

SFR27/2012 DATA QUALITY AND USES OF DATA DOCUMENT:

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN IN NEED IN ENGLAND, 2011-12, FINAL

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, 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	2
1.1 Key users.....	2
1.2 User consultation.....	2
1.3 Information for users on planned further use of the CIN data	3
2. 2011-12 CIN census data quality	3
2.1 General comments on the quality of the returns.....	3
2.2 Data flows.....	3
2.3 Referral resulting in no further action flag.....	4
2.4 Referrals within 12 months of a previous referral (Table C2)	4
2.5 Referrals resulting in no further action and children assessed not to be in need (Table C2).....	4
2.6 Local Authorities piloting new arrangements for assessments and timescales.	5
3. Comparability between CPR3 and the CIN census.....	5
4. Data Quality and the Data Confidence Indicator.....	6
ANNEX A: List of checks carried out on data to inform the data confidence indicator	9

1. Key Users and Uses of the Data

1.1 Key users

There are three key users of the children in need data:

- The Department for Education uses the data to provide advice to Ministers for policy monitoring and setting future policies;
- Local authorities themselves (who submit the data) use the information to compare their own performance with regional and national averages and to benchmark themselves against other authorities;
- 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 do a lot of analysis of these statistics over the year, looking for different things at different times, sometimes overviews and sometimes very specific bits of information, but are always interested 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.

1.2 User consultation

A data usage focus group was set up to consult on the format and content of the publication of statistics on children in need. The first user consultation was carried out in Autumn 2011 and requested feedback on the tables in the 2009-10 publication and the feedback was incorporated into the 2010-11 final publication. In addition a general consultation on the publication was placed on the DfE Research and Statistics gateway at:

<http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/onlinesurveys.shtml> and ran through January and early February 2012. No responses were received.

The Local Authority Focus Group which meets 3-4 times a year was consulted in early summer 2012 and feedback was obtained on the proposed tables for this publication.

1.3 Information for users on planned further use of the CIN data

Being a child-level data collection we intend to link the census to the Children Looked After data collection and the National Pupil Database (NPD). This will allow us to track and analyse 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, Looked After and Special Educational Need status) and build a more complete local and national picture of the Children in Need population.

Analysis of the matching rates between the 2011-2012 CIN census and i) the 2010-2011 CIN census; and ii) the 2012 Children Looked After (CLA) data, will be passed back to local authorities in late 2012/early 2013 to help identify where there are inconsistencies in the data and where improvements can be made .

2. 2011-12 CIN census data quality

2.1 General comments on the quality of the returns

150 out of 152 local authorities provided a CIN census return in summer 2012. Newham and Havering local authorities were unable to make a CIN census return. In 2011 we allowed local authorities with missing, or incorrect CIN data, to provide supplementary aggregate figures instead. As we are now in the third year of the census and the data quality is improving we did not allow any local authority to supplement their CIN data with aggregate figures. Where specific issues were raised by a local authority about key figures, the data has not been used.

Figures in this Statistical Release represent the final position of the 2011-12 CIN 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 plan at 31 March 2012 does not equate to:

- the number at 31 March 2011, plus
- the number started in the year, minus
- those ceased in the year.

The same applies for the numbers of Children in Need.

It is likely this is largely due to:

- Continuing quality issues with the data returned. We are intending to look in more detail at matching rates between the 2011-12 and 2010-11 censuses to identify where these discrepancies are greatest and feedback the results to local authorities to obtain an explanation.
- The census is a snapshot each year, for example a case which is recorded late in the year may not be included in the 2010-11 census but would be included in 2011-12 data as an ongoing case (and may subsequently be closed).

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

2.3 Referral resulting in no further action flag

A key data item for identifying a child assessed to be in need is the 'referral no further action' flag. This is used to identify a referral which does not result in any further action, i.e. an initial assessment is not carried out.

The quality of the data returned this year was improved to the extent we could use it as originally intended to help identify children assessed to be in need.

2.4 Referrals within 12 months of a previous referral (Table C2)

Figures for the number and percentage of referrals in 2011-12 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 2010-11 and 2011-12 CIN census returns. Each 2011-12 referral 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 has been calculated this year to sit alongside these figures. Further detail of the checks made to inform this indicator can be found in the annex.

