Department for Education

Children's services statutory returns suppliers' and local authority focus group joint meeting

3 September 2015 (London); 4 September 2015 (Sheffield) Chair: Alan Brooks (DfE)

November 2015

Contents

1 Introduction

Alan Brooks opened the meeting and thanked local authority and software supplier representatives for attending. OFSTED are also thanked for attending the London meeting.

These notes are in addition to the presentation slides used during the meeting, which will be available at [Meeting notes on web](#)

2 Actions from previous meetings

2.1 Actions from December 2014 meeting

Action point 1 – CIN (children in need)

Local authorities to provide any further feedback on CIN topics via the mailbox. This includes local authorities who did not attend the meeting who wish to comment. (Local authorities had been asked to comment on the usefulness of tables; data items that were burdensome to prepare and any further useful data that could be provided).

Update: CIN team would like to thank local authorities for their feedback.

Action point 2 – CIN

CIN team to check why CIN/CLA (children looked after) data matching is no longer shared.

Update: CIN/CLA matching rates are passed back to local authorities on request. There were no requests recorded. CIN team asked if any local authorities missed having these provided and the general consensus was that it was not required. Therefore we do not intend to provide these again in 2016.

Action point 3 – CLA (children looked after) – care leavers

Louise Feebrey would check that any errors that were outstanding on the list of missing OC3 records would be corrected ahead of this year's collection.

Update: This had been done.

Action point 4 – CLA – care leavers

Louise would see if the 19 to 21 child list for the coming year could be obtained at the press of a button.

Update: This is still not possible but is noted as desirable.

Action point 5 – CLA – care leavers

Louise would look into the automatic trigger of OC3 for children who are away for agreed days over a period of time.

Update: The purpose of this action had become unclear and no comments at meetings indicated an ongoing issue. Local authorities are welcome to respond to the notes if there is an outstanding issue.

Action point 6 – CLA – missing from care

Louise would feedback on issues raised about replicating missing from care episodes between 2014 and 2015.

Update: This related to how local authorities should return information for open missing episodes at 31March 2014. This was completed.

Action point 7 – CLA – missing from care

Department for Education (DfE) to inform local authorities about the methodology for placement indicators

Update: Please see main meeting note about long term fostering.

Action point 8 – CLA – missing from care

Louise would let local authorities know when the long term fostering definition would be released.

Update: This has been done and will also be included in the next iteration of guidance.

Action point 9 – CLA – missing from care

This action was considered to be a replication of action point 7.

Action point 10 – CLA – post code data

Louise would check if a more up to date set of post codes could be available in the DfE system.

Update: It was not always possible for the DfE systems to be totally up to date with post codes for very new addresses. But if there are any postcodes that are not available on the system then LAs should contact the DfE and we will seek to manually add the postcode to the system.

Action points 11, 12 and 13 – CLA – 2016 to 2017 collection – reason for out of area placement

The above actions all concerned a potential new data item on 'reason for out of area placement'. This change to the data collection is now not going to go ahead in 2016 to 2017.

Action point 14 – helpdesk

Gale McNiff to look at how response and courtesy call communications can be better coordinated (especially in relation to outstanding queries). Local authorities commented on coordination of communications from DfE. They said it was frustrating to be waiting for one or more answers to queries – and then to receive a call from DfE staff chasing their return. Gale said she would look into this.

Update: This will be addressed by asking local authorities to proactively keep in touch with the Department by way of updating us on progress, to aim to keep ring rounds to a minimum. DfE has also set up an issues log so if a local authority has logged a query we will assess whether to contact them in a ring round to chase the return.

Action Point 15 – helpdesk

Gale McNiff would check if the content of the service request form could be enhanced eg to include query content and to be local authority specific. Local authorities had commented on the service request form, saying it would be useful to have a case reference and the case content fed back to them as a receipt. This is because of the delay of response but also because they often had more than one request ongoing at any one time. Another local authority said it would be useful to have a local authority specific request form as the basic details were burdensome to complete when so many requests had to be made.

