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Introduction

1. Between May and August 2012 the Department for Education and the Welsh Government consulted on a number of proposals to reform the legislation for licensing children to take part in performance activities.

2. The legal framework was designed to ensure that arrangements are made for the safety and wellbeing of children when they perform. Much of the framework was developed in the 1960s, and some aspects seem outdated. A number of the conditions placed on licences and powers given to local authorities were seen by many respondents to the consultation (from all sectors) as overly prescriptive, bureaucratic, and unnecessary for ensuring the wellbeing of child performers.

3. The key purpose of the measures proposed in the consultation was to increase the opportunities for children to benefit from taking part in performances, and to ensure that children in different areas can access them on an equal basis. The intention is to clarify responsibilities for the safety, wellbeing, and education of children when they perform, and to remove unnecessary bureaucracy that, in some areas, can unfairly restrict or prevent children from taking part in activities.

4. This report summarises the views expressed in the consultation exercise. The responses to the written questions are not weighted to take account of whether they represent a body of views, such as those of a trade association, or the views of a single individual. The views gathered through discussions and workshops have also been taken into account and are reflected throughout this report.
Responses

5. There were 232 written responses to the consultation. These came from a variety of interests, including broadcasting and production companies, professional and amateur theatre groups, the advertising industry and individuals. Over a third of them came from local authorities and licensing officers, who are responsible for the administration of the licensing rules and processes. A list of response categories is provided in Annex 8.

6. Evidence from the written responses was supplemented by that gathered from a series of sector-specific workshops, public meetings, discussions with experts and meetings of local authority child performance licensing officers. There was also a workshop with children and a children’s questionnaire. Details of these events are provided in Annex 9. We are grateful for all the contributions, and for the time that people gave to tell us of their views and experiences.
Summary

7. Most people agreed with the aim to increase the opportunities for children to benefit from taking part in performances, and to ensure that children in different areas can access them on an equal basis. The majority felt that some sort of change to performance licensing is required. However, there were some very different views about the direction that change should take. Responses were split on a number of proposals. There were different views about the arrangements needed to increase opportunities whilst protecting children from undue risk. Over half of respondents were not sure that the measures in the consultation would improve equality of opportunity for children.

8. On specific questions about whether the proposals would benefit equality of opportunity:
   - 62% were not sure there would be benefits to boys;
   - 62% were not sure there would be benefits to girls;
   - 67% were not sure there would be benefits to children with a physical or learning disability;
   - 49% thought that the proposals might benefit children from lower income households or different communities, but 48% were not sure.

9. Across all of the questions, respondents raised four key issues in comments and discussion:
   - whether a single approach is appropriate across very different sectors and types of activity;
   - there is a risk of placing local authority resources under unnecessary pressure;
   - there are mixed views about measures to reduce bureaucracy, and the balance of responsibility and decision-making between local authorities and parents; and
   - there are different views on how and where to draw the boundaries between matters of wellbeing and judgements of taste.

Different sectors

10. A ‘one size fits all’ approach to reform was challenged. The current licensing framework applies to a diverse range of activities. For example, modelling in a photographic studio, filming a television programme, recording a voice over, appearing in a big stage production or playing in a professional orchestra are all activities that may require licensing. The same rules and processes apply. A number of respondents felt that more work was needed to reflect the different risks and opportunities in different sectors.
Pressure on local authorities

11. Respondents pointed out that some areas contain a number of organisations that create performance opportunities but in others the opportunities will be fewer. The volume of licence applications will consequently vary, and the resource assigned to carry out the licensing function is likely to reflect that. Respondents felt that this affects the capacity of different areas to manage changes to the rules and processes. Concerns were expressed that blanket requirements to speed up licensing could put undue pressures on local authorities. A number of respondents, from local authorities and production companies, felt that in some sectors it seems reasonable to require producers to think through licensing requirements in advance, and provide a longer period of notice of these requirements than in others.

Mixed views about deregulation

12. The consultation responses were divided as to whether the deregulatory proposals set out would increase opportunities whilst also ensuring children are not exposed to undue risks.

