ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT DATASET

Rotherham

Produced November 2007

Revisions in the APA 2007 dataset.

The following revisions have been made to data presented in the first (August) version of the dataset.

1002HC In the data definition section, the sub-heading read 'Commentary on Bristol values:' for all local authorities, so has been revised to 'Commentary:'. The data and traffic lights were referring to the correct local authorities so are unchanged.

1044HC The second part of this indicator relates to 'Under 18s on adult wards that are 16 or 17'. This text was missing from the description for some local authorities but has now been added.

1043SC The bandings for some councils were previously increased by one band colour. They are now accurately coloured for all councils. The data is unchanged.

2022SC The bandings for all councils have now been uprated for 2006-07. The data is unchanged.

2037SC The denominator data has been revised to use section 47 data rather than conference data. The data may be revised downwards as a result.

2054SC The denominator data has been revised to exclude all the children listed in the definition. The data may be revised upwards very slightly as a result.

2066SC The denominator data has been revised to omit the unborn. The data may be revised upwards very slightly as a result.

3035OF The statistical neighbours traffic lights for authorised and unauthorised absences were incorrectly based on the 'old' Ofsted statistical neighbours. They are now correctly based on the 'new' NFER statistical neighbours. The local authority and statistical neighbour data itself is unchanged.

3073SC The numerator data has been revised to include data provided to CSCI up to 2005-06.

3092DE The national traffic lights for 2005 and 2006 had not been applied so showed as white/'in line' for all local authorities. They have now been applied so will now be coloured for some local authorities. The data itself is unchanged.

5022SC The graph title now matches the performance indicator title. The data is unchanged.

5041DE}
5042DE}
5043DE} Data was incorrectly labelled as 03-04, 04-05 and 05-06, and has now been revised to 04-05, 05-
5044DE} 06, 06-07. The data itself is unchanged.
5045DE}
5046DE}

6003SC The numerator data has been revised so that all councils have their correct data. Data for some councils will have changed as a result.

6005SC The numerator data has been revised so that all councils have their correct data. Data for some councils will have changed as a result.

6024SC Councils are now all in their correct ACA groups and are correctly banded.

6049DE The statistical neighbours data were based on the old Ofsted groupings and have now been amended to the new NFER groupings.

Statistical Neighbours

Statistical neighbour groups help to benchmark local authorities' performance, and provide an initial guide as to whether it is above or below the level that might be expected. Some of the statistical neighbour groups used in this year's datasets have altered from those used in last years' APA and in JAR toolkits prior to block 16. The NFER's Children's Services statistical neighbour groups were published in February 2007 and are designed to be used across all children's services data. They replace the old Ofsted and CIPFA groups for education and social care indicators. The new NFER groups are used on the majority of indicators in this dataset; key exceptions being indicators from the Healthcare Commission, Youth Justice Board and HMI Probation, where data may not be at local authority level. Please refer to appendices 1, 2 and 3.

Traffic Lights and bandings

On a number of indicators, traffic lights are used to highlight strong or poor performance. For data on educational attainment and absences the traffic lights show differences between the authority and its statistical neighbours, as well as between the authority and the national figure. For this reason the shading is applied to the neighbours' and national figures rather than the figures for the authority itself. On social care Performance Assessment Framework indicators, shading is applied to the local authority, neighbours and national figures, as the bandings are based on cut-off points, not relative position. Please refer to individual indicators and contact the relevant inspectorate for further information if required.

Social care data

Some of the social care data in this year's APA datasets may differ to that in previous years' APA datasets. This is because the majority of data is now sourced from central data collections run by the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) and The Information Centre for health and social care (IC); rather than from CSCI's data collection. The national and statistical neighbour figures are produced by summing the numerators and denominators for each authority to produce the indicator score. This brings the methodology into line with that used in most Ofsted, DCSF and PAF publications. As CSCI's APA collection, however, only collected data at indicator level, the national figures used in previous year's APA datasets were produced by averaging the indicator scores for all the authorities. This change in methodology has affected some national figures, with most changes resulting in lower figures than presented in earlier datasets.

The exception to this is the set of nine indicators that Ofsted collected directly from local authorities in June 2007. As the old years' data for these is taken from the indicator level data collected by CSCI during previous APAs, Ofsted collected the 2006/07 data in the same way. The statistical neighbour and national figures therefore continue to be averages of the authorities' indicator scores.

The 2006/07 child protection data in the second and third versions of the dataset are second cut data from the DCSF's CPR3 data collection. This data has not altered from the first cut of CPR3 data used in version one of the APA dataset, except for the revisions highlighted at the start of these guidance notes. Statistical neighbour and England comparisons are included in this version.

The 2006-07 data on looked after children in this, third, version is from the DCSF's SSDA903 collection. Again, comparative data are included in this version.

The 2006-07 data on finance and staffing is taken from The IC's PSS EX1 and SSDS001 collections (6050SC only) is included in this version. Comparative data is also included.

Please contact the team at jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk if you have any queries.

	Education otherwise than at school data	153	
3067AC	BVPI 159a, 159b, 159c & 159d - % of permanently excluded pupils provided with alternative tuition.	154	

	School places and admissions data	155	
3089DE	% of primary schools with 25% or more surplus places as at Easter statutory return to the DCSF.	156	
3090DE	% of secondary schools with 25% or more surplus places as at Easter statutory return to the DCSF.	157	

	Youth offending information	158	
3080YJ	Education, Training and Employment - proportion of supervised juveniles in full time ETE.	159	

	Looked after children and care leavers data	160	
3085SC	PAF CF/C69: The percentage of children newly looked after in the year, and still looked after at 31 March, who were placed at 31 March more than 20 miles from their home address from which first placed.	161	
3071SC	The percentage of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam.	163	
3072SC	PAF CF/A2: The percentage of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with at least 1 GCSE at grade A*-G or a GNVQ (BVPI 50).	165	
3073SC	The percentage of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQs equivalent to grades A*-C.	167	
3074SC	PAF CF/C24: The percentage of children who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months and were of school age, who missed a total of at least 25 days of schooling for any reason during the previous school year.	169	

	Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data	171	
3106DE	The percentage of fixed term exclusions for pupils with statements in mainstream schools (broken down into Primary and Secondary phase).	172	
3086OF	Section 5 school inspection judgement: How well learners with learning difficulties and disabilities make progress (primary, secondary and special schools).	173	
3095DE	% of pupils with a statement of special educational needs (SEN).	174	
3063DE	DCSF SEN2 – number of new statements of special educational needs (SEN).	175	
3070AC	Audit Commission BVPI – percentage of new statements of special educational needs (SEN) prepared within 18 weeks.	176	
3066DE	DCSF SEN2 - percentage of pupils with statements of special educational needs (SEN) placed in special schools.	177	
3097DE	% of permanent exclusions in relation to the number of pupils in special schools.	178	
3099DE	% of fixed term exclusions of more than five days in relation to the number of pupils in special schools.	179	

BEING HEALTHY

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

BEING HEALTHY 1050HC

Mental Health Data

Child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) increased services

	numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?

Data not available (Doncaster and South Humber Healthcare NHS Trust)

Time Period: CAMHS mapping financial years 2004/05 & 2005/06

Indicator Description: Numerator is the total diference between the values for 2005/06 and 2004/05 for each criteria. The denominator is the total value for each criteria in 2004/05. The indicator value is a combination of % increase

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good, assessment is based on a comparison between CAMHS mapping data for the financial years 2004/05 and 2005/06. This is a national target in the Annual Health Check with a score of either 0, 1 or 2. The indicator itself is in two parts and looks at changes in levels of staffing and activity. Part 1: The percentage increase in staffing levels between 2004/05 and 2005/06. Part 2: The percentage increase in either total caseload or total number of new cases between 20045/05 and 2005/06. Scoring rationale: Thresholds for this indicator would be set as follows.
2= Achieved: An increase in staffing levels of equal to or greater than 1% between 2004/05 and 2005/06 and a greater than or equal to 1% increase in either total caseload or new cases between 2004/05 and 2005/06.
1= Underachieved: Less than 1% increase in staffing levels and a greater than or equal to 1% increase in either total caseload or new cases, or a greater than or equal to 1% increase in staffing levels and less than 1% increase in both total caseload and new cases between 2004/05 and 2005/06.
0= Failed: Less than 1% increase in staffing levels, total caseload and new cases

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = score of 2
no colour = score of 1
red = score of 0

Data Source: For 2005 data, http://ratings2005.healthcarecommission.org.uk/more_information.asp
For 2005/06 Healthcare Commission performance ratings http://ratings.healthcarecommission.org.uk/indicators_2005/06

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY 1001HC

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Proportion of expectant mothers smoking during pregnancy
(Page 1 of 1)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
ROTHERHAM PCT								
Proportion of expectant mothers smoking	2005/06	654	2490	**26.3%**	22.3%	-	16.6%	-
	2004/05	643	2259	**28.5%**	24.0%	-	18.2%	-
	2003/04	6	28	**21.4%**	23.9%	-	19.2%	-



Time Period: 1 April to 31 March

Indicator Description: The numerator is the number of mothers known to be smokers at the time of delivery. The denominator is the number of deliveries at which the smoking status of the mother was known (not the total number of maternities). NB. Please note that PCTs were reconfigured in October 2006. For current PCT names please see the Healthcare Commission APA briefing.

Guidance & Interpretation: Low is good. Maternal smoking during pregnancy is an important cause of low birth weight. A high percentage of mothers smoking in pregnancy could prompt questions surrounding the PCT's health promotion schemes. This data was collected for the first time in 2003/04 and the smoking status of new mothers was only recorded in 86% of maternities, rising to 92% in 2004/05, 2005/06 the figure was 93% although in some PCTs this % was much lower. Recognising the data quality/coverage issues the Healthcare Commission PI measured the % for which smoking status was recorded, rather than the % smoking. In future a higher percentage of data is expected to be available which should make this indicator more reliable.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly low rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly high rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: Selective data submitted for the "infant health" PCT PI: http://ratings2005.healthcarecommission.org.uk/more_information.asp

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

Being Healthy 1002HC

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Percentage of babies with low birth weight
(Page 1 of 1)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	95% confidence limits (CL) of indicator value Lower CL	Upper CL	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
Rotherham MCD	2005	n/a	n/a	**2.0**	1.6	2.6	1.5	Signif High	1.5	Signif High
	2004	n/a	n/a	**1.4**	1.0	1.9	1.5		1.5	
Percentage of babies with low birth weight (%<1.5Kg)	2003	n/a	n/a	**1.7**	1.3	2.2	1.6		1.5	
	2002	n/a	n/a	**1.8**	1.4	2.4	1.5		1.5	
	2001	40	2741	**1.5**	1.1	2.0	n/a	n/a	1.5	
	2005	n/a	n/a	**9.2**	8.2	10.3	7.8	Signif High	7.9	Signif High
	2004	n/a	n/a	**8.7**	7.7	9.7	8.0		7.9	
Percentage of babies with low birth weight (%< 2.5Kg)	2003	n/a	n/a	**8.3**	7.4	9.4	8.2		8.0	
	2002	n/a	n/a	**9.6**	8.5	10.7	8.2	Signif High	8.1	Signif High
	2001	218	2741	**8.0**	7.0	9.0	n/a	n/a	7.9	

Percentage of babies with low birth weight (<1.5kg)



Percentage of babies with low birth weight (<2.5kg)



Time Period: Births during the calendar year

Indicator Description: The indicator displays percentage of live and still births occurring in the calendar year with birth weights under 1500 grams and under 2500 grams. The denominator is all live and still births occurring in the respective calendar year.

Guidance & Interpretation: Low percentage is good. Low birth weight is thought to cause childhood asthma, and probably contributes to adult diseases, including cardiovascular disease and type 2 diabetes pregnancy. Note that some ethnic groups tend to have a higher proportion of low birth weights than other ethnic groups, and this should not be seen as a simple indicator of health deprivation without taking such factors into account. However, a high percentage of low birth weights could prompt questions surrounding health promotion schemes. Excludes births without a stated birth weight. Birth weight is obtained from the birth notification information provided to the registrar of births and deaths by the local health services. Birth weight is not always available from notifications. The figures presented are expressed as percentages of live and still births with a stated birth weight, thereby excluding births without a stated birth weight from the denominator. Separate numerators are not available for this indicator for 2002, 2003 or 2004.

Commentary:

Judgement basis: green = significantly low rate at 95% confidence interval
amber = within the expected range of variation at 95% confidence interval
red = significantly high rate at 95% confidence interval

Data source: Compendium of Clinical and Health Indicators / Clinical and Health Outcomes Knowledge Base (nww.nchod.nhs.uk) based on National Statistics. Data code DA04J_090

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY 1003HC

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Proportion of mothers initiating breast feeding
(Page 1 of 1)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
ROTHERHAM PCT								
Proportion of mothers initiating breastfeeding	2005/06	1347	2546	**52.9%**	57.3%	-	68.9%	-
	2004/05	1251	2525	**49.5%**	54.6%	-	66.6%	-
	2003/04	1265	2484	**50.9%**	53.8%	-	64.6%	-



Time Period: 1 April to 31 March

Indicator Description: The numerator is the number of mothers known to have initiated breastfeeding. The denominator is the number of deliveries for which the breastfeeding status of the mother was known (not the total number of maternities). NB. Please note that PCTs were reconfigured in October 2006. For current PCT names please see the Healthcare Commission APA briefing.

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good. Breastfeeding, especially in the first six months, is generally accepted to have health benefits for the child. A low percentage of mothers breastfeeding could prompt questions surrounding the PCT's health promotion schemes. This data was collected for the first time in 2003/04 and the breastfeeding status of new mothers was only recorded in 87% of maternities, rising to 93% in 2004/05in 2005/06 the figure was 93% although in some PCTs this % was much lower. Recognising the data quality/coverage issues, the Healthcare Commission PI measured the % for which breastfeeding status was recorded, rather than the % breastfeeding. In future a higher percentage of data is expected to be available which should make this indicator more reliable.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly high rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly low rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: Selective data submitted for the "infant health" PCT PI: http://ratings2005.healthcarecommission.org.uk/more_information.asp

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
ROTHERHAM PCT								
Immunisation rates by second birthday - diptheria	2005/06	2590	2782	**93%**	96%	-	94%	-
	2004/05	2555	2749	**93%**	95%	-	93%	-
	2003/04	2550	2717	**94%**	95%	-	94%	-
	2002/03	2677	2846	**94%**	95%	-	93%	-
Immunisation rates by second birthday - haemophilus influenzae type B (hib)	2005/06	2590	2782	**93%**	95%	-	94%	-
	2004/05	2552	2749	**93%**	95%	-	93%	-
	2003/04	2545	2717	**94%**	95%	-	93%	-
	2002/03	2667	2846	**94%**	95%	-	93%	-
Immunisation rates by second birthday - measles, mumps, rubella	2005/06	2337	2782	**84%**	88%	-	84%	-
	2004/05	2220	2749	**81%**	84%	-	81%	-
	2003/04	2254	2717	**83%**	84%	-	80%	-
	2002/03	2380	2846	**84%**	86%	-	82%	-
Immunisation rates by second birthday - meningitis C	2005/06	2582	2782	**93%**	96%	-	93%	-
	2004/05	2545	2749	**93%**	95%	-	93%	-
	2003/04	2550	2717	**94%**	95%	-	93%	-
	2002/03	2638	2846	**93%**	94%	-	92%	-
Immunisation rates by second birthday - pertussis	2005/06	2590	2782	**93%**	95%	-	94%	-
	2004/05	2552	2749	**93%**	95%	-	93%	-
	2003/04	2545	2717	**94%**	95%	-	93%	-
	2002/03	2667	2846	**94%**	95%	-	93%	-

Time Period: 1 April to 31 March. Data for years before 2002/03 were not reported on a PCT basis.

Indicator Description: Percentage of children immunised by their second birthday for diphtheria, pertussis (whooping cough), hib (haemophilius influenza b), MMR (measles mumps and rubella) pertussis and meningitis C. The denominator is the number of children for whom the PCT is responsible on 31st March reaching their 2nd birthday during the year to 31st March. NB. Please note that PCTs were reconfigured in October 2006. For current PCT names please see the Healthcare Commission APA briefing.

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good. A high percentage coverage is required to protect the community from the risk of outbreak of disease ("herd immunity") - this required % varies between diseases and for example is estimated at 95% for measles in the UK by Berger (1999, at http://bmj.bmjjournals.com/cgi/ content/full/319/7223/1462#resp1). A low percentage of immunisations could be a reflection of the PCT's immunisation strategies. Children for whom the PCT is responsible are all children registered with a GP whose practice forms part of the PCT, regardless of where the child is resident, plus any children not registered with a GP who are resident within the PCT's statutory geographical boundary.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly high rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly low rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: 2004/05 data is available from the DH website:
http://www.dh.gov.uk/PublicationsAndStatistics/Publications/PublicationsStatistics/PublicationsStatisticsArticle/fs/en?CONTENT_ID=4119649&chk=r6rlW4.
This is based on COVER (cover of vaccination evaluated rapidly) data collection undertaken by the Health Protection Agency (HPA), Centre for Infections (CfI), and from the Department of Health return KC50.

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY 1005HC

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Immunisation rates by 5th birthday
(Page 1 of 1)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
ROTHERHAM PCT								
Immunisation rates by fifth birthday - diptheria, tetanus polio primary & booster	2005/06	2002	2800	**71%**	85%	-	81%	-
	2004/05	2108	2929	**72%**	83%	-	79%	-
	2003/04	2224	2970	**75%**	85%	-	80%	-
	2002/03	2332	3238	**72%**	85%	-	80%	-
Immunisation rates by fifth birthday - measles, mumps, rubella first and second dose	2005/06	1960	2800	**70%**	80%	-	74%	-
	2004/05	2090	2929	**71%**	80%	-	73%	-
	2003/04	2207	2970	**74%**	81%	-	75%	-
	2002/03	2304	3238	**71%**	81%	-	75%	-
Immunisation rates by fifth birthday - measles, mumps, rubella first dose	2005/06	2419	2800	**86%**	91%	-	87%	-
	2004/05	2628	2929	**90%**	92%	-	89%	-
	2003/04	2711	2970	**91%**	93%	-	90%	-
	2002/03	2922	3238	**90%**	93%	-	90%	-

Time Period: 1 April to 31 March. Data for years before 2002/03 were not reported on a PCT basis.

Indicator Description: Percentage of children immunised by their fifth birthday, including where relevant the primary and follow-up immunisation. The denominator is the number of children for whom the PCT is responsible on 31st March reaching their 5th birthday during the year to 31st March. NB. Please note that PCTs were reconfigured in October 2006. For current PCT names please see the Healthcare Commission APA briefing.

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good. High percentage coverage is required to protect the community from the risk of outbreak of disease (see details for 1004HC). A low percentage of immunisations could be a reflection of the PCT's immunisation strategies. Children for whom the PCT is responsible are all children registered with a GP whose practice forms part of the PCT, regardless of where the child is resident, plus any children not registered with a GP who are resident within the PCT's statutory geographical boundary.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly high rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly low rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: 2004/05 data is available from the DH website: http://www.dh.gov.uk/PublicationsAndStatistics/Publications/PublicationsStatistics/PublicationsStatisticsArticle/fs/en?CONTENT_ID=4119649&chk=r6rlW4. This is based on COVER (cover of vaccination evaluated rapidly) data collection undertaken by the Health Protection Agency (HPA), Centre for Infections (CfI), and from the Department of Health return KC50.

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY 1049HC

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Emergency admissions to hospital 0-19 year olds
(Page 1 of 1)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**		*England average*	significant difference vs England?
Rotherham MCD							
All emergency admissions to hospital 0-19 year olds	2005/06	5792	64400	**8994**		6627	-
	2004/05	5486	64400	**8519**		6245	-

Time Period: 1st April to 31st March

Indicator Description: The indicator decribes all emergency admissions to hospital with the exception of road traffic accidents (RTAs) for all 0-19 year olds in the respective calendar years, represented as a standardised ratio, per 100,000 head of target population.

Guidance & Interpretation: Low is good. High rates may indicate a failure by PCTs within the borough to manage conditions which later require emergency hospitalisation. However, high rates may also be indicative of other factors beyond the local authority's control.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly low rate with 95% confidence
no colour = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly high rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: Healthcare Commission analysis of Hospital Episode Statistics 2004/05 and 2005/06

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY
Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

department for children, schools and families

1047SC - Percentage change in number of conceptions amongst 15-17 year olds (BVPI 197)

Rotherham

Number of conceptions amongst 15 - 17 year olds per 1,000 population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
LA	58	51	53	48	52	51	50
SN	59	55	53	53	55	54	55
Eng	45	44	43	43	42	42	41

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers

% change from base year (1998) in number of conceptions amongst 15 - 17 year olds

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
LA	2.4	-10.0	-5.7	-14.8	-9.0	-9.1	-12.5
SN	-0.3	-8.9	-10.7	-13.3	-8.4	-10.7	-7.6
Eng	-3.3	-6.4	-8.6	-8.0	-9.5	-10.5	-12.0





Data definition

Part one: Number of conceptions among girls aged under 18 resident in an area per 1,000 girls aged 15-17 years resident in the area.

Numerator

Number of conceptions among girls aged under 18

Denominator

Total population aged 15-17 years in council area

Part two: Percentage change in number of conceptions amongst 15-17 year olds

Numerator

The actual number of conceptions among girls aged under 18 resident in the authority area per 1,000 girls aged 15-17 years resident in the area for the calendar year.

Denominator

The actual number of conceptions among girls aged under 18 resident in the authority area per 1,000 girls aged 15-17 years resident in the area in 1998 (baseline year)

N = (Numerator - denominator) / denominator x 100

[Source - Teenage Pregnancy Unit]

Measuring unit

Positive or negative percentage to one decimal place

Continued on following page

BEING HEALTHY

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

department for children, schools and families

1047SC - Percentage change in number of conceptions amongst 15-17 year olds (BVPI 197)

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

Progress in reducing conception rates amongst 15-17 year olds against the 1998 baseline would be represented by a negative figure in the percentage change in number of conceptions amongst 15-17 year olds. A positive figure would suggest that the conception rate has increased. Continued improvement would show a negative figure getting increasingly larger whilst fluctuations in this figure year on year may suggest that strategies to reduce conceptions in 15-17 year olds may be ineffective. This data should be looked at alongside the rate of conceptions per 1,000 population of 15-17 year olds.

Data on teenage conceptions is available on a calendar year basis and ONS publish this data in February each year, 14 months after the year to which they relate. Therefore the indicator presented in the 2006/07 BVPI set will be the data published in February 2007 relating to calendar year 2005.

The National Teenage Pregnancy Strategy outlines the National target to halve the under-18 conception rate in England by 2010 (with an interim target of 15% by 2004 included in the NHS Plan).

BEING HEALTHY 1011HC

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

GP practices providing child health surveillance services

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
ROTHERHAM PCT								
Percentage of GP practices providing child health surveillance services	2005/06	39	39	**100%**	97%	-	95%	-
	2004/05	39	39	**100%**	93%	-	93%	-



Time Period: 01/04/2004 to 31/03/2005

Indicator Description: The numerator is the number of GP practices in the PCT providing child health surveillance services, for which the practice has been awarded points under the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF). The denominator is the total number of GP practices in the PCT participating in QOF. NB. Please note that PCTs were reconfigured in October 2006. For current PCT names please see the Healthcare Commission APA briefing.

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good. Child health services may be provided other than through GP practices. The QOF payments system is a component of the General Medical Services (GMS) GP contract, introduced on 1st April 2004. QOF points are awarded against 146 indicators, including CHS1 "Child development checks are offered at the intervals agreed in local guidelines and problems are followed up". Submission of QOF data is not compulsory, but participation rates are very high with most Personal Medical Services GPs in addition to most GMS GPs submitting details for 2004/05. Where PMS practices have agreed local arrangements to determine QOF payments, some elements of QOF achievement may not have been entered into the national Quality Management and Analysis System (QMAS) by the practices and PCTs concerned. QMAS was established as a mechanism to support the calculation of practice QOF payments - it is not a totally comprehensive source of data on quality of care in general practice. Data is only available for 2004/05 as this is a new data source, hence no temporal trends can be identified until further QOF data collections are made.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly high rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly low rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: Compiled via the Quality Management and Analysis System (QMAS) for the QOF GP payments system by the Health and Social Care Information Centre. See http://www.ic.nhs.uk/services/qof/ for details. Practice level data has been aggregated by the Healthcare Commission.

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Percentage of schools participating and achieving the National Healthy Schools Status (NHSS)

Rotherham

	Number of Primary and Secondary maintained schools	School participation rates		School achievement rates			
		Number of schools participating	Percentage participating	Agreed LA target: number of schools to achieve NHSS (A)	Schools achieved NHSS by end July 2007 (B)	Current progress: schools achieving NHSS as percentage of LA target (C)	Current progress: schools achieving NHSS as percentage of July 2007 national target of 50% (D)
LA	128	128	100%	70	92	131%	72%
Government Office Region: Yorkshire & Humberside	2,326	2,194	94%	1,179	1,224	104%	53%
SN	973	919	94%	541	492	n/a	n/a
NAT	22,274	20,184	91%	..	10,586	..	47%

Current progress of schools achieving NHSS as percentage of LA target (C) : calculation = column (B) / column (A)

Current progress of schools achieving NHSS as percentage of national target of 50% (D): calculation = (B) / total number of schools in the area

School numbers excludes nurseries and independents

..= data not avaliable



Data Definition: The National Healthy Schools Programme is a joint initiative between the Department of Health (DoH) and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). It originated in 1997 out of the White Paper Excellence in Schools. In 2004 the programme was revised as a result of the White Paper Choosing Health as there was a need to ensure consistency across the country. There are now four themes-Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE), Physical Activity, Healthy Eating and Emotional Health and Wellbeing (EHWB). Each theme has its own criteria that schools have to meet to achieve National Healthy Schools Status (NHSS). Schools need to meet the criteria through the Whole School Approach (WSA) which is at the core of the NHSP. There are ten elements to the WSA and a process that schools needs to employ while participating in the NHSP. Schools now Self-Validate and 10 per cent of all schools who Self-Validate go through moderation. The NHSP has four aims which are to support children and young people in developing healthy behaviours, help raise the achievement of children and young people, reduce health inequalities and promote social inclusion. There are two targets for the NHSP-that all schools will be participating in the programme and 50 percent of schools will achieve NHSS by July 2007. Further information can be found at http://www.healthyschools.gov.uk/ . Data is a 'snap shot' of participation and achievement as of July 2007.

