

Document Control

Change History

Version No	Date	Author	Change	Status
1.0	06/03/2013	Ola Alli	Logic and standard changes for prior attainment, date of birth and destination	Authorisation
2.0	16/04/2013	Ola Alli	Change in Empstat data standard highlighted in Green	Authorisation

Reviewers

Role	Name	Date
Head of Data Management - IA	Peter Ashton	22/02/2013
Data Management Analyst - IA	Sharon King	05/03/2013

Table of Contents

Document Control	1
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Advise to Providers	
1.2 Part A - Data Quality Standards	3
1.3 ILR – Data Standardisation	3
1.4 ILR Funding mode and Data threshold	4 - 12
1.5 Data Logic	13
2.0 Part B - Main Stakeholders and Main Data Uses	

ſ

1.0. Introduction

This document sets out the Data Quality Standards and provides the main stakeholders to the ILR data and their data element uses.

1.1. Advice to Providers

The information authority recommends that all providers comply with these standards so that the individualised learner record (ILR) sent to the Data Service is suitable for the purposes for which it is collected. These set standards will also aid improvement of the ILR data for the provision delivered in 2012/13 onwards.

Provider organisations that are unable to act in accordance with with these standards should seek further assistance from *the information authority* and the Data Service.

This Appendix is split into 2 sections; Part A – Data Quality Standards and Part B – Main Stakeholders and data element uses.

1.2. Part A - Data Quality Standards

The original request for *the information authority* secretariat to develop common data standards came from *the information authority* Board. For 2013/14, the same approach used in previous years to data quality will be adopted based on the performance of providers against the standards set for 2011/12. The fact that we can apply the same method to the data means that the standards are realistic and achievable.

The standards gives providers a way of assuring themselves that the data sent to the Data Service are fit for the purposes for which it is requested.

Overtime, the *information authority* will further refine the standards so that those stakeholders using the ILR data can have even greater confidence that it is adequate to meet their needs. Providers should also assure themselves that their data is fit for purpose by applying the six ILR data management principles published on the *information authority* website at http://www.theia.org.uk/ilr/datamanagement/

3

Where a stakeholder wishes to use existing ILR data for a new purpose it will be able to use these data quality standards to identify whether the ILR as it stands is capable of supporting their requirement. Where a stakeholder identifies that the data quality standard does not meet its requirement it will be able to make a request for change which will be processed in the normal way by measuring it against the ILR change criteria.

1.3. ILR – Data Standardisation

Producing data that is 'fit for purpose' should be an integral part of providers' operational, performance management and corporate governance arrangements. Failure to identify and address weaknesses in data quality or the arrangements that underpin data collection and reporting by the Data Service could lead to information that is misleading, flawed decision making, wasted or misdirected resources, poor services with no improvement and ill founded policy setting. Furthermore, good performance may not be recognised and rewarded

Data quality standards are required to ensure stakeholders' requirements for quality are met in order to:

- Base decisions on fact;
- Assist in prioritising corrective action;
- Assist in determining the source of quality problems; and
- Provide clarity

The measurement of information quality assumes and depends on the measurement of data quality. Providers are expected to send data which are:

- **Complete:** Fulfilling formal requirements and expectations with no gaps i.e. the data contains records completed in full compliance with the instructions contained in the current version of the ILR Specification and for all learners for whom a record is required
- Accurate: Exact and precise i.e. the data reflects 'reality' as it contains records consistent with the situation described by the data
- **Timeliness (In time):** Current and not outdated i.e. providers should adhere to the current ILR timeliness standard
- Integrity: what was requested and expected;
- Relevant: Fits intended purpose and use

4

1.4. ILR Funding Model and Data threshold

Different data quality standards are applied to certain ILR data elements based on the funding model which applies. Providers should note that these standards are applied to data which has passed the validation rules – details of all mandatory elements can be found in the <u>ILR specification</u>. As mentioned in section 1.2, for 2013/14 adherence to the six ILR data management principles in the ILR specification document are essential to the integrity and quality of the ILR data.