Update: Testing was currently underway for enhancements to the service request form. The aim is that when customers complete the form they will immediately get an acknowledgement on the web page of the forms submission, also giving them a reference number. They will then get an e-mail quoting the reference number and giving details of the request they have logged. Unfortunately, DfE cannot implement changes to the form that will automatically fill in fields for the user ie an intelligent form that recognises the user and completes name, local authority, etc.

3 Children looked after (CLA) – Louise Feebrey

3.1 2014 to 2015 data collection review and feedback

Please see the 2014 data collection review and feedback slide in the presentation pack.

Local authorities asked about how the introduction of new placement type codes (eg long-term fostering) and the new missing from care module would impact on the measure 'percentage of children with 3 or more placements in the year'. In the case of long-term fostering, these children might not actually move so local authorities questioned whether it would be counted as a placement move. Louise confirmed that for the 2015 SFR (statistical first release), missing episodes would not count as a placement in the 2015 national figures, and therefore the data would be inconsistent with previous years. Some issues had also been encountered when drawing statistics off the data (ie differences between CSV and downloads for missing episodes). The CLA team will be checking this in the testing of next year's system.

There was general agreement that the CLA system was preferred to COLLECT since reports were instant, uploads were easier and changes took effect immediately rather than needing an overnight process to run.

3.2 2014 to 2015 statistical publications

Please see the 2014 to 2015 statistical publications slide in the presentation pack.

Louise confirmed that the statistical first release(SFR) 'Children Looked After in England, year ending 31 March 2015' would be published on 1 October 2015. Views had been received from 12 local authorities and 6 other users from across the sector (eg charities and independent researchers) and there would be changes to tables for the 2015 SFR. All local authority tables would remain but some national tables would be removed: Participation in reviews (table A8), days of care provided (table B2), and starts by legal status (C3), would no longer be published. For some other tables (eg the looked after mothers table), the totals would continue to be presented, but some of the detailed breakdowns of these children will no longer be presented. There will be new tables on missing from care.

Louise thanked local authorities for their responses and support with the review, which was helpful in understanding which information local authorities find useful.

3.3 Children missing from care (2014 to 2015 publications)

Please see the missing from care slide in the presentation pack. Louise asked for feedback.

Action Point 1: Louise to clarify how the average number of missing incidents per looked after child would be calculated.

Update: Louise has now confirmed that the average number of missing incidents per looked after child is based on looked after children who have had at least one missing incident during the year, rather than all looked after children.

Local authorities commented that they had concerns about the consistency of the data eg there were different approaches between local authorities in categorising missing and absent cases. There were also issues about the duration of absences. The collection does ask for dates and times but for episodes lasting less than one day the data looked the same for one hour as for 23 hours. An overnight absence which could be for good reasons could appear as though it was an absence of a whole day. There might be some inconsistencies in reporting eg one foster carer might report a child as missing when they are 'ten minutes late', but another might not. Consistency of social worker recording could also be an issue, and reports may only be clear in their notes (which are not reportable for the collection).

One local authority commented that the size of the local authority and the volumes of cases/episodes could affect data quality. A common issue was that it is sometimes difficult to reconcile the police data with the local authority data. Some main issues were:

- Not getting police data and social worker data at the same time, so there was a risk of duplication;
- It was not always clear from police and social worker notifications if the case relates to a CIN or CLA – different police forces did not report consistently;
- Missing start dates are always reported; return dates are much more difficult to obtain.

Other issues discussed included software systems not being updated quickly enough; the range of data partners and systems necessary to work with; the knowledge and training of foster carers.

A local authority commented that freedom of information requests required a breakdown of missing children by UASC status of data eg unaccompanied asylum seeker. Louise said that it was unlikely that a breakdown would be published this year.

Louise said that DfE were aware of some of these issues and that the data was more far more detailed than it used to be for missing periods. It was agreed that this year is the first year of collecting the more detailed information on missing episodes and therefore it would be possible for DfE to caveat the data if appropriate.

Local authorities asked to see the local authority table on children missing from care before it was published, in order to understand the figures and brief their directors. There were concerns about usage of the figures, eg by Ofsted, without a full understanding of

the context, eg the percentage of UASC in the authority. Louise explained that it is not possible to circulate data pre-publication and whilst Louise acknowledged that there may be different contextual factors underpinning the figures, it is still helpful to publish them.

