



Department
for Education

Characteristics of children in need in England: 2014 to 2015

Data quality and uses

October 2015

Contents

Purpose	3
1. Key users and uses of the data	4
1.1 Key users	4
1.2 User consultation	4
1.3 Current and planned further uses of children in need data	4
2. Children in need 2014 to 2015 census data quality	6
2.1 General comments on the quality of the returns	6
2.2 Data flows	6
2.3 Referrals within 12 months of a previous referral (table C1)	7
2.4 Referrals resulting in no further action and children assessed not to be in need (table C1)	7
2.5 Local authorities piloting new arrangements for assessments and timescales	7
2.6 Assessments data	8
2.7 Factors identified at assessment	8
2.8 Children who were the subject of a child protection plan who were seen by a lead social worker	9
3. Comparability between CPR3 and the children in need census	10
3.1 Referrals	10
3.2 Initial and Core Assessments	10
3.3 Child protection plans	10
3.4 Numbers of children in need	11
3.5 Other general comments	11
4. Data quality and the data confidence indicator	12
4.1 Data quality	12
4.2 Data confidence	12
4.3 Year-on-year comparability	12
Annex A: List of checks carried out on data to inform the data confidence indicator	14

Purpose

The purpose of this publication is to provide the latest information on children referred to local authority social care services, children assessed to be in need of social services, and children who were the subject of a child protection plan. This document details the key users and uses of the publication statistics, and highlights any known data quality issues and concerns.

1. Key users and uses of the data

1.1 Key users

The main users of the children in need data are:

- the Department for Education who use the data to provide advice to Ministers on policy monitoring and setting future policies;
- the local authorities who use the information to benchmark themselves against other authorities as well as regional and national averages;
- Ofsted who use the information as part of their inspection activities.

Other known users of the data are:

- the Ministry of Justice who use the data, particularly on the number of children on child protection plans, to forecast the number of public law cases likely to enter the courts;
- the NSPCC Consultancy Service to understand numbers of children who are the subject of a child protection plan;
- the NSPCC Information Service analyse the statistics with a particular interest in breakdowns by age, gender, category of abuse, ethnicity and disability;
- the Metropolitan Police Service (Child Abuse Investigation Command) for research into child abuse;
- Action for Children group looking into the number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan, by local authority and by category of abuse;
- other UK government departments for comparison purposes;
- The Home Office;
- Office of the Children's Commissioner's.

1.2 User consultation

In previous years we have consulted with users of the data on the format and contents of this publication. We hold a regular local authority focus group, which meets up to three times a year, and regularly receive feedback on the publication.

1.3 Current and planned further uses of children in need data

The children in need data is linked to the children looked after data collection and the national pupil database (NPD). The linked data provides the outcomes statistics in the additional tables published later in February.

Further analysis could include tracking and analysing the journeys of individual children and explore how these vary according to their characteristics and needs, for example:

- linking to the children looked after data will allow the analysis of the proportion of looked after children who are disabled and analysis of the original reasons for the child being identified as being in need.
- linking to the NPD will allow the analysis of pupil outcomes for children in need, for example, identifying the attainment of children in need and the progression between key stages following the receipt of services. It will also let us explore other relationships with absence, exclusions and characteristics (such as free school meal eligibility (FSM), looked after and special educational need (SEN) status) and build a more complete local and national picture of the children in need population.

2. Children in need 2014 to 2015 census data quality

2.1 General comments on the quality of the returns

All 152 local authorities provided a children in need census return in summer 2015. In earlier years of the census we allowed local authorities with missing or incorrect children in need data to provide supplementary aggregate figures to supplement their return. However, since 2012 to 2013, given the data quality as a whole is improving we did not allow any local authority to supplement their children in need data with aggregate figures. However, estimates have been used on some occasions where specific quality issues were raised by the local authority. Estimates are highlighted in the tables using footnotes and the method for estimating is outlined in the methodology document accompanying this release.

Figures in this statistical first release represent the final position of the 2014 to 2015 children in need census. In order to provide maximum use to users of the statistics we have published local authority level data wherever possible. To supplement this, a data confidence indicator (see section 4) has been included in all tables to highlight to users of the statistics if any issues have been identified in the data quality or completeness.

2.2 Data flows

The number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan at 31 March 2015 does not equate to:

- the number at 31 March in the previous year, plus
- the number started in the year, minus
- those ceased in the year.

The same applies for the numbers of children in need.

