

Children's Improvement Board

**Supporting the effective use of data
and information**

**Summary of regional data activity for children's
services**

July 2013

Children's Improvement Board

The Children's Improvement Board (CIB) leads sector-led improvement in children's services. It is a partnership between the Local Government Association (LGA), the Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS) and the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE). All partners on the Board are committed to supporting local government to take charge of its own performance and improvement in the interests of children and young people. Its work supports local government's overall approach to sector led improvement

Following the unexpected withdrawal of Department for Education (DfE) funding for 2013-14, CIB is developing plans for an orderly closure of the current programme, ensuring continuation of a core legacy programme supported by LGA, ADCS and SOLACE.

Supporting the effective use of data

CIB recognises the importance of councils and local area partnerships having good data and the capacity to use it effectively. Effective performance management is an essential component in answering the question "Are we doing the right things?" and "Are we making a difference?" to evidence that:

- We have kept children safe;
- We have improved outcomes for children and their families;
- We have done so in a cost effective and consistent manner.

Through its work on data and information it aims to provide support to councils and Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (LSCBs) to maximise their skills and capacity in using data, capitalising on the good practice already out there.

CIB, working with the Centre for Excellence and Outcomes (C4EO) have been engaging with regional data networks to identify and develop tools, guidance and good practice to support the effective use of data and information for children's services. This is one of a number of products designed to help councils and LSCBs in using data and information effectively, to support their improvement. Support is aimed at senior managers and members, as well as data specialists, to provide practical support that strengthens local skills and capacity in the effective use of data, and enhances their self-assessment and peer challenge through

- Providing accessible, timely and relevant intelligence about children's services;
- Equipping operational staff, managers and members to assess and build their capacity and confidence, and that of their authority, in making effective use of data and intelligence;
- Providing tools and guidance that demonstrate appropriate use of intelligence and other evidence to commission, monitor, evaluate and improve services.

Working with regional data networks

At the start of 2013, CIB engaged with regional data networks to gather information about the way they work, and identify tools, guidance and good practice that could be shared with other networks. This paper reports on the discussions with each of the regional networks, providing an insight into how they operate and covering:

- Next steps;
- 'What works well in regional data management' - a one page summary highlighting some features of effective regional working identified;
- Common benchmarking set;
- Regional contact details; and
- How the regional networks work.

A number of tools have been, and continue to be gathered from the regions. Arrangements are in place to provide shared access to these. Appendix A provides summary information about the regional groups. Appendix B provides a summary of all benchmarking data sets in use across the regions.

All regions welcomed the direction and support that CIB is providing, together with the knowledge and skills data specialists were able to offer through this work. CIB acknowledges and values the support and feedback given by regional data networks for this work, and the range of material offered for wider sharing.

Notable successes through this work have been to provide support to two regions setting up new performance and information groups; provide challenge and support to regional groups in terms of membership and governance; and to share a significant number of tools with a region about to 'reinvent the wheel'.

Next steps

CIB's aim is that through sharing information about how different groups work, individual networks will be encouraged to share information and knowledge across regions, increasing their capacity and capability for using data and information effectively.

In June 2013 CIB facilitated a meeting for representatives from all data networks. The group agreed to explore ways to support the on-going sharing of tools and knowledge between regional groups. Using the soon to be released LG Inform online service, CIB will produce a range of data reports that support key topics and measures used in regional benchmarking sets.

CIB through its work with C4EO has produced the following tools and training packages. Designed for local delivery, these can be adapted to suit local requirements.

- A Performance Management Diagnostic Tool for Children's Services, designed to assist children's services organisations at any level to review and challenge the effectiveness of their performance management arrangements, and the extent to which it is embedded in the culture of their organisation and adding value to the management of the service.
- A modular package of training resources focused on increasing local capacity for understanding and using data effectively in supporting the delivery of services for children.

What works well in regional data management

Discussions with regional data networks about how they work and how they have developed has highlighted some key features of what works well. These are detailed below as a guide for groups in the early stages of development, or for those who simply want to be more effective in the way that they work.

<i>What works well for regional groups</i>	<i>What improves regional groups further</i>
Establishing a clear purpose of providing intelligence to support self-evaluation and service improvement in Safeguarding (a statutory inspection requirement for LAs)	Providing support and input for peer review
A champion within the regional ADCS group who attends at least once a year	A route into the regional ADCS group agenda for benchmarking and other analyses undertaken
A link with the regional Sector Led Improvement programme	Data management activity commissioned through regional SLI or ADCS structures with resources identified
A core membership of LA safeguarding performance and data leads – most of whom are at tier 3 and who are encouraged to attend by their LA	A small strategic steering group that can manage and drive the regional performance data agenda
The identification of non-core members who are kept informed of group activity	Web based solutions that allow the sharing of documents and communication between meetings
Agreement to share outcomes information across member authorities	A learning culture of reflection and openness to challenge A multi-agency dimension to data sharing
An agreed regional benchmark dataset that is collated to an agreed timetable and shared across members	Defining tasks and activities that can be commissioned and/or undertaken by member authorities to develop further the analysis of regional datasets
Clear definitions for all data within the regional benchmark dataset, with use of national definitions wherever possible	A secure web based repository for data A focus on data quality issues raised by data collation and the development of feedback into LAs.
Sharing practice in data management and analysis	Identifying best practice in data management and analysis
Inviting OFSTED to provide a link officer for the group	Inviting guest speakers from out of region or national agencies that can help develop the group agenda

Common benchmarking set

Regional data networks are using a wide range of indicators. Some groups are very focused in specific areas and work with a relatively small number of indicators, whilst others are attempting to cover a wide area. Only a relatively small number of indicators are common across more than one region.

