



Department
for Education

Children's Services Statutory Returns Suppliers' and LA Focus Group Joint Meeting

**12 July 2013 (London); 19 July 2013
(Sheffield) Chair: Gerard Hassett/Alan
Brooks, DfE**

Contents

1 Introduction	3
2 Actions from previous meetings	4
2.1 Actions from January 2013 meetings	4
3 Feedback from 2013 SSSA903 collection (Louise Febrey / Julie Glendenning)	7
4 2013 publication plans for CLA data and changes for 2013-14 (Louise Febrey / Julie Glendenning)	8
5 Changes to SSSA 903 collection from April 2014 (Andy Brook)	10
6 Children missing from care (Louise Febrey/Sarah Wolstenholme)	15
7 Quarterly Adoption Survey (Sarah French)	17
8 New Data Packs (Andy Brook)	19
9 Children in Need Census (Jessica Vickerstaff)	20
10 A.O.B	23

1 Introduction

Gerard Hassett (London)/Alan Brooks (Sheffield) opened the meeting and thanked LA, Software Supplier and Ofsted representatives for attending.

These notes are in addition to the presentation slides used during the meeting, which are available at [CIN CLA Focus Group notes and presentations](#)

2 Actions from previous meetings

2.1 Actions from January 2013 meetings

Action Point 1: DfE to investigate and clarify whether LAs could check education data for CIN cases as some LAs had reported that did not believe they could use the UPNs to link to educational data.

Update: There is no block on the use of UPNs in this way mentioned in either guidance or FAQs.

Action Point 2: DfE to send information on detail of Year on Year matching rates in the next month (it will be no good to LAs if it comes just before the next CIN census)

Update: LA contacts were emailed data on individual LA matching rates on Friday 8 February and Child IDs were sent out to LAs with the lowest matching rates w/c 11 February.

Action Point 3: DfE to distribute details of adoption breakdown collection either within the guidance notes or in a special communication as soon as possible. This is to include confirmation of whether children entering respite care should be recorded.

Update: This has been done.

Action Point 4: DfE to confirm how to record LA number when the LA has split and formed new LAs

Update: This was included in the note for action 3.

Action Point 5: DfE to provide guidance on action to take when a child's history is not known.

Update: This was included in the note for action 3.

Action Point 6: DfE to check whether the placement in/out of LA field can be calculated on the system from an input of the post code without the data being submitted.

Update: Yes, this will be done.

Action Point 7: DfE to provide guidance on action to take when the child's post code cannot be disclosed.

Update: This will be included in the guide for 2013-14.

Action Point 8: DfE to confirm when guidance on change to LA placement will be published. Raised as an AOB item, an LA mentioned on-going conflict in the CLA system between the old LA social care codes and current LA codes. Graham Knox said he would investigate if the LA in question emailed him with details.

Update: Waiting for details from LA in question.

Action Point 9: LAs to feed any issues on collection pages to Graham Knox who will take these forward with the web editor who is working on the guidance pages.

Update: Comments still welcomed. School Census pages should be used as the base line for how web pages should look/feel.

Action Point 10: DfE to confirm if children aged 19 and not disabled can be recorded within the 903 as being looked after.

Update: This is possible.

Action Point 11: DfE to investigate the occurrence of children leaving care immediately prior to their 18th birthday and crosstab with LAs using high frequency of code E8 ('any other reason').

Update: This has not been done, but new reasons codes have been introduced so the department proposes carrying out this analysis when the new data becomes available.

Action Point 12: DfE to confirm whether risk to the child, and if the child was safe but causing risk to others, during a period of being missing - should be treated separately.

Update: The department does not propose to collect information on risk any longer

Action Point 13: DfE to see if a version of the placement moves table can be produced where missing is not included as a placement move.

Update: this is not possible with the current resources available and given the potential changes to create a missing module in 2014-15 we do not propose to make any changes to the placement moves table.