The standards applied to the ILR for 2013/14 are described in Table 1 and are as follows (an 'X' in the right hand column indicates that thresholds are applied to data sent for the relevant funding model):

Funding Model	Logic
16 – 19 EFA funding – (16 – 19 EFA)	FundModel = 25
Adult skills funding – (ASF)	FundModel = 35
Community learning – (CL)	FundModel = 10
ESF funded – (ESF)	FundModel = 70
Other Skills funding agency funding – (Other Funding	FundModel = 81
SFA)	
Other EFA funding - – (Other Funding EFA)	FundModel = 82
No Skills funding agency or EFA funding for this	FundModel = 99
learning aim – (No Funding)	

XML Element Name	Description	Data Quality Standard	16 – 19 EFA	ASF	CL	ESF	Other Funding (SFA)	Other Funding (EFA)	No funding
DateOfBirth	Date of birth	 16-18 EFA, ASF and ESF - Providers with more than 0.1% of cases where the field is not completed in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return Providers must aim to have 0% of cases where the field is completed by the final return of the year Other funding (SFA, EFA) - Providers must aim to have less than 0.1% of cases where the field is not completed by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.2% of cases where the field is not completed in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end of-year-return. 	X	X		X	X	X	
Ethnicity	Ethnicity	 16-18 EFA - Providers must aim to have less than 0.7% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.8% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return ASF - Providers must aim to have less than 0.5% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries by the final return of the year. 	X	X	X	X	X		X

XML Element Name	Description	Data Quality Standard	16 – 19 EFA	ASF	CL	ESF	Other Funding (SFA)	Other Funding (EFA)	No funding
Ethnicity (Continued)	Ethnicity	 Providers with more than 0.6% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return CL, Other funding (SFA, EFA) - Providers must aim to have less than 1.3% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 1.6% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return ESF - Providers must aim to have less than 0.8% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 1.0% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 1.0% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return No funding - Providers must aim to have less than 0.8% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return No funding - Providers must aim to have less than 0.8% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries by the final return of the year. Providers must aim to have less than 0.8% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 1.1% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 1.1% 'Not known / not provided' ethnicity entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return. 							

XML Element Name	Description	Data Quality Standard	16 – 19 EFA	ASF	CL	ESF	Other Funding (SFA)	Other Funding (EFA)	No funding
PostCode	Postcode prior to enrolment	 16-18 EFA, CL, Other Funding (SFA, EFA) - Providers must aim to have less than 0.3% missing or incomplete postcodes prior to enrolment by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.4% missing or incomplete entries in- year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return ASF - Providers must aim to have less than 0.1% missing or incomplete postcodes prior to enrolment by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.2% missing or incomplete entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return ESF - Providers must aim to have less than 0.2% missing or incomplete postcodes prior to enrolment by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.4% missing or incomplete entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return No funding - Providers must aim to have less than 0.2% missing or incomplete postcodes prior to enrolment by the final return of the year. Providers must aim to have less than 0.2% missing or incomplete postcodes prior to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return No funding - Providers must aim to have less than 0.2% missing or incomplete postcodes prior to enrolment by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.3% missing or incomplete entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return 	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

XML Element Name	Description	Data Quality Standard	16 – 19 EFA	ASF	CL	ESF	Other Funding	Other Funding	No funding
							(SFA)	(EFA)	
PriorAttain	Prior attainment	 <i>Level 2 Provision</i>:- Other Funding (SFA) and No funding – Providers must aim to have less than 3.7% 'Not known' prior attainment levels recorded by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 5.5% 'Not known' entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return ASF – Providers must aim to have less than 0.7% 'Not known' prior attainment levels recorded by the final, return of the year. Providers with more than 1.1% 'Not known' in-year will be 		Х		X	X		X
PriorAttain (continued)	Prior attainment	 asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return ESF - Providers must aim to have less than 0.5% 'Not known' prior attainment levels recorded by the final, return of the year. Providers with more than 1.5% 'Not known' entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return Level 3 Provision:- Other Funding (SFA) and No funding – Providers must aim to have less than 3.1% 'Not known' prior attainment levels by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 4.6% 'Not known' prior attainment levels by the final return of the year. 							