Relatively wide differences in remit are illustrated by the indicator sets. Some groups have a focused 'safeguarding' remit, whilst others have a remit that considers safeguarding in a wider context. Some groups are attempting to develop specific local indicators, whilst others are relying entirely on nationally available indicators gathered elsewhere.

Not all regional benchmark groups have, as yet, engaged fully with the post Munro [DfE Children's Safeguarding Performance Information Framework¹](#), and only one region appears to have engaged with the local indicators as a benchmark item. The indicators used elsewhere are predominantly 'traditional' measures that have been in use for some time.

The following provides a summary of the common activity data and performance measures collated for benchmarking purposes across more than one region. This is based on measures in use as at April 2013. All measures in use are detailed in Appendix B.

Using the soon to be released [LG Inform²](#) online service, CIB will produce a range of data reports that support and inform key topics and measures used for regional benchmarking and analysis.

EARLY YEARS

Prevalence of breastfeeding at 6-8 weeks

% of early years registered providers inspected rated good or outstanding

78 points achieved across Foundation Stage with at least 6 points in each scale

% of children in reception who are overweight or obese

FAMILY SUPPORT

Count of CAFs completed in the period / CAF (Common Assessment Framework) rate per 10,000 children and young people

% of TAC (Team around the child) closures due to achievement of satisfactory outcomes

¹ <http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/safeguardingchildren/protection/b00209694/perf-info>

² <http://www.local.gov.uk/about-lginform>

ACTIVITY AND TIMELINESS MEASURES

Children in need, rate per 10,000 children and young people (excluding children in care and those with child protection plans)

Rate of section 47 enquiries per 10,000 children and young people

Rate of referrals per 10,000 children and young people

Percentage of referrals to children's social care from different agencies, such as health visitors, accident and emergency services, probation trusts, police services, schools etc.

Percentage of referrals that result in no further action following the referral

Referrals to children's social care going on to initial assessment

Rate of initial assessments per 10,000 children and young people

Percentage of referrals that result in no further action following an assessment

Percentage of referrals within 12 months of a previous referral

Rate of Initial Child Protection Conference (ICPC) per 10,000 children and young people

Percentage of ICPC held within 15 days of the start of a section 47 enquiry which led to the conference

% of initial assessments completed within 7 working days

% of initial assessments completed within 10 working days.

Core assessments completed a) total b) in timescale - NI60 (within 35 days) c) out of timescale.

CHILD PROTECTION

Children who are subject of a Child Protection Plan - rate per 10,000 children and young people

Percentage of children becoming the subject of Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time (within two years of previous plan end date)

Percentage of child protection plans lasting two years or more at 31st March and for child protection plans which have ended during the year

Percentage of cases where the lead social worker has seen a child/young person in accordance with the timescales specified in their Child Protection Plan (Source: CIN Census from 1 April 2013), for all children who were subject of a child protection plan during the year

LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN AND ADOPTION

Looked after children, number per 10,000 children and young people

Percentage of looked after children at 31st March with three or more placements in that year

Children in care absent from school

Average time between a child entering care and moving in with its adoptive family, for children who have been adopted (days)

Average time between a local authority receiving court authority to place a child and the local authority deciding on a match to an adoptive family (days)

Adoptions from care - % leaving care who are adopted

% looked after children adopted during the year who were placed for adoption within 12 months of the decision.

Proportion of young people leaving care who are in suitable accommodation.

Proportion of young people leaving care in education, employment or training (EET)

EDUCATION ATTAINMENT

Percentage of pupils achieving Key Stage 2 Level 4+ in English and Maths

Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent, including English and Maths

Achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19

Achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19

Attainment of level 2 in English & maths at 19 for those who had not achieved this at 16

Progression by levels in English between KS1 and KS2

Progression by levels in maths between KS1 and KS2

Progression from KS2 to KS4 in English

Progression from KS2 to KS4 in maths

YOUNG PEOPLE

The rate of hospital inpatient admissions caused by unintentional and deliberate injuries to children and young people aged 0-17

Rate of offences committed against children and young people (CRIMSEC Police stats)

Under 18 conception rate

Percentage of young people aged 10-17 entering the Youth Justice system for the first time

Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders

Total absence in secondary schools - half days missed

Persistent absence rate (new definition) state funded secondary schools

Secondary school fixed period exclusions

Participation in education and work based learning at age 17

Young People 16-18 who are not in education, employment or training (NEET)

Regional groups contact details

Below are the current contact details for each of the regional data networks.

