

## **Early Childhood Education in Spain (1993-2007)**

**Paper for the annual conference of The European Group of Public Administration, Third Sector Study Group, Madrid, 19-22 September 2007**

By Isabel Vidal  
[ividal@grupcies.com](mailto:ividal@grupcies.com)

### **I. Introduction**

The process of making early childhood education services universal is recent in Spain. There are two main reasons to explain why the Spanish authorities finally decided to dedicate public resources to create school places for children under six years of age. The main reason is internal, the robust economic growth registered by the Spanish economy since 1995. Extensive economic growth has facilitated the incorporation of women, young people and people from other countries into the labor force. This increase in the working population has increased tax revenue and has reduced public spending on unemployment benefits. At the same time, this has made the demand for certain social services more of a priority, leading to the start up or the speeding up of new social policies. The second reason is external and is related to the function of the European Commission to encourage its member governments to make a commitment to social policy. These two reasons are the vectors that have facilitated the implementation of early childhood education in Spain in the past five years.

#### *Overall objective:*

This report examines the introduction of early childhood education in the different autonomous communities and cities.

#### *Specific objectives:*

1. The evolution of schooling rates for children between the ages of three and five by autonomous community and city.
2. The distribution of school places in the second cycle of early childhood education according to legal status of schools and by autonomous community and city.
3. The evolution of schooling rates for children under three years of age by autonomous community and city.
4. The distribution of school places in the first cycle of early childhood education according to legal status of schools and by autonomous community and city.

## *Methodology*

The type of analysis utilized is aggregate level, macro analysis. The current situation is examined based on the assumption that in the past five years early childhood education has advanced as a consequence of greater involvement by the education authorities.

This report is based on the analysis of data on non-university education provided by the Ministry of Education and Science (2007) available on their webpage [www.mec.es](http://www.mec.es). This data base is used to achieve two objectives:

1. To document the evolution in the implementation of early childhood education.
2. To analyze the agents involved in the implementation of early childhood education.

The variable chosen is number of school places since the principal objective of this report is to document the level and rhythm of the introduction of early childhood education into Spain.

As the data provided by the Ministry of Education and Science does not include information on school places provided by publically-funded private schools it has not been possible to include which private schools work in network with the educational authorities in the provision of early childhood education.

All of the tables utilized can be found in the appendix at the end of the report.

## *The institutional framework of early childhood education*

There are two cycles in early childhood education. The first cycle is for children from under one year old up to two years old, and the second cycle is for children from three to five years old. Early childhood education is voluntary and was established for the first time as an educational level in the Spanish education system by the General Law of Education of 1970. The educational law of 1990, the Ley Organica de Ordenacion General del Sistema Educativo (LOGSE) (Law on the General Organization of the Educational System) regulated the organization of this stage of education by establishing the two previously cited cycles. The current Education Law 2/2006 (Ley Orgánica 2/2006) from Education on 3 May (BOE, number 106), required that the second cycle of early childhood education be free of charge starting in the academic year 2006-2007. To meet the demand of families the education administrations must provide a sufficient number of places in their educational program in public schools and publically-funded private schools (The Education Law 2/2006: Ley Orgánica 2/2006 de Educación, article 15, section 2). The introduction and management of

education policy is the competence of the governments of the autonomous communities and cities.

The first cycle of early childhood education is regulated but is not free, and the public administrations do not guarantee that the demand by families will be covered in public schools and publically-funded private schools.

### *Structure*

This report is organized into five sections in addition to this introduction. The second section analyzes the implementation of the second cycle of early childhood education in Spain. It studies the evolution of schooling rates from 1993 to 2007. It shows the significant difference in schooling rates in the different autonomous communities and cities in 1993 and points out the superb effort made by the autonomous communities and cities with lower levels of schooling to guarantee a school place for all children from three years old and up in the academic year 2006-2007. Having achieved a rate of almost 100% schooling for children over two years of age is one of the most important advances in social policy in this country in the past twenty years. The second section of the report also analyzes schooling rates by type of school: private or public. The data shows that the majority of places are in public schools. Regarding places in private schools, although the number of places in publically-funded private schools is not provided in the data, it is assumed to be a high percentage. The third section analyzes the provision of first cycle early childhood education in Spain. The first cycle is in its early stages, but it is the level with the highest rate of increase of school places. Because provision of places for the first cycle of early childhood education is voluntary for the education administrations, the number of places in private schools is greater than in public, and the highest percentage of these is in private schools that are not publically-funded. This third section also emphasizes the co-management that has been established between the autonomous and municipal governments in order to create new municipal schools to provide the first cycle in early childhood education. The fourth is the conclusions, fifth and sixth are notes and bibliography respectively, and finally there is an appendix containing the statistics included in this report.