Possible reasons are:

- local authorities cleaning their data
- where estimates were used for local authorities who could not return their data
- the census being a snapshot each year. For example, a case which is recorded late in the year may not be included in the 2013 to 2014 census but would be included in 2014 to 2015 data as an ongoing case (and may subsequently be closed)

Evidence to support this theory has been provided by local authorities at our focus groups and a longer time series of data from the children in need census is required to fully identify these issues.

2.3 Referrals within 12 months of a previous referral (table C1)

Figures for the number and percentage of referrals in 2014 to 2015 which occurred within 12 months of a previous referral are presented in the publication again this year. They are based on data returned by the local authority in both their 2013 to 2014 and 2014 to 2015 children in need census returns. Each referral in 2014 to 2015 is counted in the re-referral figure if there has been another referral for the child within the previous 12 months. A data confidence indicator sits alongside these figures. Further detail of the checks made to inform this indicator can be found in the annex.

2.4 Referrals resulting in no further action and children assessed not to be in need (table C1)

Figures for children referred and no further action are referrals where, after initial consideration, no further action is required and therefore the case is not formally assessed.

Figures for children assessed not to be in need are identified as referrals which only resulted in an assessment, and which end with a case closure reason of 'RC8 – Case closed after assessment – no further action'. Supporting guidance for the collection explains that this closure code should only be used for cases where the child has been assessed not to be in need.

There appears to be a significant variation between local authorities in the number of referrals resulting in no further action and the numbers of children assessed not to be in need. This could be down to differing local practices on the thresholds of when certain assessments are carried out, or it could be a data issue. As such, users should be cautious in using these figures.

2.5 Local authorities piloting new arrangements for assessments and timescales

During the 2014 to 2015 collection year, 6 local authorities were given dispensation by the Secretary of State to trial new approaches to assessing children in need. The 6 local authorities involved in the trials were Hackney, Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, Wandsworth, Westminster and Hartlepool. The following table details the approaches trialled:

Local authority	Removed distinction between initial and core assessment and associated timescales	Removed 15 working day timescale from section 47 to initial child protection conference
Hackney	✓	✓
Hammersmith and Fulham	✓	
Kensington and Chelsea	✓	✓
Wandsworth	✓	
Westminster	✓	✓
Hartlepool	✓	

2.6 Assessments data

Revised statutory guidance 'Working Together to Safeguard Children 2013' was released in early 2013. This revised guidance allowed local authorities more flexibility in carrying out assessments. This resulted in a mixed approach reported by many local authorities last year which has continued in the 2014 to 2015 collection. By the end of March 2015, 139 local authorities had begun to implement continuous assessments (which should be completed within 45 working days) rather than initial and core assessments (which should be completed within 10 and 35 working days). No distinction between the types of assessment carried out was recorded in the data collected this year. For example, a local authority still operating initial and core assessments may have recorded two separate assessments where as a local authority operating the single continuous assessment may only record one assessment. Therefore, it is hard to draw robust conclusions when analysing year on year comparisons of the number of assessments.

2.7 Factors identified at assessment

Recording of all factors as understood at the end of assessment relevant to:

- the impairment of the child's health and development,
- the parent/carer's capacity to respond to the child's needs, and
- other people in the family/household e.g. a sibling or lodger.

Where more than one factor was relevant, then all were reported.

Factors identified at the end of assessment were collected and reported for the first time last year; however data was only published at a national level due to some concerns about its quality. The quality has improved this year so we have published information at local authority level. Experience tells us that it can take a year or two for new data items to 'bed in' so users should use the data with some caution. If more than one factor has been identified at assessment, each can be reported within the census. Most children will have more than one factor identified and reported.

2.8 Children who were the subject of a child protection plan who were seen by a lead social worker

This data item was collected for the first time last year and is a flag for all children who were the subject of a child protection plan at some point in the year, showing whether the child was seen by the lead social worker in accordance with the timescales specified in their plan. The flag was reported 'true' if all visits had been met or 'false' if some or all visits had not been met.

Local authorities have raised a number of concerns with this indicator since it was introduced last year and it has been discussed at local authority focus groups during the year. The main concern is around the differing timescales local authorities apply and drawing unfair comparisons. Broadly, the timescales for visits varied between two weeks and six weeks. Therefore where a local authority measures to a shorter timescale, it is more likely they will see fewer cases within their timescales. If only one visit was missed, maybe due to the child not being at home when the social worker visited, then this would count as visits not being made within timescales even if all other visits within the year were on time for the child. This data item is currently being reviewed and users of the data are advised to use this data with caution.