Traffic Lighting:
Column (C): These figures relate to July 2007 targets (new NHSS only) agreed with local authorities. The banding of green 100%-85%, amber 84%-50% and red 49%-0% reflects the DoH's judgement of the extent a programme has met its targets in a context of its longer term December 2007 target.
Column (D): These figures relates to the national 50% target for July 2007. The banding of green>50%-42%, amber<42%-25% and red<24%-0% reflects the DoH's judgement of the extent a programme has met the national target in a context of the longer term December 2007 target of 55%, and the December 2009 target of 75%.
Only the LA and government office region figures are traffic lighted; however the statistical neighbour figure is not traffic lighted.
SN= National Foundation for Educational Research Statistical Neighbours.

[Source: DoH National Healthy Schools Standard RAG ratings]

Health Warning: School numbers were provided by the DoH and may not be the same as those published by Ofsted or used in other indicators in this dataset. Schools are not obliged to join the National Healthy Schools Programme. However, involvement in the National Healthy Schools Programme and achievement of National Healthy School Status, is an illustration that the school is attempting to improve the health outcomes for its children.

BEING HEALTHY

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the health, and food and drink national standards; and childcare inspection judgements on the outcome Being Healthy

Rotherham

Actions imposed on new providers at the time of registration visit - all providers

Percentage of providers where actions were issued at registration visits between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total registration visits in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	175
Total registration visits in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1070
Total registration visits in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	29017

Actions imposed from Children Act (CA) inspections - all providers

Percentage of active providers where actions were issued at CA inspections between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total CA inspections in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	262
Total CA inspections in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1533
Total CA inspections in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	44576

Data Definition: Two aspects of childcare are judged in this indicator, corresponding to two of the fourteen standards: Standard 7 - Health: The registered person promotes the good health of children and takes positive steps to prevent the spread of infection and appropriate measures when they are ill. Standard 8 - Food and drink: Children are provided with regular drinks and food in adequate quantities for their needs. Food and drink is properly prepared, nutritious and complies with dietary and religious requirements.

Health Warning: Data only takes into account registration visits that have been finalised. The latest CA inspections of active providers that have been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. Since the December 2006 Local Authority Early Years Profile was published, the method used to capture registration actions has been revised and these figures reflect the change. Therefore, the percentage of providers with registration actions may differ slightly from the figures in the Profile and the Early Years APA briefing.

Area	SN	NAT

BEING HEALTHY

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the health, and food and drink national standards; and childcare inspection judgements on the outcome Being Healthy

Rotherham

Judgements on quality gradings against Being Healthy for Children Act inspections for active providers between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006 (in percentages)



Data Definition: The judgements awarded vary according to the type of inspection and the type of provider. Therefore, the total numbers of judgements may differ between the Early Years indicators.
Health Warning: Data only takes into account the latest inspection of active providers, where reports have been been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. “All day care” has been used to refer to a combination of full, sessional, out of school, crèche and multiple day care provisions.

Outstanding | **Good** | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory**

BEING HEALTHY

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Section 5 school inspection judgements: The extent to which schools enable learners to be healthy (primary, secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total No	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Total No	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Total No	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Pri	Sec	Spec
3G The extent to which learners adopt healthy lifestyles																			
LA	no	68	23	40	5	0	13	2	5	6	0	4	1	1	2	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	108	295	44	0	112	13	64	35	0	32	12	14	6	0	767	152	49
LA	%		34	59	7	0		15	38	46	0								
SN	%		24	66	10	0		12	57	31	0								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about how well learners adopt a healthy life style. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements.The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

BEING HEALTHY 1052HC

Healthy lifestyle and preventative care data

Children's Accident and Emergency facilities, opening hours

	Monday-Friday		Saturday		Sunday	
	Midday	Midnight	Midday	Midnight	Midday	Midnight
Sheffield ChildrenS Hospital						
Childrens A&E facilities, opening hours	2005	OPEN	OPEN	OPEN	OPEN	OPEN	OPEN

Time Period: Data collected in September 2005. Data has been collected as a one-off as part of the children's service improvement review.

Indicator Description: The opening hours for children's A&E for acute trusts serving the LA in question. Data is available for opening at midday and midnight. This is divided between opening on Monday-Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good, although this indicator is more contextual than "performance", since it would not always be appropriate for an A&E department to have dedicated children's facilities (for example in cities with both a specialist children's trust and a general acute trust).
For the department to count as a child-only A&E it must have children's waiting areas AND treatment areas separate from general A&E (does not include A&Es that have children's waiting rooms and children's treatment cubicles situated within a general A&E department). Includes child-only walk-in centres where they are managed by the trust. Does not include short-term assessment units. data for all child-only A&Es and walk-in centres on the hospital site. Data collected once so no time trend. A high performing trust would have at least one children's A&E which serves the LA area and is open 7 days per week midday and midnight. A poorly performing trust would have n facilities which serves the LA area and is open 7 days per week midday and midnight.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis:
Green = open
Red = closed

Data Source: Healthcare Commission Children's Services Improvement Review: http://www.healthcarecommission.org.uk/serviceproviderinformation/reviewsandinspections/improvementreviews/servicesforchildreninhospital.cfm

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY

Physical health data

BEING HEALTHY 1015HC

Physical health data

Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)
(Page 1 of 1)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value per 1,000**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
Rotherham MCD								
Infant mortality, deaths per 1000 live births - infant under one year	2003-05	61	8714	**7.0**	5.3	-	5.1	-
	2002-04	56	8485	**6.6**	5.2	-	5.2	-
	2001-03	45	8333	**5.4**	5.2	-	5.4	-
	2000-02	38	8261	**4.6**	5.5	-	5.4	-
	1999-2001	46	8519	**5.4**	5.9	-	5.6	-



Time Period: Deaths registered during the 3 calendar years, eg from 01/01/1999 to 31/12/2001, divided by live births during the same period

Indicator Description: This indicator displays deaths of infants aged less than 1 year per 1000 live births occurring in the respective calendar year(s).

Guidance & Interpretation: Low is good. High rates may indicate problems such as deprivation, although other factors may also affect rates such as prevalence of low birth weight, age of mother, marital status and ethnicity. These factors are likely to be interlinked. High rates would warrant further investigation. These data are pooled over 3 years because of small numbers issues.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly low rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly high rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: Compendium of Clinical and Health Indicators / Clinical and Health Outcomes Knowledge Base (nww.nchod.nhs.uk) based on National Statistics Code DA04N

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY 1016HC

Physical health data

Perinatal mortality (number of stillbirths and deaths of infants at ages under 7 days)
(Page 1 of 1)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value per 1,000**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
Rotherham MCD								
Perinatal mortality (number of stillbirths and deaths of infants under seven days)	2003-05	85	8763	**9.7**	8.2	-	8.2	-
	2002-04	84	8571	**9.8**	8.5	-	8.3	-
	2001-03	78	8387	**9.3**	8.3	-	8.3	-
	2000-02	63	8289	**7.6**	8.2	-	8.2	-
	1999-2001	57	8507	**6.7**	8.2	-	8.1	-



Time Period: Births and deaths registered during the 3 calendar years, eg from 01/01/1999 to 31/12/2001

Indicator Description: Number of stillbirths and deaths of infants at ages under 7 days registered in the 3-year period divided by the number of live and still births occurring in the respective 3 calendar years.

Guidance & Interpretation: Low is good. High rates may indicate problems such as deprivation, although other factors may also affect rates such as prevalence of low birth weight, age of mother, marital status and ethnicity. These factors are likely to be interlinked. High rates would warrant further investigation. These data are pooled over 3 years because of small numbers issues.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly low rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly high rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: Compendium of Clinical and Health Indicators / Clinical and Health Outcomes Knowledge Base (nww.nchod.nhs.uk) based on National Statistics. Code DA04L

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY 1017HC

Physical health data

Deaths of children under age 15
(Page 1 of 1)

		number	expected	**indicator value**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
Rotherham MCD								
Deaths of children aged under 15	2002-04	79	65	**121.2**	101.9	-	100.0	-
	2001-03	67	67	**99.9**	98.9	-	100.0	-
	2001-02	39	45	**87.6**	96.4	-	100.5	-
	1999 & 2001	47	48	**97.9**	103.8	-	100.0	-
	1998-2000	85	72	**118.0**	109.0	-	100.0	-



Time Period: Data covers deaths over two or three calendar years - data is "pooled" over 2 or 3 years because numbers are low.

Indicator Description: Indicator is expressed as the indirectly standardised mortality ration (SMR) - for which values less than 100 indicate less deaths than expected (England and Wales average = 100) given the age and sex profile of the local population.

Guidance & Interpretation: Low is good. High rates would need to be explored in conjunction with the Local Children's Safeguarding Board (LCSB). Includes deaths from all causes, classified by underlying cause of death (ICD-10 A00-Y99, ICD-9 001-E999). Note that approximately 70% of deaths of under-15 year olds occur in the first year, hence this over-dispersion within the infant mortality indicator.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly low rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly high rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: Compendium of Clinical and Health Indicators / Clinical and Health Outcomes Knowledge Base (nww.nchod.nhs.uk) based on National Statistics. Code CA03C_073SMP2

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

Being Healthy 1020HC

Physical health data

Oral health in children – number of decayed/ missing/ filled teeth in children aged 5, 12 and 14

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	95% confidence limits (CL) of indicator value Lower CL	Upper CL	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
Rotherham PCT										
Average number of decayed/ missing/ filled teeth in children aged 5	2003/04			**1.89**	1.78	2.00	n/a	n/a	1.49	Signif High
	2001/02			**1.89**	1.79	1.99	n/a	n/a	1.47	Signif High
Average number of decayed/ missing/ filled teeth in children aged 14	2002/03			**1.68**	1.50	1.86	n/a	n/a	1.43	Signif High

Time Period: Data taken from a survey carried out in the academic year. Surveys have been conducted every second year for 5 year olds and every fourth year for 12 years olds and 14 year olds.

Please note that PCTs were reconfigured in October 2006. For current PCT names please see the Healthcare Commission APA briefing.

Indicator Description: The indicator reports the mean number of teeth per child in the whole age-group which are either actively decayed and require treatment or which were treated for decay either by extraction or filling i.e. the mean number of teeth which were affected by decay. This is a summation of the mean number of decayed/missing/filled teeth.

Guidance & Interpretation: Low is good. Consider these data in light of presence/absence of fluoridation, and NHS dentistry access rates. A high average could prompt questions surrounding the PCT's health promotion schemes and dentistry provision. Only one age group is surveyed each year, and only recent surveys have been reported at PCT and/or LA level. 2002/2003 data (age 14) is incomplete due to difficulties in accessing secondary schools in general and 14-year-old children in particular. Thames Valley and South East London are not included in this data set. The data for the South West Peninsula only relate to North and East Devon. It is not at all clear whether surveys of this age group can continue in England and Wales in the future. These health warnings are taken from BASCD website (www.bascd.org).

Judgement basis: green = significantly low rate at 95% confidence interval
amber = within the expected range of variation at 95% confidence interval
red = significantly high rate at 95% confidence interval

Data source: British Association for the Study of Community Dentistry via DH Compendium code DB04T_118 or www.bascd.org

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY 1053HC

Physical health data

Is Registered children's nursing cover commensurate with workload in A&E?

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**		*England average*	Difference vs England?
Rotherham District General Hospital							
Is RN-C cover commensurate with workload in A&E?	2005	6	46320	**0.000129534**		0.000119289	High
Sheffield ChildrenS Hospital							
Is RN-C cover commensurate with workload in A&E?	2005	14	140079	**9.99436E-05**		0.000119289	-

Time Period: Data collected in September 2005. Data has been collected as a one-off as part of the children's service improvement review.

Indicator Description: Numerator is the number of registered children's nurses (RN-C) in A&E. Denominator is the departmental throughput of children aged 0-16.

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good. Indicator derived from indicator 20a of the children's services improvement review. Where a trust failed to return adequate data a red traffic light is awarded. Based on one point in the year and hence does not take account of seasonal pressures on A&E. Data collected once so no time trend.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: Green = Headcount/throughput is average or above (across all trusts)
No colour = Headcount/throughput is 50% lower than the average (across all trusts) or better than this (above this)
Red = Headcount/throughput is more than 50% lower than the average (across all trusts)

Data Source: Healthcare Commission Children's Services Improvement Review:
http://www.healthcarecommission.org.uk/serviceproviderinformation/reviewsandinspections/improvementreviews/servicesforchildreninhospital.cfm

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY

Mental health data

BEING HEALTHY 1029HC

Mental health data

Substance misuse related admissions to hospital, ages under 20s

		number	expected	**indicator value**	*Benchmark Group Average*	significant difference vs benchmark grp?	*England average*	significant difference vs England?
Rotherham MCD								
Admissions to hospital of under 20 year olds with mental and behavioural disorders due to substance misuse	2003-06	84	85	**98.3**	119.9	-	100.7	-
	2002-05	73	77	**94.7**	119.3	-	101.0	-
	2001-04	70	73	**95.6**	120.6	-	101.3	-
Admissions to hospital of under 20 year olds with poisoning by narcotics and psychodysleptics	2003-06	28	18	**158.7**	153.6	-	131.7	-
	2002-05	19	17	**113.9**	159.4	-	133.6	-
	2001-04	17	17	**102.0**	153.8	-	137.3	-

Time Period: Hospital admissions between 1 April and 31 March. Data are pooled over 3 years because of small numbers issues.

Indicator Description: The indicator value is the standardised admission ratio - the number of hospital admission first finished consultant episodes (FFCEs) with the specified diagnosis code of patients aged under 20 resident in the local authority area, divided by the "expected" number of admissions, expressed as a percentage (ie England = 100). The expected number of admissions is calculated by multiplying the national rates of admissions for each age group (0, 1-4, 5-9, 10-14 and 15-19) and sex by the mid 2002 population of the LA within each of these age/sex groups. The specified diagnosis codes for mental and behavioural disorders are F10 to F19 inclusive, which include use of alcohol, opioids, cannabinoids, cocaine, solvents etc. The diagnosis codes for poisoning are T40 including opioids, cocaine and cannabis but not alcohol.

Guidance & Interpretation: Low is good. A low value indicates that drug misuse in the area is not leading to a high level of admissions to hospital - possibly due to there not being a major drug problem amongst children and young people in the area, and/or having good access to treatment/services that address problems short of hospital admission. High numbers could indicate poor access to preventative services or a high preponderance of drug use in the area. 2002-05 drug overdose/poisoning indicator values for 169 LAs have been suppressed due to being based on less than 5 admissions (also 9 LAs' data has been suppressed for mental disorders).

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = significantly low rate with 95% confidence
amber = within the expected range of variation with 95% confidence
red = significantly high rate with 95% confidence. NB Confidence intervals are not shown as the calculation uses an additive over-dispersion model which replaces a single target value with a distribution representing acceptable variability. If the observed indicator is inside the tolerance range, then it cannot be declared significantly different. If it is just outside and there is some overlap with its confidence interval, then it still may be OK. But if there is no overlap, or only minimal overlap, it will be declared significantly different (this assessment is based on a formula and does not correspond exactly to whether the intervals overlap or not) . This means that CI alone might suggest a significant difference where one is not present.

Data Source: Healthcare Commission analysis of Hospital Episode Statistics 2001/02 - 2003/04 and 2002/03 - 2004/05 -2005/06 and ONS population data mid 2002 and mid 2003 and mid 2004

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

Percentage of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new cases with length of wait under 4 weeks and under 26 weeks

(Page 1 of 2)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**		*England average*	difference vs England?
DONCASTER AND SOUTH HUMBER HEALTHCARE NHS TRUST							
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new non-specialist cases with length of wait under 26 weeks	2005	55	57	**96.5%**		94.4%	-
	2004	93	101	**92.1%**		91.8%	-
	2003	103	107	**96.3%**		91.4%	-
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new non-specialist cases with length of wait under 4 weeks	2005	35	57	**61.4%**		51.2%	-
	2004	63	101	**62.4%**		48.8%	-
	2003	53	107	**49.5%**		47.5%	-
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new specialist cases with length of wait under 4 weeks.	2005	3	5	**60.0%**		62.8%	-
	2004	1	9	**11.1%**		66.5%	low
	2003	1	1	**100.0%**		55.2%	high
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new specialist cases with length of wait under 26 weeks.	2005	5	5	**100.0%**		97.0%	high
	2004	6	9	**66.7%**		97.5%	low
	2003	1	1	**100.0%**		94.2%	high
ROTHERHAM PCT							
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new non-specialist cases with length of wait under 26 weeks	2005	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
	2004	96	97	**99.0%**		91.8%	-
	2003	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new non-specialist cases with length of wait under 4 weeks	2005	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
	2004	16	97	**16.5%**		48.8%	low
	2003	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new specialist cases with length of wait under 4 weeks.	2005	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
	2004	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
	2003	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new specialist cases with length of wait under 26 weeks.	2005	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
	2004	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
	2003	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	
SHEFFIELD CHILDREN'S NHS TRUST							
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new non-specialist cases with length of wait under 26 weeks	2005	210	247	**85.0%**		94.4%	-
	2004	180	244	**73.8%**		91.8%	-
	2003	100	133	**75.2%**		91.4%	-
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new non-specialist cases with length of wait under 4 weeks	2005	104	247	**42.1%**		51.2%	-
	2004	80	244	**32.8%**		48.8%	-
	2003	60	133	**45.1%**		47.5%	-
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new specialist cases with length of wait under 4 weeks.	2005	32	36	**88.9%**		62.8%	high
	2004	33	40	**82.5%**		66.5%	-
	2003	12	26	**46.2%**		55.2%	-
Proportion of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new specialist cases with length of wait under 26 weeks.	2005	36	36	**100.0%**		97.0%	high
	2004	40	40	**100.0%**		97.5%	high
	2003	26	26	**100.0%**		94.2%	high

BEING HEALTHY 1030HC

Mental health data

Percentage of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) new cases with length of wait under 4 weeks and under 26 weeks

Time Period: For non-specialist cases, the data collection period was 1st of November to 30th November 2003 and 2004. For special care teams, the data collection period was 1st of April to 30th September 2003 and 1st June to 30th November 2004.

Indicator Description: The numerator is the number of cases waiting for under the specified amount of time. The denominator is the total number of cases waiting. Data is supplied separately for specialist and non-specialist cases at the 4 week and 26 week junctures. From 2005 data were reported for tier 2/3 and tier 4 cases instead of non-specialist cases and specialist cases

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good, indicating cases were seen within acceptable time frames. During the data collection period total caseload was broken down by time waited prior to treatment. The duration of the wait is the interval between the receipt of the referral request and the time the case is first seen. In the case of DNAs or cancellations, the wait is from the most recent DNA or cancellation.Non-specialist cases require clinics where clients come for meetings with staff or for group sessions, or individual home visits. Specialist cases require longer term or more intensive provision, which may take the form of whole- or half-day activities, in-patient care, or outreach support as an alternative to in-patient care. Data relates to the provider trust(s) mainly serving an area rather than all children from the LA area. In some cases the extent to which a provider serves children from the LA is not clear. Criteria triggering referral vary between LAs therefore cases may exist that have not been referred. From 2005 CAMHS groups were described as tier 2/3 and tier 4 instead of non-specialist and specialist

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = more than 20% points above national average at 4 weeks, or 100% at 26 weeks
amber = within 20% of average
red = more than 20% points below national average at 4 weeks or at 26 weeks

Data Source: All data taken from the CAMHS mapping atlas table 4.2: http://www.dur.ac.uk/camhs.mapping/index.php?page=atlas&a=19#s18

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

BEING HEALTHY 1031HC

Mental Health Data

Child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) performance indicator for PCTs

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**	*England average*
ROTHERHAM PCT					
Child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) performance indicator for PCTs - old scale	2004/05			**5**	5
	2003/04			**5**	3
Up to date needs assessment	2005/06			**no**	82% of PCTs rated "yes"
	2004/05			**yes**	77% of PCTs rated "yes"
	2003/04			**yes**	60% of PCTs rated "yes"
Increase in annual expenditure	2004/05			**15%**	23%
	2003/04			**7%**	42%

Time Period: 1 April to 31 March. New indicator for 2003/04 so not available for previous years.

Indicator Description: Score is on a scale of 0 to 2 and depends on two factors: i) Having an up to date "needs assessment" which meets the requirements set out in 'A Comprehensive CAMHS'; ii) The percentage increase in budgeted expenditure on CAMHS in 2004/05 by the PCT against expenditure in 2003/04 (should be at least 10% to get the highest rating - this threshold was 5% in 2003/04 compared to 2002/03). This 3 point scale replaced the previous 5 point scale in 2005/6. Scale explained: 0= "Not achieved" 1= "Underachieved" 2= "Achieved". To score 2 "achieved" a PCT must have an up to date needs assessment and in increase in annual expenditure of not less than 10% from the previous year. Failure to fulfil one of these criteria results in a score of 1 "underachieved" failure to fulfil both of these criteria results in a score of 0 "underachieved" NB. Please note that PCTs were reconfigured in October 2006. For current PCT names please see the Healthcare Commission APA briefing. Note n/a indicates data not returned to the Healthcare Commission.

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good. Only considers two aspects of CAMHS. Only a three point scale.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: green = score of 2
amber = score of 1
red = score of 0

Data Source: For 2005 data, http://ratings2005.healthcarecommission.org.uk/more_information.asp
For 2003/04 Healthcare Commission performance ratings http://ratings.healthcarecommission.org.uk/indicators_2004/05. For 2006 data, http://ratings.healthcarecommission.org.uk/indicators_2006

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

Rotherham

Progress made towards a comprehensive Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service

	2005-06	2006-07
LA	11	13
SN	11	13
Eng	12	13

Data is not banded for 2005-06
.. = Data not available



Bands	Low				High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●
2006-07	4,5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15,16

1. Was a full range of CAMH services for children and young people with learning disabilities commissioned for your council area?

Possible responses:

1: None of the above in place OR Strategic plans for the council area have yet to address the needs of children and young people with learning disabilities and mental health needs.

2: Plans and protocols for children and young people with learning disabilities and mental health needs are in place: services have yet to be put in place.

3: Plans and protocols for children and young people with learning disabilities and mental health needs are in place: some services are in place, some are still to be developed so as to provide cover across the whole council area.

4: A fully comprehensive CAMH Service for children with learning disabilities and mental health needs is available, including fully implemented protocols between services and appropriately trained staff, covering the whole council area.

LA response:

As at 31 Jan 2006	3: Protocols and plans are in place. Services in place/in development
As at 31 Jan 2007	4: Fully comprehensive service available, including protocols, whole area

Percentage of SN & England responses (LA's response is highlighted)

	1	2	3	4	Missing
SN - As at 31 Jan 2006	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
SN - As at 31 Jan 2007	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	0.0
Eng - As at 31 Jan 2006	8.8	23.1	65.3	2.7	2.0
Eng - As at 31 Jan 2007	0.0	6.0	68.7	25.3	0.0

Continued on following page

Rotherham

2. Did 16 and 17 year olds from your council area who require mental health services have access to services appropriate to their age and level of maturity?

Possible responses:

1: None of the above are in place OR Strategic plans for the council area have yet to address the needs of 16 and 17 year olds who require mental health services.
2: Plans and protocols for 16 and 17 year olds who require mental health services are in place: services have yet to be put in place.
3: Plans and protocols for 16 and 17 year olds who require mental health services are in place: some services are in place, some are still to be developed so as to provide cover across the whole council area.
4:A fully comprehensive CAMH service for 16 and 17 year olds who require mental health services is available, including fully implemented protocols between services and appropriately trained staff, covering the whole council area.

LA response:

As at 31 Jan 2006	3: Protocols and plans are in place. Services in place/in development
As at 31 Jan 2007	3: Protocols and plans are in place. Services in place/in development

Percentage of SN & England responses (LA's response is highlighted)

	1	2	3	4	Missing
SN - As at 31 Jan 2006	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	0.0
SN - As at 31 Jan 2007	0.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
Eng - As at 31 Jan 2006	2.0	18.4	62.6	17.0	2.0
Eng - As at 31 Jan 2007	0.0	6.0	68.7	25.3	0.0

3. Were arrangements in place for your council area to ensure that 24 hour cover is available to meet urgent mental health needs of children and young people and for a specialist mental health assessment to be undertaken within 24 hours or the next working day where indicated?

Possible responses:

1: Strategic plans for the council area have yet to address the needs for 24 hour / 7 days per week access for emergencies and/or for specialist mental health assessment within 24 hours.
2: Protocols and plans are in place: services have yet to be put in place.
3: Protocols and plans are in place but are only partially implemented
4: Protocols and plans are in place and are fully implemented.

LA response:

As at 31 Jan 2006	3: Protocols and plans are in place, only partially implemented
As at 31 Jan 2007	3: Protocols and plans are in place, only partially implemented

Percentage of SN & England responses (LA's response is highlighted)

	1	2	3	4	Missing
SN - As at 31 Jan 2006	10.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	0.0
SN - As at 31 Jan 2007	10.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	0.0
Eng - As at 31 Jan 2006	3.4	10.9	48.3	37.4	2.0
Eng - As at 31 Jan 2007	1.3	0.7	40.9	57.0	0.7

Continued on following page

Rotherham

4. Were protocols in place for your council area for partnership working between agencies for children and young people with complex, persistent and severe behavioural and mental health needs?