Region	Network	Contact details
East and East Midlands	East and East Midlands Performance & Information Group	Laura Llewellyn, Performance and Data Analyst, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Laurallewellyn@southend.gov.uk)
London	London Information Exchange Group	Wai Chan, Performance Manager, Children's Services, Ealing (chanwa@ealing.gov.uk)
North East	Performance and Data Leads Network	Simon Willson, Head of Business Support & Improvement, Children, Education and Social Care, Stockton (simon.willson@stockton.gov.uk)
North West	North West Regional Information Group	Paul Bunker, Regional Development Manager, Safeguarding and Vulnerable Children - Hosted by Stockport (paul.bunker@stockport.gov.uk)
South East	South East Regional Data and Performance Group	Janet Shipton, East Sussex, Research and Information Manager Planning & Performance and Information Management Team, Children's Services (janet.shipton@eastsussex.gov.uk)
South West	South West ADCS Performance Leads	Christina Smale, (csmale@blueyonder.co.uk)
West Midlands	West Midlands Data, Quality & Performance Improvement Network Strategic Performance Group	Karen Marcroft, Head of Performance and QA, Walsall (karen.marcroft@btinternet.com) Tony Barnsley, Social Care Performance and Data Manager, Sandwell (tony_barnsley@sandwell.gov.uk) Polly Reed, WM Children's Programme Manager (preed@westmidlandsiep.gov.uk)
Yorkshire and Humberside	ADCS Yorkshire and Humberside Regional Performance and Information Management Group	Oliver Wiggins, Service Improvement Officer at Bradford Council, Business Support - Children's Services, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (oliver.wiggins@bradford.gov.uk)

How the regional networks work

Regional performance and data networks were contacted and interviews carried out to gather information about membership, activity and needs. Support was also provided to help develop the groups, and enhance their capacity for sharing skills and expertise across a region in a structured manner with links to regional Sector Led Improvement and other networks.

This section provides a summary of current practice reported under the following headings:

- Governance and resources
- Membership
- Organisation and communication
- Benchmarking and other activity
- Development

Governance and resources

About half of regional groups were set up 5 to 10 years ago, but coverage and history varies. Some groups are more recent such as the South West set up in January 2013 and the South East group currently being formed. In general, groups are considered effective, although most respondents added some caveats when saying this, with a desire that things could be better still. Most appear to be at a point of review, and all are open to the possibility of better collaboration across regions.

All have links, or the potential for links, to ADCS regional bodies and Sector Led Improvement, but these vary in quality and strength. Some groups, such as the North East and South West, were set up with those links as an integral part of how they work. For others, such as Yorkshire and Humber, West Midlands, and East Midlands the links have been consciously made. Some links to ADCS do not work as well as they could, and the size and complexity of linkages in the London region make this especially difficult. Most groups are made up principally of local authorities, but some do link with other groups and structures.

There is consensus that group purpose should include the provision of 'intelligence' to support service improvement, often through benchmarking. Data quality, systems and projects are a means of achieving this overarching purpose. All groups accepted that this implies the sharing of performance data and that this is being successfully taken forward, even with local authorities that do not routinely attend the regional group. In some areas this is directly supported by ADCS groups. Again in London, there is added complexity with the London Council network also collating children's social care data.

Changes over time are described as organisational, as the landscape of children's services has changed, and a shift in focus from data returns to a more direct and interactive relationship with the improvement agenda.

Resources vary, and most groups have few resources other than what member authorities contribute, or what key people in roles that allow them are able to contribute. Despite this the products can be considerable. For example the West Midlands benchmarking tool, the development of a web portal in Yorkshire and Humber, and the South West's SWISH (South West Information Sharing Hub). Sharing resources has been mentioned as a potential benefit, especially for smaller authorities. Some regions

have benefitted from targeted funding for data related work through the Sector Led Improvement work.

Mutual support, a learning culture, participation and openness are highlighted as good features of current arrangements. Some regions identified better links and alignment with regional improvement structures as areas for improvement. One group suggested the ability of officers within an authority to pass on information and connect could be improved. This could be a reflection on the profile of the group, its visibility and links to strategic networks. This seems a particular problem in London.

Membership

For some groups membership is open to all those who are interested. For others it is targeted specifically at Safeguarding data leads, and in these cases representation tends to be through more junior officers, below tier 3. Where there are more formal links to the ADCS performance structure such as in the South West, North East and Yorkshire and Humber, membership includes a higher proportion of officers at tier 3 and above.

Keeping track of members or relevant officers can be difficult where there is change in staffing. This is particularly an issue in Yorkshire and Humberside and London. The East and East Midlands region found it helpful to use the data specialist working with them to assist in reviewing and renewing their membership.

No groups have health staff as core members. Whilst responses varied depending on how strategic or operational the group is, some saw this as potential for future development as local authorities take on public health functions. This was considered more relevant for strategic groups. Currently joint activity with health colleagues appears to be limited to the North West. However some groups, such as the North East see the potential for future collaboration on joint task focused work.

Groups meet 3 to 4 times a year. All regions seem to have a core group who ensure things happen, but all regions also report a small number of non-attending local authorities. Attendance varies between 50% and 90%, with travel time to meeting venue a key determining factor. The distances some colleagues need to travel, especially in the South West and Yorkshire & Humberside, mean that attending a regional meeting is a major commitment. Where distance and travel time is an issue, some regions are exploring the option of sub regional networks, and the East and East Midland regional group is thinking of alternating its venue. The London group has not met recently and attendance here is probably below the range mentioned above.

With one possible exception there appears to be a good sense of ownership and collaboration in the groups. The strength of this can be affected by the strategic positioning of the group and the extent to which members feel empowered or ignored by those connections.

Organisation and communication

Most groups have a chair or steering group that drives agendas and activity. Many say that they are reactive to national and regional policy changes, and all are willing to open agendas to others. Some suggested they would welcome a more pro-active focus on joint activities that can benefit the region. All regions responded positively to the possibility of wider sharing of good practice.

With the exception of the newly formed South West group, all groups have had external speakers. Ofsted and those presenting on benchmarking and tools were most commonly mentioned. Showcasing current practice and sharing best practice is universally seen as

part of the remit for visitors and guests to the region. Some regions have held workshops with a specific focus. Following a discussion about the CIB data workstream, the Ofsted data team expressed interest in linking with the regional information groups in a more planned and useful way, including attendance at a group meeting.

