

## Full-time places in 2015: data report

This report looks at the children in Birmingham who had a full-time place in the three terms in 2015.

The data analysed includes children aged three and four who were funded for full-time hours during the year. Although the council only has criteria for funding full-time places for three and four year olds, there were small numbers of two year olds funded in all three terms, and these have been excluded from the analysis. Most of the analysis is confined to three year olds only. Where there is little difference in the data between the terms, the figures given are for autumn 2015, the most recent term.

In autumn term 2015 nearly 20% of all funded places were funded for full-time hours, an increase from 17% and 16% in the spring and summer terms. The autumn term numbers are 3,409 children. The majority (82%) of those funded for full-time hours take up their place in a maintained setting – a nursery school or class. This picture differs substantially from part-time places, as shown below.

Provider Type Autumn Term 2015	Number of children FT	% of all FT children	Number of children PT	% of all PT children	All children	% of all children
Childminder	3	0.09%	104	0.79%	107	0.65%
Community Day Nursery	8	0.24%	99	0.75%	107	0.65%
Day Nursery	543	16.23%	5,596	42.47%	6139	37.16%
Nursery Class	1,989	59.44%	5,389	40.90%	7378	44.66%
Nursery School	799	23.88%	1,257	9.54%	2056	12.44%
PreSchool Playgroup	4	0.12%	546	4.14%	550	3.33%
Independent school nursery			184	1.4%	184	1.11%
Grand Total	3,346	100%	13693	100%	16,521	100%

### Wards

Analysis by ward shows enormous variation in the proportion of children being funded for full time places in different parts of the city. The data shown in the Appendix One includes three separate key items:

- the take up of EEE places overall in the ward
- proportion of children living in the ward who have funded full time places
- proportion of children taking up EEE who have a funded full time place

The analysis shows that in some wards the proportion of children with full time places are unusually high whilst the overall take-up is lower than average. Specifically, Ladywood, Aston, Sparkbrook, Billesley and Washwood Heath fall into this category. This suggests that the offer of so many full-time places may be preventing take-up of the statutory requirement by other children in these wards.

Conversely, there are three wards where overall take-up of EEE is very high and the proportion of children having full time places is also high – Nechells, Northfield and Kingstanding. This suggests that there are sufficient places in these wards to meet the current full-time needs.

## **Vulnerable children**

The current priority one criteria for full time places has a focus on those children who have additional vulnerabilities, such as those with special educational needs and disabilities and those on a child protection plan. Appendix Two shows the data per ward for vulnerable children – in this case this refers to those children who are currently subject to a Child Protection, Looked After, Child in Need or CAF plan; the figure is for all children aged under five, as the number of children in each year group in each ward is very small. The data is from 1st December 2015, so within the autumn term for which the data is presented.

Looking at the data compared to the proportion of children in each ward who are currently vulnerable shows that the current priority one criteria do not account for the vast majority of funded places. It is clear that some wards have a much greater discrepancy between the proportion of funded full time places and the proportion of vulnerable children.

Shard End, Hodge Hill and Weoley all have higher than average proportions of vulnerable children, but lower than average proportion of full-time funded places. Similarly, Soho has slightly higher than average proportion of children in full-time places but almost twice the average proportion of vulnerable children. Settings in these wards may only be able to provide full-time places to those closest to meeting priority one needs than in some other wards.

On the other hand, some wards are providing full time places to far more children than the average compared with the proportion of vulnerable children. It suggests that most children having funded places in the following wards receive them under the current priority two criteria:

- Billesley
- Kings Norton
- Kingstanding
- Ladywood
- Northfield
- Sparkbrook
- Nechells
- Washwood Heath
- Aston

This suggests that that any changes to the current criteria will affect children in these wards more than average.

## **Deprivation**

A supplement is paid to the settings for each child who lives in areas of deprivation in the city. The measure of deprivation used is the IDACI (Income deprivation affecting children index) profile, where the 0-5% band is the most deprived 5% areas of England, chosen because it is the only national index of deprivation which focuses directly on children. Over half of all children under five (57.1%) in Birmingham live in these areas, the most deprived 20% in the country. Children living in these areas are more likely to meet one or more of the economic factors in the priority two criteria for a full time place. Therefore, we would expect there to be some correlation between the wards with the highest levels of deprivation and those with the highest take up of full time places.