Possible responses:

1: No protocols or partnership services are in place for children and young people with complex, persistent and severe behavioural and mental health needs.
2: Protocols and plans at an early stage of development: agreed access arrangements are not yet operating.
3: Protocols and plans are in place: access arrangements are operating but not across the whole council area.
4: Protocols and plans are in place: access arrangements for services are fully operational.

LA response:

As at 31 Jan 2006	2: Protocols/plans in early development: agreed access not operational
As at 31 Jan 2007	3: Protocols and plans are in place, only partially implemented

Percentage of SN & England responses (LA's response is highlighted)

	1	2	3	4	Missing
SN - As at 31 Jan 2006	10.0	50.0	30.0	10.0	0.0
SN - As at 31 Jan 2007	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
Eng - As at 31 Jan 2006	1.4	31.3	43.5	23.8	2.0
Eng - As at 31 Jan 2007	0.7	15.3	42.7	41.3	0.0

Data definition

1. Was a full range of CAMH services for children and young people with learning disabilities commissioned for your council area?

2. Did 16 and 17 year olds from your council area who require mental health services have access to services appropriate to their age and level of maturity?

3. Were arrangements in place for your council area to ensure that 24 hour cover is available to meet urgent mental health needs of children and young people and for a specialist mental health assessment to be undertaken within 24 hours or the next working day where indicated?

4. Were protocols in place for your council area for partnership working between agencies for children and young people with complex, persistent and severe behavioural and mental health needs?

Councils will have rated their performance against each of the components on a scale of 1 to 4, and the final figure will be an aggregate of these four component scores, i.e. a whole number between four and sixteen. The ratings for each of the four components are above in the body of the indicator.

[Source - Durham University annual CAMHS mapping exercises]

Measuring Unit

Whole number between four and sixteen

Guidance/interpretation

The indicator reflects development in local authority areas of key services for children and adolescents. It has four components, the first three of which relate to a PSA target on CAMHS services. The scoring used is broadly in line with the CAMHS Self Assessment matrix for 2005-06 - each of the components features in this matrix. The plans and protocols for each component must be part of the overall strategy for the CAMHS service developed for each CAMHS partnership in line with the NSF.

This indicator was new in 2005-06. The data for 2006-07 is submitted in February 2007; councils submit data rating themselves on components 1-4; the PI is calculated from the answers given for each of these components.

Percentage of mental health inpatients aged under 18 on CAMHS wards

(Page 1 of 2)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**		*England average*	difference vs England?
DONCASTER AND SOUTH HUMBER HEALTHCARE NHS TRUST							
Percentage of mental health inpatients aged under 18 on CAMHS wards (Under 18s on CAMHS wards)	Q4 2006/07	0	226	**0%**		87%	low
	Q3 2006/07	0	71	**0%**		85%	low
	Q2 2006/07	0	18	**0%**		86%	low
	Q1 2006/07	0	17	**0%**		88%	low
	Q4 2005/06	0	478	**0%**		83%	low
	Q3 2005/06	0	469	**0%**		80%	low
	Q2 2005/06	0	293	**0%**		79%	low
	Q1 2005/06	0	130	**0%**		78%	low
Percentage of mental health inpatients aged under 18 on CAMHS wards (Under 18s on adult wards that are 16 or 17)	Q4 2006/07	226	226	**100%**		99%	-
	Q3 2006/07	71	71	**100%**		99%	-
	Q2 2006/07	18	18	**100%**		99%	-
	Q1 2006/07	17	17	**100%**		98%	-
	Q4 2005/06	476	478	**100%**		99%	-
	Q3 2005/06	469	469	**100%**		93%	-
	Q2 2005/06	293	293	**100%**		95%	-
	Q1 2005/06	130	130	**100%**		95%	-
SHEFFIELD CHILDREN'S NHS TRUST							
Percentage of mental health inpatients aged under 18 on CAMHS wards (Under 18s on CAMHS wards)	Q4 2006/07	4156	4156	**100%**		87%	high
	Q3 2006/07	3243	3243	**100%**		85%	high
	Q2 2006/07	2184	2184	**100%**		86%	high
	Q1 2006/07	1147	1147	**100%**		n/a	high
	Q4 2005/06	3906	3906	**100%**			high
	Q3 2005/06	2979	2979	**100%**		80%	high
	Q2 2005/06	1957	1957	**100%**		79%	high
	Q1 2005/06	877	877	**100%**		78%	high
Percentage of mental health inpatients aged under 18 on CAMHS wards (Under 18s on adult wards that are 16 or 17)	Q4 2006/07	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	-
	Q3 2006/07	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	-
	Q2 2006/07	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	-
	Q1 2006/07	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	-
	Q4 2005/06	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	-
	Q3 2005/06	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	-
	Q2 2005/06	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	-
	Q1 2005/06	n/a	n/a	**n/a**		n/a	-

Time Period: Quarterly data, Q1 2005/06 is from 01/04/2005 to 30/06/2005. Bed days per quarter are 'year-to-date' (cumulative for year thus far).

Indicator Description: Numbers reflect number of hospital occupied bed days, under the care of a psychiatric specialist, age on admission. This is a two part indicator: Part one: Children and young people under 18 should be placed in Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) wards rather than adult wards, which may lack adequate facilities for adolescents. Number of bed days on CAMHS wards of patients aged under 18 (Local Development Plan Return (LDPR) line 5410) divided by number of bed days on CAMHS and adult wards of patients aged under 18 (LDRP lines 5410, 5411 and 5412) In Q3 2005/06, 12 trusts (14%) achieved 100%, 48 (58%) trusts scored less than 75%. Part two: Under 18s on adult wards should be 16 or 17 years old, rather than under 16. Number of bed days on adult psychiatric wards of patients aged 16 or 17 (LDPR line 5412) divided by number of bed days on adult psychiatric wards aged under 18 (LDPR line 5411 and 5412).

BEING HEALTHY 1044HC

Mental health data

Percentage of mental health inpatients aged under 18 on CAMHS wards

(Page 2 of 2)

Guidance & Interpretation: High is good, indicating young people being treated in the appropriate environment. Bed days per quarter are 'year-to-date' (cumulative for year thus far). This is a fairly new data source which has not previously been used to construct an indicator so is untested in the field.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Judgment basis: First indicator only - Under 18s on CAMHS wards
green = Under 18s on CAMHS wards 100%
amber = any other combination
red = Under 18s on CAMHS wards under 75%

Data Source: Child & Adolescent Mental Health LDPR lines, quarterly data collection by the Department of Health, line numbers 5410 to 5412
Data returned on provider basis per NHS Trust

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

Moving towards a comprehensive CAMHS service (24/7, children and young people with LD, CAMHS for 16 & 17 year olds) for PCTs

(Page 1 of 2)

		numerator	denominator	**indicator value**		*England average*
ROTHERHAM PCT						
Moving towards a comprehensive CAMHS service (24 Hour Coverage) for PCTs.	Q4 2006/07			**Yes**		80% said "yes"
	Q3 2006/07			**Yes**		64% said "yes"
	Q2 2006/07			**Yes**		88% said "yes"
	Q1 2006/07			**Yes**		85% answered yes
	Q4 2005/06			**Yes**		83% answered yes
	Q3 2005/06			**Yes**		83% answered yes
	Q2 2005/06			**Yes**		80% answered yes
	Q1 2005/06			**yes**		81% answered yes
Moving towards a comprehensive CAMHS service (CAMHS for minors with LD) for PCTs	Q4 2006/07			**Yes**		91% said "yes"
	Q3 2006/07			**Yes**		87% said "yes"
	Q2 2006/07			**Yes**		96% said "yes"
	Q1 2006/07			**Yes**		59% answered yes
	Q4 2005/06			**Yes**		50% answered yes
	Q3 2005/06			**Yes**		50% answered yes
	Q2 2005/06			**Yes**		42% answered yes
	Q1 2005/06			**no**		49% answered yes
Moving towards a comprehensive child and adolescent mental health service (access for 16s and 17s) for primary care trusts	Q4 2006/07			**Yes**		91% answered yes
	Q3 2006/07			**Yes**		98% of PCTs rated "yes"
	Q2 2006/07			**Yes**		81% said "yes"
	Q1 2006/07			**Yes**		78% answered yes
	Q4 2005/06			**Yes**		74% answered yes
	Q3 2005/06			**Yes**		74% answered yes
	Q2 2005/06			**Yes**		74% answered yes
	Q1 2005/06			**yes**		74% answered yes

Time Period: Quarterly data, Q1 2005/06 is from 01/04/2005 to 30/06/2005

Indicator Description: These three elements were set out in a letter from the Department of Health to chief executives of trusts and LAs dated 11th March 2005 as key elements that should be present as part of a comprehensive Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS). The Local Development Plan Return (LDPR) line descriptors are as follows: 24 Hour Coverage (line 5334): Are arrangements in place to ensure that 24 hour cover is available to meet the urgent mental health needs of children and young people and specialist mental health assessments undertaken within 24 hours or during the next working day where indicated?CAMHS for under 18s with Learning Disability (LD) (line 5335): Is a full range of CAMHS for children and young people who also have a learning disability explicitly commissioned by or on behalf of all of the PCTs in your area? Access for 16 and 17 year olds (line 5336): Do all 16 and 17 year old in your area who need CAMHS have access to service appropriate to their age and level of maturity? NB. Please note that PCTs were reconfigured in October 2006. For current PCT names please see the Healthcare Commission APA briefing. Please note that Q3 & Q4 2006/07 data are reported for reconfigured PCTs, where they

Guidance & Interpretation: Yes is good. This is a fairly new data source which has not previously been used to construct an indicator so is untested in the field. It is based on self-declaration by trusts, and there is scope for them to differ in their interpretation of the requirement.

Commentary on Rotherham values:

Moving towards a comprehensive CAMHS service (24/7, children and young people with LD, CAMHS for 16 & 17 year olds) for PCTs

Judgment basis: green = yes for all three elements
amber = yes for two elements
red = no for two or more elements

Data Source: Child & Adolescent Mental Health LDPR lines, quarterly data collection by the Department of Health, lines numbers 5334 to 5336, data returned by PCT which commission CAMHS

Owner: Healthcare Commission

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact JARs@healthcarecommission.org.uk

Youth Offending Information **Rotherham**

Indicator: The referral of juveniles manifesting mental health difficulties to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services

Youth Justice Board
Bwrdd Cyfiawnder Ieuenctid

Acute Mental Health Needs

	YP with Acute Mental Health Needs	Assessed in 5 working days	YOT Performance	YJB Statistical Neighbour	England and Wales	Over time	Against neighbour	Against England & Wales
Jan-Mar 05	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	87.2%	-	0.0%	12.8%
Apr-Jun 05	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	58.3%	0.0%	0.0%	41.7%
Jul-Sep 05	0	0	n/a	100.0%	59.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Oct-Dec 05	0	0	n/a	76.9%	80.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Jan-Mar 06	0	0	n/a	100.0%	85.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Apr-Jun 06	2	2	100.0%	66.7%	68.2%	n/a	33.3%	31.8%
Jul-Sep 06	2	2	100.0%	88.9%	93.8%	0.0%	11.1%	6.2%
Oct-Dec 06	0	0	n/a	100.0%	85.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a

KPI Performance



Variation



Non-Acute Mental Health Needs

	YP with Acute Mental Health Needs	Assessed in 5 working days	YOT Performance	YJB Statistical Neighbour	England and Wales	Over time	Against neighbour	Against England & Wales
Jan-Mar 05	6	6	100.0%	78.8%	91.2%	-	21.2%	8.8%
Apr-Jun 05	21	20	95.2%	83.8%	87.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Jul-Sep 05	9	9	100.0%	94.4%	89.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Oct-Dec 05	8	8	100.0%	68.8%	87.5%	n/a	31.3%	12.5%
Jan-Mar 06	39	37	94.9%	78.5%	90.9%	-5.1%	16.4%	3.9%
Apr-Jun 06	23	16	69.6%	73.3%	89.6%	-25.3%	-3.8%	-20.0%
Jul-Sep 06	8	8	100.0%	92.1%	91.5%	30.4%	7.9%	8.5%
Oct-Dec 06	20	20	100.0%	95.9%	91.8%	n/a	n/a	n/a

KPI Performance



Variation



Data Definition: Ensure that all young people, who are assessed as manifesting (i) acute mental health difficulties to be referred by YOTs to the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) for a formal assessment commenced within 5 working days of the receipt of referral, with a view to their accessing a tier 3 service or other appropriate CAMHS tier service based on this assessment; and (ii) non-acute mental health concerns should be referred by the YOT for an assessment, and engagement by the appropriate CAMHS tier (1 - 3) commenced within 15 working days. Full counting rules are posted on the YJB website.

Source: Youth Offending Team case management systems & YJB MIS.

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Nick Read on 020 7271 3068 Ref: 1041YJ

Youth offending information **Rotherham**

Indicator: Substance Misuse: the proportion of young people with identified substance misuse needs who receive specialist assessment within 5 working days and, following the assessment, access the early intervention and treatment services they require within 10 working days

Youth Justice Board
Bwrdd Cyfiawnder Ieuenctid

Substance Misuse Assessment

	YP Identified with SMU Needs	Assessed in 5 working days	YOT Performance	YJB Statistical Neighbour	England and Wales	Over time	Against neighbour	Against England & Wales
Jan-Mar 05	33	22	66.7%	69.4%	76.2%	-	-2.8%	-9.6%
Apr-Jun 05	39	15	38.5%	64.0%	75.9%	-28.2%	-25.6%	-37.4%
Jul-Sep 05	45	17	37.8%	69.8%	76.8%	-0.7%	-32.0%	-39.0%
Oct-Dec 05	51	19	37.3%	69.8%	77.8%	-0.5%	-32.6%	-40.5%
Jan-Mar 06	46	25	54.3%	83.9%	82.3%	17.1%	-29.6%	-28.0%
Apr-Jun 06	41	35	85.4%	93.6%	83.4%	31.0%	-8.2%	2.0%
Jul-Sep 06	23	22	95.7%	92.9%	88.6%	10.3%	2.8%	7.1%
Oct-Dec 06	33	33	100.0%	90.9%	87.3%	4.3%	9.1%	12.7%

KPI Performance



Variation



Substance Misuse Intervention

	YP Requiring Intervention	Received Intervention in 10 working days	YOT Performance	YJB Statistical Neighbour	England and Wales	Over time	Against neighbour	Against England & Wales
Jan-Mar 05	22	22	100.0%	91.2%	93.1%	-	8.8%	6.9%
Apr-Jun 05	15	15	100.0%	89.9%	91.4%	0.0%	10.1%	8.6%
Jul-Sep 05	17	17	100.0%	95.1%	94.2%	0.0%	4.9%	5.8%
Oct-Dec 05	19	19	100.0%	86.7%	90.9%	0.0%	13.3%	9.1%
Jan-Mar 06	25	25	100.0%	94.6%	95.0%	0.0%	5.4%	5.0%
Apr-Jun 06	34	34	100.0%	91.7%	93.6%	0.0%	8.3%	6.4%
Jul-Sep 06	23	23	100.0%	94.4%	95.5%	0.0%	5.6%	4.5%
Oct-Dec 06	32	32	100.0%	92.4%	93.5%	0.0%	7.6%	6.5%

KPI Performance



Variation



Source: Youth Offending Team case management systems & YJB MIS.

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Nick Read on 020 7271 3068 Ref: 1042YJ

Rotherham Drug Action Team

		numerator	denominator	indicator value	YORKSHIRE average	DAT - region difference
Proportion of those in treatment who are aged less than 18	2005	173	1,478	12%	7%	5%
	2006	272	1,678	16%	8%	8%
Proportion of under 18s in treatment with young people's services	2005	163	173	94%	74%	20%
	2006	261	272	96%	83%	13%

Note: difference is calculated using actual numbers, not rounded figures as stated in indicator values

Indicator description and interpretation: This is a two part indicator:
For the first part the numerator is the number of people aged less than 18 who have received drug treatment during the year. The denominator is the number of people of all ages who have received drug treatment during the year.
High is good - the number of under 18 substance misusers is generally around 11% of the total for all ages: if the percentage of those in treatment aged <18 is higher than this then the DAT has been relatively successful in getting young people into treatment.

For the second part the numerator is the number of under 18 year olds receiving treatment from specialist treatment services providing tier 3/4 interventions to under 18s. The denominator is the numerator for the first part i.e. the number of people aged less than 18 receiving treatment
High is good, suggesting that interventions for young people are child focused. A high % will indicate the existence of young people's interventions to meet all needs. A low figure (less than 90%) is likely to indicate that adult services are still providing the more clinical aspects of drug treatment such as prescribing.
All numbers are based on the drug action team area (which is the same as the local authority area) where the person lives, not where the treatment is provided.

Health warning: Data collection from young persons' treatment services only started in April 2005/06 we would therefore expect large differences with data from 2005/06 to 2006/07. This may be due to better compliance with NDTMS.
A low percentage for the first part of this indicator could be due to excellent performance by adult services in getting substance misusers into treatment rather than poor performance by young people's services. The NTA has introduced a new definition of treatment with new thresholds so a drop in numbers in 2007 could reflect a change in practice. An increase in the % of young people in young people's treatment services would be a more realistic indicator of improved services.

2005	**Traffic Light: GREEN**
2006	**Traffic Light: GREEN**

judgment basis for 2005 data: For the first part of the indicator based on a National Average of 5%:
green = more than 7% of those receiving treatment are age less than 18
amber = between 3% and 7%
red = less than 3%
The second part of the indicator is provided for information only, but a high number and high % would indicate a comprehensive range of children's treatment services

judgment basis for 2006 data: For the first part of the indicator based on a National Average of 11.3%:
green = more than 14% of those receiving treatment are age less than 18
amber = between 11 and 13.9%
red = less than 11%
The second part of the indicator is provided for information only, but a high number and high % would indicate a comprehensive range of children's treatment services

Data Source: National Drug Treatment Monitoring System
year end figures will be available on www.nta.nhs.uk

Owner: National Treatment Agency

Data Contact: If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Tom Aldridge on 020 7261 8540 or Kirsty Blenkins 020 7261 8550. Please quote REF: 1040NT

BEING HEALTHY

Looked after children and care leavers data

BEING HEALTHY
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

1037SC - PAF CF/C19: The average of the percentages of children looked after who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months, and who had their teeth checked by a dentist during the previous 12 months, and had an annual health assessment during the previous 12 months

Rotherham

	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07
LA	71	61	69	78	61	60	78
SN	70	73	73	72	77	79	82
Eng	64	68	72	75	78	81	84

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●
2000-07	0<50	50<60	60<70	70<80	80<=100

Data definition
This indicator is the average of two indicators which are calculated separately.
Numerator i
The number of the children in the denominator who had their teeth checked by a dentist during the year ending 30 September.
[Source - OC2 Question 10]
Numerator ii
The number of the children in the denominator who had had an annual health assessment during the year ending 30 September.
[Source - OC2 Question 11]
Denominator
The total number of children looked after at 30 September, who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months.
[Source - OC2 Question 1]
Measuring unit
Percentage as a whole number which is an average of the percentage of (Numerator i/denominator) and (Numerator ii/denominator)

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator measures some health requirements, which are basic for all children, which should not be overlooked for children looked after and serve as a proxy for good overall health outcomes.
This indicator should have an association with good parenting, notwithstanding the fact that older children looked after might exercise their right to refuse medical examinations and treatments. We would expect to see high proportions of children looked after receiving this basic health care. There is an associated National Priorities Guidance objective to enable looked after children to gain maximum life chance benefit from educational opportunities, health care, social care and other services
This indicator is an amalgam of two components dealing with visits to the dentist and health assessments. It may be useful to look at each of these individually; poor performance on one component may be masked by good performance on the other. If the figure is low, then the age breakdown of the LAC cohort may be relevant, since older children are more likely to refuse. As is the case with all performance indicators, indicators 'indicate', they do not 'mean'. The overall figure for this indicator should be interpreted with caution.
Although councils should encourage children looked after to have a health assessment, participation in them is not mandatory and refusals may have a substantial impact on a council's indicator value.
Health issues are regularly raised in reviews, so there is a likely relationship between participation in, and the timeliness of, reviews (4016SC PAF CF/C63 & 2064SC - PAF CF/C68). Distance from home (3085SC PAF CF/C69) may have an influence on health outcomes, as would frequent placement moves (2043SC PAF CF/A1).

Continued on following page

BEING HEALTHY

Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

1037SC - PAF CF/C19: The average of the percentages of children looked after who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months, and who had their teeth checked by a dentist during the previous 12 months, and had an annual health assessment during the previous 12 months

Rotherham

Related measures

2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196

STAYING SAFE

Environmental and other safety data

STAYING SAFE
Environmental and other safety data

Number of children aged 0 to 15 killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents

Rotherham

		1994 - 1998 Average	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2005 percentage change on baseline
Number of children aged 0 to 15 killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents	Rotherham	34	26	11	16	21	19	-43%
	England	5,729	4,242	3,884	3,477	3,353	2,977	-48%
	Great Britain	6,860	4,988	4,596	4,100	3,905	3,472	-49%

Commentary on Rotherham values

The Department for Transport has agreed a target to reduce the number of children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents by 50% by 2010 compared with the average for 1994-98. Statistics showed the number of children killed or seriously injured in Great Britain in 2005 to be 49% below the 1994-98 average.

In Rotherham the number of children killed or seriously injured in 2005 was 43% below the 1994-98 average for that Local Authority.
Whilst the 2005 total for killed or seriously injured child casualties in Rotherham was 43% below the baseline, this figure can be highly variable year on year. This variability may occur because a relatively small number of children are killed or seriously injured each year in road accidents at Local Authority level.

The overarching PSA target for Road Safety:

To reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in Great Britain in road accidents by 40%, and the number of children killed or seriously injured by 50%, by 2010 compared with the average for 1994-98, tackling the significantly higher incidence in disadvantaged communities.

Coverage of the Road Safety target:

The 40% and 50% casualty reduction targets apply to Great Britain as a whole, as they were set in the context of the national strategy that included many measures that would affect the whole country in the same way. However, DfT's locus in local interventions necessary to address the special problems of disadvantaged areas is solely a matter for the devolved administrations in Scotland and Wales, and so that part of the target applies to England only.

Definitions:

The 40% and 50% targets - these relate to combined totals of deaths and serious injuries
Children - those aged under 16
Killed - people whose injuries cause their death less than 30 days after the accident
Seriously injured - people whose injuries cause them to be detained in hospital as an "in-patient", or include any of the following injuries whether or not they are detained in hospital: fractures, concussion, internal injuries, crushings, burns (excluding friction burns), severe cuts and lacerations, severe general shock requiring medical treatment and injuries causing death 30 or more days after the accident
Road accidents - those involving personal injury on the public highway (including footways) in which at least one road vehicle is involved and which becomes known to the police within 30 days of its occurrence
Disadvantaged communities - those within the ODPM's 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Fund areas

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE
Environmental and other safety data

Number of children aged 0 to 15 killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents

Statistics, baselines and targets
Provisional statistics for each calendar year are published about six months after it ends, with final figures following in September in the annual publication "Road Accidents Great Britain - The Casualty Report".
The PSA target relates to road casualty figures for 2010 to be published in 2011.
The baseline figures are the averages for the calendar years 1994 to 1998 in Great Britain:
· Total killed or seriously injured 47,656 (after 40% reduction = 28594)
· Children killed or seriously injured 6,860 (after 50% reduction = 3430)
For disadvantaged communities, our target is a bigger reduction than for England as a whole in the overall road casualty rate by population for ODPM's 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Fund areas, comparing the figure for 2006 with the average for 2000 to 2002.

Data collection and quality assurance
On receipt of the data, DfT carries out its own validation checks and refers back any records with errors or suspicious values, such as any where the number of vehicles and/or casualties noted on the attendant circumstances record is inconsistent with the actual number of vehicle/casualty records in the accident set.
Before annual statistics are compiled, DfT carries out further quality checks including ensuring that the number of records it holds agrees with the total held by data providers.
DfT is confident that its casualty statistics based on STATS19 data are accurate, but recognises that, by their nature, they do not cover casualties arising from any accidents that are not reported to the police. Also, studies have shown that the police can underestimate the severity of injuries because of the difficulty of determining this at the scene.

The credible monitoring of targeted reductions requires that data be reported consistently and accurately. Local and national government, and local police forces, work closely to achieve a common reporting standard. A complex devolved reporting system such as that operated in Great Britain will never produce perfect results, but the high standards that are achieved reflect the efforts of local authorities and police forces to report to the standard national requirement. However readers should note that while very few, if any, fatal accidents do not become known to the police, there is evidence that an appreciable proportion of non fatal injury accidents are not reported to the police and thus are not included.

Any queries on the statistics or requests for further information should be directed to Linden Francis, tel: 020 7944 3078, e-mail: roadacc.stats@dft.gsi.gov.uk

STAYING SAFE

Child protection data - child protection procedures

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2015SC - KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	538	588	880	521	536	494
SN	634	654	613	623	618	604
Eng	511	513	517	499	515	493

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
The number of referrals in period between 1 April and 31 March
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 1, box 1]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
Rate per 10,000 as a whole number

Continued on following page

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator tries to establish whether appropriate thresholds are being used in the cases of children who are in need.
Referrals of children to councils are important as a measure of local concerns about children's welfare. They cover a wide range of concerns including potential abuse, disability, family functioning etc. They may be made by other professionals, family members, friends, the general public or children referring themselves.
A referral is defined as a request for services to be provided by social care services

This is either:

* in respect of a case of a child not previously known to the council;
* where a case was previously open but is now closed.

New information about a child who is part of an already open case does not constitute a referral for the purpose of this return. Open cases should include cases of children receiving an ongoing service that will continue until it is reviewed at a given date, but until that date the case is not active so far as fieldwork and decision making is concerned.
Reception and initial contact activity is not in itself a referral for the purposes of child protection plans. Such activity may, or may not, lead to a referral. Only the number of actual referrals should be counted on the return.