Action Point 2: Louise to see if there was any possibility of a pre circulation of missing from care data.

Update: It is not possible to circulate final data prior to release, but of course, local authorities will have their own figures and will be able to contextualise these in briefings with their directors or with others

3.4 Care leavers (2014 to 2015 publications)

Please see the care leavers slide in the slide presentation pack.

Louise confirmed the bullet points. A local authority asked if DfE would provide information of the number of young people whom have died or have returned home for a period of at least 6 months, even though these will be excluded from the percentage calculations for care leavers.

Action Point 3: Louise to consider this when planning the SFR tables.

3.5 Number of placements in latest year (2014 to 2015 publications)

Please see number of placements in latest year slide in the presentation pack.

Louise confirmed the information provided in the slide. The main point was that missing would no longer be counted as a placement type in 2014 to 2015 and that it would be clearly noted for the time series.

3.6 Outcomes for looked after children statistical first release (SFR) (2014 to 2015 publications)

Please see outcomes for looked after children statistical first release slide in the presentation pack.

Louise asked for feedback on proposed changes to the statistical first release – as shown on the slide. Local authorities did not have strong views but noted that the later data is available, the less relevant it becomes. While the extra data was interesting and valuable – it was not critical.

In relation to adopted children, Louise confirmed that information on attainment of adopted children is now available to the Department through matching attainment data

with information collected via the school census on whether a child was adopted, had a special guardianship order, or a child arrangement order. However, this is only recorded on the school census if it has been declared to the school, so this will be caveated.

The meeting suggested that the education data for looked after children could be published with other education data for all children. Louise said this had been considered but there were issues related to differences in the groups of cohorts included which need further consideration.

Action point 3: Louise to consider a local authority suggestion to provide attainment by type of school.

3.7 Reminder of changes (2015 to 2016 publications)

Please see reminder of changes slide in the presentation pack.

The information in the slide about changes for 2015 to 2016 had been discussed previously. Louise ran through the information again and thanked local authorities for their spread sheet returns for 17 and 18 year old care leavers. These will now be included in the 'care leavers' cohort and there would no longer be a separate spread sheet return.

There were no further comments from local authorities.

3.8 Proposed revisions to the local authority return guide (2014 to 2015 publications)

Please see the proposed revisions to the local authority return guide pack slide in the presentation pack. There are two slides for this topic.

Louise ran through the bullet points on the slide and confirmed that these were proposals at this stage. Final guides would be confirmed in writing by DfE.

A couple of questions were raised:

A local authority asked why `in touch' needs to be returned for care leavers if local authorities are now able to return activity and accommodation information where the local authority is not formally in touch with the young person during the period but are absolutely certain of their activity and accommodation during the 4 month window.

Action Point 4: Louise to clarify the need for 'in touch' data and why the period was four months.

Some local authorities had concerns about their systems validating this data correctly and the lead time necessary for suppliers. Louise said that this was understood and should be done as soon as possible.

A local authority asked about cases where some children claimed to be under eighteen but were found to over eighteen, and whether these should be counted as care leavers. Louise said she would advise but noted that there is now a specific category of 'reason episode ceased' to record such cases, so we are able to identify them in the data.

Action point 5: Louise to confirm action to take when a child is found to be over eighteen who was previously thought to be under eighteen.

Long term foster placements: The slide pack contains a link to the definition of a long term foster placement which came into effect from 1 April 2015, and confirms use for placement codes 'U1' and 'U4'. There was a long conversation about long term fostering coding. Local authorities expressed concerns about the proposal to only collect long-term foster placements with a start date of 1 April 2015 onwards. Many LAs had already been recording long-term fostering placements with a start date prior to this and it would be resource-intensive to manually recode these to 1 April 2015.

Action point 6: Louise to reconsider the proposals regarding recording of long-term fostering in light of local authority concerns.

Action Point 7: Louise to check if the reason for placement change code should be returned in the new episode or at the end of the old one. Louise has confirmed that this should be at the end of the previous episode.

An LA asked about URNs (Unique Reference Number) and how they get access to a list. Rob Campbell said that there was an OFSTED source but only a small number of people in the local authority may have access. Rob kindly sent the following address: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk. It is advised to include the 'subject' as for the attention of Sarah Matthews - children's home list.