XML Element Description **Data Quality Standard** 16 – 19 ASF CL ESF Other Other No Funding Name EFA Funding funding (SFA) (EFA) ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return ASF- Providers must aim to have less than 0.6% 'Not known' prior attainment levels by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.8% 'Not known' prior attainment levels in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return ESF - Providers must aim to • have less than 1.1% 'Not known' prior attainment levels by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 1.8% 'Not known' prior attainment levels in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return. Х Х Х Х ASF, CL, Other funding (SFA) -• Providers must aim to have less than 3.5% 'Destination Unknown' for apprenticeships by the final return of the year. Dest Providers with more than 4.0% 'Destination Unknown' for apprenticeships in-year will be asked to ensure that this Destination improves by the end-of-year return ESF (ESF co-financed) -• Providers must aim to have less than 3.4% 'Destination Unknown' entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 5.2% 'Destination Unknown'

XML Element Name	Description	Data Quality Standard	16 – 19 EFA	ASF	CL	ESF	Other Funding (SFA)	Other Funding (EFA)	No funding
EmpStat	Employment status	 16-19 EFA and Other funding (EFA) - Providers must aim to have less than 0.6% 'Not known / Not provided' entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 1.0% 'Not known / Not provided' entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return. (Standard to be applied to part-time learners where study hours is less than 540 hours in the teaching year) ASF, ESF and Other funding (SFA) - Providers must aim to have less than 0.3% 'Not known / Not provided' entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.6% 'Not known / Not provided' entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return. 	X	X		x	X	X	
LLDDCode	LLDD and health problem code	 Data collected only if Learner LLDD and health problem is indicated 16-19 EFA, ASF, ESF, Other funding (SFA, EFA), No funding - Providers must aim to have less than 0.3% 'Not known / Not provided' entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.5% 'Not known / Not provided' entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return. CL Providers – only needs to complete where the learner's 	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

XML Element Name	Description	Data Quality Standard	16 – 19 EFA	ASF	CL	ESF	Other Funding (SFA)	Other Funding (EFA)	No funding
		planned learning hours is 10 or less. Providers must aim to have less than 0.4% 'Not known / Not provided' entries by the final return of the year. Providers with more than 0.7% 'Not known / Not provided' entries in-year will be asked to ensure that this improves by the end-of-year return.							

1.5. Data Logic

In order to assist Providers in meeting the data quality targets for these fields, the following logic is supplied to demonstrate the methodology used to calculate Provider performance against the targets.

This is the logic used by the Data Service when producing reporting on Provider performance against data quality standards.

XML Element Name	Query Descriptio n	Logic	Logic Description
DateOfBirth	Not Known	DateOfBirth = 00000000	The learner's date of birth is not known
Ethnicity	Not Provided	Ethnicity=99	The learner's ethnicity is not provided
PostCode	Unknown (UK)	PostCode ='ZZ99 9ZZ'	The learner's postcode prior to enrolment is not known (UK & Islands only)
PriorAttain	Not Known	(PriorAttain = 98) AND (L_FULLLEVEL2 = 1) AND FundModel in (35,70,81,99)	The learner's prior attainment is not known - learner is following a full Level 2 aim
PriorAttain	Not Known	(PriorAttain = 98) AND (L_FULLLEVEL3 = 1) AND FundModel in (35,70,81,99)	The learner's prior attainment is not known - learner is following a full Level 3 aim
Dest	Not known	Dest = 98	The learner's destination is not known/not provided/missing
EmpStat	Not Know	EmpStat = 98	The learner's employment status is not known

XML Element Name	Query Descriptio n	Logic	Logic Description
LLDDCode	Not Know	LLDDType in ("DS","LD") AND LLDDCode = 99	The learner's disabilities/learning difficulties is not known

2. Part B - Main Stakeholders and Main Data Uses

The information authority board also requested the secretariat to map the data collection and analysis process – in other words, to document what data is collected, and how the data is analysed and used. This part of the appendix aims to meet that request.

Part B of the appendix identifies for each data element in the ILR, the stakeholder, the information group and the main data use of that element.

The secretariat will check with stakeholders that they are content with the impact of any request to change in the ILR specification.

The data elements are categorised into four major informational groups which relate to stakeholders contractual functions.

- **Operations:** data elements within the ILR that are used in monitoring individual providers' delivery against allocation, inform decisions about payments, performance data calculation, and reconciliation
- Intervention: ILR elements used for financial probity and to calculate the funding associated with the provision delivered
- **Dissemination:** data elements used in policy analysis/formulation, information to assist in inspection planning, public information, published statistics, FE and skills sector information and contextual pre-inspection data to inform Ofsted inspectors
- **Other:** Other information about the data element that are of use to the stakeholders and internal systems; also to monitor quality of provision and evaluate the effectiveness of providers data