Appendix Three shows that there is correlation for some wards, notably Aston, Washwood Heath and Nechells. It also shows that whilst there is also correlation between high deprivation levels and high full time places in Kingstanding, Sparkbrook and Lozells and East Handsworth wards, there is also a high 'gap' between the proportion of children in the

highest deprivation areas and the proportion of children taking up full-time places in these three wards.

Notably, the Appendix shows that there are five wards in the city where there are over 70% of children living in the highest deprivation area but where take up of full time places is less than or equal to the average of just under 20%. This suggests that children in these wards are currently disproportionately disadvantaged from taking up a full time place, compared to wards with similar levels of deprivation. These wards are:

- Shard End
- Soho
- Bartley Green
- Weoley
- Longbridge.

The data also shows that in two wards the correlation between the numbers of children living in high deprivation areas and the number taking up a full time place works in reverse. These are:

- Northfield, where 43% of children live in high deprivation areas and 31.2% have a full time place.
- Kings Norton, where 59% of children live in high deprivation areas and 26.6% have a full time place.

Overall, the data suggests is that there are inconsistencies across the city in the access to full time places in relation to deprivation.

**Appendix One: Analysis by Ward**

<b>Pupil Ward</b>	<b>FT</b>	<b>All take-up</b>	<b>All children</b>	<b>% of all children who accessed a EEE place who have a full time place</b>	<b>% of all children in the ward who have a full-time place</b>	<b>Overall take-up of a EEE place</b>
Acocks Green	64	428	509	14.95%	12.57%	84.09%
Aston	279	603	668	46.27%	41.77%	90.27%
Bartley Green	78	378	405	20.63%	19.26%	93.33%
Billesley	105	356	441	29.49%	23.81%	80.73%
Bordesley Green	122	717	867	17.02%	14.07%	82.70%
Bournville	29	305	326	9.51%	8.90%	93.56%
Brandwood	45	330	383	13.64%	11.75%	86.16%
Edgbaston	51	213	272	23.94%	18.75%	78.31%
Erdington	32	308	334	10.39%	9.58%	92.22%
Hall Green	9	318	393	2.83%	2.29%	80.92%
Handsworth Wood	52	347	406	14.99%	12.81%	85.47%
Harborne	9	256	318	3.52%	2.83%	80.50%
Hodge Hill	89	541	579	16.45%	15.37%	93.44%
Kings Norton	103	360	388	28.61%	26.55%	92.78%
Kingstanding	136	429	445	31.70%	30.56%	96.40%
Ladywood	111	287	364	38.68%	30.49%	78.85%
Longbridge	43	344	384	12.50%	11.20%	89.58%
Lozells and East Handsworth	149	602	664	24.75%	22.44%	90.66%
Moseley and Kings Heath	31	307	317	10.10%	9.78%	96.85%
Nechells	228	638	664	35.74%	34.34%	96.08%
Northfield	118	388	378	30.41%	31.22%	102.65%
Oscott	36	326	378	11.04%	9.52%	86.24%
Perry Barr	33	297	381	11.11%	8.66%	77.95%
Quinton	63	332	373	18.98%	16.89%	89.01%
Selly Oak	30	197	209	15.23%	14.35%	94.26%
Shard End	55	444	510	12.39%	10.78%	87.06%
Sheldon	34	266	319	12.78%	10.66%	83.39%
Soho	125	558	657	22.40%	19.03%	84.93%
South Yardley	104	544	602	19.12%	17.28%	90.37%
Sparkbrook	218	575	645	37.91%	33.80%	89.15%
Springfield	80	593	671	13.49%	11.92%	88.38%
Stechford and Yardley North	65	394	423	16.50%	15.37%	93.14%
Stockland Green	35	376	397	9.31%	8.82%	94.71%
Sutton Four Oaks	17	215	263	7.91%	6.46%	81.75%
Sutton New Hall	26	215	223	12.09%	11.66%	96.41%
Sutton Trinity	18	308	322	5.84%	5.59%	95.65%
Sutton Vesey	5	265	279	1.89%	1.79%	94.98%
Tyburn	93	389	424	23.91%	21.93%	91.75%
Washwood Heath	303	735	811	41.22%	37.36%	90.63%
Weoley	54	404	398	13.37%	13.57%	101.51%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3,346</b>	<b>15,888</b>	<b>17,790</b>	<b>21.06%</b>	<b>18.81%</b>	<b>89.31%</b>