Action point 8: A local authority said that worked examples in the collection guide were really helpful. Local authorities were asked to send complicated case scenarios to alan.brooks@education.gsi.gov.uk

One local authority asked whether it is possible for DfE to share back information on adoption/SGO (special guardianship order)/CAO (child arrangements order) breakdowns with the responsible local authority at the time the order was granted, as this is not always known by those local authorities.

Action point 9: Louise to explore the possibilities for data sharing.

A local authority asked about neighbourhood returns. Louise confirmed this was in LAIT (local authority interactive tool) and not in the statistical first release.

Action Point 10: Louise to update local authorities on 2015 to 2016 technical specification and XSD development.

3.9 2016 to 2017 collection

There were no changes planned for the 2016 to 2017 collection.

4 Children in need census (CIN) – Adam Whitaker

4.1 Child protection visits

Please see the two child protection slides in the presentation pack.

Adam led a conversation about the data item in the CIN census which checked the number of child protection plans (CPP) where the child was seen by the lead social worker in accordance with the timescales specified within their plan. This was part of recommendations in Professor Munro's review but there were general concerns about the consistency of the data across local authorities with differing timescales and also the perceptions created by the data ie there were different circumstances affecting when a child could be seen. This was of particular concern for local authorities since even though there were caveats in the table, all missed visits counted even if the reasons they were missed were out of the control of the local authority. Local authorities also mentioned how time consuming this particular data item was to record.

An alternative approach had been suggested by a local authority (see the second slide) – which proposed having a 'buffer' of two occasions; and/or one day beyond the timescale. Both suggestions did not receive support from the groups as they did not address the main issues, which included the following:

- The main issue was that local authorities may use different timescales – thus there is no meaningful consistency across the statistics. Some authorities said they would be happy with a set frequency but it was agreed that there was a danger that the Department could be seen as being over prescriptive and it would lose individuality if fixed;
- There are issues that impact on the availability of the child that are out of social worker control eg they may simply be on holiday;
- Some local authorities used a team of officers – it was felt unfair on them that the measure only applied for qualified social workers;
- A point was made about the progress of a child protection plan ie that as time passed there often was less need to see the child;
- It was felt that one missed appointment could affect others – which gave the wrong impression when assessing the data;
- It was generally agreed that local authorities check on these things and that the data item was the wrong place for this to be measured – especially since the public could be given a distorted impression of how cases were managed.

Action point 11: Adam to report feedback to policy colleagues for their consideration as to whether this data item should continue to be collected.

4.2 Factors identified at the end of assessment

Please see the factors identified at the end of assessment slide in the presentation pack.

Adam commented that for the 2013 to 2014 census the data was published at a national level due to the quality and coverage in the first year of collection. For the October 2015 publication there would be a local authority breakdown as the quality and coverage had improved.

A local authority asked if the data would be expressed as numbers or percentages. Adam confirmed it would be in numbers.

Local authorities said that while they saw the data as worthwhile, it was difficult to collect and relied on social workers using the tick list properly.

Local authorities said they had had to deal with many errors when they had used the code 'RC8' (no further action) but had recorded factors. They said that this should be possible to return. There was a comment that section 47 assessments can run in parallel with a continuous assessment – and that if no factors are identified in one assessment this can cause issues. Local authorities generally felt that factors should be recorded as at the start, rather than the end, of the assessment.

A common issue was that the collection forced disability to be a factor if the child had a disability. Local authorities said that disability was not always a factor.

Action point 12: Anneka and Adam to review whether disability should always have to be an assessment factor if the child has a disability.

Adam asked what 'other' factors were. One local authority said they had been forced to use 'other' to pass some validation rules which triggered when there was no information to work on since they did not have the resources to check them all, and wondered if 'other' could be removed from the statistics. Adam said not and that 'other' was sometimes used alone or sometimes in conjunction with other factors. Another authority said that `parent' categories did not fit anywhere else. Adam said that the Department did not want to introduce lots of new factors, but that if there were a couple of important ones they would be considered. A couple of suggestions were `parent adolescent conflict' and 'concerns over parenting' but there did not seem to be a common theme for new factors. One local authority said they would like to see a factor that indicated that the data was not available. Adam said that the Department would prefer the field to be left blank and a case note provided.