13. Most people agreed that common sense is needed but there was no consensus over who was best placed to exercise that. One view that was often expressed was that there can be a tension between common sense and artistic vision or ambition. Conversely, we also heard the view that common sense could be overridden by an administrative concern to cover every possible eventuality and avoid any kind of risk, leading to an overly bureaucratic and heavy handed approach – which can constrain children’s access to opportunities.

Judgements about the best interests of children

14. There were different views about where the boundary should be drawn between matters of safety and wellbeing, particularly psychological wellbeing, and judgements of taste. Producers and parents were concerned that licensing officers can overstep that boundary, because it is not clearly drawn.

15. Some agencies believed that licensing officers generally need to be more concerned about whether a child may experience embarrassment, or teasing, or stage fright, and that licences should be refused where these issues are a concern. But parents felt that they are better placed to understand what their child wants, what the child is capable of, and how resilient he or she is. They therefore believed that judgements about how well their child may cope with the performance situation and any ensuing attention, and final decisions about whether the child should participate in an activity, should rest with them.
Good practice

16. Examples of effective ways to address some of these issues surfaced during the consultation. We heard about producers and licensing authorities working together from early in the planning stage of productions to identify risks and agree how to manage them in the best interests of children. We learnt of parents being fully involved in licensing decisions and having their views heard. Respondents suggested some simple and practical ways to streamline processes and minimise bureaucracy, such as making greater use of standard application forms, accepting email applications, and making information and training materials available online.

Conclusions

17. All parties agreed that children should be able to benefit from opportunities to take part in performance activities. There were, however, very different views about the arrangements needed to increase opportunities whilst protecting children from undue risk. Respondents to the consultation raised a number of issues that require further consideration. Overall, respondents were not clear that the package of proposals in this consultation would increase equality of opportunity.
Annex 1: When a performance licence is required

The consultation sought views on when a performance licence is required. 92% of respondents agreed that the list of activities set out in paragraph 5.2 of the consultation document should require a licence. But in discussions, it was clear that most people did not feel that the list captured all the circumstances that should be covered or provided enough of a guide for it to be clear when a licence is required and when it is not. The key issues raised by respondents were:

- The difficulty of clearly defining what should be considered a performance activity for licensing purposes, and how this may be consistently applied;
- Whether there is a clear and appropriate division of responsibilities between the licensing system and Ofcom for the protection of children in broadcasting;
- Views were divided on some of the additional activities that should be in scope and those that should be exempt;
- How far a risk assessment carried out by the producer should be used to determine whether a licence is required. Some local authorities queried how they could verify or judge these;
- Who would determine, and how, which activities should be defined as paid sport, with some sports bodies concerned about the implications for sponsorship and support for talent development.

The majority of respondents agreed that a licence should continue to be required, as now, where a child is placed in a circumstance which has been contrived for dramatic or artificial effect, as this presents risks that the child would not be exposed to during the ordinary course of their life. The presumption was that producers should consult the local authority, and that it should be for the local authority to decide if a licence is required, based on an assessment of the extent to which the activity may present risks to the child’s wellbeing. However, a number of respondents felt that deciding what was a ‘contrived activity’ is difficult.

Workshop discussions explored whether it is possible to define a performance activity for licensing purposes. It was widely agreed that any new rules or definitions should be ‘future-proofed’ as far as that is possible. The view was expressed that a prescriptive list of circumstances would be unlikely to capture all those that should be included in a licensing system, including new types of programmes and activities that could develop in future. Although some parties, including a number of licensing officers, felt that a clear list or definition would be helpful, there were no ready answers as to what should be captured within it.

Broadcasters, agents and other organisations noted that the participation of children in all programmes was in any case covered by the rules contained in the Ofcom Broadcasting
Code, which all UK broadcasters are required to follow. The Code includes specific provisions for the protection of children who take part in radio and television programmes. The broadcasting sector felt that, even where programmes clearly do fall within scope of the licensing requirements, some aspects of the production should not be part of the licensing considerations – issues of artistic and editorial control are addressed through the broadcast regulator.