## **II. Schooling rates for children over two years of age**

The information available for the academic year 2003-2004 shows that only some countries such as France and Belgium had achieved 100% schooling for three year old children. In the opposite extreme was The Netherlands with a schooling rate of 1 out of 100 (see appendix, table number 1). In the case of Spain, it has taken more than thirty-five years to bring about universal education in the second cycle of early childhood education; from 1970, when early childhood education was first recognized as a level in the education system (General Law of Education of 1970) until the academic year 2006-2007. In the academic year 2006-2007, 97.5% of three year old children and 100% of four and five year old children were enrolled in school (table number 2). With this important and long awaited accomplishment,

the option of children being educated at home as opposed to sending them to early childhood education centers has also been respected.

### *The process of implementing the second cycle of early childhood education in Spain*

Table 2 shows the evolution in schooling rates for three year old children for the period between the academic years 1993-1994 and 2006-2007. During this period there was outstanding growth in schooling rates: from 53% in 1993-1994 to over 97% in 2006-2007.

### *Academic year 1993-1994: great territorial diversity in schooling rates for three year old children*

A closer look at table 2 also shows that in the academic year 1993-1994 the schooling rate for three year olds varied greatly in different regions of the country, with the autonomous community of the Basque Country standing out with 100% schooling while in Andalucía only 16% of three year old children were being schooled. This 84 point difference between these two autonomous communities is indicative of the difference in effort made to implement the same educational policies by different education authorities within the country.

### *Effort made to achieve similar levels of schooling*

However, table 2 also shows how those autonomous communities starting out with very low levels of schooling for three year olds in the academic year 1993-1994 made an important effort to bring the schooling rates up to or to surpass the national average by the academic year 2006-2007. This is the case of Andalucía and the Canary Islands.

### *Minor presence of school places in private schools*

The two principal providers of school places in the second cycle of early childhood education are the public schools under the jurisdiction of the autonomous governments<sup>2</sup> and the publically-funded private schools.

Schools can opt for providing the two cycles of early childhood education or for one of the two cycles. Of the different ways to create school places for children under six (first, second cycle and today, progressive implementation of first cycle), the way that has been most utilized has been to provide the second cycle of early childhood education in those schools already offering the subsequent levels of education<sup>3</sup>. Under the headings public and private, table 3 shows the schools that offered schooling for children from three to six years old for the academic years 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. In the two academic years analyzed, public school places in the second cycle of early childhood education accounted for 68% of total places offered; therefore, direct management predominates in the second cycle of early childhood education.

An analysis at the territorial level shows that there are differences in rates of children enrolled in public schools and in private schools among the different autonomous communities. A comparison of the autonomous community with the highest rate of enrolment in private schools and the community with the lowest rate of enrolment in private schools shows a 32 point difference in the academic year 2006-2007.

The question to look at then is why the rate of school places in private schools is approximately 50% in the Basque Country while in Castilla la Mancha the rate is only 18%. From the available data it can be deduced that the autonomous communities where the education authorities began to implement the second cycle of early childhood education sooner have a higher number of school places in private schools. On the contrary, the autonomous communities where the education authorities began to implement this cycle later and therefore have had a shorter period for its full implementation are those with the largest number of places in public schools.

### **III. Schooling rates for children between the ages of under one year old and two years old**

The next objective of the education authorities is to gradually increase the number of school places for children under three years old<sup>4</sup>, beginning by prioritizing free schooling for two year olds. Based on the data available, table 4 contains the schooling rate for children between the ages of under one year old and two years old in nursery schools recognized by the Ministry of Education and Science, by autonomous community for the academic years 2003-2004, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007.