Action Point 14: DfE to confirm how publication of new Working Together guidance will be communicated

Update: The Department will notify Local Authorities via the LA Newsletter. DfE will also email the focus group circulation list (all LAs). The guidance and the consultation response will be placed on the DfE website.

Action Point 15: Further updates on decisions to switch to SAs to be included as an agenda item at the next Focus Group.

Update: This has been done.

Action Point 16: DfE to consider whether the Seen by Social Worker data item should be recorded on CPP or Review module

Update: 'Seen by social worker' will be included on the CPP module for 2013-14.

3 Feedback from 2013 SSDA903 collection (Louise Febrey / Julie Glendenning)

DfE thanked LAs for the overall high quality of the data supplied. However, there were some issues related to children missing from care.

DfE raised the issue of some LAs reporting no missing episodes in 2012-13. All of these LAs have now been contacted by DfE and have revised their figures. LAs fed back that recording missing episodes is sometimes a manual task and sometimes systems which record missing episodes are separate to the LAC files. Others reported concerns that social workers were not always recording this information.

LAs felt that a separate module for missing episodes would be helpful and they welcomed that missing would no longer be counted as a placement move.

Some LAs asked if missing could be removed from the placement stability indicator. DfE explained that it was not possible to do this accurately since the department doesn't know if a child returns to the same placement after a missing episode as we don't have postcodes for all placements. For the 2013 collection, the post code was only for 31.3.2013 and LAs commented that this can give a misleading picture if there has been more than one placement.

DfE appreciated the issues raised, and confirmed that changes may be possible next year with the change to postcode collection happening in 2014. Information about this will be communicated to local authorities as soon as possible. LAs requested that guidance and specifications on the revised postcode collection were issued as soon as possible.

A question was asked about whether DfE will publish the number of missing episodes by LA if the missing episodes are to continue being counted in the placement stability indicator. (**Note:** After the meeting it was reported that at present DfE are not planning on publishing the number of missing placements for each LA in the Statistical First Release).

4 2013 publication plans for CLA data and changes for 2013-14 (Louise Feebrey / Julie Glendenning)

DfE stated that the main CLA tables (including adoption and care leavers) will be published at the end of September. The rest of the data will be published in December, alongside the SFR on Outcomes for children looked after.

The statistical commentary within the outcomes for looked after children SFR is being looked at with the UK statistics authority and there may be some changes to layout and design, but no major changes are expected. Any suggestions LAs had could be sent to DfE, but changes are intended to be presentational only.

DfE also mentioned that there will be cosmetic changes to the look and feel of the CLA collection system from 2014.

Additionally, National Indicator and Performance Assessment Framework figures are likely to be removed and replaced with Children in Care and adoption performance tables and adoption scorecards. LA feedback on these changes was welcomed. In Sheffield, LAs preferred that the tables were not removed but brought alongside. Although guidance made them not compatible LAs felt this would still be a useful guide. LAs reported that they liked the current system and that the use of colours was helpful. Familiarisation was likely to be in February/March (but would be as soon as possible).

In London there was some discussion of whether the 3-year time series would be published for the adoption scorecards and performance tables.

There was some debate about the recording of NI 66 (percentage of looked after children who were reviewed on time within the year). LAs felt that because the Independent Reviewing Officer can set non-standard review times then it isn't clear from the data whether these reviews have happened on time or not.

The possibility of bringing forward the deadline for signing off of the collection to mid-June was discussed, which would make internal publication deadlines more realistic. LAs felt that lack of resources precluded this, especially since this was in the same year as other changes (e.g. post codes).

There would be great pressure on LA teams (who have other roles as well as 903) as some data was not within their MIS but came from OGDs (and needed validation). LAs also undertook comparisons with local data and DfE confirmed that quality is increasing year on year. This change would also pass pressure onto social workers. LAs also felt that Ofsted sometimes requested data returns with no notice, causing a duplication of data requests.