2.5 Referrals resulting in no further action and children assessed not to be in need (Table C2)

These figures are presented here for the first time. Figures for children assessed not to be in need are identified as referrals which only resulted in an initial 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.

2.6 Local Authorities piloting new arrangements for assessments and timescales

Throughout the 2011-12 collection year eight local authorities were given dispensation by the Secretary of State to trial new approaches to assessing children in need. The eight local authorities involved in the trials were Cumbria, Knowsley, Hackney, Westminster, Hammersmith and Fulham, Islington, Kensington and Chelsea, and Wandsworth. The exemptions focus mainly on the flexibility to remove the distinction between initial and core assessments and their related timescales. As such, in each case we discussed the publication of individual local authority figures with the local authority and in most cases this means that the number of initial and core assessments completed, and/or the duration of the assessments have not been published. Further information on the trials, and the emerging findings, can be found at:

<http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/safeguardingchildren/protectio n/a00198964/the-trial-authorities>.

3. Comparability between CPR3 and the CIN census

There are a number of issues to consider if the user is trying to compare figures reported through the aggregate CPR3 return (data up to 2008/09) and the CIN census (2009/10 onwards). Whilst broad comparisons can be made between the two collections, users of the statistics should be cautious in doing so.

Numbers of referrals, assessments, children who were the subject of a child protection plan and children in need, 2006/07 – 2011/12

Year	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09		2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Referrals	545,000	538,500	547,000		603,700	615,000	605,100
Initial Assessments	305,000	319,900	349,000		395,300	439,800	451,500
Core Assessments	93,400	105,100	120,600		142,100	185,400	220,700
Section 47 enquiries	73,800	76,800	84,100		89,300	111,700	124,600
Child protection plans (at 31 March)	27,900	29,200	34,100		39,100	42,700	42,900
Children in Need (at 31 March)		375,900	382,400	369,400

Source: CPR3 and CIN census

Specifically:

- Referrals – whilst the number of referrals often fluctuated year on year, there was a large increase when the reporting moved to the CIN census. In some cases this was due to multiple referrals being reported by the LA (for example, reporting new information on an already open case as a referral). Whilst this issue has now been resolved in most LAs, the number of referrals reported in CIN is still higher than those reported in CPR3. 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.

- Initial and Core Assessments – The number of both of these assessments completed in the year increased when they were reported through the CIN 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). Child level validation on the CIN return is helping to ensure that these core assessments are consistently recorded.
- 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.
- 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 CIN census and so the figures are not directly comparable.
- 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

In 2009-10 we introduced **data confidence indicators** for each breakdown included in this Statistical Release. We have done the same this year.

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 CIN 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 2011-12 CIN return. This involved analysing three components from the 2011-12 CIN census:

i. Data Quality - this involved analysing the child-level data to provide an indication of the quality of each 2011-12 CIN return. For the majority of LAs 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 LA received the **minimum score** for their overall “data quality” confidence level based on this range of measures.

ii. Data Confidence – this involved examining the notes that each local authority made alongside their 2011-12 CIN 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”.

iii. Data Completeness – this involved comparing reported figures for 2011-12 with those reported in 2010-11. A large difference in figures data does not necessarily mean that information provided for 2011-12 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 three 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 three 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 three components above will lead to a low score for the overall data confidence indicator published for each measure).

The summary table below outlines how the data confidence indicator for each measure included in the Statistical 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No major data quality issues ('3') and - No issues raised in the notes ('3') and - No large differences between 2010-11 and 2011-12 return ('3')
2 (medium confidence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some data quality issues ('2') or - Large differences between 2010-11 and 2011-12 return ('2') or - Issues raised in the notes ('2')
1 (low confidence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Major data quality issues ('1')
P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LAs who were part of the pilot exercise for removing timescales relating to initial assessments, core assessments and initial child protection conferences
..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LAs who have not provided us with a 2011-12 CIN return