*Low schooling rate but with rapid creation of school places for children between the ages of under one and two years old*

The national rate of schooling for children under three was 18% in the academic year 2006-2007, having registered a growth of 34% in the period from 2003 to 2007<sup>5</sup>. The information included in table 4 shows that all of the autonomous communities, with the exception of the Canary Islands, registered increases in their schooling rates in the period between 2003 and 2007. In only three academic years, Asturias quadrupled its rate, although its schooling rate is still only 8.7 out of 100. Cantabria tripled its rate, reaching 16.5 out of 100 in the schooling rate for children under three.

*Strong territorial inequality in schooling rates for children between the ages of under one and two years old*

There are significant differences in schooling rates for children between the ages of under one and two years old among the different autonomous communities and cities. For the academic year 2006-2007, table 4 shows that the autonomous communities registering the highest schooling rates for children under one to two years old were The Basque Country (48.3%), Madrid (32.9%), Catalonia (32.1%) and Aragon (30.4%). The autonomous communities registering the lowest schooling rates were The Canary Islands (0%), Castilla la Mancha (2.5%), and Extremadura (2.9%). There was a 48

point difference between the community with the highest schooling rate and the community with the lowest. Why is there such great disparity between the Canary Islands with 0% and the Basque Country with 48.3%? To understand these differences it is necessary to refer to what the French literature calls the territorial matrix; that is, the institutional, economic, social and historical framework in which education policy has developed. Territory is understood to mean a place with a strong specific historical identity; it is not a neutral variable (Vidal 2006).

*Providers of school places for children under three: dominance of private school places*

The providers of school places for children under three can be public schools - under the jurisdiction of the autonomous and local governments- and private schools. Below we will analyze the distribution of school places between public and private schools. Table 5 shows the supply of school places for the academic years 2003-2004, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. Unlike what occurred with the distribution of enrolment in the second cycle of early childhood education where nationally the number of school places in public schools was greater than in private schools, in the first cycle the situation is the opposite. In this cycle, the number of places in private schools is greater than in public schools. Table 5 shows that 56.8% of school places in the first cycle of early childhood education were provided by private schools in the academic year 2006-2007. It is important to note that these places were probably in schools that are not publically-funded. If the practice of co-management between public administrations and the private sector in the provision of the first cycle exists at all, it is in its early stages and is not a developed practice.

*Predominance of places in public schools among newly-created places in the period 2003-2007*

If the number of places offered in 2003-2004 is compared to the number offered in 2006-2007, it is clear that the number of places in public schools is growing at a faster rate than the number in private schools; the result is the relative reduction in places in private schools in relation to places in public schools. For the academic year 2006-2007, seven autonomous communities reduced the percentage of places in private schools.

*Networking among territorial administrations: mechanisms for the creation of new school places in the first cycle of early childhood education*

What mechanism is used most frequently by the education authorities in the autonomous governments to create new school places for children under three? The most frequently chosen option is through coordination with municipal governments. Why this change in strategy on the part of the education authorities compared to the strategy employed for the creation of school places for children over three? A simple and working explanation is that in the case of schooling for children over three the private sector was already working in this area, so the new education administrations chose to work in network with existing private programs and create public places in areas not covered by the private sector. In addition, the predominant

mechanism for the creation of second cycle school places was to utilize schools already offering the higher levels of formal education and to expand them.

In the case of children under three, the offer of school places in private schools is minor or non-existent. Moreover, by law nursery schools providing the first cycle of early childhood education cannot be located in the same buildings as schools providing the other levels of formal non-university education.

In order to build a new school there must be land available, and the transfer of land for the construction of new schools is the responsibility of the municipal governments. In short, the education authorities of the autonomous governments work in network with the municipal governments, and the result of this co-management between the two public administrations is to promote the construction of first cycle nursery schools under the ownership of the municipal governments<sup>6</sup>. This networking between two public administrations explains the rapid growth of school places in the first cycle of early childhood education in the period from 2003- 2005.

#### *The cost to families for schooling children under three years of age*

The first cycle of early childhood education is not free of charge. As a result, parents must pay something for it. This can be a partial payment in the case of places in a public center or full payment in a private center that is not publically-funded.