Overall the feeling from LAs was that they would have to sacrifice accuracy for speed if this change was implemented. Some LAs commented that they would prefer DfE to more stringently enforce the current deadline and provide more help to late LAs. The change to deadline may even increase the burden on DfE to chase late LAs.

LAs generally felt that the onus should be on the department to ensure sufficient resource to process data in good time for the SFR production, rather than requesting LAs to provide data earlier.

In Sheffield, LAs asked about timescales for guides. Julie advised that the guide on post codes was due the week following the meeting.

LAs asked if LAC reviews would be published. (**Note:** After the meeting it was reported that DfE are still investigating the publication of LAC reviews but will let LAs know once initial work has been completed).

ACTION POINT 1: Another LA asked if the scorecard data which will be shown in the CLA system will be 3 year average or single years. DfE undertook to answer this after the meeting.

5 Changes to SSDA 903 collection from April 2014 (Andy Brook)

Andy introduced changes to the CLA collection for 2014-15.

Fostering for adoption/long term fostering

There is growing interest in improving the range of permanence options for looked after children. The only permanency not collected within the 903 is long term fostering arrangements; therefore changes will be made to the 2014-15 collection to capture this information. To do this DfE aims to introduce a specific definition of long term foster care into the Care Planning, Placement and Case Review (England) Regulations 2010. The final definition will be agreed later in the year, but the draft definition being consulted on is:

- “Long term fostering placement” means arrangements made by the responsible authority for the child to be placed with the foster carer where:
 - The long term plan for the child’s upbringing is fostering
 - The foster carer has agreed to accommodate the child until the child ceases to be looked after
 - The arrangements have been agreed by the nominated officer

Changes to the 2014-15 collection to include capturing data on fostering for adoption were also discussed. Fostering for adoption is defined as placements where the child is placed with foster carers who are also approved adopters and the local authority is considering adoption. The child will be adopted by those carers if no other permanent option is agreed. This does not include foster placements with no current parental consent to adopt (even if the child goes on to be adopted by those foster carers).

These changes will be made to the placement codes and further details will be shared with LAs in September. For 2014-15 the department proposes to split Q1 and Q2 to capture whether fostering placements are long term or fostering for adoption.

- U1: Foster placement with relative or friend – long term fostering
- U2: Foster placement with relative or friend who is also an approved adopter – fostering for adoption
- U3: Foster placement with relative or friend – not long term or fostering for adoption
- U4: Foster placement with other foster carer – long term fostering
- U5: Foster placement with other foster carer who is also an approved adopter – fostering for adoption

- U6: Foster placement with other foster carer – not long term or fostering for adoption

An LA asked about cases where the foster carer wants to adopt the child, but hasn't been approved. Andy replied that these would not be fostering for adoption cases

Reason Episode Ceased

1 in 5 placements that ended in 2011-12 had the "reason episode ceased" recorded as "other". The department is regularly asked about these children and proposes to increase the codeset to reduce the number of "other" reasons. The proposed extra codes are:

- Accommodation on remand ended
- Child moves abroad (NB – this includes if the child was deported)
- Left care to live with one or more adults, none of whom has caring responsibilities (LAs were asked to feedback whether they phrasing "Parental responsibility" was better than "Caring responsibility")
- Age assessment and codes E5, E6 and E7 do not apply (18 and over)
- Young person reaches age 18 and no other codes apply

The department is also proposing splitting code E4 to distinguish between those returns which are part of the care planning process and those which are not:

- E4A: return home to live with parents, relatives or other person with parental responsibility as planned in the child's care plan
- E4B: return home to live with parents, relatives or other person with parental responsibility not planned as part of the current care planning process

Reason for placement moves

Research has shown that too many children experience large numbers of placement moves which leads to poor outcomes. The department intends to collect information on the reasons that a child may move placement. This has not yet been agreed with Star Chamber and if it is further details will be shared with LAs in September. This information may be either voluntary or mandatory from April 2014. Recording reasons for moves will shape national policy and lead to better understanding of placement stability.