A local authority suggested grouping some factors that regularly occurred together in publications (eg drug and alcohol, parental mental health, domestic abuse). Another suggested that it would be useful to compare factors over time to see if they changed for re-referrals. Adam said this would be considered.

4.3 Private fostering (PF1) consultation

Please see the private fostering consultation slide in the presentation pack, and subsequent slides on the addition of new factors for 2016 to 2017 CIN census.

Adam commented that the consultation was seeking views on the proposal to close the PF1 collection and expand the list of factors identified at the end of assessment within the CIN census to give further information on a privately fostered child. Whilst the PF1 data shows a range of information about children, it does not show which types of arrangement children may be in, nor whether the arrangement was found to be harmful. The PF1 collection relies on carers reporting the existence of these arrangements to their local authority and is believed to be an underestimate of the total number of children in private fostering arrangements. The proposal would only include children who were already included in the CIN census ie a privately fostered child must have been referred to and assessed to be in need of services by children's social care in addition to receiving the required statutory visits because they are privately fostered will be included. If a privately fostered child is only receiving the required statutory visits from social care, then the child is not included in the children in need census. Louise Woodward (from the Department's child protection and local authority performance team) was able to attend the London meeting and commented that the proposal aimed to know more about those private fostering arrangements that are deemed most at risk of harm and could lead to improved targeting and detection of cases of concern. Local authorities said that this would not save them much time, but did not raise any major objections to the overall proposal.

Adam said that the CIN census would not be expanded except that new factors would be introduced in the 2016 to 2017 collection. These are shown in the slides, were recommended by OFSTED and have subsequently been agreed by Star Chamber. The priority was to collect information on children who were privately fostered and at risk of harm, but if information was returned on others this would be fine and the information would be analysed. Local authorities said that numbers would be small and in some years there might be no cases reported. They also commented that the factors may not always be mutually exclusive. By use of factors Adam said that it was hoped that local authority systems would not have to undergo significant change. The approach was meant to be of light touch eg although the data was meant to be for British nationals, the Department were not expecting extra checks to be made. New information on this would be published in October 2015 for the data to begin to be collected in April 2016.

Adam ran through the other factors that were hoped to be introduced. These have subsequently been agreed by Star Chamber. These included female genital mutilation (FGM) (the types of FGM listed in the slide are for information – not separate categories to be recorded), and abuse linked to faith or belief. Local authorities commented that there were an increasing number of factors and raised concerns about the time social workers would have to use these properly.

Adam confirmed that if the new codes were introduced, information would be available in October for collection from April 2016 onwards in the collection guide. Not all local authorities were confident their systems would be ready in time but Adam was hopeful that the data could be collected for most of the year if not from the start.

Adam invited local authorities to suggest further factors that would be useful. All agreed that there should not be too many factors. One suggestion at the meeting was for 'homelessness' which received some support. Criminal behaviour was discussed, but was included in anti-social behaviour (the age of responsibility was acknowledged as an issue).

Some local authorities said that there would be judgements that social workers would have to make eg is the factor about the belief or more about the family itself and other factors. Some social workers may have similar beliefs. The impact of belief factors would be hard to distinguish from the rest of the environment eg political views. Other local authorities felt that social workers were professionals who would make impartial judgements. Time would tell if there were too many factors to be workable, or if the data would be consistent and meaningful.

Action point 13: Local authorities to respond to let the Department know if there were further factors they wished to be considered.

5 Children in need and children looked after longitudinal analysis – Adam Whitaker

Adam Whitaker gave a presentation about the CIN-CLA longitudinal database work. This covered an overview of the process for joining each year's data and dealing with overlapping episodes, as well as some initial output for consideration. Delegates provided useful feedback which included possible explanations for some results and where to investigate further.

There is on-going work to improve the analysis so that the results can be shared at future group meetings.

6 Data integration (Liz Stanbridge, Surrey county council)

6.1 Introduction

Liz Stanbridge from Surrey county council offered to present information on the work Surrey had done on data integration. It was unfortunately not possible to make this presentation at both meetings. However, Liz kindly provided the following notes so that the information can be shared.

Before the presentation Alan thanked Liz and made the following statement:

One of the primary aims of this group is to provide a forum to allow data providers to discuss current practice in the social care sector and the following presentation is something which Surrey felt would be useful sharing with the group. However please note that the views discussed in this presentation are the views of Surrey local authority and not the Department for Education.

6.2 Presentation

Surrey County Council has been working on a project to integrate their looked after children data between two different systems which we use for our social care and education data. Building on this success we have also been able to use the same software to help us with our CIN census return.

When a child enters or leaves care it is recorded on our social care database, but that information needs to be mirrored on our education database in order for our virtual school to get involved and support that child as they have a responsibility for raising the educational standards of our children in care.

The key is to have timely accurate data which wasn't always possible in the past as although the information was regularly updated, it was a manual process. This can lead to problems with typos and delays with updates being undertaken once a week.

We had been searching for a solution for a number of years. Our technical department had previously purchased a software toolkit which they identified could be used to solve the problem of integrating our looked after children data. We then commissioned a software development partner to provide a solution.

Using robotics this software accesses the user interface in much the same way as a human would. An extract is taken from our social care database overnight and the software updates our education database each morning with any changes. Automatic notifications are sent out with details of the successes and failures.

Failures usually relate to children who are not yet in school because they are too young or who have only recently arrived in the country, ie unaccompanied asylum seeking children. A recent enhancement to the process now sends emails to the relevant team every morning detailing any children who need creating on the education database. The new child's record is created during the day and then the transaction re-runs at 5pm and updates the newly created record.

This data integration has worked really well for our looked after children data, but then we realised that we could also use it for our statistical returns which was a real bonus.

We had found that when collating the data for the CIN census one of the most time consuming pieces of information to find was the child's unique pupil number (UPN). We were missing thousands of UPNs for school age children which we simply didn't have the time to look up manually

The problem was that the UPN was recorded primarily on the education database whereas the CIN census is run from our social care database. So we worked with our development partner to amend the integration software and use it instead to extract data.

We provided a list of names and dates of birth and these were all looked up on the education database and the UPN returned if found. This took about 36 hours to run over a weekend but was successful in about 70% of cases and as a result we extracted an extra 6000 UPNs in total last year.

We were also able to re-run it again, at very short notice, when we had our Ofsted inspection and needed to provide the data quickly.

We had struggled previously to find a solution for updating data between these systems, as although the education database did have a programmable interface it was read only. Although in our local authorities we all use different back-office applications, the integration software toolkit can run on virtually any system. So if you are facing similar problems with moving data between different systems you might like to consider the possibility of a robotic solution.

7 Additional information – Alan Brooks

7.1 Helpdesk

As well as the development work reported in answer to action points 14 and 15, helpdesk has implemented some enhancements to their systems which will help the helpdesk deal with queries. When cases are moved between queues or individuals, the date the case was first received remains the same. This allows helpdesk to monitor cases which are close to their service level agreement easier. A button has been added whereby an e-mail can be issued to the customer with a holding response if a case is assigned to a second line colleague, enabling helpdesk to keep the customer informed of progress to their case.

Several local authorities felt that although the work had addressed some of the concerns they had about helpdesk, the service request form process meant that they did not get responses quick enough in their view. Also, that there was no substitute for talking to expert officers as quickly as possible. Delays often meant that local authorities took an approach to data issues that they felt was right – but which may be wrong or inconsistent with other local authorities, which may impact on data quality. Local authorities felt there were common issues that were not being addressed quickly enough. It was accepted that there were resource issues but delays to answer from DfE was still felt to be a risk. Some local authorities appreciated that the new approach to courtesy calls addressed concerns raised previously, but some commented that sometimes this was the best chance they had to speak to a DfE officer directly.

Action point 14: Alan to report that local authorities would appreciate the officers actually responsible for the service request form strategy to come to speak to them at the next focus group.

7.2 DfE forum

Alan confirmed that the DfE forum is still available for use - for discussion, sharing views and knowledge. It is a DfE forum so it is monitored so that incorrect information may be corrected and advice provided on common and significant issues.