3. Comparability between CPR3 and the children in need census

There are a number of issues to consider when comparing figures reported through the aggregate CPR3 return (data up to 2008 to 2009) and the children in need census (2009 to 2010 onwards). Whilst broad comparisons can be made between the two collections, users of the statistics should be cautious in doing so.

3.1 Referrals

Whilst the number of referrals often fluctuate year on year, there was a large increase when the reporting moved from the CPR3 return to the children in need census. In some cases this was due to multiple referrals being reported by the local authority (for example, reporting new information on an already open case as a referral); this issue has now been resolved in most local authorities. At the same time as the change in data sources, there was a lot of media interest in the 'Baby P' case which is likely to have had an impact on the numbers of referrals received by local authorities. However, it is not possible to determine for certain if the scale of the increase in referrals was solely down to this, or if it was down to the change in data collection method.

3.2 Initial and Core Assessments

The number of both of these assessments completed in the year increased when they were reported through the children in need census which seems to confirm that the increase in referrals was a real one (as the increase in referrals has led to an increase in the number of assessments carried out). However we do know that the number of core assessments has historically been undercounted as not all section 47 enquiries had a corresponding core assessment recorded (statutory guidance states that a section 47 enquiry is carried out through a core assessment or through a continuous assessment from 2013). Child level validation on the CIN return is helping to ensure that these core assessments are consistently recorded.

3.3 Child protection plans

The number of children who were the subject of child protection plans has been rising over the recent years, a pattern that has continued through the collection of data from both sources. However, whilst it is likely there was an increase between 2008-09 and 2009-10, due to the differences in the data sources it is not possible to confirm if the increase was solely down to an increase in the number of children who were the subject of a plan, or if the increase is partially explained by the change in data source.

3.4 Numbers of children in need

Children in need were not collected in the CPR3 return. Whilst there was a periodic children in need collection, the latest covering a week in February 2005, it was carried out on a very different basis to the current children in need census and so the figures are not directly comparable.

3.5 Other general comments

Collecting data at child level has allowed us to work on getting the base child level data consistent between local authorities. In turn this has meant that on the whole, key indicators calculated from the data are more comparable than they were with CPR3 data as definitions have been applied consistently. For example, consistent definitions of 3 and 6 months have been applied when calculating the number of child protection plans that have been reviewed within the required 3 and 6 month timescales.

4. Data quality and the data confidence indicator

Data confidence indicators enable local authorities to make more robust comparisons with statistical neighbours and national averages. It also allows those local authorities who have invested time and effort in data quality to demonstrate the quality of their information and seek out similar high quality data for benchmarking.

In local authorities where issues were identified that affected a high proportion of records, the data confidence indicator was set to “1” (i.e. low confidence in the data). Where issues were identified which affected a small number of records they were classified as “2” and where no or few issues were identified they were classified as “3” (i.e. high confidence in the data).

We recommend that comparisons are not made between local authorities with the lowest confidence rating (“1”). Local authorities who have not provided us with usable children in need data information do not have a data confidence indicator for that section.

Data confidence indicators were calculated by analysing the child-level data to provide an indication of the quality of each 2014 to 2015 children in need return. This involved analysing 3 components from the 2014 to 2015 children in need census:

4.1 Data quality

This involved analysing the child-level data to provide an indication of the quality of each 2014 to 2015 children in need return. For the majority of local authorities this component determined the overall indicator. Each data quality indicator used a range of measures (for example, identifying the number of duplicate records and identifying overlapping assessments). Each local authority received the minimum score for their overall “data quality” confidence level based on this range of measures.

4.2 Data confidence

This involved examining the notes that each local authority made alongside their 2014 to 2015 children in need return. Local authorities that mentioned issues that had impacted on their data quality or confidence were classified as “2” and if there were no notes that explicitly indicated that there were known issues with the data then they were classified as “3”.

4.3 Year-on-year comparability

This involved comparing reported figures for 2014 to 2015 with those reported in 2013 to 2014. A large difference in figures does not necessarily mean that information provided for 2014 to 2015 is not accurate. However, it means that we are most confident in figures from local authorities with the fewest fluctuations in their historic data. Local authorities

with figures that are very different from previous years were classified as “2” and those with few differences as “3”.

All 3 components were combined to construct the overall indicator. As with the assessment of data quality, each local authority has received the minimum score out of the 3 parts of the data confidence indicator to indicate the overall confidence level for a specific measure (i.e. a low score in any one of 3 components above will lead to a low score for the overall data confidence indicator published for each measure).