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 Children in Need Statistical Release		Data Confidence Indicator		
		1	2	3
1	Numbers of children in need			
A	CIN episodes starting			
	Proportion of duplicate records by LA, childID and CIN start date	>5% **	1-5% **	0-1% **
	Number of CIN episodes which begin each month in 2011-12	N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average
B	CIN episodes ending			
	Proportion of duplicate records by LA, 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 2011-12	N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average
C	Children in Need throughout 2011-12 and as at 31 March			
	Same measures as CIN starting above			
	Same measures as CIN ending above			
NEW	Proportion of duplicate records by LA and childID	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
2	Numbers of children in need at 31 March 2011, by gender and age			
	Same measures as CIN at 31 March above			
	Proportion of children aged over 25	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of children with no age entered (i.e. no date of birth and no expected date of birth)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of each age group, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratios- Children aged over 18 is only age group where there are some LAs with large difference to the national proportion	>20% aged 18 or over	10-20% aged 18 or over	0-10% aged 18 or over
	Proportion of gender which are outside the code set for gender	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of males to females, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratio Have used proportion of males	N/A	> 60% or <40% males	Between 40% and 60% males
	Proportion of children with no gender (excluding children who are unborn- i.e. with a expected DOB)	>5%	2-5%	0-2%
	Proportion of cases where the gender code is indeterminate	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
3	Numbers of children ceasing to be in need in the year ending 31 March 2011, by reason for case closure			
	Same measures as CIN episodes ending above			
	Proportion of cases where the reason for closure is outside of the code set	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of each reason, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national ratio	100% =RC8	NA	<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%

4	Numbers of children in need at 31 March 2011, by ethnicity			
	Same measures as CIN at 31 March above			
	Proportion of cases with missing ethnicity (taking unborn children into account)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases where the ethnicity is outside of the code set	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of each ethnicity, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national average Only ratio with great difference is proportion where the ethnicity was not obtained	>50% not obtained	30-50% not obtained	<30% not obtained
5	Numbers of children in need at 31 March 2011, by disability			
	Same measures as CIN at 31 March above			
	Number of disabilities per child, highlighting LAs which have only used one disability per child or a small proportion of multiple	100%	70-100%	0-70%
	Number of disability codes used per LA, highlighting LAs which have used a small number of disability codes (this measure	1-7	8-9	10+
	Proportion of all children in need that have a disability, identifying LAs with proportions which are much lower than the	0-1%	>20%	1-20%
	Proportion of cases with a disability code of "NONE", but which also have another disability recorded which is not "NONE"	>1%	-	0-1%
6	Numbers of children in need at 31 March 2011, by primary need at initial assessment			
	Same measures as CIN 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%
	Ratio of each primary need, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national ratio	>50% N9	10-50% N9	<10% N9
7	Numbers of children ceasing to be in need in the year ending 31 March 2011, by duration of episode of need			
	Same measures as CIN at 31 March above			
	Ratio of each duration, highlighting durations where the proportions more than three times higher or lower than the national proportion	N/A	More than three times higher or lower than national proportion	Between three times higher or lower than national proportion
	Proportion of cases where the referral date is an arbitrary date	>25%	5-25%	0-5%
8	Number of children in need at 31 March 2011, by duration of episode of need			
	Same measures as CIN at 31 March above			
	Ratio of each duration, highlighting durations where the proportions are more than three times higher or lower than the		Various	
	Proportion of cases where the referral date is an arbitrary date	>25%	1-5%	0-1%
9	Numbers of referrals			
	Data quality			
	Proportion of referrals which are duplicates by the child ID and referral date and neither of the duplicate referrals is recorded	>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 2011-12	0%	NA	>0%
	Number of referrals received each month in 2011-12	N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average
	Proportion of cases entered into CIN with missing referral dates	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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

10	Numbers of Initial assessments completed by children's social care services and timeliness					
A	Numbers of Initial assessments completed by children's social care services					
	Data quality					
		Proportion of cases which are duplicates by child ID, effective start date and effective end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
		Proportion of cases where the effective end date is before the effective start date (build in flexibility of cases which end on	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
		Proportion of start dates which are before a previous initial assessment has ended or start on the same day as a previous	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
		Proportion of initial assessment start dates which are more than 1 week but less than 6 months after the referral date.	>9%	7-9%	0-7%	
		Number of initial assessments which begin each month in 2011-12	N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average	
		Number of initial assessments which end each month in 2011-12	N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average	
	NEW	Proportion of cases with missing initial assessment start dates	>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
	Data confidence (Notes)					
		This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 assessments provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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	Initial assessments duration					
	Data quality					
		Same measures as initial assessments above				
	NEW	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 LA's 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 assessments provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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	Initial assessment as a percentage of referrals					
	Data quality					
		Same measures as initial assessments above				
		Same measures as referrals above				
	Data confidence (Notes)					
		This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 and the number of initial assessments provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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	