7.3 CIN products

There was a new approach being taken to the provision of products for the CIN census. This included the XSLT, XSD and the XML generator. This new approach was across all collections and not just CIN. The only significant change was for the XML generator.

XSLT: The XSLT would be distributed to known software suppliers. New software suppliers could request the product.

XSD schema: No change. This would still be published on the website.

XML generator: These will be issued on request from local authorities.

If there were queries or concerns about the new arrangement, these could be raised by responding to survey questionnaires which Alan sent out in October. These surveys were asking about if and how the products are used so the Department may account for the resources it uses to produce them. Alan encouraged software suppliers and local authorities to complete the surveys when they were sent out.

7.4 Data exchange

At the previous meeting in December 2014 there was a presentation from the Department's data exchange colleagues. This was reported in the meeting notes and is a project aimed at looking at the benefits of more regular data flow between the Department and data providers – and providing the right way forward to achieve this if seen as beneficial. This is generally referred to as data inoperability. The proposed method was to have a data hub with a common set of exchange formats and data standards and protocols to automatically share data with partner organisations (eg DfE). In principle, data would be shared in real time and this would replace one off data collections. The project had moved into the pathfinder phase (evidence gathering). The meeting was told that project would be very grateful if local authorities and software suppliers would read slides that Alan had been asked to send out via email after the meetings, and answer questions on the final slide. This would allow the project to assess if findings so far were accurate and receive further views. Project managers have said they would be happy to attend future meetings, and the meetings appeared to think this would be useful. Update: Alan sent the slides out following the meeting.

12 Attendance Lists

Organisation	Name	Organisation	Name
LONDON MEETING		Newcastle	Ann Howard
Barking & Dagenham	Gareth Crane	North East Lincs	Sonia Rides, Antony Shaw
Bournemouth	Paul Johnson	North Yorks	Sharon Lawn
Bracknell Forest	Elizabeth McClelland	Nottinghamshire	Hannah Lomas
Brent	Suzanne McCarthy	Sheffield	Rob Campbell
Brighton	Daryl Perilli	Solihull	Peter White
City of London	Elizabeth Malton	Staffordshire	Craig Woods
Devon	Simon Cherry	Stockport	Carl Wheeler
Dorset	Annette Atkinson	Worcestershire	Sally Gray
Ealing	Andy Leung	York	Karen Jaques,
Enfield	Marc Thompson	**SUPPLIERS**	
Hampshire	Jenny Lovell	Capita	Mim Johnson
Hertfordshire	Yvonne Seville	Careworks	Bryan Maguire
Hillingdon	David Mellor	Civica	Stuart Chandler
Hounslow	Natasha Verma	Liquidlogic	Iain Holloway
Islington	Dawn Farrin	OLM	Chris Pina-Eccles
Lambeth	Lorna Brown	Servelec-Corelogic	Angela Robertson
Milton Keynes	Jane Spencer		
Newham	Alison Matthews		
Oxfordshire	Danny Hearn		
Poole	Adam Partridge	**OFSTED**	
Reading	Vijay Chandrasekaran	Judith Swindell	London

Redbridge	Keith Hurst		
Slough	Hari Cheema	**DfE**	
Southampton	John Colman	Alan Brooks	Louise Woodward
Southend	Jonathan Jacomb	Miguel Marques-Dos Santos	Adam Whitaker
Southwark	Vanessa Walker	Anneka Nelson-Girtchen	Louise Feebrey
Surrey	Liz Stanbridge		
Sutton	James Whitfield		
Thurrock	Bob Mills		
Wokingham	Barbara Sorkin		
SHEFFIELD MEETING			
Birmingham	Sandra Dawkes		
Bradford	Cat Moss		
Calderdale	Graham Mozley		
Cambridgeshire	Richard Davies		
Cheshire East	Debra Sloan		
Coventry	Ross Hughes		
Derbyshire	Andrew Clapham		
East Riding	Neviana Paunova		
Halton	Julie Jones		
Lancashire	Sharon Morgan		
Leeds	David O'Connor		
Manchester	Yuen San Ling		
Middlesbrough	Joanne Hudson		

	Follow us on Twitter: @educationgovuk		Like us on Facebook: facebook.com/educationgovuk