The local authorities have a chance to view their data confidence indicators and feedback before publication. If confirmations of true reflections in activity have taken place and not a data quality issue, their data confidence indicator may be changed.

The summary table below outlines how the data confidence indicator for each measure included in the statistical first release have been constructed. The full list of comparisons carried out when assessing the confidence in the data is given in annex A.

Data Confidence Indicator	Definition
3 (high confidence)	- No major data quality issues ('3') and - No issues raised in the notes ('3') and - No large differences between 2013 to 2014 and 2014 to 2015 return ('3')
2 (medium confidence)	Some data quality issues ('2') or - Large unexplained differences between 2013 to 2014 and 2014 to 2015 return ('2') or - Issues raised in the notes ('2')
1 (low confidence)	- Major data quality issues ('1')
P	- Local authorities who were part of the pilot exercise for any part of the year for removing timescales relating to assessments and initial child protection conferences
..	- Local authorities who have not provided us with a 2014 to 2015 children in need return, or useable data
.	- Not applicable

Annex A: List of checks carried out on data to inform the data confidence indicator

Methodology and thresholds for the calculation of data confidence indicators included in the 'Characteristics of children in need' statistical first release			Data confidence indicator		
			1	2	3
1	Numbers of children in need				
A	Children in need episodes starting				
	<i>Data quality</i>				
	Proportion of duplicate records by local authority, childID and CIN start date		>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Number of children in need episodes which begin each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases starting each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}		N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average
	<i>Data confidence (Notes)</i>				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT		N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Data completeness (Comparisons)</i>				
	This measure calculates the differences between the number of children in need episodes starting in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)		N/A	Average national change +/- 30 percentage points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
B	Children in need episodes ending				
	<i>Data quality</i>				
	Proportion of duplicate records by local authority, childID, CIN start date and CIN end date		>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of end dates which are on the same day as the start dates		>10%	6-10%	0-6%
	Proportion of end dates which are the day after the start dates		>10%	4-10%	0-4%
	Number of CIN episodes which end each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases starting each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}		N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average

	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of children in need episodes ending in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average national change +/- 30 percentage points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
C	Children in need throughout 2014 to 2015 and as at 31 March 2015				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as children in need episodes starting above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Same measures as children in need episodes ending above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of duplicate records by local authority and childID	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of children in need throughout and at 31 March in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average national change +/- 30 percentage points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
2	Numbers of children in need at 31 March 2015, by disability				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as children in need at 31 March 2015 above			
		Number of disabilities per child, highlighting local authorities which have only used one disability per child.	100%	70-100%	0-70%

	Number of disability codes used per local authority, highlighting local authorities which have used a small number of disability codes (this measure does not apply to local authorities with less than 20 children in need at 31 March with a disability recorded)	<8 disabilities recorded	<10 disabilities recorded	10+
	Proportion of all children in need that have a disability, identifying local authorities with proportions which are much lower than the national proportion	0-1%	>20%	1-20%
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences between the number of children in need at 31 March 2014 with the number of children in need at 31 March 2015 and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average national change +/- 30 percentage points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
3	Numbers of children in need at 31 March 2015, by primary need at assessment			
Data quality				
	Same measures as children in need at 31 March above			
	Proportion of cases with missing primary need code	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases which are outside of the code set	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases with primary need code N9	>50% N9	10-50% N9	<10% N9
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences between the number of children in need at 31 March 2014 with the number of children in need at 31 March 2015 and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average national change +/- 30 percentage points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
4	Number of children in need at 31 March 2015, by duration of episode of need			
Data quality				

	Same measures as children in need at 31 March 2015 above			
	Ratio of each duration, highlighting durations where the proportions are more than three times higher or lower than the national proportion	Various		
	Proportion of cases where the referral date is an arbitrary date	>25%	5-25%	0-5%
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences between the number of children in need at 31 March 2014 with the number of children in need at 31 March 2015 and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average national change +/- 30 percentage points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
5	Numbers of children ceasing to be in need in the year ending 31 March 2015, by duration of episode of need			
Data quality				
	Same measures as children in need at 31 March 2015 above			
	Ratio of each duration, highlighting durations where the proportions more than 3 times higher or lower than the national proportion	N/A	More than 3 times higher or lower than national proportion	Between 3 times higher or lower than national proportion
	Proportion of cases where the referral date is an arbitrary date	>25%	5-25%	0-5%
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences between the number of children in need episodes ending in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average national change +/- 30 percentage points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change