The cost for places in a public center is a policy decision made by each education administration for each academic year. In Spain there are nineteen different prices, as many different prices as there are autonomous communities and cities. For example, In Catalonia, a place in the first cycle in a public center cost 159€ a month with lunch included and 73€ a month without lunch during the academic year 2006-2007. The average cost of a place in a non-publically-funded private school was around 350€ a month including lunch.

#### **IV. Conclusions**

The first conclusion that can be drawn from the information analyzed is that in Spain there is a different education policy in each autonomous community and city. Differences in when education authorities decide to initiate the development of early childhood education, differences in schooling rates for children of the same age as well as differences in models of networking permit us to speak of early childhood education policies in plural. It is also possible to talk about education policies in the plural in reference to the higher education levels corresponding to certified formal education (Vidal 2007). Even though in certified formal education there are no differences in terms of schooling rates among the autonomous communities and cities, there are differences in the forms of networking between public administrations and private providers of school places (Vidal 2007).

The development of the second cycle of early childhood education has been accompanied by an increase in places in public schools as well as in publically-funded private schools. Although it has not been possible to confirm, this means that organizations belonging to the Third Sector have probably taken advantage of this historic opportunity to create new school places. However, taking advantage of the expansion of the sector does not mean parent and teacher associations and cooperatives have gained more importance relative to the private sector in providing community childcare services. In the case of France, Eme and Fraisse (2002) point out that over the course of the preceding ten years two-thirds of new school places were provided by associations. As a result, in 31 out of 100 cases the supply of community childcare services in the year 2002 was provided by centers run by associations which operated 3,700 centers with 87,000 places working in co-management with the municipal authorities. In conclusion, Fraisse (2006) wrote that the development of community childcare services was an opportunity for the development of associations in the sector. This conclusion does not appear to be valid in the case of early childhood education in Spain. Based on the findings of the European Project *Changing Family Structures and Social Policies: Childcare Services* (TSFEPS) <sup>8</sup> Vidal and Claver (2003) reached the conclusion that networking relationships between education authorities and the Third Sector are the same as networking relationships between the education authorities and the private sector in general. After five years, it did not appear that networking and co-management between the education authorities and the Third Sector had increased any more than between the education authorities and the rest of the private organizations.

The Spanish social welfare model has been characterized by an historic weakness in its social policies for families. The education policies promoting school places for children under six have reduced this weakness. With the development of the second cycle of early childhood education the Spanish model of social welfare has become less family based and is moving progressively closer toward the continental model of social welfare that has prevailed in countries such as France and Belgium for more than forty years. An important characteristic of this continental model of social welfare is having the public resources to facilitate the financing or co-financing of community services that are universal and free-of-charge. In countries such as Belgium and France where the family policies demanded by other countries have already been implemented, new areas of analysis are focusing on creating support for providing public resources to promote new community out-of-school services that complement early childhood education, through co-management with organizations of the Third Sector. In Belgium, Lhuiller (2002 and 2003) raised the need for developing community childcare services for children under six that complement school activities. In the preface to a report published in 2006, the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions pointed out that there had been enough reflection on the positive external factors generating public policies in early childhood education, and that now we should focus on the public promotion of community out-of-school activities (Elniff, Dreyling and William 2006). This focus clashes with the literature coming out of the USA which dominates the liberal model of social welfare.

Warner (2006) advocates for the American public authorities getting involved in the development of early childhood education as one of the key lines of regional and community development. As can be observed, public resources are at the base of this discussion. The European Project *Changing Family Structures and Social Policies: Childcare Services* (TSFEPS)<sup>9</sup> showed overwhelmingly that if early childhood education is going to become universal, the education authorities must get involved by providing the resources. Young families cannot afford to pay the total cost of school places. As is demonstrated in this report, the second cycle of early childhood education has become entirely developed as the education authorities have begun to contribute the resources.

In the case of Spain, things are less optimistic in the development of the first cycle of early childhood education. The Education law 2/2006 does not require the autonomous communities to guarantee a school place free of charge for all children even though it recommends a progressive increase. At this age, the rate of school enrolment is low- 18% for the academic year 2006-2007- although a growth rate of more than 34% was registered in only three academic years, and at present, it is the education cycle that is registering the greatest increase in the creation of new school places in the majority of autonomous communities. The data also show that the process of creating school places for children under one year old to two years old is not going to be homogeneous for all of Spain. Some autonomous communities are moving faster than others with the Basque Country taking the lead in this process.