### **Appendix Two: Analysis for vulnerable children**

<b>Pupil Ward</b>	<b>% of all children who accessed a EEE place who have a full time place</b>	<b>% of all children in the ward who have a full-time place</b>	<b>Overall take-up of a EEE place</b>	<b>Proportion of vulnerable children</b>	<b>Difference between full-time take up and vulnerable children</b>
Acocks Green	14.95%	12.57%	84.09%	2.48%	10.09%
Aston	46.27%	41.77%	90.27%	3.54%	38.22%
Bartley Green	20.63%	19.26%	93.33%	3.31%	15.95%
Billesley	29.49%	23.81%	80.73%	3.07%	20.74%
Bordesley Green	17.02%	14.07%	82.70%	2.32%	11.75%
Bournville	9.51%	8.90%	93.56%	2.36%	6.53%
Brandwood	13.64%	11.75%	86.16%	2.17%	9.58%
Edgbaston	23.94%	18.75%	78.31%	0.71%	18.04%
Erdington	10.39%	9.58%	92.22%	2.40%	7.18%
Hall Green	2.83%	2.29%	80.92%	0.71%	1.58%
Handsworth Wood	14.99%	12.81%	85.47%	1.97%	10.84%
Harborne	3.52%	2.83%	80.50%	0.98%	1.85%
Hodge Hill	16.45%	15.37%	93.44%	2.95%	12.42%
Kings Norton	28.61%	26.55%	92.78%	2.84%	23.71%
Kingstanding	31.70%	30.56%	96.40%	3.70%	26.86%
Ladywood	38.68%	30.49%	78.85%	1.93%	28.56%
Longbridge	12.50%	11.20%	89.58%	2.64%	8.56%
Lozells and East Handsworth	24.75%	22.44%	90.66%	4.21%	18.23%
Moseley and Kings Heath	10.10%	9.78%	96.85%	1.14%	8.64%
Nechells	35.74%	34.34%	96.08%	2.52%	31.82%
Northfield	30.41%	31.22%	102.65%	1.89%	29.33%
Oscott	11.04%	9.52%	86.24%	1.30%	8.22%
Perry Barr	11.11%	8.66%	77.95%	1.30%	7.36%
Quinton	18.98%	16.89%	89.01%	2.52%	14.37%
Selly Oak	15.23%	14.35%	94.26%	0.83%	13.53%
Shard End	12.39%	10.78%	87.06%	2.99%	7.79%
Sheldon	12.78%	10.66%	83.39%	2.09%	8.57%
Soho	22.40%	19.03%	84.93%	5.16%	13.87%
South Yardley	19.12%	17.28%	90.37%	2.68%	14.60%
Sparkbrook	37.91%	33.80%	89.15%	2.44%	31.36%
Springfield	13.49%	11.92%	88.38%	2.24%	9.68%
Stechford and Yardley North	16.50%	15.37%	93.14%	2.13%	13.24%
Stockland Green	9.31%	8.82%	94.71%	1.93%	6.89%
Sutton Four Oaks	7.91%	6.46%	81.75%	0.43%	6.03%
Sutton New Hall	12.09%	11.66%	96.41%	0.32%	11.34%
Sutton Trinity	5.84%	5.59%	95.65%	1.22%	4.37%
Sutton Vesey	1.89%	1.79%	94.98%	0.43%	1.36%
Tyburn	23.91%	21.93%	91.75%	2.76%	19.18%
Washwood Heath	41.22%	37.36%	90.63%	2.56%	34.80%
Weoley	13.37%	13.57%	101.51%	3.03%	10.54%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>21.06%</b>	<b>19.12%</b>	<b>89.31%</b>	<b>2.60%</b>	<b>16.52%</b>

### Appendix Three: Analysis by deprivation

Pupil Ward	% of all children who accessed a EEE place who have a full time place	% of all children in the ward who have a full-time place	Overall take-up of a EEE place	Proportion of children living in the most deprived 20% areas	Difference between full-time take up and children in deprived areas
Acocks Green	14.95%	12.57%	84.09%	53.05%	40.47%
Aston	46.27%	41.77%	90.27%	82.19%	40.42%
Bartley Green	20.63%	19.26%	93.33%	82.47%	63.21%
Billesley	29.49%	23.81%	80.73%	64.17%	40.36%
Bordesley Green	17.02%	14.07%	82.70%	55.71%	41.64%
Bournville	9.51%	8.90%	93.56%	27.91%	19.02%
Brandwood	13.64%	11.75%	86.16%	51.44%	39.69%
Edgbaston	23.94%	18.75%	78.31%	19.12%	0.37%
Erdington	10.39%	9.58%	92.22%	49.10%	39.52%
Hall Green	2.83%	2.29%	80.92%	9.92%	7.63%
Handsworth Wood	14.99%	12.81%	85.47%	38.42%	25.62%
Harborne	3.52%	2.83%	80.50%	6.29%	3.46%
Hodge Hill	16.45%	15.37%	93.44%	51.81%	36.44%
Kings Norton	28.61%	26.55%	92.78%	59.02%	32.47%
Kingstanding	31.70%	30.56%	96.40%	95.96%	65.39%
Ladywood	38.68%	30.49%	78.85%	66.48%	35.99%
Longbridge	12.50%	11.20%	89.58%	73.70%	62.50%
Lozells and East Handsworth	24.75%	22.44%	90.66%	82.98%	60.54%
Moseley and Kings Heath	10.10%	9.78%	96.85%	20.82%	11.04%
Nechells	35.74%	34.34%	96.08%	93.37%	59.04%
Northfield	30.41%	31.22%	102.65%	42.86%	11.64%
Oscott	11.04%	9.52%	86.24%	17.72%	8.20%
Perry Barr	11.11%	8.66%	77.95%	23.62%	14.96%
Quinton	18.98%	16.89%	89.01%	47.45%	30.56%
Selly Oak	15.23%	14.35%	94.26%	8.61%	-5.74%
Shard End	12.39%	10.78%	87.06%	96.27%	85.49%
Sheldon	12.78%	10.66%	83.39%	47.02%	36.36%
Soho	22.40%	19.03%	84.93%	87.98%	68.95%
South Yardley	19.12%	17.28%	90.37%	65.12%	47.84%
Sparkbrook	37.91%	33.80%	89.15%	95.35%	61.55%
Springfield	13.49%	11.92%	88.38%	38.60%	26.68%
Stechford and Yardley North	16.50%	15.37%	93.14%	60.99%	45.63%
Stockland Green	9.31%	8.82%	94.71%	51.89%	43.07%
Sutton Four Oaks	7.91%	6.46%	81.75%	0.00%	-6.46%
Sutton New Hall	12.09%	11.66%	96.41%	0.00%	-11.66%
Sutton Trinity	5.84%	5.59%	95.65%	8.39%	2.80%
Sutton Vesey	1.89%	1.79%	94.98%	0.00%	-1.79%
Tyburn	23.91%	21.93%	91.75%	68.40%	46.46%
Washwood Heath	41.22%	37.36%	90.63%	88.16%	50.80%
Weoley	13.37%	13.57%	101.51%	76.63%	63.07%
<b>Total</b>	<b>21.06%</b>	<b>19.12%</b>	<b>89.31%</b>	<b>57.09%</b>	<b>37.97%</b>