LAs generally thought the proposals sensible but some had concerns about whether they would be able to deliver this change in time for the 2014-15 collection. It may depend on what the software supplier could provide. LAs also raised issues about whether this would risk looking as though there were more episodes than there really were i.e. 'paper moves'. If it was one extra field it would probably be OK for 2014-15. Sarah Wolstenholme felt that it would comprise of a new field on an existing row of data i.e. it

was intended to provide more information on placements currently recorded as a move rather than ask for more moves to be recorded.

Proposed reasons for moves include:

- Change to care plan
 - To be used where the change is a planned part of the care plan on a temporary or permanent basis. This would include moves that were not expected but become necessary. The key factor is that planning takes place and the decision is recorded in the child's care plan before the move takes place.
- Foster carer resignation
 - Circumstances would include where the child's placement had lasted longer than expected, where a foster carer becomes ill or another change of circumstances means that the foster carer is no longer able to provide a placement for the child.
- Short term to long term foster care – new placement
 - To be used where a change from a short term to a long term foster care placement has occurred as part of the child's care plan. The new placement would be with new foster carers and involve a physical placement move. This would include where a child is placed under FFA which does not lead to adoption and the child moves to a long term foster care arrangement with a new carer.
- Short term to long term foster care – existing placement
 - To be used where a change from a short term to a long term foster care placement has occurred as part of the child's care plan. The new placement would be with the existing foster carers and not involve a physical placement move. This would include where a child is placed under FFA which does not lead to adoption and the child stays with the current care under a long term foster care arrangement.
- Fostering For Adoption which does not lead to adoption
 - The child is in a fostering for adoption placement, but the child's plan does not become adoption, or the court does not agree to make a placement order. This is a possible outcome for any fostering for adoption placement.
- Any other planned move
- Allegation
 - To be used where a child has been removed from placement because of an allegation which is being investigated under section 47.
- Standard of care concern

- To be used where a child has been removed from placement as a result of concerns about a foster carer's standard of care. This does not include a child protection investigation which would come under s47.
- Approval termination
 - To be used when approval is terminated following a s47 investigation, a standards of care issue, a complaint or for other reasons that relate to the foster carer's conduct. This is not the code for when a foster carer resigns and their approval is terminated as part of this.
- Carer requests placement ends
 - To be used where the placement has broken down or been disrupted and the carer has asked for the child to be moved to another placement. There may be some planning involved and a short period of time may pass but this is not a planned move.
- Child requests placement ends
 - To be used where the placement has broken down or been disrupted and the child has asked to move to another placement. There may be some planning involved and a short period of time may pass but this is not a planned move.
- LA requests placement ends
 - To be used where the responsible authority has decided that the placement no longer meets the child's needs. There may be some planning involved and a short period of time may pass but this is not a planned move. Not to be used for allegation or standards of care concern. Where the placement no longer meets a child's need but there is no immediate risk – this code would be used.
- Any other unplanned move
- LAs suggested some other possible reasons for move, and had some further thoughts and concerns:
 - Change of school can be a reason for placement move
 - Where the carer is changed from in-house to agency. The department responded that a change in status of the carer should not be recorded as a placement move if the child remains in the same house with the same carer.
 - If a child is in care at birth then the hospital is one placement, followed by a short term placement and finally the first actual placement is recorded as the third placement.
 - LAs had a concern that the `other' options will be used a lot

LAs suggested consideration of cases such as `in remand' and where a placement broke down because a child impacted on others

Finally, LAs asked about further consultation and when the voluntary/mandatory decision would be made. Sarah Wolstenholme replied that this would be sent as soon as possible or failing that in the usual September letter (so further comments would be needed by mid August). LAs commented that an earlier `invitation' would be useful – but this session at the Focus Group was playing that role.

6 Children missing from care (Louise Feebrey/Sarah Wolstenholme)

Louise/Sarah introduced the group to discussions on the new Children Missing From Care module to be included in SSSA 903 from 2014-15. It was noted that any proposals are still provisional, and subject to further discussion with and approval by SCSB.

The new module should enable collection of information on children who are missing or absent from their placement, and the start/end date and time of the missing episode. It will also remove the 24-hour trigger, remove missing as 'placement type' and should encourage better exchange and sharing of data and information between LAs and police. The 24 hour trigger depended on the context of the episode and the level of information available.

We are part-way through a pilot with 9 LAs and police forces to identify issues and best practice. Feedback so far indicates that it is not difficult to supply data on start and end dates and times of missing/absent episodes and that good data exchange exists between police and LAs. However there has been some difficulty identifying looked after children in police data, especially for out of area children placed in LA, and there has also been some confusion over definitions.

One LA that was part of the pilot told the focus group that the lack of a statutory framework made data sharing very difficult. Other questions from LAs included:

- How can LAs check that people are missing if they live semi-independently and are only visited 2 or 3 times a week?
- Is being late home the same as being missing? Many teenagers are regularly late home. Sarah agreed that there were short periods where a child may be missing regularly; but also longer periods. We wanted to see trends.
- Sarah confirmed that the need for the time the child went missing was being considered within the department and this may not be taken forward in the final proposal.
- How should LAs record children who are missing but the LA is pursuing them?
- Another LA asked about children who are absent but contactable by phone. The department replied that the crucial difference between absent and missing was whether the LA knew where the children were
- There was a concern about where the module would be recorded (suppliers would need to provide a new screen)
- An LA asked if police data would be shared with forces not within the LA itself. Sarah said the hope was that there would not be rigid arrangements, but rather a fluid exchange of data where needed.

- LAs mentioned other fields that may be relevant e.g. 'where found'; 'return interview'; 'safe and well'; 'harm/risk'. Sarah explained that DfE were aiming to keep the collection as small as possible to reduce the burdens on LAs and that LAs may be recording this already for their purposes.

It was mentioned that Ofsted asks for a return of children missing for short periods.

Sarah said that the Department was keen for this module to be introduced, but that the burden on LAs and if data was already being recorded somewhere were issues that needed to be considered. Completing and evaluation the pilot would take place in July, and Star Chamber approval would be sought in September with a view to finalising in the Autumn. Some LAs were concerned about the length of time for a decision. DfE apologised for this but we can't be more definite at the moment (e.g. Star Chamber may ask for more information).

ACTION POINT 2: Feedback from the pilot exercise would be sent out to all LAs (if this was agreed by the pilot LAs themselves).

7 Quarterly Adoption Survey (Sarah French)

Sarah discussed the quarterly adoption survey and ran through slides to show internal analysis outcomes (please see the slides associated with the presentations). Modelled trends presented were based on findings from the quarterly survey and anecdotal evidence from several sources.

The number of new decisions annually have increased over time, despite the declining in-year figures shown for 2012-13. There was a spike in the first quarter followed by decreases in the following quarters (although overall the annual figure increased). LA views were welcomed about why there was a spike in the figures. Possibilities included the publication of the annual scorecard.

The annual estimate for 2012-13 new decisions from the three quarters returned shows that the expected level is roughly in line with the projection. Sarah said that efforts would be made to update the modeled figures in a timely way.

In the previous round of focus groups an LA asked about the impact for/on LAs who have not returned for all quarters. Sarah said that DfE are looking into developing the analyses to cover all returns. Possibilities include analysing grossing factors for individual quarters to assess whether trends can be drawn from all data rather than just those from LAs who have returned each quarter. Also whether trends could be compared for those who have returned for all quarters against those who have returned subsets and if these are consistent we can back fill. There could also be analyses on timeliness to incorporate all returns (as these do not grossing factors to be applied).