11	Numbers of core assessments completed by children's social care services and timeliness					
A	Numbers of Core assessments completed by children's social care services					
	Data quality					
	Proportion of cases w hich are duplicates by child ID, effective start date and effective end date		>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
	Proportion of cases w here the effective end date is before the effective start date		>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
	Proportion of cases w hich start before a previous core assessment ended or starting on the same day as a previous core		>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
	Number of S47s w ith no corresponding core assessment		NA	>50%	0-50%	
	Number of core assessments w hich start and end on the same day		>25%	10-25%	0-10%	
	Number of core assessments w hich begin each month in 2011-12		N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average	
	Number of core assessments w hich end each month in 2011-12		N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average	
NEW	Proportion of cases w ith missing core assessment start dates.		>5%	1-5%	0-1%	
	Data confidence (Notes)					
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT		N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Data completeness (Comparisons)					
	This measure calculates the differences betw een the number of core assessments provided by the LA in 2010-11 w ith the 2011-12 CIN data and identifies cases w here the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes w ith previous year's data w here 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	Core assessments duration					
	Data quality					
	Same measures as core assessments above					
NEW	Comparison to national mean duration highlighting cases w hich are more than 2 times higher or low er than national mean duration		N/A	More than 2 times higher or low er than national mean duration	Betw een 2 times higher or low er than national mean duration	
	Data confidence (Notes)					
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT		N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Data completeness (Comparisons)					
	This measure calculates the differences betw een the number of core assessments provided by the LA in 2010-11 w ith the 2011-12 CIN data and identifies cases w here the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes w ith previous year's data w here 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	

12	Number of children who were subject to section 47 enquiries and initial child protection conferences and initial			
A	Number of children who were subject to section 47 enquiries			
	Data quality			
	Duplicates by LA, 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 2011-12	N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 LA, 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 2011-12	N/A	< 1/3 average	>= 1/3 average
	Number of CPPs starting in 2011-12 compared to the number of ICPCs	No of ICPC is >5% lower than the number of CPPs	No of ICPC is 1-5% lower than the number of CPPs	ICPC is up to 1% lower than the CPP number
	Number of CPPs which do not start on the ICPC date	>50%	25-50%	0-25%
NEW	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 LA's 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 LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 ICPCs above					
NEW	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 LA's 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 LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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
13	Number of children who became the subject of a child protection plan throughout the year, who ceased to be the					
A	BECAME					
	Data quality					
	Proportion of cases which are duplicates by child ID and CPP start			>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 CPP ended			>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases which began before a previous plan has ended			>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Number of CPPs which begin each month in 2011-12 {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 monthly average	>= 1/3 monthly average
	Data confidence (Notes)					
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 w hich are duplicates by child ID and CPP end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases w here the start date is after the end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases w here the start date is on the same day as the end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases w here the end date is 1 day after the start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases w here another CPP begins one day after the end date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Number of CPPs w hich end each month in 2011-12 {If the number of cases ending each month is less than a third of the average monthly cases then the DCI w ill be 2}	N/A	< 1/3 monthly average	>= 1/3 monthly average
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences betw een the number of CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 w ith the 2011-12 CIN data and identifies cases w here the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes w ith previous year's data w here appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
C 31 MARCH				
Data quality				
	Same measures as CPP began above			
	Proportion of cases w hich are duplicates by child ID and CPP start	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences betw een the number of CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 w ith the 2011-12 CIN data and identifies cases w here the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes w ith previous year's data w here appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage point	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
14 Number of children who became the subject of a child protection plan throughout the year ending 31 March 2011, by				
Data quality				
	Same measures as CPP began above			
	Proportion of cases w here 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 w here 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 w here the ratios are greatly different to the national ratio	Various thresholds		
	Proportion of cases w here the initial category of abuse is the same as the latest category of abuse	N/A	100%	<100%
Data confidence (Notes)				
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data completeness (Comparisons)				
	This measure calculates the differences betw een the number of CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 w ith the 2011-12 CIN data and identifies cases w here the change is much larger than average. (Comparing changes w ith previous year's data w here appropriate.)	N/A	Average change +/- 30 percentage points	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 2011, by initial & latest category of			
	Data quality			
	Same measures as CPP 31 March above			
	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	N/A	100%	<100%
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 points	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 2011, by gender and age (at 31 March			
	Data quality			
	Same measures as CPP 31 March above			
	Proportion of children aged over 25	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of children with no age entered (i.e. no date of birth and no expected date of birth)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of each age group, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratios- Children aged over 18 is only age group where there are some LAs with large difference to the national proportion	N/A	Greater than 3 times national average	Less than 3 times national average
	Proportion of gender which are outside the code set for gender	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of males to females, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratio (proportion of males)	N/A	>60% or <40% males	Between 40% and 60% males
	Proportion of children with no gender (excluding children who are unborn- i.e. with a expected DOB)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases where the gender code is indeterminate	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change

