cabinet following consideration of the proposal at a Cabinet meeting on the 10th October 2014, with the Consultation originally scheduled to run from the 21st October - 5 p.m. 16th December 2014.
- Cabinet decision taken on the 16th December 2014 to extend the consultation exercise until 5p.m. 30th January 2015, with further additional information being made available to consultees.

4. PERSONAL INTERESTS DECLARED:

- County Borough Councillor R.Bevan declared a personal interest – “I previously declared an interest in relation to a family member of mine being affected by any potential changes to the current provision. This position no longer applies. I am also the Chair of governors at Tylorstown Primary School and Governor of Pontygwaith Primary School, and this interest is not prejudicial because of the exemption set out in paragraph 12(2)(a) of the Code of Conduct.
- County Borough Councillor E.Hanagan declared a personal interest “Grandmother with children who will be affected and Governor of Tonyrefail Primary School and this interest is not prejudicial because of the exemption

set out in paragraph 12(2)(a) of the Code of Conduct.”

- County Borough Councillor M.Forey declared a personal interest “My grandson will be affected directly by implementation of the proposals.”.
- County Borough Councillor M.Webber declared a personal interest “I have grandchildren that will be affected and I am Governor of Heol Y Celyn Primary school and this interest is not prejudicial because of the exemption set out in paragraph 12(2)(a) of the Code of Conduct.
- County Borough councillor A Morgan declared a personal interest - “ I am the Chair of governors at Glenboi Primary and Darren Las Primary School and this interest is not prejudicial because of the exemption set out in paragraph 12(2)(a) of the Code of Conduct.
- County Borough Councillor G Hopkins declared a personal interest – “ I am a Governor of Llanharan Primary School and this interest is not prejudicial because of the exemption set out in paragraph 12(2)(a) of the Code of Conduct.
- County Borough Councillor K Montague declared a personal interest – “ I am a Trustee of Friends of Ferndale – I do not receive any payments for this role and also I am Governor of Maerdy Primary School but my interest is not prejudicial because of the exemption set out in paragraph 12(2)(a) of the Code of Conduct.
- County Borough Councillor A Crimmmings declared a personal interest – I am a Governor of Aberdare Park Primary School and this interest is not prejudicial because of the exemption set out in paragraph 12(2)(a) of the Code of Conduct.

5. DISPENSATION TO SPEAK (AS GRANTED BY STANDARDS COMMITTEE):

- In accordance with the Code of Conduct, County Borough Councillor P.Jarman stated in relation to the agenda item that “On 4th November, 2014, following a request I made to the Standards Committee, I was granted a dispensation in my capacity as Leader of the Opposition to speak and vote at meetings of the Council and the Overview and Scrutiny Committees on matters relating to all services affected by the budget process for a period leading up to and including the formal approval of the budget for 2015/2016 by the Council.”

6. (a) IS THE DECISION URGENT AND NOT TO BE THE SUBJECT OF ANY CALL-IN BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:

YES NO ✓

Note: This decision will not come into force and may not be implemented until the expiry of 5 clear working days after its publication i.e. **20th February 2015** to enable it to be the subject to the Call-In Procedure in Rule 17.1 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules.

6. (b) IF YES, REASONS WHY IN THE OPINION OF THE DECISION-MAKER THE DECISION IS URGENT:

N/A

. (c) SIGNATURE OF MAYOR OR DEPUTY MAYOR OR HEAD OF PAID SERVICE CONFIRMING AGREEMENT THAT THE PROPOSED DECISION IS REASONABLE IN ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES FOR IT BEING TREATED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULE 17.2:

N/A

.....
(Mayor)

.....
(Dated)



.....
(Proper Officer)

12.02.15
(Dated)

Appendix C

17. Call-In

17.1 Rules

- (a) Where a decision is made by the Cabinet, an individual Member of the Cabinet or a Committee of the Cabinet or an Area Committee or under joint arrangements, the decision shall be published by the Proper Officer, including where possible by electronic means, and shall be available at the main offices of the Council normally within 2 clear working days of it being made. All Members of the Council will be sent copies of the records of all such decisions within the same time scale, by the person responsible for publishing the decision.
- (b) That notice will bear the date on which it is published and will specify that the decision will come into force and may then be implemented, on the expiry of 5 clear working days after the publication of the decision, unless the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Service Scrutiny Committees objects to it and calls it in for review.
- (c) During that period the Monitoring Officer shall call-in a decision for scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Service Scrutiny Committee if so requested in the specified format by any 3 Non-Executive Members and, shall then notify the decision taker of the call-in. He/she shall convene a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or relevant Service Scrutiny Committee on such a date as he/she may determine, where possible after consultation with the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or relevant Service Scrutiny Committee, and in any case the meeting will be held within 5 clear working days of the decision to call-in (only in exceptional circumstances will the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or relevant Service Scrutiny Committee consider extending this time limit).
- (d) As soon as the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny or Service Scrutiny Committee signs a call-in form he/she shall cease to be the Chair for all purposes for the duration of the call-in process. If this situation arises then for the purposes of these Overview and Scrutiny Procedure rules references to 'Chair' of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Service Scrutiny Committee should be read as a reference to the 'Vice-Chair' of that Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Service Scrutiny Committee.
- (e) If, having considered the decision, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or relevant Service Scrutiny Committee is still concerned about it, then it may refer it back to the decision making body for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns or refer the matter to full Council. If referred to the decision maker they shall then reconsider within a further 5 clear working days, amending the decision or not,

before adopting a final decision.