Data for quarter number three was published on 16th July. The deadline for the first quarter for 2013-14 was the end of July, and extensions were given to LAs who required extra time. It is hoped that the time lag in publishing analyses will decrease over the summer period.

One LA said that the timing of the collection is poor and asked that the collection be done later. They suggested that synchronising the collection with SSDA 903 would result in higher quality data – this will be taken on board and the Department will look to see what can be done for the quarter 4 2013-14 collection.

Another LA asked how long the collection would be voluntary. Sarah felt that this would be the case indefinitely. Quarter 3 saw 105 LAs returning data and there are no proposals to make this a mandatory collection (or to cease), although Star Chamber may have an input on this. In terms of an LA question about 'statutory' and noting that some LA management felt the return should be done, Sarah confirmed that the collection was voluntary from the DfE position.

It was noted that the July to September quarter has a revised template to reflect the new 2 stage process for approving adopters.

8 New Data Packs (Andy Brook)

Andy Brook explained that two new data packs would be published shortly by the department:

Placement Stability Data Pack

This pack shows the variations in the number of placements experienced by looked after children and comparisons by age, local authority, length of time in care, placement type, reason for entering care etc.

Children's homes data pack

Updates to children's homes data pack, last published in March 2012. This data pack shows locations and number of places in children's homes, location of children accommodated in children's homes and their characteristics.

Last year's pack is available at [Childrens Homes data pack](#)

9 Children in Need Census (Jessica Vickerstaff)

Jessica lead a discussion of the Children in Need census.

2012-13 census

Jessica outlined the department's plans for publishing data. These include;

- Publishing initial and core assessment timescales
- Plan to publish 'actual' duration of assessment
- Time between actual start date and authorisation date
- Same format as 2011-12 i.e. bands of working days
- Propose to remove LA level tables split by (i) age and gender and (ii) ethnicity due to high level of suppression but keep national level tables covering these breakdowns
- Propose to publish new table covering continuous assessments carried out by 8 pilot LAs during 2012-13

LAs were asked for their views:

- Some expressed concern about data quality e.g. social workers copying data from one child to other children in the same family,
- New validation rules stating you can't have strategy discussion in the middle of initial assessment, but this shouldn't be a problem next year when many LAs move to single assessments.
- When a referral was recorded as after the initial assessment began it didn't flag an error.
- How are working days calculated if the authorisation date is on a weekend
- Last year some assessments were recorded as not finishing because the assessment ended on 31 March (a Sunday) and was allocated to the next working day.
- An LA asked if there were any new Data Confidence Intervals, Jessica responded that these hadn't been discussed yet but that LAs would be informed.

2013-14 Census

Feedback was asked for about the new data items in the 2013-14 collection. LAs said that they had difficulty recording the factors identified at assessment. Discussion in London moved onto the Children's Safeguarding Performance Information Framework. Definitions are being worked on and are yet to be published. Sarah agreed to share the definitions with LAs prior to publishing the data itself. In Sheffield, some LAs said that

their systems were not ready to record the new data items for 2013-14, and Jessica advised them to initially record data outside of systems in readiness.

Recording of assessments

2013-14 specification details how to record assessments. There are the following 3 assessment modules:

- Initial assessment
- Core assessment
- Assessment (i.e. continuous assessments)

The structure of the 2013-14 collection will allow LAs to record all 3 types of assessments during transition if necessary.

DfE will be contacting LAs to see how they are recording assessments. If LAs wish to use continuous assessments but their systems will not currently allow this – they should use the Initial Assessment module in the meantime. LAs should begin to compile a set of dates so that they can inform DfE of how they will be recording assessments for 2013-14. This will allow DfE to carry out analyses correctly.

Given a rough show of hands at the Sheffield focus group – it appeared that most LAs were not currently recording continuous assessments, but had plans to move to continuous assessments in the coming year.