Views were divided over whether some additional activities should require a licence, or whether they should be exempt.

**Q2. Do you think there are other activities which should be included in the list of those that require a licence?**

There were 201 responses to this question. 76 (38%) of respondents thought that other activities should be included in the list of those that require a licence. The main activities they thought should be included were beauty pageants, dance and talent competitions and student films.

**Q3. Do you think any of these activities should be exempt from the licensing requirements?**

There were 198 responses. 28 (14%) of the respondents thought that some of the activities listed should be exempt from licensing requirements. Activities that it was suggested should be exempt included: auditions; charity shows; unpaid work such as student films; and activities organised by dance or stage schools.

In discussions, many people said that events designed to raise money for charity or, for example, to raise funds to support the amateur group or the sports or gymnastics club, should be exempt from licensing. The idea that the need for a licence could be determined on the basis of a risk assessment carried out by the producer or organiser was not universally welcomed. Licensing officers questioned how they could verify the assumptions in such assessments. There were questions as to whether a nationally agreed model for risk assessments could be workable or applicable across all types of activity, and whether an approach based on a risk assessment model could result in more bureaucracy for both producers and local authorities, and thus reduce opportunities for children.

People from many different sectors expressed the view that any proposal to extend a licensing regime to performances on the internet where the intention is to profit financially is unworkable in practice.

Despite the headline responses to this question, many of the written responses questioned the need for performance licences based solely on whether the premises that the children will perform in are licenced to sell alcohol. This was echoed in the workshops and discussions.
The legislation sets out that if a child is not paid (apart from expenses) then a licence is not required for up to four days of performances in any six month period. Concerns were raised by local authorities about how often this might be used inappropriately to by-pass licensing requirements.

**Q4. Do you think we should keep the four day rule, reduce the amount of days in the rule, or scrap the rule?**

**Q5. If you think the rule should be scrapped, how many days do you think should be allowed before a licence is required?**

There were 202 responses to Q4. 54% thought the rule should be scrapped, and 41% thought the rule should be kept. Most of those who felt the rule should be kept felt that it was necessary because in some areas it was the only way to enable a child to take part in a production in the time available. There was no overall consensus in the responses to Q5.

A performance licence is required for a child to take part in paid sport. This was introduced in 1998, in order to implement requirements agreed in the 1994 European Directive on the protection of young people at work. The consultation proposed that responsibility for meeting this requirement should transfer from local authorities to recognised sports governing bodies.

**Q6. Do you think responsibility for safeguarding in sport should sit with sports governing bodies, local authorities, or elsewhere?**

There were 176 responses to this question. 103 (59%) thought that responsibility should move to sports governing bodies. But 59 respondents (34%) were not sure. Local authorities said they are rarely contacted about performance licensing for children to take part in paid sport.
Annex 2: Amateur sector

The consultation explored questions about the regulation of the amateur sector, which provides a significant number of opportunities for children to perform and be otherwise involved in productions.

The key concerns that were raised in responses and discussions with the amateur sector were that the requirements for licensing children can be burdensome, and that this can lead to decisions to exclude children from opportunities to take part. Respondents from amateur theatre groups also expressed concerns that the requirement for local authority approval of chaperones was unnecessary and bureaucratic, and made it difficult to recruit and appoint people to this role, again leading to a barrier to the involvement of children in productions.

The legislation allows for a ‘Body of Persons Approval’ to be granted to an organisation, meaning that individual licences do not need to be obtained for the children who are participating in a performance put on by that organisation. This type of approval can only be provided where the children are not paid. This process also allows the local authority to exercise greater flexibility than offered through individual licensing. This ‘light touch’ approach can reduce administrative burdens for amateur groups and organisations as well as for local authorities, and many respondents said that it was a positive approach which could address a number of problems with licensing. However, responses and discussions revealed that in some areas this approach is not used and there seems to be a lack of awareness of it.

69% of all respondents agreed that this type of approval should be allowed to be given where children are paid, not just when they are unpaid. The rationale for the consultation proposal to allow this only where the children are aged 13 or over was questioned by many people. The EU Directive (94/33/EC) on the protection of young people at work makes clear that children under 13 must be subject to prior authorisation in individual cases.