Some groups have alternative communication channels other than email. Yorkshire and Humberside are able to use their web interface, and the East and East Midlands group have their Eastern Safeguarding Project (ESP) Website. Others such as the South West and West Midlands are developing something or awaiting the development of LG Inform. The Knowledge Hub does not appear to be popular with the groups and is not perceived as user friendly.

Several groups have members who participate in other groups. Those mentioned include the social care 'Google group', ADCS Standards, Performance and Inspection (SPI) committee, CIPFA benchmarking groups, and local ADCS groups.

Benchmarking and other activity

All regions have a joint agreed dataset, including the newly formed South East group, and the South West group where this is under development and review. This implies a general agreement to share data. For most this is explicitly about benchmarking with other local authorities. The West Midlands group are using information about other agencies. For example, reviewing the rate of referrals from other agencies and the percentage with 'no further action'.

For most regions, data collation and analysis is done by a volunteer local authority, and the outputs shared with the group. The West Midlands group have addressed the need for sustainability and resourced this activity through regional funding. Not surprisingly this is also the region with the clearest remit to report the analysis to the regional ADCS group, and a summary of the regional data will be submitted to a regional Strategic Performance Group each quarter, where performance data, quality of practice information and the child's voice information will be triangulated to provide a better regional understanding of performance. Beyond this the reach and impact of data produced seems variable and unclear.

All groups identified self-assessment and inspection as key elements of the group agenda. For the North West this is currently limited, but with a recognition that it will increase as part of the CIB peer challenge activity. Council scrutiny and quality assurance (QA) processes were seen as a part of agendas, though some felt the impact in this area is down to the capacity and views of individual local authorities.

LSCB focused work was also important in some regions but more variable in impact than inspection and self-assessment, with little focus in some local authorities. The North West group includes representation from an LSCB, giving the LSCB focus a higher profile.

Agendas universally cover safeguarding, care and adoption. Consequently any linked inspection or review activities and data systems are also on the agenda. Some groups mentioned coverage of troubled families, the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) agenda with a focus on the social care disabilities area, and a 'closing the gap' focus on SEND commissioned by ADCS in the West Midlands. There did not appear to be any coverage of Education and Early Years, or Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and Health. In London, there is a separate group known as the London Education Research Network that focuses on education.

Given the focus of agendas, it is inevitable that Integrated Children's System (ICS), the Children in Need (CIN) census, and for some groups other social care returns such as

the Children Looked After (SSDA903) return and Adoption returns are also part of regular discussion.

Development

Most respondents felt that groups were sustainable, because participants are committed and find it valuable, but also because their task is strategically important. Reductions in teams, shortages of time, and ability to prioritise were seen as barriers to development. There is concern that budget pressures and staff cuts could affect the ability of group members to attend. The enhanced web communication in Yorkshire and Humberside was viewed as helpful in enabling colleagues stay in touch even if they cannot attend meetings.

Geography can make attendance difficult for some local authorities. Lack of organisational resources such as meeting space and administrative support were also highlighted as barriers, especially in London where the usual meeting place had been withdrawn. Significant risks were identified for London where the group has not met for some time.

The increase in demand for intelligence on safeguarding at the same time as the reduction in centrally provided resources can act as both an incentive and a barrier to development. Some respondents suggest that a clearer and raised profile for their group may enhance development in the future. For example, through clarifying its role and contribution within the regional infrastructure and local authority.

Appendix A: About the regional groups

Region: East and East Midlands

Known as the East and East Midlands Performance & Information Group, this group was set up a number of years ago as an Eastern region group hosted by CSCI. Some current members were part of the original group. Quarterly meetings are held in March, June, September, December, with all dates set for the year ahead. Membership is self-selecting and it is a fairly large group. East Midlands was incorporated a number of years ago, and more recently some authorities from the South East have joined.

When the group was set up, the chair reported back through their DCS to the eastern region ADCS group. There have been no linkages for a few years and the group is now standalone. However as part of a wider review of groups in the region, the group could become a sub-group of the regional ADCS structure. There have been links with the regional Sector Led Improvement programme, and more recently with the regional Quality Assurance network as there are common areas across the groups.

Contact: Laura Llewellyn, Southend-on-Sea BC, (Laurallewellyn@southend.gov.uk)

Region: London

The group is known as the London Information Exchange Group, and includes all London Boroughs. It is a voluntary group set up in 2004 as part of a pan-London social care network covering adults and children. In 2006 a separate children's group was formed. Most attendees are performance managers and officers in children's social care.

Whilst the original group had links with Heads of Social Service, this has not been fully replaced with a link to ADCS in London, and the group is not part of any formal reporting structure. It aims to meet 3 times a year, although due to problems in finding a suitable venue the group has been unable to meet recently. There is also a separate group with a focus on education, known as the London Education Research Network.

Contact: Wai Chan, Ealing (chanwa@ealing.gov.uk)

Region: North East

Known as the Performance and Data Leads Network, this group covers the North East and Cumbria. It has been operational since May 2012, and reports to ADCS and the Regional CIB programme. It was established as a priority in the 2012/13 Sector Led Improvement delivery plan, and membership is currently made up of a designated data and performance lead from each local authority.

Contact: Simon Willson, Stockton (simon.willson@stockton.gov.uk)

Region: North West

The group is known as the North West Regional Information Group, and covers the North West region. The group is longstanding and its existence predates current membership and chair arrangements. The group meets quarterly, and reports to the Regional Assessment Group (Heads of Service/Senior Managers, Children's Social Care) and is accountable through the regional AD Social Care Network. It is increasingly linked to the NW Children's Improvement Board and NW ADCS. These arrangements are currently being formalised. Membership is not limited, but a self-identifying lead officer for each authority usually emerges to ensure continuity.

Contact: Paul Bunker, Regional Development Manager, hosted by Stockport (paul.bunker@stockport.gov.uk)

Region: South East

This is a new group currently known as the South East Regional Data and Performance Group. In the process of being set up, it is likely to report into the regional ADCS group. Quarterly meetings are proposed, and there are close links with the Sector Led Improvement programme. The purpose of the group is to support local authority self-assessment through the development of data resources and by helping to define good performance. The initial target membership is data and performance leads, limited to one per authority in the region for the time being.

Contact: Janet Shipton, East Sussex, (janet.shipton@eastsussex.gov.uk)

Region: South West

The group is known as the South West ADCS Performance Leads, and is a sub group linked to SW ADCS. It was set up in the latter part of 2012, and currently meets every 2 months. This will move to quarterly once a performance Quality Assurance framework is in place. Membership is made up one representative from each authority in the region.

Contact: Christina Smale, (csmale@blueyonder.co.uk)

Region: West Midlands

The West Midlands has recently established a Strategic Performance Group. This brings together key local authority colleagues from across Performance, Social Care and Education to work collectively on matters relating to performance. This group, chaired by Gail Quinton, Director of Children's Services at Worcestershire County Council, has strong links to the region's SLI Board.

The West Midlands Data, Quality & Performance Improvement (DQPI) Network, established over 5 years ago, is now a sub group of this and meets quarterly. Over time the group has broadened its remit from data exploration and statutory returns to consider sector led improvement, Ofsted developments and related experience, and other data sources.

Contact: Polly Reed, WM Children's Programme Manager, for the Strategic Performance Group (preed@westmidlandsiep.gov.uk) or Karen Marcroft, Walsall BC, (karen.marcroft@btinternet.com) and Tony Barnsley, Sandwell (tony_barnsley@sandwell.gov.uk) for the DQPI Network.

Region: Yorkshire & Humberside

This group is known as the ADCS Yorkshire & Humberside Regional Performance and Information Management Group, and covers the Yorkshire and Humberside region. The group has strong links to the regional Sector Led Improvement work.

The present group is the result of various splits and mergers going back to the days of ADSS. The group has been running in the same format since 2009, and meetings have become more frequent as a result of the Sector Led Improvement work. It aims to meet 3 to 4 times a year, with subgroups established as necessary for specific pieces of work.

Contact: Oliver Wiggins, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (oliver.wiggins@bradford.gov.uk)

Appendix B: Summary of regional benchmark datasets

Based on position as at 01/04/2013

The following provides a summary of activity data and performance measures collated for benchmarking purposes across all regions.

There are many ways to 'slice and dice' or categorise the various indicators collected, and regions have different ways of both categorising and reporting these. This summary presents the regional sets in common groupings. Any additional indicators used by regional groups have been included in the category that is closest.

The indicators shown are those provided by regional groups as at April 2013. They will be reviewed and changed by the groups to reflect any changes and developments affecting the regional and national scene.

Abbreviation: IDACI – Income deprivation affecting children index

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	CONTEXT										
1	Proportion of children living in poverty	✓				✓					
2	Primary pupils with English as an additional language	✓				✓					
3	Secondary pupils with English as an additional language	✓				✓					
4	Primary pupils eligible for free school meals	✓				✓					
5	Secondary pupils eligible for free school meals	✓				✓					
6	Indices of multiple deprivation, rank of average score (1 being most deprived)	✓				✓					
7	0-17 year old mid-year population estimates									✓	
	EARLY YEARS & MATERNAL HEALTH										
8	Infant mortality				✓						
9	% women who have seen a midwife or maternity healthcare professional for				✓						

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	assessment of health and social care needs, risks and choices by 12 complete weeks of pregnancy										
10	Smoking in pregnancy				✓						
11	Breast feeding initiation				✓						
12	Prevalence of breastfeeding at 6-8 weeks	✓			✓	✓					
13	Number of Health Visitors per 10,000 population aged 0 to 4 years	✓									
14	Number of school nurses per 10,000 population aged 10 to 17	✓									
15	% of 3 & 4 year olds benefiting from free early education	✓				✓					
16	% of early years registered providers inspected rated good or outstanding	✓			✓	✓					
17	Take up of formal childcare by low income working families					✓					
18	78 points achieved across Foundation Stage with at least 6 points in each scale	✓			✓	✓					
19	New early years and foundation stage achievement measure (placeholder)					✓					
20	Narrowing the gap between lowest achieving 20% in Foundation Stage profile and the rest	✓				✓					
21	% of children in reception who are overweight or obese	✓			✓	✓					
22	Total Early Years budget per pupil					✓					

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
23	Relative proportion of DSG (Direct Support Grant) allocated to early years					✓					
	FAMILY SUPPORT										
24	Count of CAFs completed in the period / CAF (Common Assessment Framework) rate per 10,000 children and young people				✓		✓				
25	Number of new CAF's initiated over last 12 months				✓						
26	Increase in CAF numbers by geographical area and age proportionate to numbers known to children's social care (Child protection, Children in need, admissions to LAC)					✓					
27	Count of initial TAC (Team Around the Child) meetings held						✓				
28	% of TAC (Team around the child) closures due to achievement of satisfactory outcomes					✓	✓				
29	Information Service contacts with families (indicator under development)				✓						
30	Number of families engaged in parenting programme				✓						
31	Number of families engaged in family support programme				✓						
32	Proportion of families requesting help who receive appropriate support				✓						

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
33	% of families reporting parenting capacity improved following parenting/family support				✓						
34	Number of families prevented from homelessness				✓						
	REFERRALS AND ASSESSMENT										
35	Contacts with social care per 10,000				✓						
36	Contacts with social care that progress to referral				✓						
37	Rate of referrals per 10,000 children and young people aged 0-17				✓		✓			✓	
38	Number of referrals received during the year ending 31st March									✓	
39	Percentage change in number of referrals received 2009-2012									✓	
40	Rate of referrals compared to expected based on IDACI									✓	
41	Number re-referrals within 12 months of previous referral									✓	
42	Re-referrals in 12 months: rate per 10,000 0-17 year olds									✓	
43	% re-referrals in 12 months of previous referral						✓			✓	
44	% change in number of re-referrals received 2009-12									✓	
45	Rate of re-referral compared to expected based on IDACI									✓	
46	Percentage of referrals to children's social care		N10		✓	✓	✓			✓	

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	from different agencies, such as health visitors, accident and emergency services, probation trusts, police services, schools etc. and the percentage that result in no further action following the referral and also following the assessment.										
47	Rate of initial assessments per 10,000 children and young people	✓	N7		✓	✓	✓			✓	
48	Percentage of referrals leading to the provision of a social care service (as defined by the child becoming a child in need)		N9		✓						
49	Referrals to children's social care going on to initial assessment	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
50	Proportion of initial assessments that lead to core assessments				✓						
51	Rate of core assessments per 10,000 children and young people						✓				
52	Number of assessments completed during the year ending March 31st									✓	
53	Percentage change in number of assessments completed 2009-2012									✓	
54	Rate of assessment compared to expected based on IDACI									✓	
55	CIN Rate per 10,000 population of children and young people (Excluding CiC and CPP)				✓	✓	✓			✓	

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
56	Number of children in Need as at 31st March									✓	
57	Percentage change in number of children in need 2009-12									✓	
58	Rate of children in need compared to expected based on IDACI									✓	
59	Length of time a child is considered to be a child in need at 31st March and for episodes of need which have ended during the year		N16		✓						
60	% of initial assessments completed within 7 working days (NI 59)				✓				✓		
61	% of initial assessments completed within 10 working days	✓			✓	✓	RANGE				
62	Core assessments completed a) total b) in timescale(NI60) c) out of timescale					✓	RANGE				
63	Distribution of working days taken from referral to assessment completion		N14		✓						
64	Core assessments completed within 35 days (NI 60)				✓				✓		
65	Number of core assessments out of timescale not yet completed							✓			
	CHILD PROTECTION										
66	Number of children who are subject of a Child Protection Plan - rate per 10,000 population	✓	N19		✓	✓	✓			✓	
67	Children who are both looked after and have a						✓				

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	Child Protection Plan										
68	Percentage change in number of children subject to a Child Protection Plan 2009-12									✓	
69	Rate of children subject to a Child Protection Plan compared to expected based on IDACI									✓	
70	Rate of de-registration from the child protection register (CPR) per 10,000					✓					
71	Review of child protection cases PAF CF/C20					✓					
72	Percentage of child protection plans lasting two years or more at 31st March and for child protection plans which have ended during the year		N17		✓	✓	✓		✓		
73	Percentage of children becoming the subject of Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time (within two years of previous plan end date)	✓	N18		✓	✓	✓		✓		
74	Percentage of cases where the lead social worker has seen a child/young person in accordance with the timescales specified in their Child Protection Plan (Source: CIN Census from 1 April 2013). For all children who were subject of a child protection plan during the year.		N20		✓		✓				
75	Percentage of child protection cases								✓		

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	reviewed within the required timescale (NI 67)										
76	Child protection visits - % conducted within statutory 6 weekly timescales						✓				
77	Percentage of CIN cases that closed within 6 months of: a) the child protection plan end date or b) the child ceasing to be looked after.		N21		✓						
78	Percentage of CPPs that close where the CIN case also closes or the child becomes looked after		N		✓						
79	Number per 10,000 children aged 0-17 years of children and young people who are the subject of an application to court in past 6 months (including care and supervision orders)		N22		✓						
80	Rate of section 47 enquiries per 10,000 population	✓	N8		✓	✓				✓	
81	Children with a previous CPP subject to a further S47 enquiry										
82	Number of children subject to section 47 enquiries Year ending 31st March									✓	
83	Percentage change in number of children subject to section 47 enquiries 2009-12									✓	
84	Rate of section 47 enquiries compared to expected based on IDACI									✓	
85	Rate of ICPCs (Initial		N13		✓					✓	

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	Child Protection Conference) per 10,000 population										
86	Number of children subject to an ICPC year ending 31st March									✓	
87	Percentage change in number of children subject to an ICPC 2009-12									✓	
88	Rate of children subject to an ICPC compared to expected based on IDACI									✓	
89	Number of ICPC as percentage of section 47 Enquiries in year. Year ending 31st March									✓	
90	Percentage of ICPCs that lead to child protection plans				✓						
91	Distribution of working days from Child Protection strategy meeting to Initial Child Protection Conference (ICPC)		N15		✓						
92	% of ICPC (Initial Child Protection Conference) held within 15 days of the start of a section 47 enquiry which led to conference	✓			✓	✓					
93	% assessments with feature of parenting ability compromised due to parental a) domestic violence, b) mental health c) substance misuse and d) learning disability						✓				
94	Potential child and parent/carer risk factors identified at assessment (for full list, see SPIF note 3). Source: CIN census		N11								

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	from 1 April 2013										
95	Number of incidents of domestic violence in households with resident children (under development)				✓						
96	Number of cases of parental substance misuse in households with resident children (under development)				✓						
97	Children subject to CPP for physical abuse (rate per 10,000 population of children and young people)		N12		✓						
98	Children subject to CPP for emotional abuse (rate per 10,000 population of children and young people)		N12		✓						
99	Children subject to CPP for sexual abuse (rate per 10,000 population of children and young people)		N12		✓						
100	Children subject to CPP for neglect (rate per 10,000 population of children and young people)		N12		✓						
101	% CPP / CiC where equality and diversity needs not fully met						✓				
102	Educational attainment of CIN (excluding children looked after) - Percentage of children achieving at least level 4 at KS2 in both English and mathematics		N1				✓				
103	Educational attainment of CIN (excluding children looked after) - Percentage of children		N1				✓				

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	who achieve 5+ A* -C grades at GCSE including English and mathematics										
104	Attendance at school of school aged CIN, excluding those who are looked after children, including a breakdown of children who are the subject of a child protection plan - percentage of sessions missed		N2				✓				
105	Attendance at school of school aged CIN, excluding those who are looked after children, including a breakdown of children who are the subject of a child protection plan - percentage classed as persistent absentees		N2				✓				
106	Exclusion from school of school-age children in need, excluding those who are looked after children, including a breakdown of children who are the subject of a child protection plan - percentage of children permanently excluded.		N3				✓				
107	Exclusion from school of school-aged children in need, excluding those who are looked after children, including a breakdown of children who are the subject of a child protection plan - percentage of children with at least one fixed exclusion.		N3				✓				

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN										
108	Rate of LAC (Looked After Children) per 10,000.	✓				✓				✓	
109	Number of LAC (Looked after children) as at 31st March									✓	
110	Percentage change in number of LAC 2009-12									✓	
111	Rate of LAC compared to expected based on IDACI (Expected compared to actual)									✓	
112	Unit cost of Children Looked After						✓				
113	% LAC at 31st March with three or more placements in that year.	✓				✓	✓		✓		
114	% of children who have been looked after for more than 2.5 years and of those, have been in the same placement for at least 2 years or placed for adoption	✓				✓	✓		✓		
115	% LAC at 31st March placed outside LA and more than 20 miles from where used to live.	✓									
116	Number of care applications to court year ending 31st March									✓	
117	Rate of care applications to court per 10,000 0-17 year olds									✓	
118	Percentage change in number of care applications to court 2009-12									✓	
119	Rate of care applications to court compared to expected									✓	

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	based on IDACI										
120	Looked after children cases which were reviewed within required timescale (NI 66)								✓		
121	CiC visits - conducted within statutory timescales						✓				
122	Emotional and Behavioural Health of Looked After children (NI 58)								✓		
123	Looked after children attainment: KS2						✓				
124	Looked after children attainment: KS4										
125	Looked after children absent from school - % CiC missing (25) days school in previous 12 months					✓	✓				
126	School age LAC attending school assessed below floor target at KS2 or 4					✓					
127	Fixed Term exclusion rate of looked after children						✓				
128	Year 11 LAC in Full Time Education					✓					
129	Year 11 LAC in Full/Part time Training or employment					✓					
130	Achievement of 5 + A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent, including English and Maths	✓				✓					
131	% LAC after 16 in Higher Education					✓					
132	Offending by children looked after continuously for at least 12 months					✓					
133	Proportion of care leavers over age of 16	✓				✓					

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	who remain looked after until their 18th birthday										
134	Proportion of young people aged 19 who were LAC at 16 who are in suitable accommodation.	✓				✓	✓		✓		
135	Proportion of young people aged 19 who were LAC at 16 who are in EET (Education, employment or training)	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓		
	ADOPTION										
136	Adoptions from care, % leaving care who are adopted	✓				✓	✓				
137	Number of children placed for adoption as at 31st March									✓	
138	Number of LAC moved to permanence through adoption, year ending 31st March									✓	
139	Number of LAC moved to permanence through RO/SGO (Residence Orders and Special Guardianship Orders), year ending 31st March									✓	
140	% LAC adopted during the year placed for adoption within 12 months of the decision.	✓					✓		✓	✓	
141	Average time between a child entering care and moving in with its adoptive family, for children who have been adopted (days)	✓			✓	✓	✓				
142	Average time between a local authority receiving court authority to place a child and the local authority deciding on a match to an	✓			✓	✓					

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	adoptive family (days)										
143	Children who wait less than 21 months between entering care and moving in with their adoptive family (%)	✓				✓					
144	Stability of LAC adopted following an agency decision					✓					
145	Percentage of adoption breakdowns (placeholder)					✓					
	SUPPORTING YOUNG PEOPLE										
146	Rate of offences committed against children and young people (CRIMSEC Police stats)				✓		✓				
147	Number of racist incidents reported by children and young people				✓						
148	Proportion of children and young people who say they have experienced bullying				✓						
149	Proportion of young people who say they feel very safe around their local community				✓						
150	The rate of hospital inpatient admissions caused by unintentional and deliberate injuries to children and young people aged 0-17		N5		✓	✓	✓				
151	The rate of violent and sexual offences against children per 10,000 population of children and young people		N4		✓						
152	The rate of hospital inpatient admissions		N5		✓	✓	✓				

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	caused by unintentional and deliberate injuries to children and young people aged 0-17										
153	The rate of accident and emergency attendance caused by unintentional and deliberate injuries to children and young people aged 0-17		N6		✓						
154	Alcohol specific hospital stays (under 18)				✓						
155	Under 18 conception rate				✓	✓					
156	% of young people aged 10-17 entering the Youth Justice system for the first time.	✓			✓	✓					
157	Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders				✓	✓					
158	Proportion of young offenders given a custodial sentence				✓						
159	Youth Offenders engagement in suitable education, employment or training	✓			✓						
160	Proportion of young offenders 16-18 who are not in education, employment or training (NEET)				✓						
	PRIMARY EDUCATION										
161	% of pupils achieving Key Stage 2 Level 4+ in English and maths	✓			✓	✓					
162	Progression by levels in English between KS1 and KS2				✓	✓					
163	Progression by levels in maths between KS1 and KS2				✓	✓					

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
164	Attainment Gap FSM/non FSM Key Stage 2 including English and maths	✓									
165	% of primary schools rated 'good' or 'outstanding'	✓			✓						
166	% of children in Year 6 who are overweight or obese.	✓			✓						
167	Total absence primary schools - half days missed				✓						
168	Proportion of young people in primary school given one or more fixed term exclusion				✓						
	SECONDARY EDUCATION										
169	Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent, including English and maths	✓			✓	✓					
170	Percentage achieving English Baccalaureate					✓					
171	Progression from KS2 to 4 in English				✓	✓					
172	Progression from KS2 to 4 in maths				✓	✓					
173	Percentage gap between the percentage of children in poverty (FSM) achieving 5+ A*-C grades or equivalent including maths and English at 16 and percentage of children not in poverty achieving 5+ A*-C grades or equivalent including maths and English.	✓									

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
174	Reduction in number of schools where fewer than 35% achieve 5 or more A*-C grades or equivalences (including English & maths)					✓					
175	Proportion of secondary schools rated good or better				✓						
176	Secondary schools with good or outstanding behaviour					✓					
177	Secondary fixed period exclusions				✓	✓					
178	Secondary permanent exclusions					✓					
179	Total absence secondary schools - half days missed				✓	✓					
180	Persistent absence rate (new definition) state funded secondary schools				✓	✓					
	ALL SCHOOLS										
181	% of half days missed due to overall absence - all schools (including special schools, CTC, academies)	✓									
182	Total permanent exclusions from school as a % of the school population	✓			✓						
	POST 16										
183	Achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19	✓			✓	✓					
183	Achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19	✓			✓	✓					
183	Attainment of level 2 in English and maths at 19 for those who had not achieved this at 16				✓	✓					

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
183	Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19	✓				✓					
183	Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19	✓				✓					
183	Attainment of Level 2 in English and maths at age 19 for those who had not achieved this level by 16 (%)	✓				✓					
183	Participation in education and work based learning at age 17				✓	✓					
183	Young People 16-18 who are NEET	✓			✓	✓					
183	Young people 16-18 whose current activity is not known					✓					
183	Proportion of teenage parents who are not in education, employment or training (NEET)				✓						
183	Proportion of young people 16-18 from black and minority ethnic groups who are not in education, employment or training (NEET)				✓						
	SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS										
184	% of school pupils who have statements of SEN, % of SEN without statements, % at School Action and % at School Action Plus.	✓									
184	SEN statements issued in 26 weeks - excluding exceptions	✓									

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
184	KS2 Attainment of children with SEN without a statement - English and maths	✓									
184	KS2 Attainment of children with a statement of SEN - English and maths	✓									
184	GCSE 5*A-C Attainment of children with SEN without a statement - including English and maths	✓									
184	GCSE 5*A-C Attainment of children with a statement of SEN, including English and maths	✓									
184	Proportion of young people 16-18 with learning difficulties or disabilities who are not in education, employment or training (NEET)				✓						
	WORKFORCE										
185	Vacancy rate of social workers		N23				✓				
186	Turnover rate of social workers		N24				✓				
187	Sickness absence of social workers		N25				✓				
188	Percentage of agency workers		N26				✓				
189	Number of social workers		N27								
190	% newly qualified social workers						✓				
191	Average caseload in Safeguarding & LAC Teams							✓			
192	Average number of open CIN (or CPP) cases per worker (Number of cases						✓				

REF No	Description	LA Profile	DfE Children's safeguarding performance information framework	NW	NE	Y&H	WM	E	L	SE	SW
	divided by number of FTEs)										
193	Number of unallocated cases over 28 days							✓			
194	% of cases audited of total open cases							✓			
195	% cases audited rated as inadequate							✓			
196	% of unfilled social worker posts in front-line teams							✓			
197	% of social worker posts filled by agency staff							✓			
198	% of unfilled team manager posts							✓			
199	% of team manager posts filled by agency							✓			
200	% posts at second and third tier filled by agency							✓			
201	Continuity at DCS level							✓			
202	-Do you feel your caseload is manageable?						✓				
203	-Do you feel you spend enough time working with children						✓				