6	Numbers of children ceasing to be in need in the year ending 31 March 2015, by reason for case closure					
	<i>Data quality</i>					
		Same measures as children in need episodes ending above				
		Proportion of cases where the reason for closure is outside of the code set	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
		Proportion of cases with reason for closure code RC8	NA	100% =RC8	<100% RC8	
		Proportion of cases with a CIN closure date but no reason for closure	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
		Proportion of open cases with a reason for closure	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
	<i>Data confidence (Notes)</i>					
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	<i>Data completeness (Comparisons)</i>					
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of children in need episodes ending in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average national change +/- 30 percentage points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change	
7	Numbers of referrals					
A	Referrals					
	<i>Data quality</i>					
		Proportion of referrals which are duplicates by the child ID and referral date and neither of the duplicate referrals is recorded as NFA	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
		Proportion of referrals which are made on open cases, which should not be described as a referral	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
		Proportion of children who are referred more than once in 2014 to 2015	N/A	0%	>0%	
		Number of referrals received each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases starting each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}	N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average	
		Proportion of cases entered into CIN with missing referral dates	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
	<i>Data confidence (Notes)</i>					

		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)					
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of referrals provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
B	Referral source				
Data quality					
		Same measures as referrals above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of referrals which are duplicates by the child ID, referral date and referral source.	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of referrals with missing referral source	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
Data confidence (Notes)					
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	Number and percentage of referrals in 2014 to 2015 within 12 months of a previous referral				
Data quality					
		Same measures as referrals above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of cases that were already open between 1 March 2014 and 1 April 2014 that were present in 2013 to 2014 dataset.	<50%	50 - 70%	70-100%
Data confidence (Notes)					
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)					

		This measure calculates the differences between the number of re-referrals provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
9	Numbers of assessments completed by children's social care services and timeliness				
A	Numbers of assessments completed by children's social care services				
	Data quality				
		Proportion of cases which are duplicates by child ID, assessment start date and assessment authorisation date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where the assessment authorisation date is before the assessment start date (build in flexibility of cases which end on the referral date and the start date is one day after to take into account systems which set up start dates one day after the referral)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of start dates which are before a previous assessment has ended or start on the same day as a previous assessment ended	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of assessment start dates which are more than 1 week but less than 6 months after the referral date. {If the number of cases described above is more than 4 times the national figure then the DCI will be 1, if the number of cases is 3 times the national figures, but less than 4 times the national figures then the DCI will be 2.}	> 4 times national average	> 3 times national average but < 4 times	< 3 times national average
		Number of assessments which begin each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases starting each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}	N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average
		Number of assessments which end each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases ending each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}	N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average
		Proportion of cases with missing assessment start dates	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
B	Assessments duration				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as assessments above	N/A	N/A	N/A

		Comparison to national mean duration highlighting cases which are more than 2 times higher or lower than national mean duration	N/A	More than 2 times higher or lower than national mean duration	Between 2 times higher or lower than national mean duration
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
C	Assessment factors				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as assessments above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of cases which are duplicates by child ID, referral date, assessment start date and factor.	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where factor 21 is recorded alongside other assessment factors.	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
10	Number of children who were subject to section 47 enquiries and initial child protection conferences and initial conferences completed within 15 days of section 47 enquiry				
A	Number of children who were subject to section 47 enquiries				
	Data quality				
		Duplicates by local authority, childID and S47 start	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Number of S47 start dates which are before the referral date	>10%	2-10%	0-2%
		Number of s47s which start each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases starting each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}	N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				

		This measure calculates the differences between the number of section 47 enquiries provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +30 percentage point or average change -50 percentage points	Within average change +30 percentage point or average change -50 percentage points
B	Number of initial child protection conferences				
	Data quality				
		Duplicates by local authority, childID and ICPC date.	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Cases where same ICPC date is replicated in CIN details and s47 module	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of ICPC dates before the referral date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of ICPC dates before the S47 date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Number of ICPCs which start each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases starting each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}	N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average
		Number of CPPs which do not start on the ICPC date	>50%	25-50%	0-25%
		Proportion of cases with missing referral (for transfer in cases) or S47 start dates.	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of ICPCs provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +30 percentage point or average change -50 percentage points	Within average change +30 percentage point or average change -50 percentage points
C	Duration between initial child protection conference and section 47 enquiry				