To bring things to a close, it is important to mention that in Spain social services for children have not focused on providing individual aid. The model of public aid to families has been to provide community services, and above all, education services. The public management of services for children is decentralized and is mainly the responsibility of the territorial administrations- autonomous and local. Today, an important objective of the education authorities is the construction of a public model of support for the family based on the dynamic growth of school places for children under three. It has not been easy to reach this point and possibly many families wish this had been accomplished by the mid-eighties when the Spanish woman decisively entered into the labor market.

## **V. Notes**

<sup>1</sup> This report does not analyze the different models of childcare. The Spanish experience based on family support and the informal economy consisted of organizational forms that hindered equal opportunity and quality of service. For a more detailed analysis on this aspect the reader should consult the research reports of the Project *Changing Family Structures and Evolution of Social Policies: Childcare Services* (TSFEPS) available on the webpage: [www.emes.net](http://www.emes.net)

<sup>2</sup> In the second cycle of early childhood education the municipal governments do not play an important role as providers of school places with some exceptions.

<sup>3</sup> Experts in pedagogy recommended that early childhood education should include two cycles and that it should take place in schools separate from

those offering the higher levels of education. However, organizational considerations have taken precedence over the pedagogical recommendations.

<sup>4</sup> The Education Law of May 2006 in article 15, section 1 states that "The public administrations will promote a progressive increase in the number of public places offered in the first cycle."

<sup>5</sup> The Strategic National Plan for Childhood and Adolescence (Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, 2006) includes in objective 8.3 having a rate of 33% of children under three in public schools by the year 2010. This objective of the strategic plan refers to a national average. The challenge is to achieve this in each of the autonomous communities.

<sup>6</sup> Example: "The mayor of Barcelona signed an agreement with the Councilor of Education and Universities (of the government of the Generalitat of Catalonia) to create 2,190 school places in the first cycle of early childhood education in the city of Barcelona between 2006 and 2009 which means that Barcelona will build a total of 26 new municipal nursery schools. The Generalitat of Catalonia will contribute 6,000€ for each new place created and between 1,200€ and 1,800€ toward maintaining each place. This information is found in the article *The city will have nearly 5,400 nursery school places in public schools in 2009*, which was published on the webpage of the Barcelona municipal government ([www.bcn.es](http://www.bcn.es)) on 26 June, 2006 at 16.08. Webpage consulted 10 August 2006.

<sup>7</sup> *EDU order/329/2006, 22 June by which the public prices of nursery school services under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education and Universities are modified and the eligibility requirements for public funds for the academic year 2006-2007 are approved*, **Official Daily newspaper of the Generalitat of Catalonia, number 4667.**

<sup>8</sup> The different studies done by the members of the network are available on the webpage: [www.emes.net](http://www.emes.net)

<sup>9</sup> Op.cit

## VI. Bibliographical references

Elniff-Larsen, A. Dreyling, M. and Williams, J. (2006), Employment developments in childcare services for school-age children, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, paper available on the web site: [www.eurofound.eu.int](http://www.eurofound.eu.int)

Eme, B. and Fraisse, L. (2002) Rapport Francaise d'études de cas TSFEPS, document available on the web site [www.emes.net](http://www.emes.net)

Fraisse, L. (2006) *The third sector in the local governance of childcare services*, **boletín CIES**, nº 39, available on the webpage of CIES ([www.grupcies.com](http://www.grupcies.com))

Lhuiller, V. et al. (2002), Rapport national belge TSFEPS, document available on the web site : [www.emes.net](http://www.emes.net)

Lhuiller, V. (2003) Accès et équité dans les milieux d'accueil de jeunes enfants, document available on the web site: [www.emes-net](http://www.emes-net)

Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (2007) Estadísticas de las enseñanzas no universitarias, document available on the web site [www.mec.es](http://www.mec.es)

Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales (2006), **Plan estratégico nacional de la infancia y de la adolescencia**, approved by Consejo de Ministros in June. Madrid.