- (f) If following an objection to the decision, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or relevant Service Scrutiny Committee does not meet within the period set out above, or does meet but does not refer the matter back to the decision making person or body, the decision shall take effect on the date of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or relevant Service Scrutiny Committee meeting, or the expiry of that further 5 clear working day period, whichever is the earlier.
- (g) If the matter was referred to full Council and the Council does not object to a decision which has been made, then no further action is necessary and the decision will be effective in accordance with the provision below. However, if the Council does object, the Council will refer any decisions to which it objects back to the decision making person or body, together with the Council's views on the decision. That decision making body or person shall choose whether to amend the decision or not before reaching a final decision and implementing it. Where the decision was taken by the Cabinet as a whole, or a Committee of it, a meeting will be convened to reconsider within 5 clear working days of the Council's request. Where the decision was made by an individual, the individual will reconsider within 5 clear working days of the Council's request.
- (h) If the Council does not meet, or if it does but does not refer the decision back to the decision making body or person, the decision will become effective on the date of the Council meeting or expiry of the period in which the Council meeting should have been held, whichever is earlier.
- (i) In order to ensure the call-in is not abused, nor causes unreasonable delay, certain limitations are to be placed on its use. These are:
 - (i) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and each of the Service Scrutiny Committees may only call-in a total of 3 decisions per 2 month period;
 - (ii) any 3 Non-Executive Members (from either (i) at least 2 political groups or (ii) in the case of an unallocated Member(s) – that unallocated Member(s) and a Member(s) from a political group) are needed for a decision to be called in;
 - (iii) once a Member has signed a request for call-in under paragraph 17 (call-in) above, he/she may not do so again until the period of 2 months has expired.
 - (iv) No Education Co-opted Members may report a decision be called in.
- (j) The Monitoring Officer may veto any request for call-in if it falls

outside the remit of this scheme.

- (k) Save in exceptional circumstances all Members requesting a matter be called in must attend the meeting at which the matter is being considered.

17.1A Reference to a 'clear working day' in these Overview and Scrutiny procedure rules is defined as the following:-

A complete period of 24 hours (excluding weekends and Bank Holidays), beginning and ending at midnight on the day in question.

Therefore, by way of example, for the purposes of these call-in rules it shall exclude the day on which the relevant Cabinet decision notice is published and the day on which the call-in meeting is held.

17.2 **Call-In and Urgency**

- (a) The call-in procedure set out above shall not apply where the decision being taken by the Cabinet is urgent. A decision will be urgent if any delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would, for example, seriously prejudice the Council's or other public interests. The record of the decision, and notice by which it is made public, shall state whether in the opinion of the decision making person or body, the decision is an urgent one, and therefore not subject to call-in. The Mayor must agree both that the decision proposed is reasonable in all the circumstances and to it being treated as a matter of urgency. In the absence of the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor's consent shall be required. In the absence of both, the Head of Paid Service or his/her nominee's consent should be required. Decisions taken as a matter of urgency must be reported at the next available meeting of the Council, together with the reasons for urgency.
- (b) The operation of the provisions relating to call-in and urgency shall be monitored annually and a report submitted to Council with proposals for review if necessary.

Appendix D

**RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES – RULE 17**

SCRUTINY CALL IN FORM

THIS FORM MUST:

- (A) BE SIGNED BY AT LEAST THREE MEMBERS FROM AT LEAST TWO DIFFERENT POLITICAL GROUPS (or in the case of an unallocated member(s) that unallocated member(s) and a member(s) from a political group).
- (B) BE DELIVERED TO PJ LUCAS, THE MONITORING OFFICER, THE PAVILIONS, CAMBRIAN PARK, CLYDACH VALE, CF40 2XX OR SENT BY FAX TO (01443) 424114 WITHIN THE TIMESCALE NOTIFIED WITHIN THE CONSTITUTION

DETAILS OF DECISION

Decision of Cabinet/Cabinet Member/Other (Please delete as appropriate)

Date of Publication of decision 12.2.2015

Subject of Decision: Medium Term Service Planning - School Admission Arrangements - Funding for provision of Nursery Education

Decision Called in (Please quote from the record of decision)

All matters recorded at Paragraph 1 through to Paragraph 1.5 of the decision notice.....

Reason for calling in decision		
1. Members relied on the EPPE report that was specific to English pre-school children not in-school educational benefits of early years education in Wales or the RCT area. 2. Members did not look at any alternative areas to make savings 3. Members did not consider the numbers of people who would be affected by this decision. 4. Members failed to extend consultation appropriately with key stakeholders post Moseley 5. Members presumed and made assumptions in their decision that fails to deliver an equitable service across Rhondda Cynon Taf. <i>Therefore further consideration in view of the</i>		
Name	Signature	Group
<i>Colin H. Powell</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>DAG.</i>
<i>P. Jorman</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>PLAD CYMRU.</i>
<i>Chr Phil Wasey</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>Independent</i>

afore mention 1-5

[Signature]

Date: 19.2.2015

For Office use only by the Monitoring Officer

Date & Time of Receipt..... *19.2.15 at 4.15pm* Officer Receiving..... *[Signature]*

Accepted as a valid Call-in:

To be submitted to Scrutiny Committee.....

Signature:: Date: