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Summary

This section sets out the main findings and implications of a rapid initial scoping study that searched for information on a specific aspect of education in the early years. The report is based on an appraisal of publication abstracts. It also presents key findings based on a more in-depth appraisal of just 11 studies judged to be of particular interest for the questions set for this scoping study.

The scoping study was carried out over a relatively short period (July and August 2008) and focused on evidence from education and social sciences. This report is not intended to be an exhaustive description of the literature. Instead, it provides an overview of the type and nature of research in relation to specific review questions. The findings reported below were judged to be of particular relevance to these questions, but they should be regarded as provisional. Quality appraisal of this research was not carried out as part of the scoping exercise; further work (a ‘main’ review) is required to carry out a deeper and more systematic appraisal of this evidence base.

Nature of the evidence base

The evidence identified in the initial scoping review is extensive, including large-scale longitudinal studies and systematic reviews of the literature.

Synopsis of findings from selected studies

Initial findings on the impact of family-based support for early learning, in relation to the three questions addressed by the review, are given below.

1. What evidence is there for the effectiveness of family-based support of early learning in improving children’s outcomes?

- Family support encompasses a wide range of interventions aimed at promoting parental involvement; such diversity in provision is beneficial to provide multiple entry routes for families that meet their different needs (Desforges with Abouchaar 2003).
- There is evidence of an association between high-quality pre-school provision and children’s learning at home with improvement in children’s outcomes (Melhuish et al 2006, Sylva et al 2004a).
- Success factors include multi-dimensional interventions and delivery modes that address more than one facet of children’s lives and which meet the needs of a wide range of users (Harvard Family Research Project 2006).
- Timing is an issue – the earlier the intervention at pre-school age, the better. There is strong evidence for the benefits of targeting interventions on socio-economically disadvantaged groups (Moran et al 2004).
- Caution should be exercised when considering the transferability of specific strategies or interventions to different contexts and countries (Penn et al 2004).
- The evidence to support the case for the benefits of integrated services is not as strong, particularly in terms of cost-effectiveness (Penn et al 2004).
2. What evidence is there on approaches that support the engagement of family members (especially parents and carers) in young children’s learning?

- Effectively engaging parents is the first step in addressing problems, yet parents most in need of family support services are often the least likely to access them (Katz et al. 2007; Quinton 2004).
- It is important for staff to establish trusting relationships with parents/carers, to support these by getting to know individual families and to maintain these through regular contact about children’s progress and learning (Moran et al. 2004).
- Early childhood education practice must be sensitive to differences in home culture and work to the strengths of these differences, supported by the evidence for culturally specific programmes improving attendance for families of different minority ethnic groups (Dutch 2005).
- There is a positive impact on a child’s development where parents are actively engaged in simple ‘educational’ activities such as teaching songs and nursery rhymes (Melhuish et al. 2006).
- Minimum levels of intervention and voluntary, rather than compulsory approaches are recommended (Scottish Government 2008b).

3. How might support-needs differ for different groups of parents/carers, such as low-income families; fathers, mothers, other family members/carers; parents/carers from black or other minority ethnic groups?

- Minority ethnic parents are likely to be disproportionately affected by barriers such as lack of time, distance to travel, cost and language (when English is a second language) (Page et al. 2008).
- Parents with disabilities may experience a sense of isolation and exclusion if their needs are not considered and met (Katz et al. 2007).
- Cultural institutions and structures can act as barriers to participation in services by families from minority ethnic backgrounds (Katz et al. 2007).
- Locally based early childhood services are important to all parents but are more difficult to access for those living in rural areas (Katz et al. 2007).
- England has a diverse population that needs to be recognised in service delivery and valued to tailor appropriate support for, and inclusion of, all families (Page et al. 2008).

Implications for the main review

Based on the scoping work, a number of recommendations are made for the main review stage related to questions, method and search parameters. There is a need to achieve clarity of definition in the key terms in the study focus, supported by further precision in the phrasing of the study questions to focus more explicitly on principles and practice of family-based support. The next review stage could either take the form of a rapid evidence review based on a broader set of search parameters, or, given the number of literature reviews available, a more in-depth ‘review of reviews’.
In terms of search parameters, we recommend conducting additional searches for literature in the field of healthcare, services for children under three years old and economic evaluation work. Expansion of the search parameters to widen the geographical scope may be helpful to draw in relevant research from other countries. The potential to include evidence from further analysis of current national datasets is limited although there is potential to explore information collated from the Foundation Stage Profile.
Purpose and scope of the study

This section outlines the reasons for the study being undertaken, its focus and the parameters associated with the study.

The Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People’s Services (C4EO) has, as its principal aim, to identify, coordinate and disseminate ‘what works’, in order to significantly improve the outcomes of children, young people and their families – realising the full potential of Every Child Matters (ECM). Its work programme is focused on six themes, each of which has three lines of enquiry or ‘priority’. The evidence base for each priority is provided by a knowledge review, which involves a sequence of activity, rather than being a one-off event. Each knowledge review will bring together a unique, quality assured blend of:

- the best research evidence from the UK – and where relevant from abroad – on what works in improving services and outcomes for children and young people
- the best quantitative data on a thematic priority with which to establish baselines and assess progress in improving outcomes
- the best validated local experience and practice on strategies and interventions that have already proved to be the most powerful in helping services improve outcomes, and why this is so.

The prime purposes of the scoping study, which initiates the C4EO review sequence for each theme priority, are to establish the key research questions and search parameters for the later review work, assess the nature and strength of the evidence base and provide an initial overview of trends in the literature.

Rationale for the scoping review and topic

Family-based support for early learning is now recognised as a central feature of successful outcomes for young children and as one of the most significant contributors to children’s continued success in the education system, particularly during periods of educational transition when families may need greater support (Quinton 2004; Sylva et al 2004a; Sammons et al 2004; Evangelou et al 2005; The National Evaluation of Sure Start 2008).

A specific emphasis on early learning within outreach and family-based support programmes can also support and enhance improved relationships between practitioners and family members and between family members and children, leading to achievement and enjoyment for children and families. There have been a number of initiatives in England since 2000, development of which has been informed by this understanding. There is a timely opportunity, therefore, to draw together and disseminate evidence and practice on the specific theme of support for early learning, extending this beyond parents to look at practice developed for the wider family and in relation to informal childcare. Strands of current policy and practice development which relate directly to this priority include plans to train and qualify the children’s workforce in skills and knowledge related to family-based support and provision of support for outreach workers within children’s centres.
Parameters of the scoping review

The review addressed the following three research questions:

1. What evidence is there for the effectiveness of family-based support of early learning in improving children's outcomes?

2. What evidence is there on approaches that support the engagement of family members (especially parents and carers) in young children's learning?

3. How might support-needs differ for different groups of parents/carers, such as low-income families; fathers, mothers, other family members/carers; parents/carers from black or other minority ethnic groups?

The study looked at evidence from England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, Republic of Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, USA and Canada. The main focus, however, was on studies carried out in the UK, especially England. The cross-cutting issues of child poverty, equality and diversity and leadership were included.
Scoping study methods

This section outlines the methods used in the study, with more details presented in Appendices 1 and 2. The study began by establishing key questions to be addressed and by determining the parameters for the identifying material relevant to the study topic. Parameters included identifying exclusion and inclusion criteria, for example associated with publication dates and country of origin. The scoping study used a broad range of sources to identify relevant material:

- searches of bibliographic databases (educational and social sciences)
- web searches
- current research
- recommendations from the Theme Advisory Group (a group of experts in early childhood policy, research and practice).

Full details of the search strategy can be found in Appendix 2. The search results were screened to remove duplicates and material that did not fit within the scoping parameters. The references were checked and abstracts sought. Each publication was assessed, selected for consideration and coded in relation to the following, using options assigned a numerical value for recording purposes:

- abstract quality (adequacy for making decisions about relevance, type etc)
- relevance to research questions
- type of literature (e.g. research study, policy statement, practice description)
- country/area involved
- design (if research) (e.g. programme evaluation, survey, case study)
- study population (e.g. age, role, gender)
- type of early years setting
- key area (field of study).

Scoping teams were asked to identify up to 10 key publications (those that most closely addressed the main questions established for the scoping study).

Limitations of the study methods

There are four main limitations that should be noted.

- The tight deadline restricted the number of searches that could be carried out. Searches were not carried out on psychological and health databases. It was not possible to include any hand searching. Databases relating to broader outcomes (such as health) were not searched.
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- Abstracts varied in information available related to coding requirements. Many were often missing from the database searches or were too brief to assess their relevance. It was not always possible to locate a summary or full copy of the publication.

- Quality assurance checking was carried out on a small sample of coding decisions (90 per cent of the coding decisions were not subject to independent checks) (details of the scoping process and of the search strategy can be found in Appendix 2).

- The findings are based on an in-depth examination of only 11 sources.
Assessment of the evidence base

This section presents an overall assessment of the scale and relevance of the evidence identified through the literature searches. A total of 129 publications were identified prior to screening. Of these publications, 93 had abstracts with sufficient detail for coding. Thirteen of these were categorised as not relevant, for reasons including the age range of the children or because they were outside the geographical scope of the study (not identified by first-stage screening). So, in total 80 publications formed the list from which the selection of key publications was drawn.

Types of publications

In this section the publications are discussed by type, based on the coding categories. These included: research (54), literature reviews (10), practice descriptions (9), conference papers (4), opinion pieces (2) and policy documents (1).

Fifty-four (67.5 per cent) of the publications were identified as research, and, in general, the studies employed mixed methods. There were examples of programme evaluations of family-based support interventions, including the Peers Early Education Partnership (PEEP) (e.g. Evangelou et al 2005) Sure Start (e.g. Malin and Morrow 2008); the Early Learning Partnership Project (e.g. Sylva et al 2008a) and Early Excellence Centres (e.g. Pascal et al 2001).

Some formed part of large-scale longitudinal studies such as the Growing Up in Scotland study (Anderson 2007); the Growing up in Australia study (Gray and Sanson 2005); the Effective Pre-School Provision in Northern Ireland (EPPNI) (Melhuish et al 2006); the Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) project (e.g. Sylva et al 2004a); PEEP (e.g. Evangelou et al 2005); and the National Evaluation of Sure Start (2008)

A few studies were quasi-experimental, involving control groups (e.g. Albritton et al 2003; Evangelou et al 2007) and two were randomised control trials (Larmar et al 2006; St Pierre et al 2005) Some used case studies (e.g. Goos 2004; Jimenez and Gillanders 2004) or had a case study element (e.g. Evangelou et al 2008)

There were several literature/evidence reviews (e.g. Desforges with Abouchaar 2003; National Literacy Trust 2001), and other studies included literature reviews as part of the research methodology (e.g. Page et al 2008; Siraj-Blatchford et al 2002). The type of review was varied and included expert reviews, systematic reviews and rapid reviews.

The large variety of early years settings and the fact that many of the studies did not specify a particular setting in the abstract made it difficult to identify the type of provision involved. Venues other than early years education and care, such as children’s social care services (Beecham and Sinclair 2006) and outreach work in a shopping centre (Sylva et al 2008b) were cited. Of particular note is the large amount of literature relating to home-based family support interventions, for example Greenfield (2006) National Evaluation of Sure Start (2006) Godfrey (2006) and Martin (2002)

Overall, over half of the studies were conducted in the UK. About one-third of the UK research evidence was specific to England, with a few studies from Scotland, and one
from Northern Ireland. Approximately one-fifth of the studies were from the USA or Canada, and a tenth from Australia. There were only a few studies from other countries, and a few involving more than one country.

Nearly one-fifth of the abstracts were practice descriptions, such as information about ways practitioners can work with parents (e.g. Frieman & Berkeley 2002; Pre-School Learning Alliance 2005), and papers describing particular family support intervention programmes (e.g. Job and Argy 2003; Martin 2002). Childminding provision was not excluded deliberately but if research synopses did not refer to this then it is not mentioned in this report. There were two opinion pieces (e.g. Reynolds 2005; Sy 2006) and one policy document (Hoffmann and Ewen 2007).

Relevance of publications to each of the research questions

Question 1
Only about a quarter of the literature provided evidence for the first research question, concerning effectiveness of family-based support of early learning in improving children’s outcomes. Most of the evidence for the first research question considers whether and how particular intervention programmes can improve child outcomes. Examples include Sure Start (e.g. National Evaluation of Sure Start 2008), PEEP (Evangelou and Sylva 2003), Even Start (St Pierre et al. 2005) Two Australian programme evaluations were: the Early Impact (EI) Program (Larmar et al. 2006) and the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) intervention (Godfrey 2006)

More general evidence relating to the relationship between family involvement in the early years and child outcomes was identified (e.g. Harvard Family Research Project, 2006; Fantuzzo et al. 2004; Roopnarine et al. 2006) and some relating to raising early literacy achievement by involving parents (Haney and Hill 2004; Nutbrown et al. 2008; National Literacy Trust 2001) The EPPE Project provides further evidence into the continued effects of pre-school education and the home-learning environment in later childhood (e.g. Melhuish et al. 2006; Sylva et al. 2004a).

Question 2
There were several evaluation studies that focused on involving parents in particular interventions, both in the UK and in other countries, for example Sure Start (e.g. Malin and Morrow 2008), Head Start (e.g. Dutch 2005), PEEP (e.g. Evangelou et al. 2008), the Tandem Project (McDougall et al. 2000), the Canadian Parenting and Readiness Center programmes (Pelletier and Brent 2002), and the Sutton Trust Evaluation Project (STEP) (Sylva et al. 2008b)

There is also some research on how particular settings can support family engagement in young children's learning, such as early years centres (Kirk 2003), extended schools (Apps et al. 2006) and out-of-home integrated care and education settings (Penn et al. 2004), home visiting (e.g. Greenfield 2006) and other outreach work (e.g. Sylva et al. 2008b; National Evaluation of Sure Start 2006)

Developing effective approaches to work with parents was often supported by practice-based publications, relating to ways practitioners can work with parents (e.g. Whalley
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2007; Pattnaik 2003) and improving parent–teacher partnerships (e.g. Billman et al 2005; Boutte et al 2003).

**Question 3**

Around half of the literature also refers to the third research question about how support needs might differ for different groups of parents/carers. Approximately a third of the literature for this question relates to programmes targeted at particular groups, especially low-income families. This includes programmes such as Sure Start (e.g. National Evaluation of Sure Start 2008), PEEP (e.g. Evangelou et al 2007) and Head Start (Fantuzzo et al 2004).

A small proportion of the literature that addresses the third research question relates to involvement of fathers in early years settings (e.g. Kahn 2006; Turbiville et al 2000). Less literature relates explicitly to mothers than fathers (e.g. Lamb-Parker et al 2001; Raikes et al 2006; Sylva et al 2004b), as in many programmes mothers are implied as the primary audience. None of the literature identified in this scope addresses how support needs might differ for other family members/carers.

Some of the literature relating to the third research question focused on particular ethnic groups. These included ethnic groups in the USA (Suizzo and Stapleton 2007); African American fathers (Downer and Mendez 2005); Asian Americans (Sy 2006); Mexican immigrants in the USA (Jimenez and Gillanders 2004); indigenous Australians (e.g. Fleer and Williams 2001; Fleer 2004; Goos et al 2007); and black and minority ethnic parents in the UK (Page et al 2008). However, approximately half of the material gave some consideration to different ethnic groups (e.g. Sammons et al 2008b; Tunstill et al 2005; Moran et al 2004).

**Relevance to related topics**

Around half of the literature related to the theme of child poverty, and a similar proportion of the literature related to equality and diversity. A small number of publications focused on leadership.

**Gaps in the evidence**

The authors of previous reviews identified gaps in the evidence. These are as follows:

- Issues of transferability of programmes developed in specific/country contexts to other contexts require more attention through further examination of comparative work.
- A more detailed understanding what does not work is needed and this is not easy to identify, as there is a tendency to avoid this kind of critique in the literature.
- There is a need to understand better the success factors associated with participant characteristics and to relate this to the evidence base on resilience, for example.
- The continuation of current longitudinal studies is needed to understand whether positive changes can be sustained over the long term and if they can be related to
participant characteristics up to point of economic independence (between 16 and 21 years old).

- Generally there appears to be a gap in mapping effectiveness to inputs – what kinds of interventions support what types of outcomes, for which parent/carer groups, linked to the question of how much input is needed to make a difference.
- Greater clarity about cost-effectiveness would help policy-makers and providers.
- There is a gap in the existing research relating to engaging with minority ethnic parents in children’s and parental services in rural areas.
- Research comparing alternative methods of engagement is limited.
Design of the main review

In this section the implications of the scoping study outcomes for further reviews are addressed through recommendations in a number of areas.

Type of review to be adopted

Two options are offered for consideration of further review work in the area of family support and outcomes in the early years. The first is to build on the completed work to conduct a rapid review of the evidence. As discussed next, this would involve scoping a broader range of literature but would continue with the scoping approach to identification of the findings and key messages used in this study. An alternative is to identify a small number of existing reviews that are considered to be of high quality in relation to the rigour of the methodology adopted and to undertake an in-depth review of these.

Range and main kinds of evidence to be used and how best to secure these

As in the scoping stage it will be useful to identify different types of evidence and to review evidence by type, either using or extending the categorisation used in this study. This approach would allow for messages from practice to be considered within an appropriate context (for example, a book based on the work of the Pen Green Centre; see Whalley 2007).

It is recommended that the review should take into account the increasing inter-disciplinary and multi-agency context of service provision, so evidence should be sought from further bibliographic databases related to health. Much of the literature reviewed for this scoping study related to pre-school provision stages, but as the scoping study indicated that early starts are recognised as valuable, more attention might be given to the first years of a child’s life, from post-natal provision to pre-school entry at three years. It is recognised, however, that this would involve a high volume of potential publications.

Refinement of review questions

For subsequent stages of work it is useful to review the original questions and consider whether they should be revised and, if so, in what ways.

The three research questions could be modified and reduced to two, although it would be helpful for the main review to be supported initially by a clear definition of all terms within the statement ‘family-based support for early learning’ to clarify, for example, whether this means engagement with early childhood services and/or encouragement for family members to engage in ‘educational’ activities with their children. The first question is concerned with core principles – whether family-based engagement is a good thing; the second is concerned with enhancing understanding of which specific approaches and interventions achieve the most positive results.

1. What evidence is there for a positive association between involvement of family members (especially parents and carers) in young children’s learning and positive outcomes for children?
2. What evidence is there on specific family-based interventions or initiatives focused on, or related to, early learning that can be linked directly with positive outcomes for children?

Overall, there is considerable potential for evidence from other thematic areas to be relevant to the next review stage, for example, evidence related to disability (both disabled children and families with members who are disabled) and integration of children with diverse backgrounds to the family-support topic. Cross-referencing would not only allow for the transfer of good practice and relevant research messages but would also avoid the potential segregation of issues for different groups of parents/carers.

Topics to be covered and amendments to search parameters

Given the different scale of projects highlighted within many of the publications identified at the scoping stage, it may be helpful to include a search dimension related to economic evaluations of services so that the links between service inputs and outcomes can be related to cost benefits.

Britain has an increasingly diverse ethnic population but this should not undermine welfare provision (Taylor-Gooby 2005). Inclusion of a broader range of literature from the European community, including accession states, and countries such as South Africa and Mexico would enable studies of potential relevance to be included. This would offer the potential for greater understanding of how to respond to the needs of different ethnic groups to be identified and addressed in a culturally appropriate way.

It is recognised that different types of evidence may provide different types of insights. While the scoping study focused upon research reviews in the choice of publications, it is suggested that the next stage review should draw upon a wide range of sources. The development of different quality criteria for evidence sources by the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) will facilitate this.

Comments on possibilities for inclusion of validated practice

The challenge of linking inputs to outcomes remains a recurring issue given that younger children are in receipt of so many different services simultaneously, both formal and informal in nature. The lack of research using control-group design means that it is often impossible to tell what would have happened in the absence of a service or intervention. Preventive services are particularly difficult to validate in terms of their impact on outcomes. There are many studies that are descriptive in nature, that identify participation satisfaction levels and that result in case study examples, which should be included in the next stage of the review. It will be important to determine what is meant by validated good practice.
Overview of key findings

This section reports on the key studies selected through the scoping review process. Given the different types of evidence identified and the variability in the quality of the underpinning research methodologies, the scoping team decided to include, where appropriate, reviews as key sources because this offered greater coverage of the evidence base. The nature of the reviews used varied from rapid reviews to full systematic reviews.

Question 1: What evidence is there for the effectiveness of family-based support of early learning in improving children’s outcomes?

• Family support encompasses a wide range of interventions aimed at promoting parental involvement that include home-visiting programmes, parent training/parenting skills programmes, cognitive/knowledge development programmes and programmes to tackle mental health amongst parents, those aimed at enhancing home–school links and those related to family and community education. Services may also wrap care and education together and such integration also raises issues of definition.

• The sources cited establish an association between high-quality pre-school provision and children’s learning at home with improvement in children’s outcomes. There is also evidence that both the home learning environment and the quality of pre-school learning impact on children’s development.

• Timing is an issue – the earlier the intervention the better and more durable the outcome for the child. However, later is better than none; a small investment in the early years can make a significant impact later on.

• It is important to offer parents/carers and children multiple entry routes into and choices of provision and to promote family involvement in the community, for example, through the use of libraries and sports centres to host meetings and sessions.

• Factors that contribute to success include multi-dimensional interventions and delivery modes that address more than one facet of children’s lives and which meet the needs of a wide range of users; investment in high-quality staff training and qualifications, including for volunteers; locally driven provision based on consultation and involvement of parents and local communities and a focus on implementation factors and working together with parents, families and children.

• The evidence of the benefits of targeting interventions on socio-economically disadvantaged groups is strong.

• For all children, the quality of the home learning environment at the pre-school stage is more important for intellectual and social development than parental occupation, education or income; in other words it matters what parents do, rather than who they are. So providing support that translates into improvement in the quality of parent–child interaction is an appropriate focus for providers, while also recognising the ways in which social disadvantage affects different domains of peoples’ lives. This relates to the next finding.
Family involvement is best understood as a continuum of different types, and intensity, of intervention. It is also a continuous process rather than a one-off incident and, as part of this, attending to smooth transitions is key, for example, by early years and primary school settings working together. Building trusted relationships with families is important and is informed by knowing about their individual circumstances and maintaining regular contact with parents about their children’s progress.

Strategies and interventions that appear successful in one context may not necessarily be suitable in another.

**Question 2. What evidence is there on approaches that support the engagement of family members (especially parents and carers) in young children’s learning?**

- There is a positive impact on a child’s development where parents are actively engaged in activities such as teaching songs and nursery rhymes, reading with their children and playing with letters and numbers. Therefore, two-generational interventions that are targeted at both parents and children can support engagement.
- Practice that is sensitive to differences in home culture and works to the strengths of these differences promotes engagement.
- Underpinning values of programmes may inform engagement or lack of it. For example, notions of partnership between parents, child and provider may not be familiar for parents from some cultures and countries, and language barriers can exacerbate misunderstandings.
- Participation can be improved by accessible venues and times for service delivery.
- Trusting relationships between staff and users are important. The profile of staff should reflect local populations and include a ‘visible mix’ of staff by age, gender and ethnicity. Effectively engaging parents is the first step in addressing problems, yet parents most in need of family support services are often the least likely to access them. Combining targeted and universal interventions/programmes is recommended to address this issue.
- In terms of parenting programmes, culturally specific programmes that strengthen cultural identity and aim to raise parents’ confidence in their cultural heritage were found to be important in improving attendance.
- Minimum levels of intervention and voluntary, rather than compulsory, approaches are generally favoured for supporting meaningful engagement with parents.
- Engagement should be viewed as a continuous process and strategies targeted at different stages of participation such as access, building working relationships, maintaining involvement and educational transition.
Question 3. How might support needs differ for different groups of parents/carers, such as low-income families; fathers, mothers, other family members/carers; parents/carers from black or other minority ethnic groups?

- The inherent diversity of the population should be recognised to tailor services appropriately; however, targeted services need to be balanced by the potential negative consequences of lack of integration leading to compartmentalisation and disconnection from mainstream services.

- While provision targeted at specific populations is recognised as important, attendance at provision with children from mixed social backgrounds can lead to improved benefits for children from socially disadvantaged groups.

- Minority ethnic parents are likely to be disproportionately affected by barriers such as lack of time, distance and cost.

- Language is a significant barrier for some minority ethnic parents wishing to access early years services.

- Services need to address indirect discrimination and to overcome prejudices concerning disabled parents, parents with learning difficulties and parents with poor mental health.

- Locally based services that are accessible by public transport and/or to those with specific mobility needs are important and the implications of rural living by policy-makers considered by policy-makers

- Cultural institutions and structures can act as social barriers to individuals and these will be different for parents/carers from black and ethnic minority communities, disabled parents, fathers, parents living in poverty and those with very young children or babies.
Summaries of selected studies

This section provides summary details of each of the 11 publications selected through the scoping process. These are listed next, with the research question numbers to which they relate.

Table 1. Selected studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of publication</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reviews were identified as key sources by the majority of the studies. Some were systematic literature reviews (Penn et al 2004). Or, like Desforges with Abouchaar (2003), they were rapid reviews with systematic features. Others were narrative reviews, including a research briefing (Harvard Family Research Project 2006), an evidence briefing (Scottish Government 2008b) and two reviews of the research evidence (Moran et al 2004; Katz et al 2007). The publication by Page et al (2008) combined a literature review with case studies in 10 settings. With the exception of the Harvard Family Research...
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Project (2006), which focused exclusively on evidence from the USA, all the reviews included international evidence. Three publications had a greater emphasis on UK-based research (Katz et al 2007; Page et al 2008; Scottish Government 2008b).

Two of the key sources were longitudinal research studies, the EPPE project (Sylva et al 2004a) and the EPPNI (Melhuish et al 2006). These studies employed a variety of methods including standardised child assessments, child social and behavioural profiles completed by pre-school and primary staff, case study observations and interviews.

Although the full list included international publications, the final list was more UK-focused because the chosen sources, based on the information available, seemed to be the most relevant.

Given the fact that some of the reviews are likely to have included the same sources, there is a danger of treating review findings as independent when they are actually drawing on the same studies. In addition, for some of the reviews, early years work is a component of, rather than the whole focus of the work.

Research questions 1 and 3

The review noted that interventions aimed at promoting parental involvement include a large number of approaches that range from parent training programmes, those aimed at enhancing home–school links and those related to family and community education. High levels of creativity and commitment by providers is evidenced and associated with high participant satisfaction levels. The review concludes that due to weaknesses in evaluation strategies – and thus the evidence base – it is difficult to demonstrate a link between intervention and pupil achievement. However, the findings imply that interventions should be targeted at socio-economically disadvantaged groups through provision of multi-dimensional programmes aimed at specific postcode areas and underpinned by rigorous evaluation.

Methods: the authors conducted a review of English language literature to establish research findings on the relationship between parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment in schools.

Research question 2

This review of the literature looked at ‘two-generation’ programmes (i.e. those that are targeted at both parents and children). It sought information on the programme effects on children and parents as a potential strategy to improve parent involvement in Head Start – a long-standing USA programme aimed at low-income families – while at the same time responding to the self-sufficiency needs of families. The majority of programmes identified continuity of childcare as crucial to achieve the desired impacts on children and the ability of parents to tailor interventions to their needs from a menu. Difficulties faced by parents
with younger children can affect programme involvement. Brokering services from existing community agencies can help to reduce costs and avoid duplication, but this requires staff investment and shared missions and goals. Participation is impacted by parental mental-health issues, transportation, domestic violence and homelessness and therefore staff training to recognise symptoms and issues aids rapid support. Overall, the parenting education component of programmes did not result in positive impacts for families.

Methods: this paper reviews several two-generation programme evaluations: Comprehensive Child Development Program, Even Start Family Literacy Program, Head Start Family Service Centers, New Chance and New Hope.

Research questions 1 and 2

This is the first in the series of US research briefings that examine learning that is complementary between home and school. This publication focuses on the linkages among and between the family, early childhood education settings and schools.

Key project recommendations based on the evidence include: that provision should approach family involvement in overlapping and multiple ways; family involvement should be conceptualised as a continuum; that attending to smooth transitions is key; and practice must be sensitive to differences in home culture and work to the strengths of these differences. In addition, early years and primary school settings should work together to promote family involvement in the community, for example, using libraries and other settings to host meetings and sessions.

Methods: a review of published research in peer-reviewed journals between 1999 and 2005 was underpinned by a conceptual framework of complementary learning.

Research question 3

This review addresses barriers to inclusion in general, rather than in the early years alone, but it does address important issues related to engagement for ‘hard to reach’ populations that has relevance for family support in the early years. Three types of barrier are discussed: physical and practical, social and stigma. Findings indicate that certain values may underpin programmes and thus inform engagement. But provision also needs to recognise ways in which disabled parents may be stigmatised and isolated directly or indirectly by their involvement. Extensive evidence was also identified to show the lack of engagement of fathers in mainstream provision and that progress to redress this is slow. Engagement may be enhanced by factors including profile of staff teams reflecting local communities, taking a holistic approach that appreciates the many issues that impact on parents’ engagement, and recognising diversity within and across minority ethnic groups.
Methods: a review of the literature on the research evidence that addresses the barriers parents face in engaging with mainstream support services and the ways services have responded successfully to these.

Research question 1

Children ‘at risk’ of learning or behavioural difficulties often suffer multiple disadvantages. These disadvantages include having more than three siblings, lower parent education and socio-economic status, and poorer home learning environment. Such children are more likely to show developmental or behavioural difficulties in infancy. Children ‘at risk’ of learning or behavioural difficulties are helped by pre-school experience. The better the quality of the pre-school experience, the greater and longer-lasting the effects, which persist until the end of Key Stage 1. Where disadvantaged children attended centres that included children from mixed social backgrounds they showed further benefit than if they attended centres containing predominantly disadvantaged children. For all children of pre-school age the quality of the home learning environment is more important for intellectual and social development than parental characteristics such as occupation, education or income. This leads to the conclusion that it is what parents do with their children that matters, rather than who they are.

Methods: EPPNI is a longitudinal study which studied a range of different types of pre-schools. The sample included over 800 children from differing social backgrounds across Northern Ireland.

Research questions 1 and 2

Key findings from this review are that early interventions report better and more durable outcomes for children, but late intervention is still better than none. The following characteristics of successful interventions were identified as predicting successful emotional and behavioural development and educational development: targeting particular populations and parenting issues; focusing on implementation factors; offering multiple entry routes; using more than one mode of delivery; and working in parallel with parents, families and children.

Methods: a review of the international evidence on effective practice in parenting support, evaluation studies of parenting support interventions, and pre-existing reviews. The publications that formed the basis of the report were drawn from over two thousand potentially relevant journals, books and reports.

Research question 3
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The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) commissioned this research to explore how services for children and parents can engage effectively with black and minority ethnic parents. Five sets of recommendations were identified. The first highlights the need to recognise diversity within and across minority ethnic groups. The second recognises the need to challenge racism and promote different cultures, with services needing to tackle negative perceptions associated with minority ethnic groups and to actively promote diversity of cultures among the families of people who use services. The third addresses the evidence that minority ethnic parents are likely to be disproportionately affected by barriers such as lack of time, distance to travel and cost. Some minority ethnic parents face an additional barrier where language needs exist, so services need to address language barriers, too. Fourth, the need to provide culturally appropriate services, recognising that there are dilemmas for service providers in terms of whether targeted (culturally specific) provision is required alongside or instead of mainstream (universal) services. Fifth, a substantial amount of evidence shows that minority ethnic parents are keen to be involved in the services they access, particularly in decision-making, and this needs to be harnessed to empower minority ethnic parents.

Methods: There were two key phases in this research: a literature review and qualitative fieldwork undertaken in 10 case-study settings in England.

Research question 1

The review aimed to address a topical policy issue in the UK, namely the research evidence on the impact of the integration of care and education in the early years on children and their parents. The review identified that in many European countries it is conceptually problematic to present the care and education of young children as separate because they are simply not distinguished from each other. It might be more appropriate to represent integration of care and education as a continuum. In the UK, where childcare and education have been treated as distinct in policy and in practice, this could be seen as representing one end of the continuum. Childcare in the UK, where it exists, has been 'wrapped around' a standard two-and-a-half-hour education offer for three- to four-year-olds. Attempts are now being made to change this situation, and to offer 'integrated' provision in children's centres.

However, integration is an umbrella term that encompasses many different meanings. All seven studies rated as reliable found that, broadly speaking, the impact of integrated care and education was beneficial for children, especially children from multi-risk families, and that early age of entry to such provision was advantageous. Nonetheless, there are considerable challenges involved in attempting to generalise across settings. It is most likely that integrated childcare and education benefits children and their parents, in particular their mothers; but the evidence does not address the wider issues of setting up such provision, access, staffing, costs and other issues involved in the development of new services.
Methods: nine studies were synthesised; these covered six countries and a range of social groups.

Research questions 2 and 3

Findings from the Supporting Parents research initiative, funded by the English Department of Health, in a series of influential research summaries. The initiative aimed to make a positive difference through better parenting. Findings distinguish between entitlements (including listening to parents and treating them with respect as partners in solving problems related to their children – treating people in a right and proper way, irrespective of whether there is a positive effect on outcomes) and effects. Evidence supports effectiveness in identifying parental perceptions of good support, but there is some way to go in assessing needs holistically and in partnership. This lack of progress impedes parents’ abilities to solve their own problems and to use different agency support to help them do this, particularly for those with a complex parenting ecology. There is a clear link between the need for high levels of support for those living in poverty and those who are disadvantaged.

Methods: overview findings from different research projects with the projects’ own summaries

Research questions 1, 2 and 3

This evidence briefing on early years and early intervention was produced for task groups in the Scottish Government. The thematic papers draw together evidence and information on good practice in early years services. The briefing concludes that effectively engaging parents is the first step in addressing problems, yet parents most in need of family support services are often the least likely to access them. It recommends that a combination of both targeted and universal interventions/programmes, resulting in a continuum of support, is likely to be most effective and cost-effective in supporting parents – minimum levels of intervention and voluntary, rather than compulsory, approaches are generally favoured. The briefing also notes that there are many parenting interventions/programmes operating in different countries that have been found to be effective in improving outcomes for children later in life.

Methods: the papers were collated by Scottish Government analysts, who have attempted to include the seminal papers on each subject and also to quality assure the evidence as it has been incorporated (although this may not always have been possible within the time constraints).

Research questions 1 and 3
The results of this longitudinal study show that individual pre-school centres vary in their effectiveness in promoting intellectual progress over the pre-school period. However, better outcomes are associated with certain forms of provision, especially settings integrating care and education and nursery schools. The research points to the separate and significant influence of the home learning environment. These aspects (quality and quantity of pre-school and home learning environment) can be seen as more susceptible to change through policy and practitioner initiatives than other child or family characteristics, such as socio-economic status.

Methods: the EPPE study had a longitudinal design. It used standardised child assessments administered on several occasions, child social/behavioural profiles completed by pre-school and primary staff, parental interviews, interviews with pre-school centre staff, quality rating scales and case study observations and interviews. The study involved 3,000 children who were recruited at age three and studied until the end of Key Stage 1 (age seven).
Data annexe

Introduction

The main focus of this priority is on how support programmes for parents and the wider family can help improve children’s cognitive development and attainment. There is evidence in the research literature (for example, from the EPPE) that high levels of parental support and engagement in their child’s education are particularly important in raising children’s attainment. The impact of early intervention on community outcomes was demonstrated by the Birth to School Study (BTSS), which evaluated the impact of PEEP over a period from 1998 to 2004. It identified a significant impact of early intervention in the development both of cognitive skills (particularly readiness for reading) and self-esteem in children living in the PEEP catchment area (one economically disadvantaged area of Oxford), ‘whether or not their families were inclined to participate in an education or parenting-based intervention’. As yet, however, few national or regional datasets provide insights into the wider impact of this support on measurable outcomes for young children.

This data-scoping annexe provides an outline of currently available information on the cognitive development and attainment of young children. It provides:

- a brief commentary on the availability of data and any gaps that have been identified
- an overview of the nature and scope of the data that was found
- an example of the type of charts and diagrams that could be produced for the full review, showing trend data and/or comparisons between national and regional data.

A summary table of the data sources of readily accessible, published and comparable data for early years at national, regional and/or local authority level is included in Appendix 4. These data sources have been set against the relevant national indicators for each priority and have been split by the five ECM outcomes.

Search strategy

There are a number of archival databases in the UK, such as the National Digital Archive of Datasets (NDAD) and the UK data archive, some of which have services that facilitate searching or access to macro- and micro-datasets (including ESDS International). Even so, searching for current and recently published data cannot yet be conducted in the same way as searching for published research findings. Access to newly published data is not supported by comprehensive searchable databases in the same way that literature searches are supported. The strategy that was used to obtain data for the Data Annex used a combination of methods, including online access to known government publications (such as the Statistical First Releases from the Department for Children and Families (DCSF) and the Department for Innovation, Universities & Skills (DIUS)); access to data published by the Office of National Statistics, the Home Office and other government departments; data published by the National Health Service and other national, regional and local bodies; and online searches following leads emerging from these publications, research funding council summaries and other literature searches. It
should be noted that links to statistical sources that were live at the time of searching may not be live by the time of publication.

**Availability of data**

Assessments of the cognitive and personal, emotional and social development of young children have traditionally been made when they enter nursery education and primary school. Such assessments include the Assessment Profile on Entry for Children and Toddlers (ASPECT) and Performance Indicators in Primary Schools (PIPS) on entry-baseline assessments. Traditionally, this data has been used by teachers primarily to monitor the progress of individual children and was not aggregated and published at local, regional or national level.

From 2006–2007, however, schools and early years settings have been under a statutory obligation to provide full data for every individual child in respect of the 13 Foundation Stage summary scales. This has meant that data on young children’s progress and development (at the end of the Foundation Stage) in all government-funded early years settings is now available annually at a local authority, regional and national level (the Foundation Stage Profile).

Even so, no information is currently available that explores the link between the attainment data on the Foundation Stage Profile and family-based support programmes. Analysis of the impact of such programmes on early learning could be undertaken at a school level, local level or regional level, as appropriate, but is not currently available.

**Nature and scope of the data**

Datasets at both national and regional level were explored in order to provide insights into this priority. The focus of the existing analyses (or in some cases, the age of the datasets) meant, however, that few hard conclusions could be drawn as to the role played by support programmes for parents and the wider family in improving children’s cognitive development and attainment. For example:

- The National Child Development Study gathered information on the link between parental interest and the attainment of children, but was based on a sample of children born in 1958. It did not provide data on attainment in the early years.
- The Millennium Cohort Study provides information on the impact of parental and family characteristics (such as family structure, parental education and employment) on children’s development, but does not provide clear insights into the impact of parental support on development.
- The EPPE study assessed more than 3,000 children at the start of pre-school (around the age of three), but this assessment took place in 1997, before most of the current intervention strategies were introduced.
- BTSS, which took place between 1997 and 2003, was a long-term evaluation of targeted early intervention strategies for PEEP in one disadvantaged area of Oxford, but the extent to which the findings may give an insight into other non-urban areas is not clear.
The Foundation Stage Profile, published as a Statistical First Release by the DCSF on an annual basis, provides the first comprehensive dataset that, matched to local information on family-based support programmes, could be used to provide some insights into this priority area. We will explore the possibility of its wider use (and the potential of other datasets such as EPPE) over the next few months.

**Example chart showing trends and regional data**

For the purpose of this scoping study we have included an exemplar chart, drawing on data from the Foundation Stage Profile, which provides regional comparisons in outcomes for young children (though no particular insights into the impact of family-based support programmes).

Figure 1 presents data linked to NI 172 and summarises the average achievement (by government office region) of children obtaining 6 or more points in the Early Years Foundation Stage across each of the scales in Personal, Social and Emotional Development, compared to the mean figures for England. The percentage of children with higher-level scores in emotional development is markedly higher than anywhere else in the East Midlands (88 per cent compared to a mean of 76 per cent across the whole of England), but lowest in London (an average of 73 per cent of children at the end of the Foundation Stage). The proportion of children in London with higher-level scores in personal and social development (78 per cent) is also lower than anywhere else in England (a mean of 80 per cent), other than the West Midlands (78 per cent) and Yorkshire and the Humber (77 per cent).
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Figure 1: Percentage of children achieving 6 or more points for selected assessment scales by GOR

Source: DCSF Foundation Stage Profile: full child collection 2

Next steps
At present we are compiling a detailed spreadsheet identifying the scope, scale, range, periodicity and accessibility of all major English datasets (longitudinal, periodic and ad hoc). Over the next few months, and in addition to identifying and summarising relevant published data for this and other themes and priorities, we aim to access and analyse these other datasets, where possible, to fill in the gaps that we find. This would enable us to provide comparative regional and local data against national indicators in cases where the data has been collected but has not yet been analysed at the level that would be necessary for the theme or priority.
Appendix 1: Search parameters

This appendix contains the parameters for the scoping study, set by the Theme Advisory Group.

Brief description of priority

Rationale: Family-based support for early learning is now recognised as a central feature of successful outcomes for young children and as one of the most significant contributors to children’s continued success in the education system. A specific emphasis on early learning within outreach and family-based support programmes can also be a key to improved relationships between practitioners and family members and between family members and children, leading to both achievement and enjoyment for children and families. Families may need greater support during periods of educational transition.

A number of successful initiatives have been put in place recently to support this understanding and it is timely to pull together and disseminate evidence and practice on the specific theme of support for learning, extending this beyond parents to look at practice developed for the wider family and for informal childcare. Strands of current policy and practice development which relate directly to this priority include the aim to train and qualify the children’s workforce in skills and knowledge related to family-based support and the support for outreach workers within children’s centres.

Main (research) questions to be answered and issues to be covered

1. What evidence is there for the effectiveness of family-based support of early learning in improving children's outcomes?

2. What evidence is there on approaches that support the engagement of family members (especially parents and carers) in young children's learning?

3. How might support-needs differ for different groups of parents/carers, such as low-income families; fathers, mothers, other family members/carers; parents/carers from black or other minority ethnic groups?

Are there any cross-cutting issues to be included?

Child poverty
Equality and diversity
Leadership
What is the likely geographical scope of the searches?

- England
- Wales
- Scotland
- N Ireland
- Republic of Ireland
- Australia/New Zealand
- USA/Canada
- Other countries (please specify)

Any comments: Main focus to be on studies carried out/including UK, especially England.

Age range
Birth to five years, with a particular focus on under-threes.

Literature search dates

What type of literature do you wish to include?

- Published research studies (books and journal articles)
- Conference reports; committee papers; unpublished reports ('grey literature')
- Policy documents
- Practice descriptions and guides
- Other types of literature - please name Information on current research

Which key words should be used for searching the literature?

Parental support set: parental support; parental involvement; parent participation; parent school relationship; parent child relationship; parent influence; home school relationship; family support; family involvement.

Learning set: learning; learning activities; learning processes; learning strategies.

Early childhood set: early childhood education; early years; under fives; young children; preschool education; preschool children; preschool playgroups; nurseries; nursery schools; nursery school curriculum; nursery school education; nursery classes; kindergarten; kindergarten children; young children; childcare; playgroups; day nurseries; children’s centres; foundation stage; primary schools; primary education.
Suggestions for websites, databases and networks to be searched or included as key sources

National Academy for Parenting Practitioners.

Key texts/books/seminal works suggested by the Theme Advisory Group
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Pre-School Learning Alliance (2005a) Fathers matter (Leaflet), London: Pre-School Learning Alliance (PSLA).


Appendix 2: Scoping study process

The first stage in the scoping study process was for the Theme Lead to set the key review questions and search parameters and agree them with the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) scoping team (see Appendix 1 for the full set of parameters) The list of databases and sources to be searched was also agreed with the Theme Lead. Sets of keywords were selected from the British Education Index (BEI) and were supplemented with free text phrases. The sets comprised an early years set covering a range of concepts equating to the early years 'stage'; and a set of terms covering concepts relating to parental support of early learning.

The keywords were adhered to as far as possible for all bibliographic databases, with closest alternatives selected where necessary. Web-based databases were searched using a more limited number of terms enabling a simultaneous search across the three priority areas within the early years theme.

A list of websites considered relevant to the search was compiled by the NFER team and supplemented by key organisations identified in the National Children’s Bureau (NCB) organisations database, the British Education Internet Resource Catalogue (BEIRC) and by others identified in the course of the bibliographic database searches.

Current research was specifically searched for in the CERUK Plus (education and children’s services research) database, in the Research Register for Social Care and on the websites of key organisations. Members of the Theme Advisory Group were invited to suggest relevant documents, networks and websites.

The next stage in the process was to carry out searching across the specified databases. Information specialists conducted the database and web searches. Initial screening was done at this stage to ensure the results conformed to the search parameters.

The records selected from the searches were then loaded into a Reference Manager database and the data cleaned. This included removing duplicates, checking citations and sourcing missing abstracts. The data was then transferred to an Excel spreadsheet provided to the researchers on the scoping team.

The scoping team members used information from the abstract and/or the full document to assess the relevance of each piece of literature in addressing the key questions for the review. They also noted the characteristics of the text, such as the type of literature, country of origin and relevance to the research question. A 10 per cent sample was selected at random and checked for accuracy by another member of staff.

The numbers of items found by the initial search, and subsequently selected, can be found in the following table. The three columns represent: items found in the initial searches; items selected for further consideration (i.e. those complying with the search parameters after the removal of duplicates); and items considered relevant to the study by a researcher who had read the abstract and/or accessed the full document.
Table 2. Overview of searches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Items found</th>
<th>Items selected for consideration</th>
<th>Items identified as relevant to this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Databases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts (ASSIA)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Education Index (AEI)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Education Index (BEI)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChildData</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Resources Information Center (ERIC)</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy and Practice</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internet databases/portals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Education Internet Resource Catalogue (BEIRC)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERUK Plus</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Research Count</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Practice</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Register for Social Care</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Online</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Search strategy**

The following section provides information on the keywords and search strategy for each database and web source searched as part of the scoping study. All searches were conducted by information specialists at NFER, with the exception of ChildData, which was searched by an information specialist at the NCB. The keywords used in the searches, together with a brief description of each of the databases searched, are outlined below. Keywords were not exploded due to time limitations, although narrower terms were used wherever possible and have been listed in the search strategy. The following conventions have been used: (ft) denotes that free-text search terms were used and * denotes a truncation of terms. Further searching of health and psychological databases will be carried out for the main review. Author searches and reference harvesting (i.e. following up references cited in text) were not undertaken due to time limitations. These will also be carried out for the main review.
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Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts (ASSIA)
(searched via CSA 21/07/08)

ASSIA is an index of articles from over 500 international English-language social science journals.

#1 early years (ft)  #13 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12
#2 under fives (ft)  #14 parent child relationships
#3 children's cent* (ft)  #15 parental participation
#4 foundation stage (ft)  #16 parental support
#5 day nurseries  #17 family support
#6 early childhood education  #18 family involvement
#7 kindergartens  #19 home school relationship
#8 nurseries  #20 learning
#9 nursery schools  #21 #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20
#10 playgroups  #22 #13 and #21
#11 preschool children
#12 preschools

Australian Education Index (AEI)
(searched via Dialog 21/07/08)

AEI is Australia’s largest source of education information covering reports, books, journal articles, online resources, conference papers and book chapters.

#1 early years (ft)  #12 parental support (ft)
#2 under fives (ft)  #13 parent-child-relationship or parent-influence or parent-participation or parent-school-relationship
#3 young children  #14 family-involve ment or family-school-relationship
#4 playgroups  #15 family support
#5 preschools or preschool-children or preschool-curriculum or preschool-education  #16 learning
#6 kindergarten or kindergarten children  #17 learning strategies or learning processes or learning activities
#7 nursery schools  #18 #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17
#8 play groups (ft)  #19 #11 and #18
#9 childcare
#10 children’s centres (ft)
#11 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10

NB. A reasonably large number of the AEI hits were blank records with the message: information withdrawn by the provider.
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**British Education Index (BEI)**
(searched via Dialog 21/07/08)

BEI provides information on research, policy and practice in education and training in the UK. Sources include over 300 journals, mostly published in the UK, plus other material including reports, series and conference papers.

#1 early childhood education
#2 early years (ft)
#3 under fives (ft)
#4 young children
#5 preschool education
#6 preschool children
#7 preschool playgroups (ft)
#8 nursery schools
#9 nursery school curriculum
#10 nursery school education
#11 nursery classes
#12 kindergarten
#13 kindergarten children
#14 childcare
#15 playgroups
#16 day care centres
#17 foundation stage (ft)
#18 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17

#19 parental support (ft)
#20 parent participation
#21 parent school relationship
#22 parent pupil relationship
#23 parent child relationship
#24 parent influence
#25 home school relationship
#26 family support (ft)
#27 family involvement
#28 learning
#29 learning activities
#30 learning processes
#31 learning strategies
#32 #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31

**British Education Internet Resource Catalogue (BEIRC)**
(searched 09/07/08)

The British Education Internet Resource catalogue is a freely accessible database of information about professionally evaluated and described internet sites that support educational research, policy and practice.

#1 early childhood education or preschool education or daycare centres or kindergarten or nursery schools or nursery school curriculum or play groups or primary education or young children

**CERUK Plus**
(searched 22/07/08)
The CERUK Plus database provides access to information about current and recently completed research, PhD level work and practitioner research in the field of education and children’s services.

#1 early childhood education or early childhood education and care or preschool education or preschool children
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ChildData
(search completed 31/07/08)

ChildData is the NCB database, containing details of around 35,000 books, reports and journal articles about children and young people.

#1 preschool children                #13 family support
#2 preschool education              #14 parental involvement (ft)
#3 day care                         #15 parental participation (ft)
#4 early childhood care and education #16 family learning
#5 early childhood services         #17 family literacy (ft)
#6 early primary school age          #18 home school relations
#7 children’s centres               #19 fathers
#8 nursery schools                  #20 grandparents
#9 nursery classes                  #21 poverty
#10 educare (ft)                     #22 disadvantage
#11 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6  #23 #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22
#12 parental support (ft)            #24 #23 and #11

Education Resources Information Center (ERIC)
(searched via Dialog 21/07/08)

ERIC is sponsored by the United States Department of Education and is the largest education database in the world. Coverage includes research documents, journal articles, technical reports, programme descriptions and evaluations and curricula material.

#1 early childhood education      #15 parent participation
#2 early years (ft)               #16 parent-child relationship
#3 under fives (ft)               #17 parent-school relationship
#4 young children                 #18 family-school relationship
#5 preschool education           #19 family involvement (ft)
#6 preschool children             #20 family programs
#7 preschool playgroups (ft)      #21 learning
#8 nursery schools                #22 learning activities
#9 kindergarten                   #23 learning strategies
#10 child-care                    #24 learning processes
#11 child-care-centers            #25 #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24
#12 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11
#13 parental support (ft)         #26 #12 and #25
#14 parent influence
Educational Evidence Portal (EEP)
(searched 13/07/08)
EEP enables users to search for educational evidence from a range of reputable sources via a single search.

#1 early years

Making Research Count
(browsed 13/07/08)
Making Research Count is a collaborative national research dissemination network based regionally in the social work departments of nine UK universities. RESEARCH NEWS, a newsletter that highlights recent or current research undertaken in the Making Research Count network, was browsed.

Research in Practice
(browsed 13/07/08)
Research in Practice is the largest children and families research implementation project in England and Wales. It is a department of the Dartington Hall Trust run in collaboration with the Association of Directors of Children’s Services, the University of Sheffield and a network of over 100 participating agencies in the UK. The EvidenceBank and publications section were browsed.

Research Register for Social Care (RRSC)
(searched 13/07/08)
The RRSC provides access to information about ongoing and completed social care research that has been subject to independent ethical and scientific review.

#1 pre-school children or early years (ft) #2 children’s centres #3 childcare (ft)

NB. Student research excluded.
Social Care Online

(sought 13/07/08)

Social Care Online is the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) database covering an extensive range of information and research on all aspects of social care. Content is drawn from a range of sources including journal articles, websites, research reviews, legislation and government documents and user knowledge.

#1  pre-school children
#2  integrated services and early years (ft)
#3  early years (ft) and health
#4  parenting and early years (ft)

Social Policy and Practice

(sought via Silverplatter 21/07/08)

Social Policy and Practice is a bibliographic database with abstracts covering evidence-based social policy, public health, social services, and mental and community health. Content is from the UK with some material from the USA and Europe.

#1  early years
#2  preschool education
#3  early childhood education
#4  kindergarten
#5  nursery
#6  childcare
#7  children’s centres
#8  #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7
#9  parental support
#10  parental involvement
#11  parental participation
#12  #9 or #10 or #11
#13  #8 and #12
Organisations

The following websites were browsed for additional sources not already found in the database searches. This entailed browsing through the publications and/or research and policy sections.