2014-15

The department proposes to continue to collect actual assessment start dates and to develop a COLLECT blade with one assessment module containing:

- Assessment actual start date
- Review date (optional)
- Assessment authorisation date

Some LAs commented that the department is increasing burdens on them while their resources shrink and that this is affecting the provision for children. Jessica responded that these data items have been proposed by the Munro review.

ACTION POINT 3: Another LA commented that the guidance lacks clarity, Jessica asked the LA to identify the parts of the guidance that needed improving so changes can be made

LA comments included

- LAs need to understand the data fully and need to have definitions of data items and need to know how the data is going to be published.
- Will review dates always be optional, Jessica said yes,
- Will single assessments be linked to referrals? Jessica said yes and the aim should be for single assessment start date to be within 45 days of referral. Some LAs commented that further re-assessments could confuse these stats.
- Section 47 review can start in the middle of single assessment.
- Can LAs return accommodation or activity as not known, separately from Residence Not Known? This question was raised at the London group. Outcomes to be confirmed (please see Action 4 below).
- An LA asked what dates were required if they continued to use the IA/CA modules. Jessica confirmed that the only dates required were start and end dates.
- An LA asked if the XML converter would be available for 2013-14. This would be available as soon as finalised – probably November.
- It was hoped the issues with the converter working slowly would be resolved by using Excel 2010. LAs experiencing issues could email Alan and/or Jessica.

ACTION 4: Outcome of discussion in relation to the following question to be confirmed:
Can LAs return accommodation or activity as not known, separately from Residence Not Known?

10 A.O.B

A Local Authority Interactive Tool (LAIT) slide is included in the slide pack. Unfortunately the presenter could not be in attendance at the Focus Group meetings but links are available on the slide.

ANNEX A

LA Representatives
Natalie Geoghegan – Bexley
Imran Khan - Bolton
Elizabeth McClelland – Bracknell Forest
Kate Stewart - Bradford
Daryl Perilli – Brighton
Laura James - Bromley
Peter Worthington – Central Bedfordshire
Louise Parker/Christopher Toyne - Doncaster
Marc Thompson - Enfield
Maura Walsh - Hackney
Catherine Johnson/Susan Davies - Halton
Jenny Lovell - Hampshire
Richard Hutton – Haringey
Dipika Patel – Harrow
Judith Swindell – Hertfordshire
Denise Beel – Hull City Council
Ian Valentine - Kent
Lorna Brown – Lambeth
Sharon Morgan - Lancashire
Emma Patrick/Kristy Eagles - Leicestershire
Linda Winton - Lincolnshire
Lynn Doyle – Merton
Jane Spencer – Milton Keynes
Mikael Husband - Newcastle
Alison Matthews/Matt Wells - Newham
Sharon Lawn – North Yorkshire
Jon Ward - Nottinghamshire
Lee Whitehead – Nottingham City
Chris Seekings - Rotherham
Tom Gamble - Sheffield
Jon Hill - Solihull
Tim Beasley – Somerset
Laura Llewellyn – Southend

LA Representatives (continued)
David Britton – S.Gloucestershire
Claire Makinson - Staffordshire
Annette Platt – Surrey
Shane Wells - Swindon
Janet Robinson/Andrea Doyle - Tameside
Bob Mills – Thurrock
Eni Olatunde-Shittu – Tower Hamlets
Marian Bird - Wirral
Barbara Sorkin – Wokingham
Supplier Representatives
Neil Margereson – Capita One
Geraldine Murphy - Careworks
Stuart Chandler - Civica
Chris Ffelan - Liquidlogic
Chris Pina-Eccles - OLM

DfE and government representatives
Gerard Hassett – DfE
Alan Brooks - DfE
Sarah French - DfE
Jessica Vickerstaff - DfE
Sarah Wolstenholme – DfE
Claire French – DfE
Louise Feebrey - DfE
Julie Glenndenning - DfE
Andy Brook - DfE
Stewart Hartshorne - Ofsted



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2013

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to the [data collections helpdesk](#).

This document is available for download from the [department's website](#).