Vidal, I. y Claver, N. (2003), TSFEPS Project. Changing Family Structures and Social Policy: Childcare Services in Europe and Social Cohesión. Syntesis Report. Spain. Document available on the web site of EMES ([www.emes.net](http://www.emes.net))

Vidal, I. (2006) Should social enterprise be a core element in the provision of public services or is it a distraction? Paper written for the Exploratory Workshop of the European Science Foundation "The Third Sector in a Changing Europe: Key Trends and Challenges" Corvinus University, Budapest, 6-8 December, 2006.

Vidal, I. (2007), Co-management and the Third Sector in Education Public Policies: the Spanish Case, Paper for The European Group of Public Administration annual conference, Third Sector Study Group, Madrid, 19-22 September 2007

Warner, M:E. (editor) (2006) The Economic Importance of Child Care for Community Development in Community Development, vol. 37, nº 2, summer.

Laws cited:

*Education Law 2/2006 of 3 May (Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación)*, **Official State Bulletin, number 106 (Boletín Oficial del Estado, nº 106)**, published 4 May.

*EDU order/329/2006, 22 June by which the public prices of nursery school services under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education and Universities are modified and the eligibility requirements for public funds for the academic year 2006-2007 are approved*, **Official Daily paper of the Generalitat of Catalonia, number 4667.**

Webpages consulted

- Ministry of Education and Science (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia), [www.mec.es](http://www.mec.es)
- National Institute of Statistics (Instituto Nacional de Estadística), [www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)

- ☑ Department of Education and Universities of the Generalitat of Catalonia (Departamento de Educación y de Universidades de la Generalidad de Cataluña), [www.gencat.es](http://www.gencat.es)
- ☑ Municipal government of Barcelona (Ayuntamiento de Barcelona): [www.bcn.es](http://www.bcn.es)

Webpages cited

- ☑ CIES: [www.grupcies.com](http://www.grupcies.com)
- ☑ EMES: [www.emes.net](http://www.emes.net)

## VII. Statistical Appendix

**Table 1: Schooling rates for three year old children, 2003-2004.**

	%
European Union	68,60
France	100,00
Belgium	99,30
Italia	98,90
Spain	95,90
Sweden	82,50
Germany	69,50
Portugal	63,90
The United Kingdom	50,70
Finland	37,70
Poland	26,10
The Netherland	1,00

Source: Ministry of Education and Science, Education statistics in Spain ([www.mec.es](http://www.mec.es)) web consulted 10 August, 2006 and 18 July 2007.

**Table 2: Schooling rates for three year old children, 1993-1994 to 2006-2007. Spain**

	1993-94	1998-99	2003-04	2005-06	2006-07
Total	52,9	80,2	95,8	97,4	97,5
Andalucía	16,4	48,8	92,1	98,5	99,4
Aragón	76,7	92,3	100	100	100
Asturias	62,7	90,3	96,4	95,3	97,4
Baleares	45,7	85,8	93	92,5	91,9
Canarias	19,4	83,6	89,6	94	97,1
Cantabria	68,1	89,2	95,6	96,9	98,1
Castilla y León	78,9	95,8	99,5	100	100
Castilla La Mancha	52,2	88	100	100	100
Cataluña	96	98,7	99,3	97,3	96,7
Comunidad Valenciana	41,4	76,2	94,4	95,2	94,5
Extremadura	49,6	88	95,9	100	100
Galicia	68,8	85,6	96,1	99,5	99,2
Madrid	55,6	87,2	93,5	93,1	91,5
Murcia	32,1	80,8	99,7	100	99,4
Navarra	98,4	96,8	100	98	99,7
País Vasco	100	100	100	100	100
Rioja	68	94,7	99,1	99,1	99
Ceuta	33,4	61,2	91,7	100	100
Melilla	28	60,6	96	100	100

Source: Ministry of Education and Science, Education statistics in Spain ([www.mec.es](http://www.mec.es)) web consulted 10 August, 2006 and 18 July 2007.