The measure will reflect: the practices of the council, for example, use of a corporate call centre as compared with access via local offices; joint working with the NHS on CAMHS and other services; and with the local Youth Offending Team. As the newly formed children's services work more closely together the counts of referrals may change, reflecting changes in 'gate keeping' arrangements. There may also be an issue, particularly where departments have recently merged, of social care referrals being correctly identified.
The measure will reflect adherence to guidance on how to count referrals for one or more children in the same family and repeat referrals for the same child. Unborn children may be referred and will be counted in this measure.
Referral rates may reflect differences in deprivation between councils; this will also apply within a council's area. Children's social care services vary in their definition of what constitutes a referral which makes comparisons difficult. Some have a 'pre-referral stage to establish if the concern meets their threshold for an assessment.

Low numbers of referrals could suggest that there are clear thresholds for assessment which are well understood by other agencies. Low numbers, however, could also indicate too high thresholds and poor practice of agencies not referring until situations have deteriorated so much that they have become child protection issues This would indicate a need to explore the range of preventative/support services available for those who did not meet the threshold for social care and /or whether local agencies share an agreed common threshold.
Referral rates need to be viewed in conjunction with repeat referrals (2016SC), referrals leading to initial assessment (2017SC), initial assessments within 7 working days of referral (2020SC), and rate & timing of core assessments (2021SC & 2022SC).
A rising referral rate, linked with a rising number of initial and core assessments, could indicate better identification of concerns by other agencies. The extent to which the introduction of the Common Assessment Framework has occured in the council may affect this indicator as there may be a change in the patterns of referrals between agencies.

Related measures

2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2017SC KIGS CH143: % of referrals of children in need that led to initial assessments - see p.61
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2021SC KIGS CH145: Number of core assessments of children in need per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.64
2022SC PAF CF/C64: Timing of core assessments - see p.65

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2016SC - KIGS CH142: Percentage of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	15.7	14.2	11.6	6.5	12.3	22.2
SN	22.5	20.3	19.1	21.3	25.3	25.5
Eng	23.8	22.1	22.2	22.1	23.3	22.7

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
The number of re-referrals in period between 1 April and 31 March
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 1, box 2]
Re-referral for this purpose is where a case has been closed and a referral occurs within 12 months of a previous referral to the same council. See CPR3 form and CPR3 FAQ (DCSF docs) for further explanation of 're-referrals'.
Denominator
The number of referrals in period between 1 April and 31 March
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 1, box 1]
Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator tries to establish whether appropriate thresholds are being used in the cases of children who are in need.
Re-referral percentages help to indicate the extent to which initial assessments at first referral are assessing needs appropriately. High, or higher than average, scores may indicate that following an assessment, appropriate services have not been put in place, or cases have been closed before the required outcomes have been achieved. Lower scores may reflect delays in closure of cases
High re-referral rates may also indicate a lack of understanding of thresholds for social care services and/or a limited range of preventative/support services in the area. It is important to look at this indicator in conjunction with other referral data (2015SC, 2017SC). There may also be links to how quickly the more substantial referrals are dealt with in terms of assessment timescales (2020SC & 2022SC PAF CF/C64).

Related measures
2015SC KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population - see p.58
2017SC KIGS CH143: % of referrals of children in need that led to initial assessments - see p.61
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2022SC PAF CF/C64: Timing of core assessments - see p.65

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2017SC - KIGS CH143: Percentage of referrals of children in need that led to initial assessments

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	17.4	51.5	65.2	94.5	58.2	67.1
SN	31.7	40.1	41.0	41.9	46.9	48.3
Eng	46.3	46.3	50.8	52.6	52.7	56.0

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
The number of initial assessments in the period between 1 April and 31 March.
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 2, box 1 + box 2]
Denominator
The number of referrals in period between 1 April and 31 March.
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 1, box 1]
Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator tries to establish whether appropriate thresholds are being used in the cases of children who are in need and whether their needs are being properly assessed.
A high percentage of referrals leading to initial assessments may indicate good inter-agency understanding of thresholds for social care services. A low percentage of referrals leading to initial assessments may indicate a lack of understanding for social care services, perhaps due to poor inter-agency, or poor intra-agency, understanding or application of thresholds.
The introduction of CAF may affect this indicator as there may be a change in the patterns of referrals between agencies.
Significant variation in council's figure from the SN average figure should prompt further investigation.
Consideration should be given to the relationship between the processing of referrals (2015SC & 2016SC), and initial & core assessment timescales (2020SC & 2022SC PAF CF/C64).

Related measures
2015SC KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population - see p.58
2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2019SC KIGS CH02: Initial child protection conferences per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.62
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2022SC PAF CF/C64: Timing of core assessments - see p.65

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2019SC - KIGS CH02: Initial child protection conferences per 10,000 population aged under 18

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	36.1	63.4	57.1	33.1	31.7	47.5
SN	34.5	39.7	41.0	36.0	34.9	36.4
Eng	31.3	33.7	34.8	33.8	34.4	35.7

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
The number of initial child protection conferences in the period between 1 April and 31 March.
[Source - CPR3 Part A Item 4, line 2]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
Rate per 10,000 to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator tries to establish whether appropriate thresholds are being used in the cases of children who are at the greatest risk of abuse.
Rates may reflect differences in deprivation between councils; this will also apply within a council's area. If there is a high mobility of families in an area this may add to numbers of initial conferences as children already on another council's child protection plan move permanently into the area. Rates may reflect differences in the age structure of the under 18 population between councils.

If the rate of ICPCs is significantly at variance to SN (not national) comparators this raises questions regarding the management and decision making regarding child protection concerns.

Related measures
2015SC KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population - see p.58
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2021SC KIGS CH145: Number of core assessments of children in need per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.64
2023SC KIGS CH01: Children and young people on child protection register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.67
2027SC KIGS CH03: Child Protection registrations per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.70

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2020SC - Percentage of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	32.1	24.3	28.8	67.4	75.8	80.3
SN	58.4	60.3	56.3	64.0	64.9	67.9
Eng	54.0	56.6	58.1	61.7	64.9	68.4

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator
The number of initial assessments completed, in the period between 1 April and 31 March, within seven working days of referral.
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 2, box 1]

Denominator
The number of initial assessments completed in the period between 1 April and 31 March.
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 2, box 1 + box 2]

Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator tries to establish whether children who are in need are being assessed in a timely manner as a proxy for the effectiveness of the assessment, and the meeting, of children's needs.

A referral is defined as a request for services to be provided by the social services department. The response may include no action, but that in itself is a decision, and should be made promptly and recorded.

It should be undertaken within a maximum of seven working days. An initial assessment is deemed to have commenced at the point of referral to Children's Services or when the new information on a case already open indicates that an initial assessment should be repeated.

The Assessment Framework sets a timescale for an initial assessment which authorities are expected to meet. Feedback from children and parents has been very positive about the requirement to undertake an initial assessment within 7 working days. Where this timescale has been met, they have described being very appreciative of a prompt service.

High scores indicate good performance. Low scores indicate poor performance. Low percentages of IAs completed within timescale suggests problems in the duty and referral system which could include either poor systems, inadequate management, insufficient staff, or poor data management. This indicator should be viewed in conjunction with data on referrals (2015SC-2017SC), core assessments (2021SC & 2022SC) and staffing (6011SC, 6012SC & 6015SC)

Related measures

2015SC KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population - see p.58
2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2017SC KIGS CH143: % of referrals of children in need that led to initial assessments - see p.61
2021SC KIGS CH145: Number of core assessments of children in need per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.64
2022SC PAF CF/C64: Timing of core assessments - see p.65
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2021SC - KIGS CH145: Number of core assessments of children in need per 10,000 population aged under 18

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	67.0	60.5	46.2	122.2	48.9	71.3
SN	39.8	60.8	47.4	54.2	72.1	80.1
Eng	50.5	50.1	57.4	66.9	76.8	84.5

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
The number of core assessments completed in the period between 1 April and 31 March.
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 3, box 1 + box 2]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
Rate per 10,000 to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
A core assessment is defined as an in-depth assessment of the needs of a child and the capacity of their parents or care givers to respond appropriately to these needs within the wider family and community network. At the conclusion of this phase of assessment, there should be an analysis of the findings to arrive at an understanding of the child's situation. This understanding should be used to inform a subsequent plan which sets out the case objectives, and the nature of services to be provided. The time-scale for the completion of a core assessment is a maximum of 35 working days. Successful meeting of the time-scales also indicates effective joint working where multi-agency assessment is required.
A core assessment is deemed to have commenced at the point at which the initial assessment ended, or strategy discussion decided to initiate enquiries under s47 of the Children Act 1989, or new information obtained on an open case indicates that a core assessment should be undertaken.
This indicator should be viewed in conjunction with data on referrals (2015SC-2017SC), assessments (2020SC & 2022SC) and staffing (6011SC, 6012SC & 6015SC). Rates may reflect differences in deprivation between councils - this will also apply within a council's area - and may reflect differences in the age structure of the under 18 population. A high rate may indicate that thresholds are set too low and a low rate may indicate threshold set too high, though either may indicate the application of proportionate thresholds. Any rates, high or low, that are consistently and significantly different to those of SN comparators, however, require further exploration.

Related measures
2015SC KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population - see p.58
2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2017SC KIGS CH143: % of referrals of children in need that led to initial assessments - see p.61
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2022SC PAF CF/C64: Timing of core assessments - see p.65
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote ref: 2021SC]

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2022SC - PAF CF/C64: The percentage of core assessments that were completed within 35 working days of their commencement

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	55	62	82
SN	70	75	82
Eng	67	74	78

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●
2004-05	0<45	45<55	55<65	65<75	75<=100
2005-06	0<45	45<60	60<70	70<80	80<=100
2006-07	0<60	60<70	70<75	75<80	80<=100

Data definition

Numerator

Of the core assessments in the denominator, the number that had been completed within 35 working days of their commencement. A core assessment is deemed to have commenced at the point at which:
* the initial assessment ended; or
* a strategy discussion decided to initiate enquiries under section 47 of the Children Act 1989; or
* new information obtained on an open case indicates that a core assessment should be undertaken.
[Source - CPR3, Item 3, box 1]

Denominator

The total number of core assessments in the year. If a child undergoes a core assessment more than once in the year, count each core assessment that finished during the year separately.
[Source - CPR3, Item 3, box 1+ box 2]

Measuring unit

Percentage as a whole number

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator tries to establish whether children who are in the greatest need are being assessed in a timely manner as a proxy for the effectiveness of the assessment, and the meeting, of children's needs.
A core assessment is deemed to have commenced at the point at which the initial assessment ended, or strategy discussion decided to initiate enquiries under s47 of the Children Act 1989, or new information obtained on an open case indicates that a core assessment should be undertaken.
The Assessment Framework sets a timescale for a core assessment which authorities are expected to meet. It is not always possible to complete core assessments appropriately within 35 days. This is the case in only a minority of instances, however, and the bandings on this indicator have been tightened further from 2005-06 to 2006-07 to both reflect this and to encourage better performance.
Examination of the 2005-06 data of the number of core assessments per 10,000 and the percentage of core assessments completed in time indicates that councils may not be recording data consistently or that practice varies widely.

This indicator should be viewed in conjunction with data on referrals (2015SC-2017SC), assessments (2020SC-2022SC), and staffing (6011SC, 6012SC & 6015SC).
High numbers generally indicate good performance. Low numbers generally indicate poor performance and suggest problems in allocation, and/or difficulties in joint working with other agencies. Moderate to very high scores in this indicator should, when coupled with high staff vacancy rates, prompt further questions to be asked about practice and/or data.

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE

Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2022SC - PAF CF/C64: The percentage of core assessments that were completed within 35 working days of their commencement

Rotherham

Related measures

2015SC KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population - see p.58
2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2017SC KIGS CH143: % of referrals of children in need that led to initial assessments - see p.61
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2021SC KIGS CH145: Number of core assessments of children in need per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.64
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2023SC - KIGS CH01: Children and young people who are the subject of a child protection plan, or on the child protection register, per 10,000 population aged under 18

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	39.2	43.9	37.1	17.6	18.6	25.2
SN	26.1	29.3	28.6	26.3	25.8	24.6
Eng	23.1	23.9	23.7	23.4	23.9	25.2

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
The number on the child protection register as at 31 March.
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 1, line 6, column 14]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
Rate per 10,000 population to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator tries to establish whether appropriate thresholds are being used in the cases of children who are at risk of suffering significant harm.
This indicator should be viewed in conjunction with data on referrals (2015SC-2017SC), child protection conferences (2019SC), assessments (2020SC & 2021SC) and staffing (6011SC, 6012SC & 6015SC). Differences in rates may reflect differences in deprivation between councils - this will also apply within a council's area - and may reflect differences in the age structure of the under 18 population. A high rate may indicate that thresholds are set too low and a low rate may indicate threshold set too high, though either may also indicate the application of proportionate thresholds. More effective inter-agency working may lead to an increased indicator value and poor inter-agency working may lead to decreased indicator value. Any rates, high or low, that are consistently and significantly different to those of SN comparators, however, require further exploration.
Further exploration is also required if there are significant changes in the trend data because this may indicate important changes in the application of thresholds (2019SC, 2027SC, 2028SC PAF CF/A3). Practice in relation to timing of both child protection reviews and of deregistration may have a bearing on this indicator (2034SC PAF CF/C20, 2035SC & 2036SC PAF CF/C21).
Changes in trend data on children looked after may also have an important connection with this indicator (2042SC).

Related measures
2015SC KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population - see p.58
2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2017SC KIGS CH143: % of referrals of children in need that led to initial assessments - see p.61
2019SC KIGS CH02: Initial child protection conferences per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.62
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2021SC KIGS CH145: Number of core assessments of children in need per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.64
2027SC KIGS CH03: Child Protection registrations per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.70
2028SC PAF CF/A3: Re-registrations on the Child Protection Register - see p.71
2034SC PAF CF/C20: Reviews of child protection cases (BVPI 162) - see p.76
2035SC KIGS CH10: De-registrations from the Child Protection Register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.78
2036SC PAF CF/C21: Duration on the Child Protection Register - see p.79
2042SC KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.92

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote ref: 2023SC]

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2024SC - Percentage of children and young people who are the subject of a child protection plan, or on the child protection register, who are not allocated to a social worker

Rotherham

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
SN	0.9	0.9	0.0	1.2
Eng	1.1	0.3	0.2	0.3

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
Of those in the denominator, numbers not allocated to a key worker at March 31.
[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]
Denominator
Numbers on the Child Protection Register at 31 March
[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]
Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator tries to use allocation data as a proxy for the measurement of the effectiveness of the interventions provided to children with a child protection plan or on the Child Protection Register.
Working Together , which was based on research, inspections, and reviews of individual cases, stresses the importance of key workers in ensuring that plans are developed and implemented to protect children from abuse. The death of Victoria Climbié and its aftermath have reinforced this importance.
The role of the Key worker is set out in paragraphs 5.75 and 5.76 of *Working Together to Safeguard Children* . The Key Worker is the *qualified* social worker who has been allocated responsibility for the case. It is *not* a managerial role.
It should be noted that since this is snapshot data, this indicator does not necessarily represent a council's performance throughout the year.
A high number would suggest that further investigation is needed around the number, recruitment, retention, and allocation of social workers. A high number would also raise questions about the use and supervision of unqualified staff (see indicators 6011SC-6012SC, 6015SC, 6020SC-6021SSC).
A low number, coupled with poor recruitment and retention figures, should prompt further investigation (see above). A low number, coupled with an increasing pressure on children's services or of the volume of child protection work, should also prompt further investigation (see indicators 2015SC-2017SC, 2021SC, 2023SC, 2027SC, 2034SC-2035SC).

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE

Child protection data – child protection procedures

2024SC - Percentage of children and young people who are the subject of a child protection plan, or on the child protection register, who are not allocated to a social worker

Rotherham

Related measures

2015SC KIGS CH141: Number of referrals of children per 10,000 population - see p.58
2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2017SC KIGS CH143: % of referrals of children in need that led to initial assessments - see p.61
2019SC KIGS CH02: Initial child protection conferences per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.62
2021SC KIGS CH145: Number of core assessments of children in need per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.64
2023SC KIGS CH01: Children and young people on child protection register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.67
2027SC KIGS CH03: Child Protection registrations per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.70
2034SC PAF CF/C20: Reviews of child protection cases (BVPI 162) - see p.76
2035SC KIGS CH10: De-registrations from the Child Protection Register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.78
2060SC % of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker - see p.106
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265
6020SC KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.268
6021SC KIGS ST12: Social workers and care managers specifically for children (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.269

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2027SC - KIGS CH03: Children who became the subject of a child protection plan, or were registered, per 10,000 population aged under 18

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	48.9	54.5	41.2	26.9	25.6	37.8
SN	31.5	33.7	34.5	31.6	30.8	32.0
Eng	25.0	27.2	28.1	27.7	28.5	30.1

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 5, line 6 (also Table 6, line 6, column 4)]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
Rate per 10,000 population to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator tries to establish whether appropriate thresholds are being used in the cases of children who are at risk of suffering significant harm.
Differences in rates between councils may reflect differences in deprivation between councils; this may also apply within a council's area. Rates may also reflect differences in the age structure of the under 18 population between councils.
If the rate of registrations is significantly at variance to national and local comparators this raises questions regarding the management and decision making regarding child protection concerns. If there are significant numbers of LAC on the CPR this should be investigated because it may suggest an inefficient use of resources or drift.
Changes in this over time is a good indicator of changing practice within an authority (more or less risk averse, better prevention etc).
This data should be viewed in conjunction with indicators on rates with child protection plans (2019SC), registration (2028SC PAF CF/A3 & 2029SC), deregistration (2035SC & 2036SC PAF CF/C21) and reviews (2034SC PAF CF/C20).

Related measures
2019SC KIGS CH02: Initial child protection conferences per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.62
2024SC % of children and young people on the child protection register who are not allocated to a social worker - see p.68
2029SC First time registrations as a % of total registrations - see p.73
2035SC KIGS CH10: De-registrations from the Child Protection Register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.78
2028SC PAF CF/A3: Re-registrations on the Child Protection Register - see p.71
2034SC PAF CF/C20: Reviews of child protection cases (BVPI 162) - see p.76
2036SC PAF CF/C21: Duration on the Child Protection Register - see p.79

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2028SC - PAF CF/A3: The percentage of children who became the subject of a child protection plan, or were registered, during the year, and were the subject of a child protection plan, or were registered, at 31 March, who had been previously registered

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	20.9	19.7	22.1	9.0	16.3	19.8
SN	12.9	13.0	14.2	13.2	13.8	13.5
Eng	14.0	13.4	13.1	13.4	14.2	13.4

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low								High
	•	••	•••	••••	•••••	••••	•••	••	•
2000-07	0<3	3<6	6<8	8<10	10<15	15<17.21	17.21<20	20<24	24<=100

Data definition

Numerator
Of the children in the denominator, the number who had previously been on the child protection plan, or the child protection register of that council, regardless of how long ago that was.
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 7 line 2 (also Table 9)]

Denominator
The number of children registered to the child protection plan at any time during the year.
This is a count of each occasion of registration in the year, and may count the same child more than once.
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 5, line 6, column 4 (also Table 9)]

Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

The purpose of the child protection plan, or registration, is to devise and implement a plan which leads to lasting improvements in the child's safety and overall well being. Some re-registrations are essential in responding to adverse changes in circumstance, but high levels of re-registration may suggest that the professionals responsible for the child's welfare are not intervening effectively either to bring about the required changes in the child's family situation, or to make alternative plans for the child's long term care.

Consideration needs to be given to the reasons for re-registration and to the timescales concerned in order to establish the extent to which re-registration is a result of inadequate child protection planning. A proportion of a council's re-registrations may be because a child had left a council area only to return to the same area at some later date; this is not necessarily evidence of a failure of a child protection plan. Also a child may have been registered and deregistered many years previously to the relevant financial year and so their re-registration will not be a reflection of any failure on the part of the council in their child protection work.

Not all councils have comprehensive records for previous registrations going back 18 years. The less comprehensive their data, the lower the rate of re-registration may be.
It is important to link this indicator with the other key child protections indicators (2023SC, 2027SC, 2029SC, 2034SC, 2035SC). The most obvious relationship is with 2036SC PAF CF/C21, duration with a child protection plan or on the register, where a good (i.e. low) figure for this indicator may have been achieved at the expense of a poor (i.e. high) figure for PAF C21. The levels of re-registrations, in other words, might be low where a council fails to achieve de-registrations within two years and children are left on the register for extended periods.

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE

Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2028SC - PAF CF/A3: The percentage of children who became the subject of a child protection plan, or were registered, during the year, and were the subject of a child protection plan, or were registered, at 31 March, who had been previously registered

Rotherham

Guidance / interpretation

Low figures may be related to poor management of data. A very low level of re-registrations may, however, mean that a council is not re-registering some children who are in need. Higher numbers in relation to SN may suggest poor decision-making to end a protection plan, or remove from the register, or a lack of appropriate support for families after de-registration. There is also a possible interplay between staffing issues and re-registrations (6011SC-6012SC).

Related measures

2023SC KIGS CH01: Children and young people on child protection register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.67
2027SC KIGS CH03: Child Protection registrations per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.70
2029SC First time registrations as a % of total registrations - see p.73
2034SC PAF CF/C20: Reviews of child protection cases (BVPI 162) - see p.76
2035SC KIGS CH10: De-registrations from the Child Protection Register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.78
2036SC PAF CF/C21: Duration on the Child Protection Register - see p.79
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2029SC - KIGS CH04: First time registrations as a percentage of total registrations

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	79.1	80.3	77.9	91.0	83.7	80.2
SN	87.1	87.0	85.8	86.8	86.2	86.5
Eng	86.0	86.6	86.9	86.6	85.8	86.6

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 7, line 1]
Denominator
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 5, line 6 (also Table 6 line 6 column 4)]
Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator has previously only been used in the JAR toolkit.
It is the exact counterpart of 2028SC CF/PAF A3; the positive expression of a council's attempt to ensure that child protection plans are successful.

Related measures
2027SC KIGS CH03: Child Protection registrations per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.70
2028SC PAF CF/A3: Re-registrations on the Child Protection Register - see p.71

department for children, schools and families

2066SC - Ethnicity of children who are the subject of a child protection plan (white, mixed ethnic origin, Asian or Asian British, and black or black British)

Rotherham

KIGS CH121: Percentage of children subject to a child protection plan at 31 March who are white

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	93.5	93.4	94.0	98.0	93.5	95.2
SN	96.5	96.2	95.6	95.9	95.6	96.1
Eng	84.1	84.2	83.3	82.0	81.4	80.7

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers

KIGS CH122: Percentage of children subject to a child protection plan at 31 March who are of mixed ethnic origin

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	-	-	-	0.0	-	-
SN	2.0	2.6	2.4	1.7	2.4	2.8
Eng	5.8	6.2	6.4	6.9	7.3	7.3

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

KIGS CH123: Percentage of children subject to a child protection plan at 31 March who are Asian or Asian British

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	4.8	4.7	-	0.0	-	-
SN	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.8	0.7	0.5
Eng	3.6	3.5	3.5	4.2	4.7	5.3

KIGS CH124: Percentage of children subject to a child protection plan at 31 March who are black or black British

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	0.0
SN	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.6
Eng	4.4	4.8	5.5	5.4	5.5	5.3









Continued on following page

department for
children, schools and families

2066SC - Ethnicity of children who are the subject of a child protection plan (white, mixed ethnic origin, Asian or Asian British, and black or black British)

Rotherham

Data definition

Numerator

Those whose ethnicity is in the following categories: white; mixed; Asian or Asian British; black or black British.
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 2, lines 1 to 3 (white); lines 4 to 7 (mixed);
lines 8 to 11 (Asian or Asian British); lines 12 to 14 (black or black British)]

Denominator

The total number of children subject to a child protection plan (minus unborn).
Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 2: rows 1 to 14 inclusive, divided by row 18 (minus row 17)]

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

If children of any particular ethnic origin are over represented among those with a child protection plan, or on the register, in relation to the population breakdown for the area this suggests that they may not be accessing preventative support at an early enough stage to prevent concerns escalating in to child protection.
If children of any particular ethnic origin are under represented, this suggests that concerns about their welfare are not being identified which may leave them at risk.
This indicator needs to be considered alongside other indicators relating to ethnicity (2039SC & 2060SC). In small authorities, or those with low numbers on the register, this set of indicators needs to be treated with care – as a small number of children can skew the figures.

Related measures

2039SC The ratio of the proportion of children on the child protection register that were from minority ethnic groups to the proportion of children in the local population that were from minority ethnic groups - see p.84
2069SC The ratio of the % of Children Looked After that were from minority ethnic groups to the % of children in the local population that were from minority ethnic groups - see p.85

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2034SC - PAF CF/C20: The percentage of child protection cases which should have been reviewed during the year that were reviewed (BVPI 162)

Rotherham

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	53.1	94.7	100.0	100.0
SN	97.2	99.7	99.9	99.7
Eng	95.5	98.8	99.4	99.5

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●
2003-07	0<92.5	92.5<95	95<97.5	97.5<100	100

Definition
Numerator
Of the children in the denominator, the number of children whose cases had been reviewed so that:
i. the first review of the year was held within 6 months of the last review in the previous year (or within 3 months of the child being placed on the Register, if there was no review in the previous year);
ii. the maximum gap between reviews during the year was 6 months; and
iii. a review was held within 6 months of the end of the year (i.e. on or after 1 October)
(Note that the only account taken of reviews in previous years is set out at i)
A review should be recorded in writing and should consider the child's safety, health and development against the intended outcomes set out in the child protection plan.
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 9]
Denominator
Number of children on Child Protection Register at 31 March who at that date had been on the register continuously for at least the previous three months
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 9]
Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator tries to use reviews as a proxy for the measurement of the effectiveness of the interventions provided to children with a child protection plan or on the register.
Guidance, *Working Together to Safeguard Children* , which came into effect from December 1999, requires that the first child protection review is held within three months of the initial child protection conference and thereafter at intervals of no more than six months. Reviews are a key element in delivering Child Protection Plans and effective reviews should ensure the provision of good quality interventions.
From 2003-04, the definition of this indicator changed to include children who had been on the Register for at least 3 months.
High figures indicate good performance. A high figure for CF/C20 might be expected to be linked with reasonably low figure for 2036SC PAF CF/C21, otherwise the efficacy of the reviews may be questionable, as well as having a potential impact on re-registrations (2028SC PAF CF/A3).

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2034SC - PAF CF/C20: The percentage of child protection cases which should have been reviewed during the year that were reviewed (BVPI 162)

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

Performance has improved in this indicator, to the extent that few councils now record a result of less than 92.5%: nonetheless close attention still needs to be paid to this part of the child protection picture. A high figure, coupled with poor recruitment and retention figures (6011SC & 6012SC), should prompt further questions about how this is managed. A high figure, coupled with an increasing volume of child protection work, should also prompt some further questions. This indicator should also be looked at in conjunction with allocation data (2024SC).

Related measures

2024SC % of children and young people on the child protection register who are not allocated to a social worker - see p.68
2028SC PAF CF/A3: Re-registrations on the Child Protection Register - see p.71
2036SC PAF CF/C21: Duration on the Child Protection Register - see p.79
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2035SC - KIGS CH10: Children whose child protection plans were discontinued, or were de-registered, per 10,000 population aged under 18

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	48.4	49.9	48.0	46.6	24.7	31.1
SN	28.7	30.5	35.2	33.6	31.5	33.2
Eng	25.8	26.3	28.3	28.1	28.1	28.8

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator
The number of plans discontinued, or deregistrations, in the period between 1 April and 31 March.
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 8, line 7, column 4]

Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]

Measuring unit
Rate per 10,000 population to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator tries to establish whether child protection plans have been effective.
It is possible for an individual child to be de-registered by the same council more than once in the year. In such circumstances each occasion of de-registration should be counted in the numerator.
This indicator needs to be considered alongside re-registration data (2028SC PAF CF A3 & 2036SC). If children in 2028SC and this indicator overlap, a comparatively high rate of de-registrations, allied with a high rate of re-registrations, would suggest a revolving door policy or practice: that is children's plans have been discontinued too quickly, before risks have been satisfactorily reduced.
Low de-registration and high registration (2027SC) and may be indicative of a risk-averse culture this would lead over time to increases in number of children on the CPR.
Comparatively low deregistration figures indicate that child protection plans are not being progressed satisfactorily, which raises questions regarding allocation (2024SC), as well as staffing (6011SC to 6025SC), quality of case working, level of case holding and managerial oversight. Low figures for deregistration could also be linked to a poor outcome on frequency of child protection reviews (2034SC PAF CF/20).

Related measures

2023SC KIGS CH01: Children and young people on child protection register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.67
2024SC % of children and young people on the child protection register who are not allocated to a social worker - see p.68
2027SC KIGS CH03: Child Protection registrations per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.70
2028SC PAF CF/A3: Re-registrations on the Child Protection Register - see p.71
2034SC PAF CF/C20: Reviews of child protection cases (BVPI 162) - see p.76
2036SC PAF CF/C21: Duration on the Child Protection Register - see p.79
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2036SC - PAF CF/C21: The percentage of children who ceased to be the subject of a child protection plan, or were de-registered, during the year ending 31 March, who had been registered, or the subject of a child protection plan, continuously for two years or more.

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	5.6	6.5	6.8	8.9	-	4.5
SN	6.2	6.2	4.4	7.4	7.6	6.2
Eng	9.9	8.4	6.7	6.0	5.8	5.8

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●	●
2000-07	.	0<10	10<15	15<20	20<=100

Data definition
Numerator
Of the children in the denominator, the number who had been on the Register continuously for two years or longer (i.e. for more than 729 days including day of de-registration).
[Source - CPR3, Table 8, lines 5 and 6, column 4 (also Table 9)]
Denominator
The number of children deregistered from the Child Protection Register during the year.
[Source - CPR3, Table 8, line 7, column 4 (also Table 9]
Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator tries to establish whether child protection plans have been effective and the extent to which risk is being managed appropriately.
Registration should ensure that children who are likely to suffer significant harm are protected and that they and their families are receiving the services necessary to bring about the required changes in the family situation. Professionals, the child and the family should be working towards specified outcomes which should lead to the child's name being taken off the Register within two years.
Numbers in the numerator for some councils will be small and the measure may vary significantly from year to year
There is often a close relationship between performance in this indicator and that for re-registrations (2028SC PAF CF/A3). A good (i.e. low) figure for de-registrations may be explained by a poor (i.e. high) figure for re-registrations. If the PAF CF/C21 figure is poor (high), then this may be explained by a poor (low) figure for the timely review of child protection cases (2034SC PAF CF/C20). It is not always clear what an extremely low figure for this indicator means.
If children in 2028SC and this indicator overlap, a comparatively high rate of de-registrations, allied with a high rate of re-registrations, would suggest a revolving door policy or practice: that is children's plans have been discontinued too quickly, before risks have been satisfactorily reduced.
Comparatively low deregistration figures indicate that child protection plans are not being progressed satisfactorily, which raises questions regarding allocation (2024SC), as well as staffing (6011SC to 6025SC), quality of case working, level of case holding and managerial oversight. Low figures for deregistration could also be linked to a poor outcome on frequency of child protection reviews (2034SC PAF CF/20).

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE

Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2036SC - PAF CF/C21: The percentage of children who ceased to be the subject of a child protection plan, or were de-registered, during the year ending 31 March, who had been registered, or the subject of a child protection plan, continuously for two years or more.

Rotherham

Related measures

2023SC KIGS CH01: Children and young people on child protection register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.67
2024SC % of children and young people on the child protection register who are not allocated to a social worker - see p.68
2027SC KIGS CH03: Child Protection registrations per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.70
2028SC PAF CF/A3: Re-registrations on the Child Protection Register - see p.71
2034SC PAF CF/C20: Reviews of child protection cases (BVPI 162) - see p.76
2035SC KIGS CH10: De-registrations from the Child Protection Register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.78
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2037SC - KIGS CH12: Percentage of s47 enquiries which led to initial child protection conferences and were held within 15 working days

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	4.1	4.9	5.6	26.1	37.8	69.7
SN	19.7	22.0	30.1	24.9	37.2	43.7
Eng	22.4	24.3	26.5	29.9	32.2	34.6

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
Number of children whose initial child protection conferences were held within 15 working days of the initiation of the s47 enquiries which led to the conference.
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 4, line 3]
Denominator
Number of children who were the subject of s47 enquiries initiated during the year.
[Source - CPR3, Part A, Item 4, line 1]
Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
Guidance, in Working Together to Safeguard Children 2006, states that all initial child protection conferences should take place within 15 working days of the strategy discussion, or the last strategy discussion if more than one has been held.
Low numbers of initial conferences completed within timescale suggests problems in the duty and referral system which could include, poor systems, inadequate management, and insufficient staff.

Related measures
2019SC KIGS CH02: Initial child protection conferences per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.62

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2038SC - Percentage of eligible, relevant and former relevant children that have pathway plans, have been allocated a personal adviser and are resident outside the council's boundaries

Rotherham

Number of young people in LA who are:

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Eligible	35	24	36	42	40
Relevant	31	34	31	16	19
Former Relevant	25	82	104	103	98

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Pathway plans

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Percentage with pathway plans who are **Eligible**					
LA	89.0	83.0	61.0	88.0	95.0
SN	67.8	78.2	74.3	89.3	91.7
Eng	68.7	75.3	79.6	81.6	86.1
Percentage with pathway plans who are **Relevant**					
LA	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	89.5
SN	76.3	86.1	90.8	82.6	97.6
Eng	74.6	81.7	85.2	83.6	85.4
Percentage with pathway plans who are **Former Relevant**					
LA	70.0	93.0	94.0	96.0	96.9
SN	77.6	74.9	86.9	83.9	88.1
Eng	70.8	78.3	82.6	85.8	88.9

Personal adviser

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Percentage with allocated personal adviser who are **Eligible**					
LA	89.0	92.0	70.0	88.0	95.0
SN	95.9	93.0	93.0	97.7	97.5
Eng	88.6	91.5	93.9	94.4	95.5
Percentage with allocated personal adviser who are **Relevant**					
LA	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	89.5
SN	98.7	99.5	97.4	99.0	98.5
Eng	88.1	91.9	92.8	91.5	91.8
Percentage with allocated personal adviser who are **Former Relevant**					
LA	77.0	94.0	81.0	96.0	96.9
SN	99.1	95.9	94.3	96.0	90.5
Eng	84.4	86.9	88.1	87.0	89.7

Resident outside council

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Percentage resident outside the council's boundaries who are **Eligible**					
LA	3.0	8.0	9.0	9.5	12.5
SN	20.1	21.0	17.4	28.4	26.8
Eng	27.5	28.4	32.1	32.7	33.7
Percentage resident outside the council's boundaries who are **Relevant**					
LA	22.0	20.0	0.0	6.0	10.0
SN	12.0	25.7	25.6	27.8	21.2
Eng	21.3	24.8	28.5	28.8	26.9
Percentage resident outside the council's boundaries who are **Former Relevant**					
LA	8.0	12.0	5.0	6.8	14.3
SN	21.3	21.9	23.9	21.9	30.4
Eng	22.6	25.3	28.4	30.0	30.9

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE

Child protection data – child protection procedures

2038SC - Percentage of eligible, relevant and former relevant children that have pathway plans, have been allocated a personal adviser and are resident outside the council's boundaries

Rotherham

Data definition

For complete detail, see Children Leaving Care Act 2000 regulations and guidance.

Eligible: a child who is aged 16 or 17 and has been looked after by a local authority for 13 weeks or periods which amounted in all to a prescribed period, which began after they reached the age of 14 and ended after they reached the age of 16. Exclude any children who were looked after under an agreed series of short term-placements (under the provisions of Reg. 13 of the Arrangement for Placement of Children (General) Regulations, 1991).

Relevant: a child is a "relevant" if they are aged 16 or 17; is not subject of a care order, and at the time when they attained the age of 16 were detained or in a hospital and immediately before they were detained or admitted to hospital were looked after by a local authority for a period or periods amounting in all to at least 13 weeks, which began after they reached the age of 14.

Former relevant: Young people aged 18-21 who have been either eligible or relevant or both. Include young people of 21 and over if they are still being helped by the responsible authority.

A Pathway plan sets out in writing, the manner in which the responsible authority proposes to meet the needs of the care leaver and the date by which, and by whom, any action required to implement any aspect of the plan will be carried out

Allocated personal adviser: to carry out the functions laid out in section 12 of the Children (Leaving Care) (England) Regulations 2001.

Resident outside the council's boundaries: eligible, relevant and former relevant children who are living in the area of another local authority remain the responsibility of the authority which looked after them.

[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Measuring unit

Number of young people as at 31.3.07: whole number

% of with pathway plans: percentage to one decimal place

Allocated personal adviser: percentage to one decimal place.

Resident outside the council's boundaries: percentage to one decimal place.

Guidance/interpretation

Once a young person is 'former relevant' they do not lose this status even if they are living with their family. Even if they are at home they should have a Pathway Plan, regularly reviewed, and a Personal Adviser. The level of support offered, however, should be appropriate to their needs, so if all is going well at home they may not need intensive services. They remain 'former relevant' for statistical purposes. Where a 'relevant' young person returns home and, six months later, this is successful and they remain under 18, then they become 'qualifying' and would not become 'former relevant' at 18.

Where figures for pathway plans and personal advisers are consistently low, this would suggest further investigation is needed in relation to leaving care indicators on education, employment and training and accommodation (5022SC and 5037SC).

Related measures

5022SC PAF CF/A4 Employment, education and training for care leavers [joint working] (BVPI 161) - see p.239

5037SC % of care leavers at age 19 who are living in suitable accommodation (as judged by the council) - see p.241

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

department for children, schools and families

2039SC - The ratio of the proportion of children subject to a child protection plan, or on the child protection register, that were from minority ethnic groups to the proportion of children in the local population that were from minority ethnic groups

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	1.2	1.2	1.1	-	1.2	0.9
SN	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8
Eng	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Those whose ethnicity is in the following categories: mixed; Asian or Asian British; black or black British; other ethnic groups, divided by the total number of children subject to a child protection plan (minus unborn).
[Source - CPR3, Part B, Table 2: rows 4 to 16 inclusive, divided by row 18 (minus row 17)]

Denominator

Residents of council area, aged under 18, who were of ethnic origin other than 'white', divided by total residents of council area aged under 18
[Source - 2001 Census]

Measuring unit

Ratio of percentage in numerator and percentage in denominator. Number to one decimal place.

Guidance/interpretation

It is unlikely that children from ethnic minority communities will have less need to access social care than white children (normally the majority ethnic group), and in some cases their need may be greater. Similarly children whose first language is not English may have difficulty in accessing services and may be those most likely to need services. For these reasons one would expect this indicator to have a value of at least 1. A value of less than 1 could suggest that children from minority ethnic communities are not being identified from referrals and provided with services in a comparable manner to white children. This may not hold true in those councils where there is a very small number of families with children from minority ethnic communities.
If children of any particular ethnic origin are over represented among those with a child protection plan, or on the register, in relation to the population breakdown for the area, this suggests that they may not be accessing preventative support at an early enough stage to prevent concerns escalating in to child protection. This needs to be considered alongside 2066SC and 2069SC.
It should be noted that some councils have a rapidly changing ethnic minority population and that the 2001 census data does not adequately reflect this.
If children of any particular ethnic origin are under represented this suggests that concerns about their welfare are not being identified which may leave them at risk.
In small authorities, or those with low numbers on the register, this set of indicators needs to be treated with care – as a small number of children can skew the figures.

Related measures

2066SC Ethnicity of children who are the subject of a child protection plan - see p.74
2069SC The ratio of the % of Children Looked After that were from minority ethnic groups to the % of children in the local population that were from minority ethnic groups - see p.85

STAYING SAFE
Child protection data – child protection procedures

2069SC - The ratio of the percentage of looked after children that were from minority ethnic groups to the percentage of children in the local population that were from minority ethnic groups

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.9	1.1
SN	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.3
Eng	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Those whose ethnicity is in the following categories: Mixed; Asian or Asian British; Black of Black British; Other ethnic groups, divided by total number of children looked after

[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

Residents of council area, aged under 18, who were of ethnic origin other than 'white', divided by total residents of council area aged under 18

[Source - 2001 Census]

Measuring unit

Ratio of percentage in numerator and percentage in denominator. Number to one decimal place.

Guidance/interpretation

It is unlikely that people from ethnic minority communities will have less need to access social care than white people (normally the majority ethnic group), and in some cases their need may be greater. Similarly people whose first language is not English may have difficulty in accessing services and may be those most likely to need services. For these reasons one would expect this indicator to have a value of at least 1. A value of less than 1 could suggest that children from ethnic minority communities are not being identified from referrals and provided with services in a comparable manner to white children. This may not hold good in those councils where there is a very small number of families with children from ethnic minority communities.

If children of any particular ethnic origin are over represented among those looked after, in relation to the population breakdown for the area this suggests that they may not be accessing preventative support at an early enough stage to prevent concerns escalating in to child protection. This needs to be considered alongside 2066SC and 2069SC.

It should be noted that some councils have a rapidly changing ethnic minority population and that the 2001 census data does not adequately reflect this.

If children of any particular ethnic origin are under represented this suggests that concerns about their welfare are not being identified which may leave them at risk.

In small authorities, or those with low numbers looked after, this set of indicators needs to be treated with care – as a small number of children can skew the figures.

Related measures

2039SC The ratio of the proportion of children on the child protection register that were from minority ethnic groups to the proportion of children in the local population that were from minority ethnic groups - see p.84

2066SC Ethnicity of children who are the subject of a child protection plan - see p.74

STAYING SAFE

Child protection data – child protection procedures

HMI Probation Effective Supervision Inspection (ESI) findings for Child Protection cases: "C5.4 Has there been Probation Area involvement in child protection arrangements?"

HMI Probation Effective Supervision Inspection (ESI) findings for Child Protection cases: "C5.4 Has there been Probation Area involvement in child protection arrangements?"

	Rotherham (South Yorkshire)	National
Percentage Excellent/Sufficient	73%	77%

Description of data

Data from HMI Probation's Effective Supervision Inspection of probation areas using representative samples of cases. The national comparator is derived from the 42 published findings for this inspection round. It is based on 428 cases. The data is for the full Criminal Justice Area/Probation area shown in brackets. This usually covers more than one local authority - even if the Probation area shown in brackets has the same name as the authority. Please contact the Home Office for further details.

How is it calculated

Percentage of those CP cases where probation involvement in CP is assessed as Excellent or Satisfactory by HMI Probation.

Health warning

Sample statistic rather than a reflection of all CP cases in the Probation Area. Also note that YOTs and Probation Areas are usually not co-terminous; Probation Areas exist at sub-regional (county) level. Data usually covers more than one local authority so use with caution.

Data Source: HMI Probation, 2003-06 HMIP programme

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Kevin Ball: kevin.ball@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk and quote REF: 2007HO

STAYING SAFE

Inspection findings

STAYING SAFE

Inspection findings

Section 5 school inspection judgements: The extent to which schools ensure that learners stay safe (primary, secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total	Grade				Total	Grade				Total	Grade						
		No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
3F The extent to which learners adopt safe practices																			
LA	no	68	20	45	3	0	13	2	5	6	0	4	1	1	2	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	104	304	39	0	112	15	65	31	1	32	10	17	4	1	767	152	49
LA	%		29	66	4	0		15	38	46	0								
SN	%		23	68	9	0		13	58	28	1								

S5 judgement		Primary			Secondary			Special		
		Total	Grade		Total	Grade		Total	Grade	
		No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
5H Procedures for safeguarding learners meet current government requirements										
LA	no	68	67	1	13	12	1	4	4	0
SN	no	447	442	5	112	112	0	32	32	0
LA	%		99	1		92	8			
SN	%		99	1		100	0			

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about how well learners adopt safe practices and the procedures for safeguarding learners meet current government requirements. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received. Judgement 3F is graded on a 1-4 scale, while judgement 5H is graded 'yes' or 'no'.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

STAGING SAFE

Environmental and other safety data

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the safety, physical environment, equipment, child protection and suitable person national standards; and childcare inspection judgements on the outcome Staying Safe

Rotherham

Actions imposed on new providers at the time of registration visit - all providers

Percentage of providers where actions were issued at registration visits between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total registration visits in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	175
Total registration visits in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1070
Total registration visits in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	29017

Actions imposed from Children Act (CA) inspections - all providers

Percentage of active providers where actions were issued at CA inspections between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total CA inspections in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	262
Total CA inspections in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1533
Total CA inspections in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	44576

Data Definition: Five aspects of childcare are judged in this indicator, corresponding to five of the fourteen standards: Standard 6 - Safety: The registered person takes positive steps to promote safety within the setting and on outings and ensures proper precautions are taken to prevent accidents. Standard 4 - Physical environment: The premises are safe, secure and suitable for their purpose. They provide adequate space in an appropriate location, are welcoming to children and offer access to the necessary facilities for a range of activities which promote their development. Standard 5 - Equipment: Furniture, equipment and toys are provided which are appropriate for their purpose and help to create an accessible and stimulating environment. They are of suitable design and condition, well maintained and conform to safety standards. Standard 13 - Child protection: The registered person complies with local child protection procedures approved by the Area Child Protection Committee and ensures that all adults working and looking after children in the provision are able to put the procedures into practice. Standard 1 - Suitable Person: Adults providing day care, looking after children or having unsupervised access to them are suitable to do so.

Health Warning: Data only takes into account registration visits that have been finalised. The latest CA inspections of active providers that have been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. Suitable Person is shown under 'Organisation' rather than Staying Safe in the Early Years LA Profile. Since the December 2006 Local Authority Early Years Profile was published, the method used to capture registration actions has been revised and these figures reflect the change. Therefore, the percentage of providers with registration actions may differ slightly from the figures in the Profile and the Early Years APA briefing.

Area	SN	NAT

STAYING SAFE

Environmental and other safety data

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the safety, physical environment, equipment, child protection and suitable person national standards; and childcare inspection judgements on the outcome Staying Safe

Rotherham

Judgements on quality gradings against Staying Safe for Children Act inspections for active providers between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006 (in percentages)



Data Definition: The judgements awarded vary according to the type of inspection and the type of provider. Therefore, the total numbers of judgements may differ between the Early Years indicators.

Health Warning: Data only takes into account the latest inspections of active providers, where reports have been been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. “All day care” has been used to refer to a combination of full, sessional, out of school, crèche and multiple day care provisions.

Outstanding | **Good** | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory**

STAYING SAFE

Looked after children and care leavers data

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

2042SC - KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	70.1	67.5	70.4	62.3	65.6	54.1	59.0
SN	58.1	57.7	56.6	58.3	58.6	59.6	60.5
Eng	52.6	53.5	54.7	55.2	55.1	54.6	54.3

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
Number of children looked after at 31 March
[Source - SSDA903]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
Rate per 10,000 to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This is an indicator intended to provide context for all indicators relating to looked after children and to provide some relative data on thresholds for LAC.
Differences between council's rates will often reflect differences in deprivation between councils. Rates may also reflect differences in the age structure of the under 18 population between councils. Rates may be notably higher for councils that have a significant number of unaccompanied asylum seeker children looked after.
Placement data is pertinent here, especially the percentage of children looked after who are placed with parents, or fostered by relatives and friends. A breakdown of placement data by type for 2004-2006 is available in the LAMA+ for 2007.
There are no 'good' or 'bad' figures for this indicator, only rates relative to comparator groups and relative to the needs of children living in the council area.
If numbers of LAC are significantly lower than comparators, it may indicate that thresholds for becoming looked after are too high, leaving some children inadequately protected. If the overall number of LAC is significantly lower than comparators and the rates of children with child protection plans (2023SC), as well as numbers of children in need, are higher, this suggests that tight gate keeping processes are in place, risk is well managed, and children supported in their communities.
If the overall number of LAC is significantly higher than comparators this suggests ineffective gate keeping and /or delays in care plans being progressed. This needs to be considered, though, with data on timescales for LAC reviews (2064SC PAF CF/C68), adoptions (2058SC, 2059SC PAF CF/C23), staffing data (2024SC; 6011SC & 6012SC) as well as the sufficiency of the support/preventative services (6009SC, 6010SC PAF CF/E44).
It is also important to consider the profile of the LAC population as high numbers can also suggest that young people are not being forced to leave care prematurely at 16. Conversely low numbers may indicate young people are leaving care prematurely.

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

2042SC - KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Related measures

2023SC KIGS CH01: Children and young people on child protection register per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.67
2058SC The % of looked after children adopted during the year who were placed for adoption within 12 months of their best interest decision being made - see p.103
2059SC PAF CF/C23: Adoptions of children looked after (BVPI 163) - see p.104
2060SC % of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker - see p.106
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101
6009SC KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18 - see p.247
6010SC PAF CF/E44: Relative spend on family support - see p.248
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

2064SC - PAF CF/C68: The percentage of children looked after cases which should have been reviewed during the year that were reviewed on time during the year

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2005-06	2006-07
LA	92	85
SN	88	85
Eng	79	85

Data is not banded for 2005-06
. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●
2006-07	0<80	80<85	85<90	90<95	95<=100

Data definition

Numerator

Of the children in the denominator, the number of children whose cases had been reviewed (in accordance with the Review of Children's Cases Regulations 1991) so that:
* the first review of the year was held within 183 days of the last review in the previous year (or within 91 days if the previous review was the child's initial review, or within four weeks of the child becoming looked after if there was no review in the previous year)
* the maximum gap between 'six month' reviews during the year was 183 days
* a review was held within 183 days of the year end (i.e. on or after 1 October).
[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

The number of children looked after at 31 March who at that date had been looked after continuously for at least the previous four weeks. Children looked after under a series of short term breaks and children placed for adoption should be excluded.
[Source - SSDA903]

Measuring unit

Percentage as a whole number

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

2064SC - PAF CF/C68: The percentage of children looked after cases which should have been reviewed during the year that were reviewed on time during the year

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator seeks to use reviews as a proxy for the measurement of the effectiveness of the monitoring of the care of looked after children and as a proxy outcome measure.

Reviews are a key element in delivering a successful care plan. The review looks at the child's progress to date and plans for the future. Effective and timely reviews should ensure that the care plan remains appropriate for the child and that the needs of the child are well met.

There is a statutory obligation to review the cases of looked after children, first within 28 days of their becoming looked after, then within a further three months, and subsequently at intervals of no more than six months until they cease to be looked after. The timeliness of the reviews, then, relates not just to the gap between reviews, but also to the start of the period of care itself. In 2004-05 data was collected on the timeliness of the latest review of those children looked after at 31 March. From 2005-06 onwards the indicator was defined to look at all the relevant reviews for a child looked after at 31 March, including ones in the previous year which establish the time frame for when reviews should occur.

The denominator consists of the number of looked after children who qualify and who were looked after at March 31. It does not consist of the number of reviews of those children in the preceding year. If a child looked after at 31 March 2007 had more than one review in 2006-07 which meet the criteria for inclusion, the child is counted once in the denominator. The numerator counts only those children, from the denominator, all of whose reviews in the year were carried out within the specified time limit. If a child had two reviews within the timescale and one review outside of the timescale, the child would be excluded from the numerator as a result of the one review out of time.

High figures indicate good performance and low figures indicate poor performance. With councils that do not score highly, consideration should be given to whether there is any pattern to the reviews that are out of time, which indicates systemic difficulties in the way that reviews are resourced and managed. Managers need to ensure that the recommendations reached at reviews are actioned so that the best possible outcome is achieved for the young person.

Delays in LAC reviews affect care planning and may allow some children to 'drift' in care. Poor timeliness of LAC reviews may affect numbers of adoption orders made, timescales for placement for adoption, placement stability and may impact on keeping numbers of LAC high. Underlying reasons for delays need to be explored. These may include problems with the review system, such as insufficient independent review chairs, or a high real number of unallocated LAC cases.

The scheduling of first reviews sometimes are not in the domain of the Independent Review Team, but rather with the locality or specialist teams; this can affect adversely timescales in relation to initial reviews.

Consideration should also be given to indicators on reviews (4016SC PAF CF/C63), adoption (2059SC PAF CF/C23), health (1037SC PAF CF/C19), placement (2043SC PAF CF/A1, 2067SC PAF CF/D78, 2068SC PAF CF/B79), education (3072SC PAF CF/A2, 3073SC, 3074SC) and offending (4015SSC PAF CF/C18).

Related measures

1037SC PAF CF/C19: Health of looked after children - see p.52
2042SC KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.92
2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2059SC PAF CF/C23: Adoptions of children looked after (BVPI 163) - see p.104
2060SC % of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker - see p.106
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101
3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165
3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167
3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169
4015SC PAF CF/C18: Final warnings/reprimands and convictions of children looked after - see p.194
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

2043SC - PAF CF/A1: The percentage of children looked after at 31 March with three or more placements during the year (BVPI 49)

Rotherham

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	12	12	14
SN	13	12	13
Eng	13	12	12

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	High				
	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●	●
2000-07	0<16.01	·	.	16.01<20	20<=100

Data definition

Numerator

Of the children looked after in the denominator, the number who had three or more separate placements (as defined by the SSDA903 collection) during the year. All placements of 24 hours or more are counted, regardless of duration. See PAF volume 2005-06 for full details of inclusions and exclusions.

[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

The total number of children who were looked after at 31 March, excluding any children who were looked after on that date under an agreed series of short term-placements (under the provisions of Reg. 13 of the Arrangement for Placement of Children (General) Regulations, 1991).

[Source - SSDA903]

Measuring unit

Percentage as a whole number

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator is an important measure of the stability of care that a child has experienced.

On the whole stability is associated with better outcomes - placement instability has been highlighted by the Social Exclusion Unit as a key barrier to improving educational outcomes. Proper assessment of a child's needs and an adequate choice of placements to meet the varied needs of different children are essential if appropriate stable placements are to be made. Inappropriate placements often break down and lead to frequent moves. The circumstances of some individual children will require 3 or more separate placements during a year if they are to be kept safe.

High figures for this indicator were, by 2005-06, relatively rare. Where they do occur, high percentages of children with 3 or more placements may suggest: that children are being placed inappropriately in placements which do not match their needs; insufficient range and number of foster carers to meet demand; lack of appropriate support to children and /or to foster carers, poor care planning and poor assessments.

Most councils seem to have been successful in their efforts to keep within the limits of the highest banding (less than 16.01%). Questions still need to be asked, however, about adequate and appropriate placement choices, especially where figures are comparatively low.

Indicators on which PAF CF/A1 may have an impact, and vice versa, are: placement type, distance from home, reviews, allocation and education.

Continued on following page

department for children, schools and families

2043SC - PAF CF/A1: The percentage of children looked after at 31 March with three or more placements during the year (BVPI 49)

Rotherham

Related measures

1037SC PAF CF/C19: Health of looked after children - see p.52
2052SC KIGS CH44: % of children looked after in residential accommodation - see p.99
2059SC PAF CF/C23: Adoptions of children looked after (BVPI 163) - see p.104
2060SC % of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker - see p.106
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
2067SC PAF CF/D78: Long term stability of children looked after - see p.98
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101
3071SC The % of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam - see p.163
3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165
3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167
3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

2067SC - PAF CF/D78: The percentage of children aged under 16 at March 31 who had been looked after continuously for at least 2.5 years, who were living in the same placement for at least 2 years, or are placed for adoption

Rotherham

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	69.0	66.7	75.4	64.1
SN	62.0	65.3	65.9	65.9
Eng	64.3	63.0	64.8	65.9

This indicator does not have banding
. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Data definition

Numerator

Of those in the denominator, all who have been living in the same placement for at least two years, i.e. at 31 March they have been in the same placement continuously for more than 729 days inclusive of 31 March.

Children who are placed for adoption at 31 March are to be included in the numerator regardless of how long they have been placed for adoption or how long they have been looked after.

[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

All children aged under 16 on 31 March of the year of measurement who had been looked after for 2.5 years or more (i.e. for more than 911 days inclusive of 31 March) on 31 March of the year of measurement.

Exclude children who had been looked after at any time during the 2.5 year period under an agreed series of short term-placements (under the provisions of Reg. 13 of the Arrangement for Placement of Children (General) Regulations, 1991)

[Source - SSDA903]

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator has replaced PAF CF/D35 as a measure indicating long-term stability. Preliminary research has shown it to be of more practical value to social work staff operationally than its predecessor.

Generally, a high figure is an indicator of good performance and a low one of poor performance, though comparator data is important to consider here, as with most indicators.

Poor outcome on long term stability (a low rate) suggest: insufficient support to young people and/or foster carers; insufficient range and number of placements; too many placements 'over numbers'; lack of placement planning around permanence; lack of available long-term foster carers; difficulties in retaining foster carers.

The age profile of the looked after population is important with high numbers of teenagers looked after posing a particular problem for this indicator.

A high figure for 2059SC CF/PAF C23 or for 2034SC CF/PAF A1 is likely to adversely affect this indicator. Conversely a low figure for PAF C23 and PAF A1 is likely to see a higher figure for PAF D78.

Related measures

2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2059SC PAF CF/C23: Adoptions of children looked after (BVPI 163) - see p.104
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

2052SC - KIGS CH44: Percentage of children looked after in residential accommodation

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	13.1	20.0	13.0	9.4	11.7	12.3	9.7
SN	16.6	15.4	15.6	15.5	15.5	15.2	13.0
Eng	16.3	16.1	15.7	15.6	15.5	14.9	14.9

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Of the children in the denominator, the number of children who were looked after in residential accommodation (Placement codes H1-H5, R1-R5, and S1)
[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

The total number of children looked after at 31 March excluding any children placed with parents (code P1) or who were looked after on that date under an agreed series of short term placements
[Source - SSDA903]

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator is intended to establish the extent to which residential placements, which current good practice consider to be suitable only for a relatively small percentage of children, are used by the council, particularly in relation to their comparators.
A low figure is considered good performance and a high figure, especially a very high figure, poor performance.
Low numbers of young people in residential care, however, may mean that some young people leave care too early (i.e. at 16) or that the council has some specialist fostering schemes that cater successfully for teenagers. High numbers, if placed with independent providers, suggest a system under pressure affected by: poor foster placement stability; lack of appropriate gate keeping; and poor care planning.
This measure may be affected by the age structure of the council's looked after children - the older the group, the more likely this measure will be higher; the younger the group, the more likely that it will be lower.
Included in this indicator are children with very complex needs in residential placements and boarding schools. If the indicator is high, some consideration should be made as to the extent to which looking after of this group of children, which constitutes good practice, affects the total figure. Conversely, a low figure may indicate poor practice in relation to this group of children, because their needs may not be being adequately met.
This indicator should be considered with other placement data (29054SC, 2068SC PAF CF/B79)

Related measures

2042SC KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.92
2054SC % of looked-after children fostered by relatives or friends - see p.100
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

2054SC - Percentage of looked after children fostered by relatives or friends

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	11.1	8.0	13.0	13.1	12.1	10.5	13.3
SN	17.7	16.0	17.7	18.7	18.4	17.8	17.6
Eng	13.2	13.3	14.1	13.9	13.8	13.4	12.7

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Of the children in the denominator, the number fostered by a relative or friend (placement codes F1 or F4). A relative includes anyone who is related to the child by blood or marriage. A friend is someone who knows the child or members of his/her family and has become a foster carer in order to care for this child.
[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

The total number of children who were looked after at 31 March, excluding any children who
- are subject of care orders and are placed with parents under the Placement of Children with Parents Regulations 1991; or
- were looked after on that date under an agreed series of short term-placements (under the provisions of Reg. 13 of the Arrangement for Placement of Children (General) Regulations, 1991).
[Source - SSDA903]

Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children should be included, along with both immediate and emergency placements under regulation 11.

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator is intended to establish the extent to which kinship placements, which current good practice consider to be the next most suitable placement for children other than with their parents, are used by the council, particularly in relation to their comparators.
A comparatively high figure is considered good performance and a comparatively low figure, especially a very low figure, poor performance. This measure may be affected by the age structure of the council's looked after children - the older the group, the more likely this measure will be higher; the younger the group, the more likely that it will be lower.

High figures in relation to comparators may indicate an under-usage by the council of residence orders supported by residence allowances and /or special guardianship orders. Some children may be inappropriately placed with family and friends due to a lack of other foster placements.
Low figures may indicate ineffectiveness of foster placement services or they may reflect a lack of suitable kinship carers available to foster.

Related measures

2042SC KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.92
2052SC KIGS CH44: % of children looked after in residential accommodation - see p.99
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

2068SC - PAF CF/B79: Of children aged at least 10 and under 16 looked after at 31 March (excluding those placed with parents) the percentage who were in foster placements or placed for adoption

Rotherham

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	87.6	84.3	86.8	87.2
SN	76.6	75.7	78.0	81.3
Eng	77.5	78.5	79.7	80.7

This indicator does not have banding
. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Data definition

Numerator

Of the children looked after in the denominator, the number aged between 10 and 15, at 31 March, who were in foster placements or placed for adoption.

[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

The total number of children, aged between 10 and 15, who were looked after at 31 March, excluding any children placed with parents or those looked after on that date under an agreed series of short term-placements (under the provisions of Reg. 13 of the Arrangement for Placement of Children (General) Regulations, 1991).

[Source - SSDA903]

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator is intended to establish the extent to which foster care and placed for adoption placements, which current good practice consider to be suitable for the majority of children, are used by the council, particularly in relation to their comparators. It measures placement type as a proxy for good placement choice and for the appropriateness of the placements chosen.

Most children's needs are such that they will make better developmental progress in family settings rather than in residential care, although for a minority of children residential care will continue to offer the best solution. In most cases, caring for children in family settings also costs less than residential care.

This indicator is a refined version of PAF B7, which looked at children of all ages, rather than this age group. Since most children under 10 have been, for some years, placed with either foster parents or prospective adopters, it was decided to focus on older children: the group more likely to go into residential care. The CSCI document *'Children_PIs_2006-07.doc'* has the full rationale for the change to PAF B79 from PAF B7.

High figures are an indicator of good performance and low figures of poor performance. A higher value indicates both a better outcome and a more efficient one, subject to placing children with parents (under care orders) where appropriate and providing residential care for the minority of children for whom this is best. A very high figure, however, raises questions because it is likely that there will always be some children needing some form of residential care.

Consideration should also be given to data on placements (2034SC CF/PAF A1, 2052SC, 2054SC, 2058SC, 2059SC CF/PAF C23, 2067SC PAF CF/D78) , reviews (2064SC PAF CF/C68), distance from home (3085SC PAF CF/C69) and unit costs (6024SC PAF CF/B8)

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

2068SC - PAF CF/B79: Of children aged at least 10 and under 16 looked after at 31 March (excluding those placed with parents) the percentage who were in foster placements or placed for adoption

Rotherham

Related measures

2042SC KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.92
2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2052SC KIGS CH44: % of children looked after in residential accommodation - see p.99
2054SC % of looked-after children fostered by relatives or friends - see p.100
2058SC The % of looked after children adopted during the year who were placed for adoption within 12 months of their best interest decision being made - see p.103
2059SC PAF CF/C23: Adoptions of children looked after (BVPI 163) - see p.104
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
2067SC PAF CF/D78: Long term stability of children looked after - see p.98
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

2058SC - The percentage of looked after children adopted during the year who were placed for adoption within 12 months of the agency deciding that the child should be placed for adoption

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	94	93	68	72	75	67	56
SN	84	85	82	79	86	78	75
Eng	81	80	81	79	81	77	77

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

The number of children included in the denominator: who were placed for adoption within 12 months of the agency deciding that the child should be placed for adoption.
[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

The number of children who ceased to be looked after during the year ending 31 March as a result of the granting of an adoption order. Includes only those children who were adopted after having been looked after by the authority immediately prior to adoption. Children placed for adoption or freed for adoption remain looked after until the adoption order is granted.
[Source - SSDA903]
N.B. The 903 database for 2006-07 was not configured to include in the denominator children ceasing to be looked after as a result of a special guardianship order, so, depending on the number in each council, this may have some bearing on the final indicator score.

Measuring unit

Percentage as a whole number

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator is intended to show the effectiveness of an important part of the adoption process.
A high figure is good performance and a low one poor performance.
Local information should be available to assess how often adoption was not the outcome once a decision had been reached to place the child for adoption.
Timescales for placing children for adoption will be affected by how easy or difficult it is to place them. Older children with more complex needs will take longer to place, as will sibling groups, disabled children and children from black and ethnic minority groups. It is important to ensure that councils are not achieving a good outcome on timescales by only making adoption decisions for younger children and/or those with less complex needs.
Delays in placing children for adoption will also occur due to: insufficient in-house adopters; lack of funding to purchase external adoptive placements; poor care planning; or court delays.
Numbers in the numerator for some councils will be small and the measure may vary significantly from year to year; this could have an impact on the figure which indicates volatility, where really there is none.

Related measures

2059SC PAF CF/C23: Adoptions of children looked after (BVPI 163) - see p.104
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

2059SC - PAF CF/C23: The number of looked after children adopted during the year as a percentage of the number of children looked after at 31 March (excluding unaccompanied asylum seekers) who had been looked after for 6 months or more on that day (BVPI 163)

Rotherham

	2005-06	2006-07
LA	11.3	5.6
SN	7.6	7.2
Eng	7.6	8.3

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low							High	
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●	●
2005-07	0<3	3<6	6<7	7<8	8<25	·	·	25<=100	·

Data definition

Numerator

The number of children who ceased to be looked after during the year as a result of the granting of an adoption order excluding any unaccompanied asylum seeking children (counting only those children who were adopted after having been looked after by the council immediately prior to adoption).
From 2005-06 onward, children ceasing to be looked after as a result of the granting of a special guardianship order should also be included.
Children placed for adoption or freed for adoption remain looked after until the adoption order is granted.
[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

The total number of children who were looked after at 31 March and who at that date had been looked after for 6 months or more (i.e. 183 or more days inclusive of 31 March), excluding any unaccompanied asylum seeking children and children who were looked after on that date under an agreed series of short term placements (under the provisions of Reg. 13 of the Arrangement for Placement of Children (General) Regulations, 1991).
[Source - SSDA903]
Asylum seeker children were excluded from the denominator, from 2002-03 on, along with all children looked after for less than 6 months.

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

2059SC - PAF CF/C23: The number of looked after children adopted during the year as a percentage of the number of children looked after at 31 March (excluding unaccompanied asylum seekers) who had been looked after for 6 months or more on that day (BVPI 163)

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator is designed to give some data on the effectiveness of the end of the adoption procedure and seeks to encourage the use of adoption.

For most children the best place to grow up is with their birth parents. Where this is not possible, society has a clear responsibility to provide children with stability and permanence in their lives. The Government believes that more can and should be done to promote the wider use of adoption which offers the only legally secure placement for children unable to return to their birth families. This does not mean that adoption is appropriate for more than a minority of children.

This is a complex indicator. Very important contextual data for this indicator is the actual trend in numbers of adoptions in each council. This is because an improvement in numbers of adoptions is not always evident in the final indicator value. Small numbers in this indicator can also lead to some variability in the indicator value year on year. This volatility means, therefore, that the data needs to be treated with some caution.

Consideration should be given to the age at adoption, as older children with more complex needs are more difficult to place, as are sibling groups, disabled children and children from black and ethnic minority groups. Other factors worth considering are the proportion of placements for adoption ending in adoption; the trend in numbers of children looked after for more than 6 months; the numbers of children returning to own families; the numbers of children looked after for fairly short periods; the number of adoption breakdowns and the numbers of special guardianship orders in the relevant council.

A high figure is, generally, considered good performance and a low figure poor performance. Comparatively low rate of adoptions may suggest: delays in permanency planning and care planning; failure to consider adoption as an option for every child not returning to parents; insufficient adopters to meet need, lack of interagency budget to purchase placements outside the council; court delays. The figures may be low, though, because of the prevalence of factors, already discussed, which can militate against a higher score, but over which the council has little of no influence.

A very high figure, particularly sustained over some years, should prompt further enquiry. It may be the result from the prevalence of factors assisting a council to achieve a high figure, but it may also be a result of a council placing children inappropriately.

Consideration should also be given to other indicators on adoption (2058SC), placement (2043SC PAF CF/A1, 2067SC PAF CF/D78, 2068SC PAF CF/B79), distance from home (3085SC PAF CF/C69)

Related measures

2042SC KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.92
2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2058SC The % of looked after children adopted during the year who were placed for adoption within 12 months of their best interest decision being made - see p.103
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
2067SC PAF CF/D78: Long term stability of children looked after - see p.98
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161

STAYING SAFE
Looked after children and care leavers data

2060SC - Percentage of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	88.9	95.9	100.0	93.0	94.6	96.2
SN	97.1	94.5	93.3	94.7	94.6	94.8
Eng	97.3	97.3	92.6	93.4	94.8	95.5

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator
The number of those children in the denominator who have a named social worker, who is qualified as a social worker, other than a team leader.
[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Denominator
The number of children looked after at March 31 (excluding those looked after on that date under an agreed series of short term-placements (under the provisions of Reg. 13 of the Arrangement for Placement of Children (General) Regulations, 1991).
[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator tries to use allocation data as a proxy for the measurement of the effectiveness of the interventions provided to children looked after.
All looked after children should be allocated to a qualified social worker; where direct work with the child is being done by an unqualified worker or social work student, the council should ensure that that person is carefully supervised and the qualified worker has oversight of and control of the care plan, ensuring that statutory requirements are met.
Data suggests that most looked after children appear to have a named worker, but inspection suggests that these are not always qualified as social workers.

A high figure indicates good performance and a low figure indicates poor performance.
A low number would suggest that further investigation is needed around the number, recruitment, retention, and allocation of social workers. A low number would also raise questions about the use and supervision of unqualified staff (see 6011SC-6012SC, 6015SC, 6020SC-6021SSC).
The consequences of a low figure for this indicator can be quite widespread. It can have an impact, for example, of the stability of placement, through drift and on the timeliness of reviews, when lack of social work input can cause delays (see 2043SC, 2059SC, 2064SC, 2085SC, 4016SC).
A high number, coupled with poor recruitment and retention figures or with an increasing volume of looked after work, should also prompt further investigation (see above and 2024SC.)

Continued on following page

STAYING SAFE

Looked after children and care leavers data

2060SC - Percentage of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker

Rotherham

Related measures

2024SC % of children and young people on the child protection register who are not allocated to a social worker - see p.68
2042SC KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.92
2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2059SC PAF CF/C23: Adoptions of children looked after (BVPI 163) - see p.104
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265
6020SC KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.268

STAYING SAFE

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

STAYING SAFE
Children with disabilities data

5026SC - What percentage of children with disabilities aged 14+ had a transition plan to support their move from Children's Services to Adult Services?

Rotherham

Possible responses:

1 - less than 50%
2 - up to 75%
3 - up to 90%
4 - over 90%

LA response:

2004-05	1 - less than 50%
2005-06	4 - over 90%
2006-07	4 - over 90%

.. = Data not available

Percentage of SN & England responses (LA's response is highlighted)

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

	1	2	3	4
SN - 2004-05	10	10	40	40
SN - 2005-06	0	20	30	50
SN - 2006-07	0	10	20	70
Eng - 2004-05	13	25	23	39
Eng - 2005-06	7	16	25	52
Eng - 2006-07	3	11	24	63

Data definition
1 - less than 50%
2 - up to 75%
3 - up to 90%
4 - over 90%
[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator *only* refers to young people in receipt of social care services, not all young people who should have a transition plan. Some children with disabilities receiving services from children's social care may not meet the threshold criteria to receive services from adult social care raising the question of how their future support needs will be met.

This indicator may prompt consideration of the extent to which the council keeps accurate and useful data on children with disabilities to whom they provide services, as well as other children with disabilities who are in need, and the extent to which threshold criteria are clearly thought out. It should also prompt consideration about how well children's and adult's services work together to see that needs of the eligible children are met appropriately.

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Early Years and Foundation Stage

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Early Years and Foundation Stage

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the care learning and play national standard; and childcare inspection judgements on Quality of Teaching and the outcome Enjoying and Achieving

Rotherham

Actions imposed on new providers at the time of registration visit - all providers

Percentage of providers where actions were issued at registration visits between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total registration visits in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	175
Total registration visits in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1070
Total registration visits in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	29017

Actions imposed from Children Act (CA) inspections - all providers

Percentage of active providers where actions were issued at CA inspections between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total CA inspections in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	262
Total CA inspections in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1533
Total CA inspections in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	44576

Data Definition: One aspect of childcare is judged in this indicator, corresponding to one of the fourteen CA standards:
Standard 3 - Care, learning and play: The registered person meets children's individual needs and promotes their welfare. They plan and provide activities and play opportunities to develop children's emotional, physical, social and intellectual capabilities.
Health Warning: Data only takes into account registration visits that have been finalised. The latest CA inspections of active providers that have been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. Since the December 2006 Local Authority Early Years Profile was published, the method used to capture registration actions has been revised and these figures reflect the change. Therefore, the percentage of providers with registration actions may differ slightly from the figures in the Profile and the Early Years APA briefing.

Area **SN** **NAT**

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Early Years and Foundation Stage

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the care learning and play national standard; and childcare inspection judgements on Quality of Teaching and the outcome Enjoying and Achieving

Rotherham

Judgements on quality gradings against the Quality of Teaching for Nursery Education inspections between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006 (in percentages)



Data Definition: The judgements awarded vary according to the type of inspection and the type of provider. Therefore, the total numbers of judgements may differ between the Early Years indicators. The outcome 'Quality of Teaching' is only measured in Nursery Inspections.
Health Warning: Data only takes into account the latest inspections of active providers, where reports have been been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. "All day care" has been used to refer to a combination of full, sessional and multiple day care provisions.

Outstanding	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Early Years and Foundation Stage

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the care learning and play national standard; and childcare inspection judgements on Quality of Teaching and the outcome Enjoying and Achieving

Rotherham

Judgements on quality gradings against Enjoying and Achieving for Children Act inspections for active providers between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006 (in percentages)



Data Definition: The judgements awarded vary according to the type of inspection and the type of provider. Therefore, the total numbers of judgements may differ between the Early Years indicators.
Health Warning: Data only takes into account the latest inspections of active providers, where reports have been been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. “All day care” has been used to refer to a combination of full, sessional, out of school, crèche and multiple day care provisions.

Outstanding	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Early Years and Foundation Stage

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the organisation, and documentation national standards; and childcare inspection judgements on Organisation overall

Rotherham

Actions imposed on new providers at the time of registration visit - all providers

Percentage of providers where actions were issued at registration visits between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total registration visits in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	175
Total registration visits in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1070
Total registration visits in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	29017

Actions imposed from Children Act (CA) inspections - all providers

Percentage of active providers where actions were issued at CA inspections between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total CA inspections in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	262
Total CA inspections in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1533
Total CA inspections in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	44576

Data Definition: Two aspects of childcare are judged in this indicator, corresponding to two of the fourteen CA standards:
Standard 2 - Organisation: The registered person meets required adult: child ratios, ensures that training and qualifications requirements are met and organises space and resources to meet the children's needs effectively. Standard 14 - Documentation: Records, policies and procedures which are required for the efficient and safe management of the provision, or to promote the welfare, care and learning of children are maintained. Records about individual children are shared with the child's parent.
Health Warning: Data only takes into account registration visits that have been finalised. The latest CA inspections of active providers that have been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. Since the December 2006 Local Authority Early Years Profile was published, the method used to capture registration actions has been revised and these figures reflect the change. Therefore, the percentage of providers with registration actions may differ slightly from the figures in the Profile and the Early Years APA briefing.

Area	SN	NAT

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Early Years and Foundation Stage

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the organisation, and documentation national standards; and childcare inspection judgements on Organisation overall

Rotherham

Judgements on quality gradings against Organisation for Children Act inspections of active providers between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006 (in percentages)



Data Definition: The judgements awarded vary according to the type of inspection and the type of provider. Therefore, the total numbers of judgements may differ between the Early Years indicators.
Health Warning: Data only takes into account the latest inspections of active providers, where reports have been been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. “All day care” has been used to refer to a combination of full, sessional, out of school, crèche and multiple day care provisions.

Outstanding | **Good** | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory**

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Early years & foundation stage

department for children, schools and families

Improvement in young children's development measured by the foundation stage profile

Rotherham

% of children achieving 78 points or more and 6 points or more in each of the Personal, Social and Emotional (PSE) and Communication, Language and Literacy (CLL) Scales

Year	Area	Nat
2006	40.45	44.59

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

% inequality gap

Year	Area	Nat
2006	43.54	38.29





□ Area average — 95% confidence levels for area

◆ Nat average

Data Definition: These data show the percentage of all eligible children on the Foundation Stage Profile in maintained schools and the private,voluntary and independent sectors who achieve a) 78 points or more across the 13 assessment scales and b) 6 points or more in each of the scales relating to the Personal, Social and Emotional (PSE) and Communication Language and Literacy (CLL) areas of learning. PSE includes 3 assessment scales: Dispositions and Attitudes, Social Development and Emotional Development; CLL includes 4 scales: Language for Communication and Thinking, Linking Sounds and Letters, Reading and Writing. The remaining 6 assessment scales in the FSP are in Mathematical Development (3 scales), Knowledge and Understanding of the World (1 scale), Physical Development (1 scale) and Creative Development (1 scale). As the estimate is based on a 10% sample, a 95% confidence interval is calculated. This illustrates the range of values the estimates could take if further samples were drawn from the same population. If the national average falls within the confidence interval for the local authority then they are not significantly different.

Also shown is the percentage gap in achievement between the mean score for the lowest 20 per cent of achieving children in a local authority, and the score of the median child in the local authority. This is presented as the difference divided by the median to give the inequality gap measuring the extent of under-achievement.

Source of data: DCSF Foundation Stage Profile 2006

Health warning: The Foundation Stage Profile is a statutory stage of the National Curriculum and measures the achievement of children in the summer term preceding a child's transition to a Key Stage 1 programme of study. The child will usually have reached the age of 5 by this time. The FS curriculum and its assessment are not yet universally established and it is likely that the results in 2006 have followed the trend of earlier years and been affected by changes in the way assessment and moderation have been undertaken. Local authorities are at different stages of development in this process and this must be taken into account when assessing their results. The figures showing the percentage of children achieving a score of 78 points or more and 6 or more in each of the PSE and CLL scales are derived from the 10 per cent child level sample and are subject to sampling error.

Statistical Neighbour comparisons have not been given for this indicator, due to areas being at different levels of development with assessing the foundation stage. Sample level data also means that comparisons would be less robust.

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Inspection findings

Section 5 school inspection judgements: The extent to which learners make a positive contribution (primary schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total number of LA maintained schools* Pri	Sec	Spec
1C The quality and standards in the Foundation Stage									
LA	no	56	12	35	9	0	104	16	7
SN	no	419	58	275	86	0	767	152	49
LA	%		21	63	16	0			
SN	%		14	66	21	0			

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about the quality and standards in the Foundation Stage. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection.The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Key Stage 1 data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS1 data

Teacher assessment results on reading: Achievement at KS1 level 2+

Rotherham

Level 2+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Reading	2002	83.22	85.03	84.84	V				
	2003	83.62	84.69	84.88	V	02/03	0.40	-0.34	0.04
	2004	82.24	85.66	85.23	V	03/04	-1.39	0.97	0.35
	2005	82.97	85.13	85.50	V	04/05	0.74	-0.52	0.27
	2006	80.76	84.73	84.78	U	05/06	-2.21	-0.40	-0.72

Trend Analysis

Level 2+ % Trend

National

Statistical Neighbours

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data



Data Definition: The indicator shows the percentage of KS1 pupils who achieve at least level 2 in Reading.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included. Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS1 data

Teacher assessment results on writing: Achievement at KS1 level 2+

Rotherham

Level 2+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Writing	2002	84.63	84.36	83.99	V				
	2003	82.29	82.33	82.67	V	02/03	-2.34	-2.02	-1.32
	2004	81.21	83.84	82.93	V	03/04	-1.08	1.51	0.26
	2005	81.97	82.62	82.75	V	04/05	0.76	-1.22	-0.19
	2006	80.33	81.89	81.71	U	05/06	-1.64	-0.73	-1.03

Trend Analysis

Level 2+ % Trend

National

Statistical Neighbours

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data



Data Definition: The indicator shows the percentage of KS1 pupils who achieve at least level 2 in Writing.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS1 data

Teacher assessment results on mathematics: Achievement at KS1 level 2+

Rotherham

Level 2+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Maths	2002	89.16	89.31	89.09	V				
	2003	88.49	88.60	88.99	V	02/03	-0.67	-0.71	-0.10
	2004	88.29	89.88	89.66	V	03/04	-0.20	1.29	0.67
	2005	90.11	91.01	91.39	V	04/05	1.81	1.12	1.72
	2006	88.42	91.09	90.67	U	05/06	-1.69	0.08	-0.72

Trend Analysis

Level 2+ % Trend

National

Statistical Neighbours

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data



Data Definition: The indicator shows the percentage of KS1 pupils who achieve at least level 2 in Mathematics.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Key Stage 2 data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS2 data

Test results on English: Achievement at KS2, level 4+ and Average Point Scores (all pupils)

Rotherham

Level 4+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
English	2002	69.62	72.61	74.78	V				
	2003	70.22	73.23	75.47	V	02/03	0.60	0.62	0.69
	2004	73.63	76.76	77.81	V	03/04	3.41	3.53	2.34
	2005	77.57	78.60	79.49	V	04/05	3.94	1.84	1.68
	2006	74.29	78.40	79.96	V	05/06	-3.28	-0.20	0.47

Trend Analysis

Level 4+ % Trend

National

Statistical Neighbours

APS						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
English	2002	26.26	26.64	26.95	V				
	2003	26.13	26.53	26.82	V	02/03	-0.13	-0.11	-0.13
	2004	26.34	26.74	26.96	V	03/04	0.21	0.21	0.14
	2005	26.79	26.92	27.06	V	04/05	0.45	0.18	0.10
	2006	26.68	27.19	27.45	V	05/06	-0.11	0.27	0.39

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data





Area ☐ SN ◇ NAT △

Data Definition: The indicator represents two measures for KS2 data on English: Level 4+ attainment and Average Point Scores (APS). Level 4 data shows the percentage of KS2 pupils who achieve at least level 4 in English. APS are calculated from all pupils' test scores. Absent and disapplied pupils are excluded from the calculation of the APS, but included in the calculation of the % attaining level 4+.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.
[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk.

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS2 data

Test results on mathematics: Achievement at KS2, level 4+ and Average Point Scores (all pupils)

Rotherham

Level 4+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Maths	2002	72.38	72.85	73.41	V				
	2003	69.05	71.96	72.66	V	02/03	-3.33	-0.89	-0.75
	2004	71.65	73.82	74.20	V	03/04	2.60	1.86	1.54
	2005	73.84	75.89	75.51	V	04/05	2.19	2.07	1.31
	2006	71.68	76.62	76.43	V	05/06	-2.16	0.73	0.92

Trend Analysis

Level 4+ % Trend

National

Statistical Neighbours

APS						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Maths	2002	26.66	26.73	26.86	V				
	2003	26.40	26.70	26.82	V	02/03	-0.26	-0.03	-0.04
	2004	26.73	26.90	27.04	V	03/04	0.33	0.20	0.22
	2005	27.00	27.06	27.10	V	04/05	0.27	0.16	0.06
	2006	26.66	27.23	27.29	V	05/06	-0.34	0.17	0.19

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data





Area ☐ SN ◇ NAT △

Data Definition: The indicator represents two measures for KS2 data on Mathematics: Level 4+ attainment and Average Point Scores (APS). Level 4 data shows the percentage of KS2 pupils who achieve at least level 4 in Mathematics. APS are calculated from all pupils' test scores. Absent and disapplied pupils are excluded from the calculation of the APS, but included in the calculation of the % attaining level 4+.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS2 data

Test results on science: Achievement at KS2, level 4+ and Average Point Scores (all pupils)

Rotherham

Level 4+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Science	2002	86.09	86.48	86.91	V				
	2003	85.33	86.72	87.11	V	02/03	-0.76	0.24	0.20
	2004	85.02	86.30	86.34	V	03/04	-0.31	-0.42	-0.77
	2005	86.83	87.06	87.17	V	04/05	1.81	0.76	0.83
	2006	82.82	87.30	87.43	V	05/06	-4.01	0.24	0.26

Trend Analysis

Level 4+ % Trend

National

Statistical Neighbours

APS						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Science	2002	28.42	28.47	28.50	V				
	2003	28.36	28.53	28.62	V	02/03	-0.06	0.06	0.12
	2004	28.54	28.59	28.66	V	03/04	0.18	0.06	0.04
	2005	28.84	28.89	28.95	V	04/05	0.30	0.30	0.29
	2006	28.24	28.84	28.90	V	05/06	-0.60	-0.05	-0.05

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data





Area SN NAT

Data Definition: The indicator represents two measures for KS2 data on Science: Level 4+ attainment and Average Point Scores (APS). Level 4 data shows the percentage of KS2 pupils who achieve at least level 4 in Science. APS are calculated from all pupils' test scores. Absent and disapplied pupils are excluded from the calculation of the APS, but included in the calculation of the % attaining Level 4+.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS2 data

Value added measures KS1 to KS2.

Rotherham

	Year	Area		Nat*
Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2	2002	..		..
Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2	2003	100	V	..
Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2	2004	99.9	V	..
Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2	2005	100	V	100.2
Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2	2006	99.1	V	99.8

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*
V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data

Data Definition:
Value Added is a measure of the progress that individual pupils make from one key stage to another, relative to the national picture. It is calculated using pupil level data that has been matched using Unique Pupil Numbers (UPNs). This indicator measures progress between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2. A value added measure of 101.0 means that, on average in the LA, pupils have made about one term's worth of extra progress between KS1 to KS2 than the median pupil. Similarly, a value added measure of 99.0 suggests that, on average in the LA, pupils have made one term or less progress. Absent and 'disregarded' pupils are excluded from the calculation of the value added measure. Note that the KS1-KS2 value added measure is presented as a number around 100, the actual national average may differ from 100.
*The average KS1-KS2 value added measure for maintained schools in England.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: Figures are calculated from maintained schools only.

RAI, Ofsted

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Key Stage 3 data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS3 data

Test results on English: Achievement at KS3, level 5+ and Average Point Scores (all pupils)

Rotherham

Level 5+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
English	2002	63.61	66.02	67.60	v				
	2003	64.91	67.97	69.82	v	02/03	1.3	1.95	2.22
	2004	63.52	67.45	71.90	v	03/04	-1.39	-0.52	2.08
	2005	71.52	72.52	75.10	v	04/05	8.00	5.07	3.20
	2006	63.62	71.29	73.81	v	05/06	-7.90	-1.23	-1.29

Trend Analysis

Level 5+ % Trend

National

Statistical Neighbours

APS						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
English	2002	32.81	33.11	33.48	v				
	2003	32.85	33.36	33.67	v	02/03	0.04	0.25	0.19
	2004	32.17	32.79	33.71	v	03/04	-0.68	-0.57	0.04
	2005	33.09	33.38	33.97	v	04/05	0.92	0.59	0.26
	2006	32.13	33.12	33.81	v	05/06	-0.96	-0.26	-0.16

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data





Area ☐ SN ◇ NAT △

Data Definition: The indicator represents two measures for KS3 data on English: Level 5+ attainment and Average Point Scores (APS). Level 5 data shows the percentage of KS3 pupils who achieve at least level 5 in English. APS are calculated from all pupils' test scores. Absent and disapplied pupils are excluded from the calculation of the APS, but included in the calculation of the % attaining Level 5+.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS3 data

Test results on mathematics: Achievement at KS3, level 5+ and Average Point Scores (all pupils)

Rotherham

Level 5+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Maths	2002	61.81	65.44	68.03	V				
	2003	67.58	69.06	71.64	V	02/03	5.77	3.62	3.61
	2004	71.73	71.46	73.98	V	03/04	4.15	2.40	2.34
	2005	72.27	72.89	74.90	V	04/05	0.54	1.43	0.92
	2006	73.91	76.13	77.94	V	05/06	1.64	3.24	3.04

Trend Analysis

Level 5+ % Trend

National	
Statistical Neighbours	

APS						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Maths	2002	33.45	34.13	34.87	V				
	2003	34.79	34.89	35.64	V	02/03	1.34	0.76	0.77
	2004	35.11	35.22	35.90	V	03/04	0.32	0.33	0.26
	2005	35.39	35.49	36.25	V	04/05	0.28	0.27	0.35
	2006	36.20	36.55	37.29	V	05/06	0.81	1.06	1.04

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*
V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data





Area ☐ SN ◇ NAT △

Data Definition: The indicator represents two measures for KS3 data on Mathematics: Level 5+ attainment and Average Point Scores (APS). Level 5 data shows the percentage of KS3 pupils who achieve at least level 5 in Mathematics. APS are calculated from all pupils' test scores. Absent and disapplied pupils are excluded from the calculation of the APS, but included in the calculation of the % attaining level 5+.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk.

Please Quote Ref: 3010OF

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS3 data

Test results on science: Achievement at KS3, level 5+ and Average Point Scores (all pupils)

Rotherham

Level 5+ %						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Science	2002	60.93	65.56	67.52	V				
	2003	64.09	66.58	69.38	V	02/03	3.16	1.02	1.86
	2004	63.50	64.23	67.08	V	03/04	-0.59	-2.35	-2.30
	2005	66.25	68.60	70.78	V	04/05	2.75	4.37	3.70
	2006	67.99	71.02	73.28	V	05/06	1.74	2.42	2.50

Trend Analysis

Level 5+ % Trend

National

Statistical Neighbours

APS						Year-on-Year Change			
Subject	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
Science	2002	32.21	32.94	33.46	V				
	2003	32.84	33.27	33.84	V	02/03	0.63	0.33	0.38
	2004	32.65	32.83	33.37	V	03/04	-0.19	-0.44	-0.47
	2005	32.87	33.26	33.81	V	04/05	0.22	0.43	0.44
	2006	33.41	33.85	34.46	V	05/06	0.54	0.59	0.65

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*
V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data





Area ☐ SN ◇ NAT △

Data Definition: The indicator represents two measures for KS3 data on Science: Level 5+ attainment and Average Point Scores (APS). Level 5 data shows the percentage of KS3 pupils who achieve at least level 5 in Science. APS are calculated from all pupils' test scores. Absent and disapplied pupils are excluded from the calculation of the APS, but included in the calculation of the % attaining Level 5+.
Trend: The trend for each year is generated by taking a three point moving average of the LA percentage figures. The rate of change is calculated by fitting a regression line to these moving averages. The rate of change for all 150 LAs are then ranked. The top 10% are classed as 'Well above', the next 20% 'Above', the next 40% 'In line', the next 20% 'Below', the final 10% 'Well below'. Similarly the rate of change for each LAs group of statistical neighbours is calculated and deducted from each LA rate of change. The differences are then ranked, and the same classification is used to compare the LA against their statistical neighbours, as is used in the national calculation. The trend indicates whether the change over time in the LA is greater or less than the change over time for the national or statistical neighbours.
[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
KS3 data

Value added measures KS2 to KS3

Rotherham

	Year	Area		Nat*
Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3	2002	99.5	V	..
Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3	2003	99	V	..
Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3	2004	98.8	V	..
Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3	2005	99.2	V	99.6
Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3	2006	99.1	V	99.8

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = *data not available* V = Validated data

n/a = *not applicable* U = Unvalidated data

Data Definition:
Value Added is a measure of the progress that individual pupils make from one key stage to another, relative to the national picture. It is calculated using pupil level data that has been matched using Unique Pupil Numbers (UPNs). This indicator measures progress between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3. A value added measure of 101.0 means that, on average in the LA pupils have made about one term's worth of extra progress between KS2 to KS3 than the median pupil. Similarly, a value added measure of 99.0 would suggest that, on average in the LA, pupils have made one term or less progress. Absent and 'disregarded' pupils are excluded from the calculation of the value added measure. Note that although the national median for the value added score is centred around 100, the actual national average may differ from 100.
*The average KS2-KS3 value added measure for maintained schools in England.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning:
Figures are calculated from maintained schools only.

RAI, Ofsted

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

GCSE/Equivalents data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
GCSE/Equivalents Data

Percentage achieving 5+ A*-C (all pupils) and Percentage achieving 5+ A*-C (all pupils) including English and Maths

Rotherham

% 5+ A*-C						Year-on-Year Change			
GCSE	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
	2002	42.72	46.20	50.28	V				
	2003	45.36	47.08	51.86	V	02/03	2.64	0.88	1.58
	2004	**47.06**	**48.25**	**52.92**	V	03/04	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2005	**50.03**	**52.11**	**55.52**	V	04/05	2.97	3.86	2.60
	2006	**53.26**	**55.18**	**58.23**	V	05/06	3.23	3.07	2.71

% 5+ A*-C (including English and Maths)						Year-on-Year Change			
GCSE	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
	2002	..	..	..					
	2003	..	..	..		02/03	..	..	..
	2004	n/a	n/a	n/a	V	03/04	..	..	..
	2005	**36.87**	**38.12**	**43.00**	V	04/05	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2006	**38.27**	**39.77**	**44.72**	V	05/06	1.40	1.65	1.72

.. = *data not available* V = Validated data

n/a = *not applicable* U = Unvalidated data





Area SN NAT

Data Definition:
These indicators show the percentage of all GCSE-eligible pupils in mainstream maintained secondary schools who attained at least five grades of C or above. A GCSE-eligible pupil is defined as a pupil who is aged 15 at the beginning of the school year. The new 5+ A*-C GCSEs (and equivalent) including English and Maths GCSEs, was announced in the 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper and subsequently confirmed in the *Driving Forward 14-19 Reform: Implementation Plan* published in December 2005. Pupils counted must have achieved at least a grade C English GCSE, and at least a grade C Maths GCSE, and at least the equivalent of another three C+ GCSEs.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.
Discontinuous Yearly Data . From 2004, the figures are calculated from a wider range of GCSE-equivalent pre-16 qualifications as well as GCSEs. Therefore, extra care should be taken when comparing post 2004 performance with previous years that do not include the wider range of qualifications. For 5 A*-C including English and Maths, 2005 figures may include Statistics counted as Maths. 2006 figures count only English and Maths GCSE or equivalent.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk.

Please Quote Ref: 3104OF

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
GCSE/Equivalents Data

Percentage achieving 1+ A*-G (all pupils)

Rotherham

% 1+ A*G						Year-on-Year Change			
GCSE	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
	2002	96.10	96.10	96.00	V				
	2003	96.58	95.91	96.12	V	02/03	0.48	-0.19	0.12
	2004	**96.32**	**96.25**	**96.47**	V	03/04	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2005	**96.77**	**96.90**	**97.02**	V	04/05	0.45	0.65	0.55
	2006	**97.48**	**97.56**	**97.63**	V	05/06	0.71	0.66	0.61

.. = *data not available* V = Validated data

n/a = *not applicable* U = Unvalidated data



Data Definition:
The indicator shows the percentage of all GCSE-eligible pupils in mainstream maintained secondary schools who attained one grade of G and above in GCSE examinations. A GCSE-eligible pupil is defined as a pupil who is aged 15 at the beginning of the school year.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.
Discontinuous Yearly Data . From 2004, the figures are calculated from a wider range of GCSE-equivalent pre-16 qualifications as well as GCSEs. Therefore, extra care should be taken when comparing post 2004 performance with previous years that do not include the wider range of qualifications.

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

GCSE/Equivalents Data

Average point scores (all pupils) and Capped average point scores (all pupils)

Rotherham

Average point score						Year-on-Year Change			
GCSE	Year	Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
	2002	36.48	38.05	39.97	V				
	2003	37.69	38.68	40.81	V	02/03	1.21	0.63	0.84
	2004	**314.97**	**332.08**	**343.07**	V	03/04	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2005	**331.06**	**344.93**	**353.31**	V	04/05	16.09	12.85	10.24
	2006	**344.21**	**362.68**	**366.01**	V	05/06	13.15	17.75	12.70

Capped average point score						Year-on-Year Change			
GCSE		Area	SN	Nat			Area	SN	Nat
	2002	31.83	33.05	34.55	V				
	2003	32.83	32.99	34.69	V	02/03	1.00	-0.06	0.14
	2004	**269.01**	**274.62**	**284.36**	V	03/04	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2005	**273.11**	**279.98**	**288.76**	V	04/05	4.10	5.36	4.40
	2006	**280.99**	**286.93**	**294.54**	V	05/06	7.88	6.95	5.78

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data





Area □ SN ◇ NAT △

Data Definition: The indicator represents two measures of GCSE performance: Average Points Scores (APS) and capped APS. APS are values calculated from all pupils' scores from GCSEs and equivalent examinations. Capped APS are calculated from each pupil's best eight GCSEs or equivalent.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.
Discontinuous Yearly Data. From 2004 figures are calculated from a wider range of GCSE-equivalent pre-16 qualifications as well as GCSEs. Therefore, extra care should be taken when comparing post 2004 performance with previous years that do not include the wider range of qualifications and are based on a different point scoring system.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
GCSE/Equivalents Data

Contextual Value added measure Key Stage 2 to GCSE/Equivalents

Rotherham

KS2 to KS4	Year	Area	Coverage %	Nat	Coverage %	
	2006	995.8	96.5	1000.6	95.3	V

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

KS2 to KS4	Year	Number of Schools	Lowest	Median	Highest	
KS2-KS4 CVA - Distribution of School CVA measures in the area	2006	19	962.9	1000.7	1032.7	V

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data

Data Definition: The LA level contextual value added (CVA) score reflects the average rate of progress of all pupils in the LA. The LA CVA measure is calculated by aggregating the CVA scores of pupils at schools within the LA and applying an adjustment to take account of the number of pupils in the calculation – for most LAs this adjustment is very small. Pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 by summer 2006 (i.e. at the end of the 2005/06 school year) for who we have prior attainment data are included in the school and LA level CVA measures. The CVA measures are centred around 1000. A CVA score of 1006.0 means that, on average pupils within the LA achieved one grade higher in one GCSE subject than similar pupils nationally. Similarly, a value added measure of 994.0 would suggest that, on average, pupils within the LA achieved one grade lower in one GCSE subject than similar pupils nationally. The coverage shows the percentage of pupils within the LA at the end of Key Stage 4 who were included in KS2-KS4 CVA measure. Along with the LA CVA score, the distribution of CVA scores of schools within the LA is shown. This shows the lowest, highest and median – or mid point – of CVA scores for the individual schools within the LA.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: The LA CVA score is the average rate of progress of all pupils in the LA and reflects the effectiveness of the groups of schools in the LA, not necessarily the overall effectiveness of the LA. The CVA figures include pupils from maintained schools including special schools. It excludes pupils in pupil referral units, Hospital schools, FE sector institutions and sixth form centres/consortia. Schools opened after January 06 are also excluded from the LA CVA score.

RAI, Ofsted

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
GCSE/Equivalents Data

Value added measures KS3 to GCSE/Equivalents

Rotherham

	Year	Area		Nat*
Key Stage 3 to GCSE/GNVQ	2002	98	V	..
Key Stage 3 to GCSE/GNVQ	2003	99.2	V	..
Key Stage 3 to GCSE/Equiv.	2004	990.2	V	..
Key Stage 3 to GCSE/Equiv.	2005	**989.4**	V	992.7

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

V = Validated data
U = Unvalidated data

Data Definition:
Value Added is a measure of the progress that individual pupils make from one key stage to another, relative to the national picture. It is calculated using pupil level data that has been matched using Unique Pupil Numbers (UPNs). This indicator measures progress between Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 (GCSE/Equivalents). A value added measure of 1006.0 means that, on average in the LA, pupils have achieved one grade higher in one GCSE than the average (median) pupil with similar Key Stage 3 prior attainment. Similarly, a value added measure of 994.0 would suggest that, on average in the LA, pupils have achieved one grade lower in one GCSE than the average (median) pupil with the same Key Stage 3 prior attainment. Absent and 'disregarded' pupils are excluded from the calculation of the value added measure. Note that although the national median for the value added score is centred around 1000, the actual national average may differ from 1000. *The average KS3-GCSE value added measure for maintained schools in England.

[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning:
Figures are calculated from maintained schools only.
Discontinuous Yearly Data . From 2004 onwards, a different method of calculating the value added score is used, and the figures published are in terms of a measure centred around 1000.

RAI, Ofsted

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
GCSE/Equivalents data

department for children, schools and families

Percentage of schools not attaining Key Stage 4 floor targets

Rotherham

Total secondary schools in Rotherham		
	2002:	17
	2003:	17
	2004:	16
	2005:	16
	2006:	16

Floor Target (2004 Spending Review PSA): by 2008, 60% of those aged 16 to achieve the equivalent of 5 GCSEs at grades A* to C; and in all schools at least 20% of pupils achieve this standard by 2004, rising to 25% by 2006 and 30% by 2008

Traffic lights have not been applied to this data

Percentage of KS4 schools below Floor Target

	15%			20%			25%			30%		
	Area	**SN**	**Nat**	**Area**	**SN**	**Nat**	**Area**	**SN**	**Nat**	**Area**	**SN**	**Nat**
2002	0.00%	0.66%	1.81%	5.88%	1.32%	5.07%	17.65%	4.61%	9.49%	29.41%	16.45%	16.10%
2003	0.00%	0.66%	1.36%	11.76%	1.99%	3.62%	11.76%	4.64%	7.24%	23.53%	12.58%	13.25%
2004	0.00%	0.00%	0.87%	0.00%	0.66%	2.33%	6.25%	6.58%	6.01%	18.75%	9.87%	11.08%
2005	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%	0.00%	0.66%	1.29%	6.25%	1.99%	3.55%	6.25%	6.62%	7.43%
2006	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.49%	0.00%	0.67%	1.53%	0.00%	4.03%	4.36%









Area ☐ SN ◇ NAT △

Data definition:

This indicator shows the % of schools failing to meet each floor target. By 2008, 60% of those aged 16 should achieve the equivalent of 5 GCSEs at grades A* to C; and in all schools at least 20% of pupils achieve this standard by 2004, rising to 25% by 2006 and 30% by 2008. The target includes all Maintained Mainstream schools, including Academies and City Technology Colleges published with GCSE and equivalent results in the secondary school performance tables. It excludes all non-maintained schools, all special schools, all hospital schools, all pupil referral units, schools that closed ahead of publication of the tables, and schools that opened after the Annual School Census (be that through mergers, amalgamations or new establishments).

GCSE and equivalent results are cumulative, i.e. all of the results achieved by those pupils in a particular year (winter and summer sessions) are counted, as well as any results they obtained in earlier years.

School level figures are adjusted for pupils recently arrived from overseas and additionally for pupils taken on by the school who were permanently excluded from previous schools.

The SN figure is calculated as the total number of schools not reaching a certain floor target for all statistical neighbours, divided by the total number of schools for all statistical neighbours.

[**Source:** Revised GCSE School and College Achievement and Attainment tables.]

Health warning:

N.B. This data shows the % of schools who fail to meet each floor target - this is not the same as showing what % of students failed to get 5 A* to Cs. Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator, as to have any school not meeting the 2006 floor target is deemed to be a poor outcome. Please note that the target is assessed at three time points, but only two of these time points have been exceeded so far.