17	Number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan at 31 March 2011 by ethnicity (at 31 March 2011)			
	Data quality			
	Same measures as CPP 31 March above			
	Proportion of cases with missing ethnicity (taking unborn children into account)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases where the ethnicity is outside of the code set	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of each ethnicity, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national average Children where the ethnicity was not obtained is only group where there are some LAs with large difference to the national proportion	>50% of ethnicities not obtained	30-50% of ethnicities not obtained	<=30% of ethnicities not obtained
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
18	Number of children who became the subject of a child protection plan during the year ending 31 March 2011, by			
	Data quality			
	Same measures as CPP began above			
	Proportion of children aged over 25	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of children with no age entered (i.e. no date of birth and no expected date of birth)	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of each age group, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratios	N/A	> 3 times national average	< 3 times national average
	Proportion of gender which are outside the code set for gender	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Ratio of males to females, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratio (proportion of males)	NA	>60% or <40% males	Between 40% and 60% males
	Proportion of children with no gender (excluding children who are unborn- i.e. with a expected DOB)	>5%	2-5%	0-2%
	Proportion of cases where the gender code is indeterminate	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change

19	Number of children who became the subject of a child protection plan throughout the year, who became the			
	Data quality			
	Same measures as CPP began above			
	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 LA's 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 CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
20	Number of children who ceased to be the subject of a plan throughout the year, by length of time as the subject of a			
	Data quality			
	Same measures as CPP ceased above			
	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 LA's 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 CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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
21	Number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan at 31 March 2011, who had been on a plan for at			
	Data quality			
	Same measures as CPP began above			
	Proportion of review records with no review date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of review records with no CPP 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 review is on the same day as the CPP start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Proportion of cases where the review is before the CPP start date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Number of CPPs which are reviewed each month in 2011-12 {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 monthly average	>= 1/3 monthly average
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	This measure makes an assessment of each LA's 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 CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change

22	NEW TABLE: Number of children who were the subject of a child protection plan at 31 March 2011 by the length of			
	Data quality			
	NEW Same measures as CPP at 31 March above			
	NEW Ratio of each duration, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratios		Various thresholds	
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	NEW This measure makes an assessment of each LA's confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)			
	NEW This measure calculates the differences between the number of CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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 points	Within 30 percentage points of the average national change
23	NEW TABLE: Number of children who ceased to be the subject of a plan during the first six months of 2011-12, by			
	Data quality			
	NEW Same measures as CPP ending above			
	NEW Ratio of each duration, highlighting cases where the ratios are greatly different to the national CIN ratios		Various thresholds	
	NEW Proportion of cases with a child protection plan end date after CIN closure date	>5%	1-5%	0-1%
	Data confidence (Notes)			
	NEW This measure makes an assessment of each LA's confidence in their data using the notes provided through COLLECT	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Data completeness (Comparisons)			
	NEW This measure calculates the differences between the number of CPPs provided by the LA in 2010-11 with the 2011-12 CIN 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

** For measures where thresholds are >5% = '3', 1-5% = '2' and 0-1%= '1'.

0-1% includes 1%.

1-5% is greater than 1% to up and including 5%.