**Table 3: Percentages of students enrolled in public schools and private schools, Second cycle of early childhood education (3-6 years old)**

	2005-2006		2006-2007	
	In public	In private	In public	In private
	schools	schools	shools	schools
Total	68,4	31,6	68,3	31,7
Andalucía	79,2	20,8	78,8	21,2
Aragón	67,1	32,9	67,4	32,6
Asturias	69,2	30,8	68,3	31,7
Baleares	61,7	38,3	61,9	38,1
Canarias	75,5	24,5	74,1	25,9
Cantabria	65,3	34,7	66,4	33,6
Castilla y León	67,6	32,4	67,4	32,6
Castilla La Mancha	81,9	18,1	82,1	17,9
Cataluña	64,5	35,5	65,2	34,8
Comunidad Valenciana	68,7	31,3	69,4	30,6
Extremadura	80,1	19,9	78,8	21,2
Galicia	67,8	32,2	67,5	32,5
Madrid	55,5	46,8	55,6	44,4
Murcia	72,6	27,4	71,3	28,7
Navarra	62,6	37,4	61,9	38,1
País Vasco	49,7	50,3	49,7	50,3
Rioja	64,9	35,1	65,1	34,9
Ceuta	73,5	26,5	73,2	26,8
Melilla	81,1	18,9	81,4	18,6

Source: Ministry of Education and Science, Education statistics in Spain ([www.mec.es](http://www.mec.es)) web consulted 10 August, 2006 and 18 July 2007.

**Table 4: Schooling Rates, First Cycle of Early Childhood Education**

	Academia year		
	2003-2004	2005-2006	2006-2007
Total	12,9	16,3	18
Andalucía	1,9	2,8	4,1
Aragón	24,9	28,6	30,4
Asturias	2,3	7,1	8,7
Baleares	6	9	10,1
Canarias	0	0	0
Cantabria	5,8	12,2	16,5
Castilla y León	10,5	11,9	12,5
Castilla La Mancha	2,3	2,7	2,5
Cataluña	28,6	31	32,1
Comunidad Valenciana	7,9	10	11,4
Extremadura	1,9	2,1	2,9
Galicia	12,7	13,6	16,2
Madrid	21,2	28,7	32,9
Murcia	10,1	11,8	14,1
Navarra	0	24,1	25,7
País Vasco	30,9	44,9	48,3
Rioja	3,4	4,3	4,8
Ceuta	2,6	3,3	4,6
Melilla	8,5	8,5	16,3

Source: Ministry of Education and Science, Education statistics in Spain ([www.mec.es](http://www.mec.es)) web consulted 10 August, 2006 and 18 July 2007.

**Table 5: Percentages of students enrolled in public schools and private schools, First Cycle of Early Childhood Education**

<b>Public schools</b>	<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>
Total	40,7	42,8	43,2
Andalucía	6,1	2,1	1
Aragón	35	37	39,5
Asturias	0	69,3	78,4
Baleares	24,9	44,9	48,2
Canarias	0	0	0
Cantabria	13,3	57,9	59,9
Castilla y León	51	44,3	43,2
Castilla La Mancha	36,3	24,9	27,1
Cataluña	39,4	44,7	47
Comunidad Valenciana	34,9	37,1	36,9
Extremadura	13,2	22,4	9,2
Galicia	63,5	66,8	73,9
Madrid	42	34	32,8
Murcia	57,8	63,4	60,6
Navarra	0	100	100
País Vasco	46,9	52,3	52,9
Rioja	0	0	0
Ceuta	0	0	0
Melilla	0,7	0	41,9

<b>Private schools</b>	<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>
Total	59,3	57,2	56,8
Andalucía	93,9	97,9	99
Aragón	65	63	60,5
Asturias	100	30,7	21,6
Baleares	75,1	55,1	51,8
Canarias	0	0	0
Cantabria	86,7	42,1	40,1
Castilla y León	49	55,7	56,8
Castilla La Mancha	63,8	75,1	72,9
Cataluña	60,6	55,3	53
Comunidad	65,1	62,9	63,1
Extremadura	86,8	77,6	90,8
Galicia	36,5	33,2	26,1
Madrid	58	66	67,2
Murcia	42,2	36,6	39,4
Navarra	-	0	0
País Vasco	53,1	47,7	47,1
Rioja	100	100	100
Ceuta	100	100	100
Melilla	99,3	100	58,1

Source: Ministry of Education and Science, Education statistics in Spain ([www.mec.es](http://www.mec.es)) web consulted 10 August, 2006 and 18 July 2007.