Amateur groups of all kinds complained that the requirements for licensing or approvals are a significant burden, where volunteers have to bear the cost and the weight of the administration involved. The consultation proposed a registration scheme for amateur groups.

Q13. Do you agree with the proposal to register amateur organisations rather than license individual children?

There were 199 responses to this question, and 139 (70%) agreed. Only 10 respondents (5%) disagreed, but those who did so had strong views about the risks to children if a registration scheme was lacking in rigorous checks. The 50 (25%) of respondents who were not sure included those who commented that standard processes, minimum
standards and best practice guidelines would be necessary to help amateur groups comply with safeguarding requirements. Some amateur groups cautioned against the development of a scheme that could involve just as much, but different, paperwork and bureaucracy.

It was suggested that a registration scheme could replace licensing for all types of performance activity – it should not be confined to the amateur sector (which is not a term that everyone defined in the same way). It was felt that a similar approach could be adopted for advertising and photographic modelling work, where the same agencies tend to use the same studios, so the people involved and the premises should be familiar to the licensing officer.

Many amateur groups expressed concern about the requirements and process for the approval of chaperones. The legislation sets out the need for such approvals, but does not specify the approval criteria to be applied by the local authority, and the approach can vary. Groups reported that in some cases the approach is overly bureaucratic, for example requiring checks on someone’s suitability to work with children when they have been a primary school teacher for a number of years.

The consultation proposed that producers in the amateur sector should take responsibility for selecting chaperones. Strong and opposing views were expressed about this proposal, and in discussions these proved resistant to attempts to reconcile the different views and reach a compromise proposal on which all could agree.
Annex 3: Chaperones

Q19. Do you think that the proposal that the amateur sector approve their own chaperones provides sufficient safeguards for children?

There were 196 responses to this question. 107 respondents (55%) disagreed with this proposal. 36 (18%) replies agreed, and 53 (27%) were not sure.

We received a large number of written comments on this proposal. Case studies were provided to illustrate how the use of approved chaperones had averted risks to children. Conversely, a number of cases were cited to illustrate how the approval requirements have presented difficulties for the amateur sector, in circumstances where they could not see a good reason for them and did not feel that any value was added in terms of improved safeguarding for children.

One view is that it is essential that chaperones have some aspect of independence in order that they can challenge producers where necessary. An approval process can ensure that they have the confidence and knowledge to act in the best interests of the child at all times. The relationship with the local authority can ensure chaperones have an avenue to seek advice and support, and to report concerns that might warrant investigation.

In some areas local authorities have tried to address the difficulties of accessing training and to reduce the bureaucracy of an approval process. The amateur sector welcomed these developments, but felt that good practice is patchy and in some places seems unlikely to be adopted.

The regulations say that a chaperone must supervise no more than 12 children at a time. The consultation sought views on whether the maximum number of children a chaperone can look after should be reduced to 10. A significant majority of those who responded to the written consultation (70% of responses) agreed with this, but a less prescriptive view emerged in discussions and workshops, where it was suggested that the number of children for whom a chaperone should be responsible should depend on the circumstances. Local authorities, producers and chaperones said that looking after 12 children is not usually practical, although it could be in some circumstances. The appropriate ratio will depend on factors such as the nature of the activity, its duration and venue, the needs and the age range of the children. It was felt that this should be factored into risk assessments, which should be the basis for determining the ratio appropriate for the circumstances.
Annex 4: Licensing process

There were a number of concerns about the process of licensing. A key issue for all producers and parents was the length of time it can take to apply for and obtain a licence, and that this process does not take account of the different sorts of activity and sectors involved. Some local authorities felt there was a need for statutory guidance to ensure consistency of approach.

The legislation allows a local authority to require 21 days’ notice of a requirement for a licence. This is not a prescribed amount of time that must be taken to process a licence application, and many local authorities said that they are geared to issue straightforward licences within a few days. However, some parents told us that in some areas the 21 day notice period is imposed for all performance licence applications.