	Data quality				
		Same measures as initial child protection conferences above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Comparison to national mean duration highlighting cases which are more than 2 times higher or lower than national mean duration	N/A	More than 2 times higher or lower than national mean duration	Between 2 times higher or lower than national mean duration
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of initial child protection conferences provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +30 percentage point or average change -50 percentage points	Within average change +30 percentage point or average change -50 percentage points
11	Number of children who became the subject of a child protection plan throughout the year, who ceased to be the subject of a plan during 2014 to 2015 and who were the subject of a plan at 31 March 2015				
A	BECAME				
	Data quality				
		Proportion of cases which are duplicates by child ID and child protection plan start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where the start date is after the end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where the start date is on the same day as the end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases with missing start dates	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases which began the day after a previous child protection plan ended	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases which began before a previous plan has ended	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Number of child protection plans which begin each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases starting each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}	N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average

Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
B	CEASED			
Data quality				
	Proportion of cases which are duplicates by child ID and child protection plan end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases where the start date is after the end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases where the start date is on the same day as the end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases where the end date is 1 day after the start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases where another child protection plan begins one day after the end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Number of child protection plans which end each month in 2014 to 2015 {If the number of cases ending each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}	N/A	< 1/3 national average	>= 1/3 national average
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
C	31-Mar			
Data quality				

		Same measures as child protection plans beginning above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of cases which are duplicates by child ID and CPP start	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
Data confidence (Notes)					
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)					
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
12	Number of children who became the subject of a child protection plan throughout the year ending 31 March 2015, by initial and latest category of abuse				
Data quality					
		Same measures as child protection plans beginning above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of cases where the category of abuse is outside of the code set (for both the initial and the latest category)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where the category of abuse is missing (for both the initial and the latest category)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Ratio of each code used, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national ratio	Various thresholds		
		Proportion of cases where the initial category of abuse is the same as the latest category of abuse	-	100%	<100%
Data confidence (Notes)					
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)					
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change

13	Number of children who became the subject of a child protection plan throughout the year, who became the subject of a plan for the second or subsequent time				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as child protection plans beginning above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of cases where the number of previous child protection plans is missing	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where details of a previous plan are recorded, but this is not included as a previous plan	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
14	Number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan at 31 March 2015, by initial & latest category of abuse				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as child protection plans at 31 March above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of cases where the category of abuse is outside of the code set (for both the initial and the latest category)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where the category of abuse is missing (for both the initial and the latest category)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Ratio of each code used, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national ratio	Various thresholds		
		Proportion of cases where the initial category of abuse is the same as the latest category of abuse	-	100%	<100%
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				

		This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
15	Number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan at 31 March 2015 by the length of time as subject of a plan				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as child protection plans at 31 March 2015 above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Ratio of each duration, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratios	Various thresholds		
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
16	Number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan at 31 March 2015, who had been on a plan for at least 3 months and who had had reviews carried out within the required timescales				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as child protection plans beginning above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Proportion of review records with no review date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of review records with no child protection plan start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases which are duplicate reviews (i.e. same child ID and same referral date and same review date)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where the reviews is on the same day as the child protection plan start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Proportion of cases where the review is before the child protection plan start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
		Number of CPPs which are reviewed each month in 2014 to 2015.	N/A	< 1/3 national	>= 1/3

		{If the number of cases ending each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI will be 2}		average	national average
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
17	Number of children who ceased to be the subject of a plan throughout the year, by length of time as the subject of a plan, year ending 31 March 2015				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as child protection plans ceasing above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Ratio of each duration, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national ratios	Various thresholds		
	Data confidence (Notes)				
		This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)				
		This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
18	Number of children who ceased to be the subject of a plan during the first six months of 2014 to 2015, by how long they remained in need after their plan ended				
	Data quality				
		Same measures as child protection plans ceasing above	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Ratio of each duration, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national ratios	Various thresholds		
		Proportion of cases with a child protection plan end date after CIN closure date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%

Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences between the number of child protection plans provided by the local authority in 2013 to 2014 with the 2014 to 2015 children in need data and identifies cases where the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes with previous year's data where appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
19	Number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan throughout the year ending 31 March 2015 who were seen by the lead social worker in accordance with the timescales specified in the plan			
Data quality				
	Same measures as child protection plans beginning above	Various thresholds		
	Same measures as child protection plans ceasing above	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases which are duplicates by child ID and child protection plans start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each local authorities confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2015

This publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/publications

Reference:



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk