**RIIA quarterly performance indicators – Draft proposal to ADCS Task Group December 2021**
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**Overview**

We present this report following discussions across several stakeholder groups. It proposes a revised RIIA quarterly dataset for commencement in April 2022, incorporating key learnings from data producers, decision makers, and policy makers across local and national government. In this proposal, the “RIIA 18” dataset loses some unhelpful measures but adds others, to effectively become “RIIA 24”.

The revised dataset is to be accompanied by updates to the existing regional Memoranda of Understanding clarifying the ways in which these measures can be shared and used by stakeholders. The two revisions together should make this dataset more valuable to the sector, leading to better decision-making and ultimately contributing to cross-regional and cross-government improvement in the ways we support children via safeguarding services.

**Summary of changes to pre-2022 set**

The proposed changes fall broadly into three categories:

* Standardisation of reporting practice across regions (e.g. time periods)
* Establishment of clear measure definitions
* Additional measures by mutual agreement

The standard reporting practice will be:

* To report **each quarter’s data independently**, with the option to make amendments to previous quarters as necessary
* To report to data co-ordinator(s) **within X weeks/months** of each quarter end
* To co-ordinate data and distribute to data users **within X weeks/months** of each quarter end
* For data to be reported on a **standard data format** (below) / For data co-ordinators to compile data to a standard data format (below)
* To adhere at all times to the terms of any Memoranda of Understanding governing this work between stakeholder organisations

Of the “clear measure definitions”, the most notable points are:

* Some definitions (e.g. contacts, assessments) accept variation between LAs as an operational constraint not to be altered by this work
* Where variations are expected, we seek to understand these with a “contextual information” dataset for each LA, to aid analysis
* Some definitions are brought in line with standard practice for DfE or other statutory returns

The key additional measures proposed are:

* Initial contacts
* Referral sources
* UASC
* EHE
* SEND
* Further measures proposed to add to development agenda for further exploration – including these now would delay this work unduly.

**Proposed measures in full**

The below is a refinement and clarification of the indicator set on which stakeholders consulted in late 2021:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *We want to…* | *Proposed measure* | *Old no.* | *New no.* | *Proposed definition* |
| Track variation in demand arriving at the front door, and get a broader view of activity below statutory social care level. | **Initial contacts**(number and rate per 10,000) | New | 201 | Initial Contacts, per child if possible, to the point of access for local authority children’s safeguarding services. This is any contact relating to a child not currently open to safeguarding services. |
| Track volume of new safeguarding work arriving in children’s services departments, using figures comparable to national publications.This measures demand, and changes in demand, for children’s social care services  | **Referrals total, and referrals by source**(number and rate per 10,000) | 1 | 2022020220203202042020520206202072020820209202102021120212 | Referrals to children’s social care, as reported in the national CIN Census. 11 supplementary measures providing breakdown by source, as per CIN Census definitions (excluding “Other”, “Anon” and “Unknown”):20202 Individual20203 Schools20204 Education services20205 Health services20206 Housing20207 LA services20208 Police20209 Other legal agency20210 Other20211 Anonymous20212 Unknown |
| Understand effects of thresholds, and whether children’s needs are being met.  | **Repeat referrals**(number and percent of referrals) | 2 | 203 | Referrals for which a previous referral exists within the previous 12 months (children), as reported from the national CIN Census.  |
| Timely view of change in demand for children’s social care services. | **Assessments started in the period**(number and rate per 10,000) | New | 204 | S17 Assessments started in the period, as reported from the national CIN Census. |
| Track demand, and changes in demand, for children’s social care services, and compare conversion rates to understand local trends. | **Assessments completed in the period**(number and rate per 10,000) | 3 | 205 | S17 Assessments completed in the period, as reported from the national CIN Census. |
| Demonstrate timeliness of front door work; identify potential drift for children. | **Assessments completed in 45 days in the period** (number and percentage) | 4 | 206 | Assessments completed in the period which were completed within 45 days, as reported from the national CIN Census. |
| Gauge levels of need and casework volumes within local areas and children’s social care services. | **Current Children in Need**(number and rate per 10,000) | 5 | 207 | Children in Need as at the end of the reporting period, as reported from the national CIN Census. |
| Track changes in demand for child protection services, and compare conversion rates from lower level activity. | **S47 enquiries**(number and rate per 10,000) | 6 | 208 | Section 47 enquiries completed in the period, as reported from the national CIN Census. |
| Demonstrate timeliness of child protection work; identify potential drift for children. | **ICPCs completed within 15 days of S47** (number and percent of S47s) | 7 | 209 | Independent Child Protection Conferences completed in the period within 15 days of S47 initiation, as reported from the national CIN Census. |
| Track demand, and changes in demand, for child protection services. | **New CPPs**(number and rate per 10,000) | 9 | 210 | Children with a CPP starting in the period. |
| Gauge levels of need and casework volumes at child protection level. | **Current CPP** (number and rate per 10,000) | 8 | 211 | Children with a CPP as at the end of the period. |
| Gauge levels of need and casework volumes at child protection level. | **CPPs ceasing**(number and rate per 10,000) | 10 | 212 | Children with a CPP ceasing in the period |
| Provide an insight into thresholds, risk tolerance and whether children’s needs are being met | **Repeat CPPs (ever)**(number and percentage of plans starting in period) | 11 | 213 | Children becoming subject of a child protection plan in the period for second or subsequent time |
| Provide an insight into thresholds, risk tolerance and whether children’s needs are being met | **Repeat CPPs (2 years)**(number and percentage of plans starting in period) | 11 | 214 | Children becoming subject of a child protection plan in the period for second or subsequent time within two years of the previous plan ending |
| Gauge levels of need and casework volumes at child looked after level. | **Current CLA** (number and rate per 10,000) | 12 | 215 | Children who are Looked After at the end of the period |
| Track demand, and changes in demand, for services for looked after children. | **New CLA** (number and rate per 10,000) | 13 | 216 | Children who are Looked After starting in the period |
| Track demand, and changes in demand, for services for looked after children. | **CLA ceasing** (number and rate per 10,000) | 14 | 217 | Children who were Looked After ceasing to be looked after in the period |
| Gauge demand, and changes in demand, for children’s social care services; Evidence the impact of immigration policy on children’s services; Influence national policy and funding decisions. | **Current CLA UASC**(number and rate per 10,000) | New | 218 | Of children who are looked after at the end of the period, the number who are UASC |
| Gauge demand and casework volumes in care leaver services. | **Care leavers**(number and rate per 10,000) | New | 219 | Care leavers aged 17-24 (as reported on Annex A “list 9” or equivalent) |
| Gauge demand, and changes in demand, for children’s social care services for UASC; Evidence the impact of immigration policy on children’s services; Influence national policy and funding decisions. | **UASC care leavers** (number and percentage of care leavers) | New | 220 | Care leavers aged 17-24 who were UASC |
| Demand and changes in demand, impact of Covid-19, to influence national policy and spending decisions | **EHE children**(number and rate per 10,000) | New | 221 | Number of children known to be electively home educated as at the end of the reporting period |
| Track demand and changes in demand around SEND, to influence national policy and spending decisions | **Requests for EHCP assessments**(number and rate per 10,000) | New | 222 | Number of requests for SEND plans in the period |
| Track activity and changes in activity around SEND, to influence national policy and spending decisions | **EHCP assessments**(number and rate per 10,000) | New | 223 | Number of SEND assessments completed in the period |
| Track activity and changes in activity around SEND, to influence national policy and spending decisions | **EHCPs issued**(number and rate per 10,000) | New | 224 | Number of SEND plans issued in the period |

**Proposed “contextual information” data items**

Where variations are expected in recording or activity practice across regions, case management systems, or individual local authorities, we seek to understand these with a “contextual information” dataset for each LA, to aid analysis.

We believe this is something not previously formally attempted which will aid analysis in the sector not only for the quarterly dataset but for other similar collections and publications, notably the CIN Census. We anticipate the additional burden on LAs of reporting this data to be low.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **We want to…** | **Proposed question** | **New no.** | **Proposed answer range** |
| Appreciate data quality risks and minimise impact on analysis | For each RIIA measure, indicate if there are significant data quality concerns in your reporting for this period | X01 – X24 | * Yes/No (per measure)
 |
| Understand differences in “initial contact” reporting | * Do you report initial contacts only for social care requests, or wider?
* Do you report contacts which do not progress to referral?
* Do you report contacts per child or per family?
* Do you include police DV notifications where no action needed?
 | X25X26X27X28 | * Social care requests only / Social care and early help / all children’s services / all children’s and adults services/ other
* Yes/No
* Child/Family
* Yes/No
 |
| Understand differences in “assessment” reporting | Do you include assessments on open cases in your assessment reporting for the CIN Census and RIIA collection? | X29 | * Yes/No
 |
| Analyse possible links between case management systems and reporting/activity practice | What is your current case management system? | X30 | Select from* CoreLogic
* LiquidLogic
* Mosaic
* Etc..
* Other
 |
| Understand impact of system changes on reporting/activity | Approximately when did your council originally implement the current case management system? | X31 | * Date or approximate date. If approximate day, use the 15th’ of the month. If approximate month, use June.
 |

**Proposed guidance/accompanying explanatory notes**

We propose to draft and issue accompanying guidance to ensure that these data are shared and read in the same context that they have been produced. This will improve decision making and understanding in the sector, and safeguard local authorities against some of the more likely misunderstandings which can arise from data used out of context. The key points are:

* 201 Initial contacts – we need to acknowledge significant differences in reporting methodologies here, in some cases due to IT system constraints. We attempt to address this in the “contextual data” table which should help identify groups of LAs who are comparable in their reporting.
* 203 Repeat referrals – we need to acknowledge underreporting here in terms of long term cases closing and quickly returning, which are not captured by our selected measure. The selected measure only tracks cases which closed within the 12 month period after opening and then re-opened within the following 12 months, not those cases where a long term support package was terminated and a new referral quickly occurred.
* 204-206 Assessments – we need to acknowledge significant differences in reporting methodologies here, in some cases due to IT system constraints. We attempt to address this in the “contextual data” table which should help identify groups of LAs who are comparable in their reporting.
* 213 Repeat CPPs – we know that this underreports, because cross-LA repeat plans happen frequently (only DfE would be able to produce this – it would therefore be a particularly useful thing for DfE to provide)
* 219 Care leavers - rate per 10,000 to be calculated regionally/nationally from the equivalent historical mid-year population estimate covering period when these children were under 18 (i.e. children aged 11-18 six years ago)
* 219 Care leavers – we need to acknowledge some differences in reporting methodologies here, however we feel collecting the full age range from 17-24 is the only way to properly account for service demands including the impact of UASC care leaver young adults

**Proposed data development agenda**

We propose the following measures/areas be added to a data development agenda. We agree there are useful measures here – provided we can identify effective ways to collect and report them – but we don’t propose to delay the current RIIA dataset revision to accommodate them.

* **Repeat referrals** based on closure date of previous case, as opposed to start date
* **Open CIN plans**, as opposed to open CIN cases/referrals
* **Placement costs and sufficiency** – separate work ongoing
* **Early Help measures** – separate work ongoing
* **SEND** – we propose that DfE removes the statistical component from the monthly SEND survey once these measures are in RIIA 24

**Format for data reporting**

The reporting format will be

* From LAs, two CSV templates to be provided, one for quarterly submission of measures and one for ad hoc updates to contextual information
* In each case the first row contains column headings and the subsequent rows contain the LA’s data for as many quarters and measures as they wish to provide or re-provide data. Each row will note both the reporting quarter and the date of reporting (this is to allow amendments to be provided in retrospect). Column headings for two proposed are:
	+ Region | LA code | LA name | Report date | Measure year | Measure quarter | Measure no. | Measure value | Quality check
	+ Region | LA code | LA name | Report date | Contextual measure no. | Contextual measure value
* Regional co-ordinators/Data to Insight/NPIMG can compile these into single files comprising all LAs’ most up-to-date values for each measure (this is to allow end users to easily incorporate retrospective amendments into existing reporting)

**Contributors**

This report was drafted based on earlier discussions across several stakeholder groups. The task group for this document was:

Alistair Herbert, Data to Insight (hosted by East Sussex County Council and representing CS-NPIMG)

Katy Block, ADCS Policy Officer (representing ADCS)

Paul Dryden, Hertfordshire County Council (representing Eastern region RIIA)

Hannah McNamee, City of York Council (representing Yorkshire & Humber region RIIA)

David Wilkinson, South Tyneside Council (representing North East region RIIA)

Tina Russell, Chief Executive Worcestershire Children First & Director of Childrens Services (representing West Midlands ADCS).