The consultation proposed that the 21 day period be reduced to 10 working days.

Q26. Do you agree that the notice period for a requirement for a licence should be reduced from 21 days to 10?

There were 204 responses to this question, fairly evenly split between those who agreed and those who did not. 86 (42%) felt that the notice period should be reduced, whereas 89 (44%) felt it should not.

Local authorities thought that 10 working days did not provide sufficient time during peak periods such as the pantomime season. Also the reduction in the processing time would place pressure on areas that are already struggling with the availability of resource and could lead to a lack of cover in other roles.

The point was made, by local authorities, parents and the advertising sector, that many authorities already issue licences in a shorter timeframe. This could be the first step in reducing the inconsistency in timescales and could increase opportunities for children to perform. Some producers said that they only choose children from “licence friendly local authorities” which have a faster turnaround. Parents said that sometimes children are passed over for a part and a young looking adult is chosen to play the role of a child in order to avoid the process.

All respondents acknowledged that some activities and some sectors do need to cast at short notice and require licences to be processed quickly. The advertising and modelling sector felt that provision ought to be made to allow for ‘fast track’ applications for their sector, as the nature of the marketing industry demands a rapid response. They felt that straightforward applications should be turned around in 36 or 48 hours.

Conversely, a range of respondents suggested that shows such as pantomimes and musicals, films and television programmes are usually planned and cast a long time in advance, and could give longer notice than 21 days. Local authorities felt that this would
avoid a build-up of pressure on local authority staff at peak times such as the pantomime season.

The consultation asked whether the local authority powers to approve place and lodgings should be repealed. Again views were evenly split. 49% of responses to the question about the power to approve the place of performance said that the power should be retained and not repealed. 43% wanted the power to approve lodgings to be retained. Local authorities felt that they need to manage the risk that children could be placed in inappropriate venues or accommodation. Some licensing officers suggested that parents like to have assurance that the local authority has approved the venue. Other respondents felt that this should be left to the chaperones as they are responsible for making sure arrangements are suitable.

The consultation asked whether there should be more flexibility allowed in the dates that performances are to take place. 46% of respondents did not want to allow flexibility in the dates that performances can take place, believing that licences should specify dates and stick to them. Some local authorities said that they need certainty in the dates in order to carry out meaningful visits to check the arrangements. Others commented that schools also need to have certainty on the dates, in order to authorise absence.

40% of respondents did not agree that the requirements for keeping records should be streamlined. Local authorities said these act as a check that the rules with regard to breaks and hours are being adhered to. The records might be needed if a complaint was received about the hours a child was being asked to perform.

Local authorities also have a power to stipulate how a proportion of a child’s earnings from performances should be saved. The vast majority of written responses (72% of those replying to this question) agreed that this power should be repealed. None of the written responses were received from children. In discussions with children, some of them suggested that earnings above a certain threshold should be set aside for when they are older, and that the local authority should ensure that parents do this. In the workshop with parents, the view was expressed that parents should not have the final say about a child’s earnings, and that over a certain threshold (which should not be per performance, but cumulative over a period of time), earnings should be put in trust for the child.

Most respondents, including a magistrate, agreed that responsibility for licensing children to perform abroad should sit with local authorities, and not with magistrates’ courts. In the written responses to the consultation 88% of responses to this question agreed with this proposal. Some local authorities expressed concerns about how they could assure themselves that suitable arrangements were in place to protect children when they are abroad. Producers were of the view that chaperones, and not parents, should be entrusted with this responsibility. Broadcasters and production companies said that experienced and professional chaperones should be a requirement for all types of
performances abroad, and said that insurance companies will usually insist on this before they will insure the production.
Annex 5: Licensing conditions

There are a number of detailed and complicated rules that are attached to a performance licence. The consultation proposed a number of changes to simplify, clarify and deregulate the licensing conditions. Most respondents agreed with the intention and thrust of the proposals. The majority of the comments in written responses and in discussions, particularly from parents and local authorities, concerned the role of schools in encouraging and supporting children to take part in external activities, and ensuring that their education does not suffer as a consequence.

A number of parents said that some schools are unwilling to authorise a child to be absent from school so that they can take part in performances. They felt that these decisions were not always based on the child’s educational needs or concerns about their attainment. Some local authorities suggested that this may be due to the categories used for recording absences, and that these should be reviewed. In discussion at an open consultation event, attendees felt that the reasons head teachers refuse to authorise absence tend to be because the child has exams or too much unauthorised absence. They all agreed that the child’s education should take precedence over performance activities.

The consultation proposed that there should be greater flexibility in the rules about when tuition must be provided. 74% of respondents welcomed this proposal. 100 (53%) of the written responses agreed that tuition should continue to be required from the 2nd day of absence from school. In a number of discussions, local authority licensing officers said that the requirements for tuition were unclear and, for short engagements, not widely enforced. They felt that the essential requirement should be that schools are content with any arrangements for tuition.

The legislation places restrictions on issuing licences to children under 14 unless they are for singing, dancing, acting or taking part in a musical performance.

Q14. Do you agree with the proposal to lift restrictions to licensing children under the age of fourteen?

There were 198 responses to this question. 92% agreed to lifting restrictions on the types of performance that children under 14 can be licensed to take part in.

The regulations covering the hours a child can perform and attend performance activities are currently split according to whether the performance is broadcast or recorded, or in a theatre, or elsewhere. Some flexibility beyond the latest permitted hour can be granted, but only for productions that take place outdoors. The consultation proposed a simplified set of rules for hours of attendance and performance, and the breaks that a child must have, based on their age. It also suggested extending the flexibility available to the local authority to a wider range of circumstances.
There were 204 written responses to the proposal for a new framework covering the hours of performance. 165 (81%) agreed with the hours proposed within a streamlined set of rules. Some local authority responses expressed concerns that the hours allowed for younger children seemed too long and that travelling time and breaks could make these hours excessive for children of all ages. Children agreed that the journey home should be taken into account when working out how late they could stay. In the workshop with children, the group concluded that the final decision on the hours of work should be made by the chaperone – as long as the children have a say.

Work which does not require a child to play a part (such as performing in a chorus) is known as ‘troupe work’ and there are restrictions on the number of engagements and their duration where a child is required to live away from home. The consultation proposed to lift these restrictions. There were 182 responses to this, and a majority of 125 (69%) agreed with the proposal. Most local authorities expressed the view that this was an outdated and seldom used part of the legislation.

There were no objections from any respondents to the proposal to remove the requirement for up to date medical certificates before a licence can be granted. Local authorities said that they would want to request one in the rare circumstances where they might feel it was necessary, although that might be more relevant to some more physical activities.
Annex 6: Equality of opportunity

The consultation sought evidence and views about the implications of the proposals for equality of opportunity. In the written responses:

- 62% were not sure there would be benefits to boys;
- 62% were not sure there would be benefits to girls;
- 67% were not sure there would be benefits to children with a physical or learning disability;
- 49% thought that the proposals might benefit children from lower income households or different communities, but 48% were not sure.

Respondents from all sectors felt that the proposal to remove the requirement for medical certificates would have a positive impact on equality of opportunity. It would address barriers to access for children from lower income households because they would not have to pay for a certificate, which can be prohibitively expensive in some areas. One local authority suggested that part of any new registration scheme for amateur groups could include training or awareness sessions about equality issues.
Annex 7: Enforcement

The majority of local authorities felt that it was essential that their ‘power of entry’ be maintained. This should not be replaced with a licence condition to allow inspections, as the power may need to be exercised where a producer has not sought a licence or an approval. In discussions, local authorities said that this power was not often used, but its existence is a useful backup, and invested them with the necessary authority to gain access to producers and work with them to develop safeguarding arrangements.

Q30. Do you think we should replace the power of entry with a condition in the licence or approval?

There were 199 responses to this question. 56% of these said no, 32% said yes, and 13% were not sure.