Table 3. Additional information sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Records selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Childhood</td>
<td><a href="http://www.allianceforchildhood.org">www.allianceforchildhood.org</a></td>
<td>0 (1 lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Council for Educational Research</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acer.edu.au">www.acer.edu.au</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dest.gov.au">www.dest.gov.au</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard van Leer Foundation (found via DECET)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bernardvanleer.org">www.bernardvanleer.org</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Association for Early Childhood Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.early-education.org.uk">www.early-education.org.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Educational Research Association (BERA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bera.ac.uk/">www.bera.ac.uk/</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) at LSE</td>
<td><a href="http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case">http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion (CESI)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cesi.org.uk/">www.cesi.org.uk/</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Equity and Innovation in Early Childhood (found via Alliance for Childhood)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/ceiec">www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/ceiec</a></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Research in Early Childhood (CREC)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crec.co.uk">www.crec.co.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Research in Social Policy (Loughborough)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crsp.ac.uk">www.crsp.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Scotland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.childreninscotland.org.uk">www.childreninscotland.org.uk</a></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Wales</td>
<td><a href="http://www.childreninwales.org.uk">www.childreninwales.org.uk</a></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daycare Trust</td>
<td><a href="http://www.daycaretrust.org.uk">www.daycaretrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) research pages</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research">www.dcsf.gov.uk/research</a></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education NI</td>
<td><a href="http://www.deni.gov.uk">www.deni.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH research pages (for health in early years settings)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Researchanddevelopment/Researchanddevelopmentpublications/index.htm">www.dh.gov.uk/en/Researchanddevelopment/Researchanddevelopmentpublications/index.htm</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Early Childhood Education and Training (DECE)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.decet.org/">www.decet.org/</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) research pages</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5">www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project</td>
<td><a href="http://k1.ioe.ac.uk/schools/ecpe/eppe/index.htm">http://k1.ioe.ac.uk/schools/ecpe/eppe/index.htm</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPI Centre Early Years Review Group</td>
<td><a href="http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms">http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms</a></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Network</td>
<td><a href="http://evidencenetwork.org">http://evidencenetwork.org</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families, Children and Childcare Study</td>
<td><a href="http://www.familieschildrenchildcare.org/fccc_frames_home.html">www.familieschildrenchildcare.org/fccc_frames_home.html</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families, early learning and literacy research group (FELL)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.education.ox.ac.uk/research/resgroup/fell/index.php">www.education.ox.ac.uk/research/resgroup/fell/index.php</a></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Parenting Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.familyandparenting.org.uk">www.familyandparenting.org.uk</a></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Rowntree Foundation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jrf.org.uk">www.jrf.org.uk</a></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Teaching Scotland link pages to early years research</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/earlyyears/resources/publications/resourcesresearch/index.asp">www.ltscotland.org.uk/earlyyears/resources/publications/resourcesresearch/index.asp</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Trust</td>
<td><a href="http://www.literacytrust.org.uk">www.literacytrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for Primary Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nape.org.uk">www.nape.org.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Parenting Practitioners</td>
<td><a href="http://www.parentingacademy.org">www.parentingacademy.org</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Campaign for Real Nursery Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ncne.co.uk">www.ncne.co.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Centre for Social Research</td>
<td><a href="http://www.natcen.ac.uk">www.natcen.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Children's Bureau. Early Childhood Forum</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ncb.org.uk/ecf">www.ncb.org.uk/ecf</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Ministry of Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.minedu.govt.nz">www.minedu.govt.nz</a></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nfer.ac.uk">www.nfer.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSPCC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nspcc.org.uk">www.nspcc.org.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers Early Education Partnership</td>
<td><a href="http://www.peep.org.uk">www.peep.org.uk</a></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Learning Alliance</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pre-school.org.uk">www.pre-school.org.uk</a></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Educational Research Association – Early Years Network</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sera.ac.uk/sitepages/earlyyearsnetwork.htm">www.sera.ac.uk/sitepages/earlyyearsnetwork.htm</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td><a href="http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Research">www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Research</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Exclusion Task Force</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social_exclusion_task_force">www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social_exclusion_task_force</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy Research Unit (York)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru">www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surestart Research</td>
<td><a href="http://www.surestart.gov.uk/research">www.surestart.gov.uk/research</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Assembly</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wales.gov.uk">www.wales.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following list records all the items identified in the searches and considered relevant to this scoping study.
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Appendix 4: Relevant national indicators and data sources for the early years theme

The early years theme has three priorities, as set out below. This scoping study addresses one of the themes; the other two are the subject of separate reports.

Key to theme priorities:

1.1 Improving development outcomes for children through effective practice in **integrating early years services**

1.2 Improving children’s attainment through a better quality of **family-based support** for early learning

1.3 Narrowing the gap in outcomes for children from the most excluded practice through **inclusive practice** in the early years

Table 4. National indicators and data sources, by Every Child Matters outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECM outcome</th>
<th>National Indicator (NI)</th>
<th>NI detail</th>
<th>Relevant early years priority</th>
<th>Data source (published information)</th>
<th>Scale (published information)</th>
<th>Links to data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be healthy</td>
<td>NI50</td>
<td>Emotional health of children</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Millennium Cohort Study</td>
<td>National (UK and country level)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/studies.asp?section=0001000200010004">www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/studies.asp?section=0001000200010004</a> <a href="http://www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/studies.asp?section=0001000200010005">www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/studies.asp?section=0001000200010005</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI51</td>
<td>Effectiveness of child and adolescent mental health services</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Nothing identified for early years as yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM outcome</td>
<td>National Indicator (NI)</td>
<td>NI detail</td>
<td>Relevant early years priority</td>
<td>Data source (published information)</td>
<td>Scale (published information)</td>
<td>Links to data source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI126</td>
<td>Early access for women to maternity services</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>National Sure Start Evaluation</td>
<td>Sure Start areas – but no clear quantitative data</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/implementation/1188.pdf">www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/implementation/1188.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N154</td>
<td>Services for disabled children</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>NFER/RNIB survey of local authority VI services</td>
<td>National (100 English local authorities and/or consortia)</td>
<td>Not published yet – data on children aged 0 to 23 months, 24 to 35 months and 36 to 59 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI55</td>
<td>Obesity among primary school age children in reception year</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Data from Health survey of England</td>
<td>National regional data is aggregated 2 to 10 years. Data on the local authority site (which uses more recent data) is available for reception year</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/PublicationsandStatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_4139556">www.dh.gov.uk/en/PublicationsandStatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_4139556</a> <a href="http://www.communityhealthprofiles.info">www.communityhealthprofiles.info</a> provides health profile data for each local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI58</td>
<td>Emotional and behavioural health of children in care</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Nothing identified yet for early years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional indicators</td>
<td>Children’s tooth decay</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Health Profile of England</td>
<td>National and regional</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/PublicationsandStatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_4139556">www.dh.gov.uk/en/PublicationsandStatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_4139556</a> <a href="http://www.communityhealthprofiles.info">www.communityhealthprofiles.info</a> provides health profile data for each local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM outcome</td>
<td>National Indicator (NI)</td>
<td>NI detail</td>
<td>Relevant early years priority</td>
<td>Data source (published information)</td>
<td>Scale (published information)</td>
<td>Links to data source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay safe</td>
<td>NI64</td>
<td>Child protection plans lasting 2 years or more</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>National Evaluation of Sure Start</td>
<td>Comparison of Sure Start Local Programme areas with data for England</td>
<td><a href="www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/lca/170.pdf">source</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI65</td>
<td>Children becoming the subject of a child protection plan for a second or subsequent time</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Nothing identified yet for early years</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/lca/170.pdf">source</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI69</td>
<td>Children who experience bullying</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Nothing identified yet for early years</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/lca/170.pdf">source</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI70</td>
<td>Hospital admissions caused by unintentional and deliberate injuries to children and young people</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>National Evaluation of Sure Start</td>
<td>Comparison of Sure Start Local Programme areas with data for England</td>
<td><a href="www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/lca/170.pdf">source</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI71</td>
<td>Children who have run away from home/care overnight</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Nothing identified yet for early years</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/lca/170.pdf">source</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition- al indicators</td>
<td>Child homicides</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Home Office Statistics Bulletin: Homicides, Firearm Offences and Intimate Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs07/hosb0207.pdf">source</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM outcome</td>
<td>National Indicator (NI)</td>
<td>NI detail</td>
<td>Relevant early years priority</td>
<td>Data source (published information)</td>
<td>Scale (published information)</td>
<td>Links to data source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy and achieve</td>
<td>NI72-</td>
<td>Achievement of at least 72 points across the Early Years FS with at least 6 in each of the scales in PSED and CLL</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3</td>
<td>Foundation Stage Profile</td>
<td>National, regional and local authority level</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000752/SFR32-2007.pdf">www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000752/SFR32-2007.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI103</td>
<td>Special educational needs – statements issued within 26 weeks</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3</td>
<td>Nothing identified yet for early years</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.surestart.gov.uk/_doc/P0002390.pdf">www.surestart.gov.uk/_doc/P0002390.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional indicators</td>
<td>Quality of childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Millennium Cohort Study</td>
<td>301 settings attended by 632 MCS children</td>
<td><a href="http://www.surestart.gov.uk/_doc/P0002390.pdf">www.surestart.gov.uk/_doc/P0002390.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early years provision</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1, 1.3</td>
<td>Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RW010.pdf">www.dcsf.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RW010.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example: [www.ofsted.gov.uk/reports/pdf/?inspectionNumber=3431&providerCategoryID=0&fileName=%5C%5CSP%5C3092005040120071231.pdf](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/reports/pdf/?inspectionNumber=3431&providerCategoryID=0&fileName=%5C%5CSP%5C3092005040120071231.pdf)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECM outcome</th>
<th>National Indicator (NI)</th>
<th>NI detail</th>
<th>Relevant early years priority</th>
<th>Data source (published information)</th>
<th>Scale (published information)</th>
<th>Links to data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI188</td>
<td></td>
<td>Take-up of formal childcare by low-income working families</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>National Evaluation of Sure Start</td>
<td>National</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/lca/150.pdf">www.ness.bbk.ac.uk/documents/activities/lca/150.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>