The consultation asked for evidence on the case for changing the penalties for non-compliance with the requirements for licensing child performers. Local authority licensing officers expressed the view that their authorities would be very unlikely to want to bring prosecutions for this. Parents and chaperones also felt that there were cases where more enforcement was necessary. Those involved in the broadcasting and advertising industries suggested that the risk of large fines for significant breaches of the rules would have the most impact. No respondents felt that short prison terms were a necessary, appropriate or effective deterrent.
Annex 8: Consultation document responses

The consultation was a joint consultation with Wales. Respondents who ticked ‘other’ were either responding from the UK or from England and Wales.

Please select the appropriate box to indicate whether you are responding from England or Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Across Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England:</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The organisational breakdown of respondents was as follows:

Please mark the category which best describes you as a respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Across Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority:</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film/Broadcasting/Production Company:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling Agency:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaperone:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Carer:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Industry:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Industry:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Association:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage School:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Academy:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses for the ‘Other’ category included:

- members of the public
- local authority licensing officers responding in a personal capacity
- amateur dramatic societies, dance groups, dance/drama schools and theatres
- youth theatres
- parents of child performers
- managers of child performers
- ASCL (Association of School and College Leaders)
- NSPCC and other children’s charities
- Professional associations
- NNCEE (National Network for Children in Entertainment and Employment)
- Agencies employing child performers
- Photography companies
- Teachers, serving and retired, primary and secondary
- British Psychological Society
- National Operatic and Dramatic Association (NODA)
- The Scout Association
- The Walt Disney Company Limited
- The Little Theatre Guild
- Casting Directors
- Equity
- Child Safeguarding Board chair
- Theatres/venues
- Art director at a creative agency
- Professional and amateur directors
- Arts Council England
- The Society of London Theatre (SOLT) and the Theatrical Management Association (TMA).
Annex 9: Additional consultation events and sources of evidence

11 May 2012: Round table meeting attended by: British Psychological Society, NODA, SOLTTMA, PACT, NNCEE, the NSPCC, Sarah Thane CBE as the author of the child performance review, Barnardo’s, the Little Theatre Guild, the Sport and Recreation Alliance, the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS), the BBC, Channel 4, the Mindful Policy Group, the Elizabeth Smith Agency, Kenwright and the Dudley Education Investigation Service Head.

26 June 2012: Meeting with Sport and Recreation Alliance – Dance Division.

Child performance questionnaire. Designed to elicit the views of children involved in performances, this slimmed down questionnaire asked questions on 8 themes. 32 responses were received. Some had been completed as group responses.

28 June 2012: Workshop with 15 local authority representatives from the South West.

29 June 2012: Interactive workshop with 23 children, ages 7 to 15, at Dean Academy of Performing Arts.

June 2012: Workshop with 8 parents of children involved in performance arts, Blackpool.

2 July 2012: NNCEE AGM (more than 50 members of the National Network for Children in Entertainment and Employment

9 July 2012: Amateur sector workshop, attended by representatives from the Welsh Government, NODA, the Little Theatre Guild, the NNCEE and the Scout Association.

12 July 2012: Modelling workshop, attended by representatives from NNCEE, The Mindful Policy Group, two agencies who deal with child models, 2 parents, the Association of Photographers and the Institute of Practitioners in Advertising

12 July 2012: TV workshop, attended by representatives from the BBC, Ofcom, PACT, NNCEE, Channel 4 and the Mindful Policy Group. Additional attendees included Sarah Thane CBE as the author of the *Exploratory review of the system of regulating child performances*, a child psychologist, a parent representative and a child agent.

16 July 2012: Sport workshop, attended by representatives from the DCMS, the Youth Sport Trust, Sport and Recreation UK, the Lawn Tennis Association, British Gymnastics and the NSPCC Children in Sport unit.
18 July 2012: Professional theatre workshop, attended by representatives from the NNCEE, the West End, the Society of London Theatres/Theatre Managers Association, a dance academy, Voluntary Arts and an acting coach, a representative and a chaperone.

19 July 2012: Open consultation event in Manchester.

27 July 2012: Open consultation event in Bristol.