All schools with pupils aged 15 on 31st August will have been included under the current target. In a minority of cases it is possible that a school is shown as failing the floor targets, although they had no pupils taking GCSEs.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3061DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

School Inspection findings

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Inspection findings

Section 5 school inspection judgements: effectiveness and achievement (primary, secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total	Grade				Total	Grade				Total	Grade						
		No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
1A	How effective, efficient and inclusive is the provision of education, integrated care and any extended services in meeting the needs of learners?																		
LA	no	68	9	27	31	1	13	1	4	5	3	4	1	1	2	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	57	208	156	26	112	11	33	54	14	32	7	16	8	1	767	152	49
LA	%		13	40	46	1		8	31	38	23								
SN	%		13	47	35	6		10	29	48	13								
2A	How well do learners achieve?																		
LA	no	68	6	30	31	1	13	1	4	5	3	4	1	1	2	0			
SN	no	447	51	213	158	25	112	8	36	54	14	32	6	16	9	1			
LA	%		9	44	46	1		8	31	38	23								
SN	%		11	48	35	6		7	32	48	13								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about how well learners achieve. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection.The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Inspection findings

Section 5 school inspection judgements: personal development and well-being of learners (primary secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
3A	How good is the overall personal development and well-being of the learners?																		
LA	no	68	20	46	2	0	13	2	5	6	0	4	1	1	2	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	118	283	46	0	112	16	54	39	3	32	11	15	5	1	767	152	49
LA	%		29	68	3	0		15	38	46	0								
SN	%		26	63	10	0		14	48	35	3								
3B	The extent of learners' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development																		
LA	no	68	18	48	2	0	13	2	6	5	0	4	1	1	2	0			
SN	no	447	116	287	44	0	112	16	53	40	3	32	11	15	5	1			
LA	%		26	71	3	0		15	46	38	0								
SN	%		26	64	10	0		14	47	36	3								
3C	The behaviour of learners																		
LA	no	68	23	42	3	0	13	2	5	6	0	4	1	2	1	0			
SN	no	447	128	281	37	1	112	13	57	39	3	32	9	18	4	1			
LA	%		34	62	4	0		15	38	46	0								
SN	%		29	63	8	0		12	51	35	3								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about learners personal development and well-being. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Inspection findings

Section 5 school inspection judgements: personal development and well-being of learners (primary secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total	Grade				Total	Grade				Total	Grade						
		No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
3D The attendance of learners																			
LA	no	68	1	32	32	3	13	1	3	7	2	4	0	1	3	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	30	164	229	24	112	5	35	53	19	32	4	16	8	4	767	152	49
LA	%		1	47	47	4		8	23	54	15								
SN	%		7	37	51	5		4	31	47	17								
3E How well learners enjoy their education																			
LA	no	68	27	37	4	0	13	1	6	6	0	4	1	2	1	0			
SN	no	447	147	265	35	0	112	16	64	30	2	32	13	14	4	1			
LA	%		40	54	6	0		8	46	46	0								
SN	%		33	59	8	0		14	57	27	2								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about learners personal development and well-being. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Inspection findings

Section 5 inspection judgements: quality of provision and leadership and management (primary, secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
4A How effective are teaching and learning in meeting the full range of learners' needs?																			
LA	no	68	6	32	30	0	13	0	5	7	1	4	1	1	2	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	43	231	157	16	112	5	41	61	5	32	5	18	9	0	767	152	49
LA	%		9	47	44	0		0	38	54	8								
SN	%		10	52	35	4		4	37	54	4								
4B How well do the curriculum and other activities meet the range of needs and interests of learners?																			
LA	no	68	12	38	18	0	13	1	8	4	0	4	1	1	2	0			
SN	no	447	67	224	149	7	112	12	57	42	1	32	8	14	9	1			
LA	%		18	56	26	0		8	62	31	0								
SN	%		15	50	33	2		11	51	38	1								
4C How well are learners cared for, guided and supported?																			
LA	no	68	17	38	13	0	13	3	5	5	0	4	1	1	2	0			
SN	no	447	113	248	83	3	112	19	62	28	3	32	12	16	3	1			
LA	%		25	56	19	0		23	38	38	0								
SN	%		25	55	19	1		17	55	25	3								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about quality of provision and leadership and management. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Inspection findings

Section 5 inspection judgements: quality of provision and leadership and management (primary, secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total	Grade				Total	Grade				Total	Grade						
		No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
5A How effective are leadership and management in raising achievement and supporting all learners?																			
LA	no	68	13	28	27	0	13	2	4	7	0	4	1	2	1	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	65	223	143	16	112	16	41	52	3	32	8	18	5	1	767	152	49
LA	%		19	41	40	0		15	31	54	0								
SN	%		15	50	32	4		14	37	46	3								
5D How well equality of opportunity is promoted and discrimination tackled so that all learners achieve as well as they can																			
LA	no	68	14	29	25	0	13	2	5	5	1	4	1	1	2	0			
SN	no	447	103	199	130	15	112	18	41	48	5	32	8	15	8	1			
LA	%		21	43	37	0		15	38	38	8								
SN	%		23	45	29	3		16	37	43	4								
1E The capacity to make any necessary improvements?																			
LA	no	42	8	21	13	0	8	1	5	2	0	4	2	1	1	0			
SN	no	251	43	135	66	7	65	10	35	18	2	18	4	12	1	1			
LA	%		19	50	31	0		13	63	25	0								
SN	%		17	54	26	3		15	54	28	3								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about quality of provision and leadership and management. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received. Note that for judgement 1E the data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2006 and the 13th July 2007 due to the grading being changed from 'yes' or 'no' to a 1-4 scale.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Inspection findings

Indicator: Percentage of schools requiring special measures since Sept 2005

Rotherham

Percentage of schools requiring special measures since Sept 2005

	Area	SN	NAT
All phases	0.00	1.83	1.59
Primary	0.00	1.85	1.48
Secondary	0.00	1.99	1.94
Special	0.00	2.08	1.19
PRU	0.00	0.00	4.20

Data Definition:
This indicator shows the percentage of local authority maintained schools which were inspected under the Section 5 framework and placed in special measures between September 2005 and the end of the summer 2007 term. The number of schools placed in a category is a cumulative total over the full period, and each school is only included once. The total number of schools used in the calculation is the number of schools open as at 27 October 2006, rather than the number of schools inspected during the period.

[Source: Ofsted Section 5 inspection data]

Health warning:
Although the number of schools placed in a category is taken over the full period, the total number of schools is a snapshot view of schools open as at 27th October 2006. Therefore the percentage figure does not take account of schools who have opened or closed over the period. This data may also include schools that will close on 31 August 2007.

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Inspection findings

Indicator: Percentage of schools requiring a notice to improve since Sept 2005

Rotherham

Percentage of schools placed in notice to improve category since Sept 2005

	Area	SN	NAT
All phases	2.31	2.75	2.62
Primary	0.97	1.99	2.21
Secondary	12.50	6.62	5.06
Special	0.00	0.00	0.74
PRU	0.00	7.14	4.42

Data Definition:
This indicator shows the percentage of local authority maintained schools which were inspected under the Section 5 framework and given a notice to improve between September 2005 and the end of the summer 2007 term. The number of schools placed in a category is a cumulative total over the full period, and each school is only included once. The total number of schools used in the calculation is the number of schools open as at 27 October 2006, rather than the number of schools inspected during the period.

[Source: Ofsted Section 5 inspection data]

Health warning:
Although the number of schools given a notice to improve is taken over the full period, the total number of schools is a snapshot view of schools open as at 27th October 2006. Therefore the percentage figure does not take account of schools who have opened or closed over the period. The Section 5 category notice to improve cannot be directly mapped to the Section 10 framework categories which included serious weaknesses, underachieving schools or inadequate sixth forms. Schools inspected prior to Sept 2005 which were placed in one of the above categories will be monitored until their Section 5 inspection. This data may also include schools that will close on 31 August 2007.

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Attendance data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Attendance data

Authorised and unauthorised absences at primary schools

Rotherham

Attendance %	Area	SN	Nat		Year-on-Year Change Area	SN	Nat
2002	93.40	93.92	94.16				
2003	93.80	93.98	94.20	02/03	0.40	0.07	0.03
2004	94.28	94.39	94.51	03/04	0.47	0.41	0.31
2005	94.52	94.53	94.58	04/05	0.24	0.14	0.07
2006	94.21	94.20	94.25	05/06	-0.31	-0.34	-0.32

Authorised Absences %	Area	SN	Nat		Year-on-Year Change Area	SN	Nat
2002	6.04	5.68	5.39				
2003	5.73	5.60	5.37	02/03	-0.30	-0.08	-0.02
2004	5.33	5.25	5.07	03/04	-0.40	-0.35	-0.31
2005	5.03	5.10	4.99	04/05	-0.30	-0.16	-0.08
2006	5.12	5.39	5.30	05/06	0.09	0.29	0.30

Unauthorised Absences %	Area	SN	Nat		Year-on-Year Change Area	SN	Nat
2002	0.56	0.41	0.44				
2003	0.46	0.42	0.43	02/03	-0.10	0.01	-0.02
2004	0.39	0.36	0.41	03/04	-0.07	-0.06	-0.02
2005	0.45	0.37	0.43	04/05	0.06	0.01	0.02
2006	0.67	0.41	0.45	05/06	0.21	0.04	0.02

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*





Area □ SN ◇ NAT △

Data Definition: The data above are based on maintained primary and middle deemed primary schools open as at December 2006.

[Source: DCSF Absence Data]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Attendance data

Authorised and unauthorised absences at secondary schools

Rotherham

Attendance %				Year-on-Year Change			
	Area	SN	Nat		Area	SN	Nat
2002	90.66	91.11	91.31				
2003	91.53	91.51	91.74	02/03	0.87	0.40	0.43
2004	91.74	91.84	91.97	03/04	0.21	0.33	0.23
2005	91.98	92.01	92.20	04/05	0.24	0.17	0.23
2006	91.25	92.02	92.09	05/06	-0.73	0.01	-0.11

Authorised Absences %				Year-on-Year Change			
	Area	SN	Nat		Area	SN	Nat
2002	7.81	7.88	7.61				
2003	7.23	7.50	7.20	02/03	-0.57	-0.38	-0.41
2004	6.75	7.19	6.91	03/04	-0.48	-0.32	-0.29
2005	6.36	6.76	6.56	04/05	-0.39	-0.42	-0.36
2006	6.69	6.71	6.72	05/06	0.34	-0.05	0.16

Unauthorised Absences %				Year-on-Year Change			
	Area	SN	Nat		Area	SN	Nat
2002	1.53	1.00	1.08				
2003	1.24	0.98	1.06	02/03	-0.29	-0.02	-0.02
2004	1.51	0.97	1.12	03/04	0.27	-0.01	0.06
2005	1.66	1.22	1.24	04/05	0.15	0.25	0.12
2006	2.06	1.27	1.19	05/06	0.40	0.04	-0.05

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*





Area SN NAT

Data Definition: The data above are based on maintained secondary and middle deemed secondary schools open as at December 2006.

[Source: DCSF Absence Data]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream maintained schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.

RAI, Ofsted | Well Above | Above | In Line | Below | Well Below

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Exclusions data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Exclusions Data

Percentage of fixed period exclusions and permanent exclusions in relation to the number of pupils in primary schools

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Type	Year	Area	SN	Nat
fixed	2004	0.85%	0.91%	0.97%
	2005	1.17%	0.80%	1.04%
permanent	2004	0.02%	..	0.03%
	2005	0.00%	..	0.03%
	2006	0.02%	..	0.02%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available

 # = Exclusion rate based on less than 3 pupils

Data Definition:

A fixed period exclusion refers to a pupil who is excluded from a school but remains on the register of that school because they are expected to return when the exclusion period is completed. A permanent exclusion refers to a pupil who is excluded and their name is removed from the school register. Where a student receives more than one fixed period exclusion during the year, each exclusion will be counted separately. Fixed term exclusions of less than a day are counted as one full day. Exclusion rates based on less than 3 pupils are not shown (indicated by #). This missing data means that SN figures could be misleading, so they are not given for permanent exclusions (indicated by ..) This indicator shows the number of fixed period and permanent exclusions expressed as a percentage of the number (headcount) of pupils in the local authority. The national figures are DCSF published figures. They are mean averages of the sum of each type of exclusion in all LAs, divided by the sum of the pupils in all LAs. However the SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's statistical neighbours.

[**Source:** DCSF Pupil Level Annual School Census (permanent exclusions) and the Termly Exclusions Survey (fixed-term exclusions).

Health warning:

The two types of exclusions are shown together to present a fuller picture of exclusions policies within the area: fixed term exclusions can be used as a strategy to prevent permanent exclusions, so are not necessarily a negative outcome for children and young people. For this reason, LA's fixed term exclusion rates do not have traffic lights. Please use with caution: high exclusion rates are a measure of how an area deals with behavioural issues - but a high rate may not always be an indication that an area has particularly poor behaviour. All %s are based on low numbers of students. Due to changes in the data collection information on fixed period exclusions the data is not available for maintained primary schools for 2006.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3091DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Exclusions Data

Percentage of fixed period exclusions and permanent exclusions in relation to the number of pupils in secondary schools

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Type	Year	Area	SN	Nat
fixed	2004	10.14%	9.88%	8.66%
	2005	8.87%	11.12%	9.94%
	2006	10.40%	12.52%	10.40%
permanent	2004	0.25%	0.27%	0.25%
	2005	0.12%	0.29%	0.24%
	2006	0.18%	0.23%	0.24%

N.B. Fixed term exclusions do not have traffic lights

.. = Data not available

 # = Exclusion rate based on less than 3 pupils

Data Definition:

A fixed period exclusion refers to a pupil who is excluded from a school but remains on the register of that school because they are expected to return when the exclusion period is completed. A permanent exclusion refers to a pupil who is excluded and their name is removed from the school register. Where a student receives more than one fixed period exclusion during the year, each exclusion will be counted separately. Fixed term exclusions of less than a day are counted as one full day. Exclusion rates based on less than 3 pupils are not shown (indicated by #). This indicator shows the number of fixed period and permanent exclusions expressed as a percentage of the number (headcount) of pupils in the Local Authority. The National figures are DCSF published figures. They are mean averages of the sum of each type of exclusion in all LAs, divided by the sum of the pupils in all LAs. However the SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's statistical neighbours. Includes middle schools deemed secondary schools.

[**Source:** DCSF Pupil Level Annual School Census (permanent exclusions) and the Termly Exclusions Survey (fixed-term exclusions).

Health warning:

The two types of exclusions are shown together to present a fuller picture of exclusions policies within the area: fixed term exclusions can be used as a strategy to prevent permanent exclusions, and so are not necessarily a negative outcome for children and young people. For this reason, LA's fixed term exclusion rates do not have traffic lights. Please use with caution: high exclusion rates are a measure of how an area deals with behavioural issues - but a high rate may not always be an indication that an area has particularly poor behaviour. All %s are based on low numbers of students.

Well above | Above | In line | Below | Well below

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3092DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Education otherwise than at school data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Education otherwise than at school data

Percentage of permanently excluded pupils provided with alternative tuition
(BVPI 159a, 159b, 159c & 159d)

Rotherham

	Area	Statistical Neighbours	Lower Quartile	England Median	Upper Quartile	Quartile position	Improving?
2002-03							
Under 6 hours a week (159a)	7.0%	0.0%	1.8%	11.0%	20.9%		
6-12 (inclusive) hours a week (159b)	17.0%	5.9%	3.3%	12.2%	20.0%		
13-19 (inclusive) hours a week (159c)	15.0%	14.5%	7.5%	16.1%	25.9%		
20 hours or more a week (159d)	61.0%	66.9%	32.2%	52.0%	75.0%	2nd Q'tile	Not Improving
2003-04							
Under 6 hours a week (159a)	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	3.9%	13.0%		
6-12 (inclusive) hours a week (159b)	1.0%	4.5%	1.0%	5.8%	12.8%		
13-19 (inclusive) hours a week (159c)	11.0%	8.1%	2.0%	10.3%	20.4%		
20 hours or more a week (159d)	88.0%	84.7%	50.5%	70.6%	93.2%	2nd Q'tile	Improving
2004-05							
Under 6 hours a week (159a)	1.0%	2.9%	0.0%	3.0%	11.7%		
6-12 (inclusive) hours a week (159b)	5.0%	1.0%	0.0%	3.8%	10.2%		
13-19 (inclusive) hours a week (159c)	4.0%	6.1%	0.5%	6.1%	15.4%		
20 hours or more a week (159d)	90.0%	82.1%	55.3%	80.3%	93.4%	2nd Q'tile	Improving

* = *Doubts expressed about the reliability of the council's arrangements for producing the data*
N/A = *Not applicable or null accepted*

Data definition

The percentage of permanently excluded pupils provided with alternative tuition of the following average hours per week:
a. 5 hours or less;
b. 6-12 hours;
c. 13-19 hours; or
d. 20 hours or more.

Provision is calculated from the 16th school day after the governors uphold the head teacher's decision to exclude, or from the date the exclusion appeal panel uphold the decision to exclude.
Target setting: Local.

Scope: Metropolitan Authorities, London Boroughs, Unitary Authorities, County Councils, Council of the Isles of Scilly, Common Council of the City of London.
[**Source:** Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) 159a, 159b, 159c & 159d]

Health warning: BVPI 159 was not collected by the Audit Commission for 2005/2006. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's statistical neighbours.

Worst Q'tile | 3rd Q'tile | 2nd Q'tile | Best Q'tile

[Data contact: r-james@audit-commission.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3067AC]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

School places and admissions data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

School places and admissions data

% of primary schools with 25% or more surplus places as at Easter statutory return to the DfES

department for education and skills
creating opportunity, releasing potential, achieving excellence

Rotherham

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2003	5.0%	9.0%	12.0%
2004	1.9%	12.7%	12.4%
2005	7.0%	13.5%	13.0%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available



Data Definition:

This indicator shows the % of primary schools with 25% or more surplus places as per the Easter statutory return to the DfES.
It does not include schools with less than 30 surplus places. Consequently a significant number of local authorities will have a value of zero.
It includes First, Infant and Junior schools with and without nurserys, as well as Middle schools which have been deemed primary.
The number on roll includes a headcount of part-time pupils but excludes full-time and part-time pupils in designated nursery classes.
SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

[**Source:** Easter Surplus Places return to the DfES. Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.]

Health warning:

Low surplus place numbers are good. LAs should take action to reduce the number of surplus places overall and to reduce the number of schools with more than 25% surplus places.
Data does not include academies, City Technology Colleges (CTCs), nursery units, nursery schools, special schools and PRUs

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3089DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

School places and admissions data

% of secondary schools with 25% or more surplus places as at Easter statutory return to the DfES

department for education and skills
creating opportunity, releasing potential, achieving excellence

Rotherham

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2003	6.0%	6.0%	8.0%
2004	5.9%	6.5%	7.4%
2005	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available



Data Definition:
This indicator shows the % of secondary schools with 25% or more surplus places as per the Easter statutory return to the DfES.
It does not include schools with less than 30 surplus places. Consequently a significant number of local authorities will have a value of zero.
It includes secondary schools with 11-16s, 11-18s, and non-standard age ranges, plus middle schools deemed secondary.
SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

[**Source:** Easter Surplus Places return to the DfES. Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.]

Health warning:
Low surplus place numbers are good. LAs should take action to reduce the number of surplus places overall and to reduce the number of schools with more than 25% surplus places.
Data does not include academies, City Technology Colleges (CTCs), nursery units, nursery schools, special schools and PRUs

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3090DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Youth offending information

Youth offending information **Rotherham**

Indicator: Education, Training and Employment - proportion of supervised juveniles in full time ETE

Youth Justice Board
Bwrdd Cyfiawnder Ieuenctid

	Yot Area	YJB Statistical Neighbour	National	Variation			
				Over time (a)	Against neighbour (b)	Against England & Wales(c)	
Jan-Mar 05	77.5%	75.6%	74.6%	-	1.9%	2.8%	
Apr-Jun 05	81.4%	73.3%	75.5%	4.0%	8.1%	5.9%	
Jul-Sep 05	78.8%	76.0%	74.9%	-2.6%	2.8%	3.9%	
Oct-Dec 05	80.5%	76.5%	75.0%	1.6%	4.0%	5.5%	
Jan-Mar 06	80.1%	76.5%	74.9%	-0.3%	3.7%	5.3%	
Apr-Jun 06	77.2%	68.9%	68.3%	-2.9%	8.3%	8.9%	(d)
Jul-Sep 06	74.4%	69.2%	68.0%	-2.8%	5.2%	6.4%	
Oct-Dec 06	73.4%	77.0%	68.5%	-1.0%	-3.6%	4.9%	

(a) Variation over time: % change between data periods
(b) Variation against statistical neighbour: % difference between Yot and statistical neighbour
(c) Variation against England & Wales: % difference between Youth Offending Team and national average

(d) The YJB has changed the Counting Rules to differentiate between 25+ hours (full-time for statutory school age young people) and 16-24 hours (part-time for statutory school age; full time for non-statutory school age) from April 2006. The data from April 2006 is calculated using a weighting system: [(Numbers in full-time ETE) + 1/2(numbers in part-time ETE)] as the numerator; number of young people supervised by the YOT as the denominator.
Prior to April 2006 YOTs only returned the number of young people in full-time ETE and this is shown in the above data.
This change has led to a small shift in how YOTs have interpreted and reported the ETE status of some young people, despite no formal change to the KPI or Counting Rules. The YJB feels that the resulting small drop in reported national performance represents a move towards a more accurate picture of the issue of disengagement from ETE.
Therefore ETE data up to March 2006 cannot be compared with data from April 2006.

KPI Performance



Variation



Data Definition (April 2006 onwards): The YJB has set YOTs a target to ensure that 90% of young offenders supervised by YOTs are in full time education, training or employment. Five offending populations are included for measurement. These are those offenders on final warnings, referral orders, reparation orders, community based penalties and custodial sentences. Full time ETE is defined as 25 hours per week for those of statutory school age and 16 hours per week for those over statutory school age. Full counting rules are posted on the YJB website.

Source: Youth Offending Team case management systems & YJB MIS.
If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Nick Read on 020 7271 3068 Ref: 3080YJ

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Looked after children and care leavers data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3085SC - PAF CF/C69: The percentage of children newly looked after in the year, and still looked after at 31 March, who were placed at 31 March more than 20 miles from their home address from which first placed

Rotherham

	2005-06	2006-07
LA	-	-
SN	8.1	7.1
Eng	12.1	11.7

This indicator does not have banding
. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Data definition

Numerator:

Of all children in the denominator, the number who were placed at March 31 more than 20 miles from their home address from which first placed.

[Source - SSDA903]

The postcode of the address from which the child / young person was first looked after will be related to the postcode of the address of their placement at 31 March. The distance in miles 'as the crow flies' between the address from which a looked after child was taken into care and that of the placement where the child was placed at 31 March has been collected from 2004-05.

Denominator:

All children newly accommodated in the year prior to 31 March 2007 and still accommodated at 31 March 2007, excluding:

* Looked after children subject to an agreed pattern of short term placements
* Unaccompanied Asylum Seeker children
* Children missing from care at 31 March 2007
* Children placed for adoption
* Children placed at home with parent(s)
* Children where the council cannot provide the distance data (e.g. because the parent(s) refused to divulge their address or were of no fixed abode or where the child is currently abroad)

All such cases are excluded on the grounds that the distance from home may exceed the stated limit but may be unavoidable and / or in the child's best interests.

[Source - SSDA903]

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Continued on following page

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3085SC - PAF CF/C69: The percentage of children newly looked after in the year, and still looked after at 31 March, who were placed at 31 March more than 20 miles from their home address from which first placed

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

There is evidence that while in some cases a distant or out-of-authority placement may be the right decision for a child, for many children such placements are not in their best interests. Children placed at a distance from home (especially out-of-authority) are likely to achieve poorer educational and other outcomes than those placed within their home area. Local authorities will find it harder to act as an attentive corporate parent where children are living far away. In general, children will be less likely to thrive if they are living well away from their own communities. This indicator addresses the capacity of councils to have sufficient placements near to home to allow contact with natural parent(s), siblings and other relatives and local communities to be facilitated. Apart from in very few cases, the further from home a child is placed, the harder it is to maintain links with their family and for them to return to their community when they leave school or care.

A key issue with this indicator is the reasoning behind why a child would be placed far from home and involves elements of both placement choice and placement availability (2043SC, 2059SC, 3085SC). Educational performance is also an important element to be considered (3071SC-3074SC).

The results for this indicator need to be treated with caution. While it is true of all indicators that no one p.i. should ever be used on its own to make a judgement, it is particularly the case with this indicator. So, for example, the extent to which children thrive may not be influenced by distance at all. Also, a move of 5 miles in an urban area can have the same, or worse, dislocating consequences for a child as one of 30 miles in a rural area.

In 2005-06, 37% of authorities had figures of between 1 and 5 in their numerator: results should be interpreted carefully for all authorities where numbers of children newly placed are small.

Related measures

1037SC PAF CF/C19: Health of looked after children - see p.52
2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2059SC PAF CF/C23: Adoptions of children looked after (BVPI 163) - see p.104
2067SC PAF CF/D78: Long term stability of children looked after - see p.98
2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101
3071SC The % of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam - see p.163
3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165
3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167
3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3071SC - The percentage of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam

Rotherham

	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07
LA	60.0	42.9	46.4	76.0	40.0	67.7	62.1
SN	51.4	57.2	54.8	57.1	64.2	54.6	65.2
Eng	53.0	54.1	57.9	56.8	59.1	64.0	65.6

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Of the children in the denominator, the number who on 30 September had sat at least one GCSE or equivalent examination
[Source - OC2 question 6b]

Denominator

The number of children looked after at 30 September who at that time had been looked after continuously by the council for at least 12 months who were in, or should have been in, School Year 11 in the school year prior to the 30 September date who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations.
[Source - OC2 question 6a]

N.B. In 2006-07, for this indicator and 3074SC CF/C24, the data for 30 September 2006 relates to the school year 2005-2006, i.e. the school year that ended in July 2006.
Unaccompanied asylum seeker children are still included in this measure if they have been looked after for at least one year

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator measures the extent to which a council is able to ensure that children looked after are able to sit GSCE or equivalent exams.
Educational attainment is one of the most important determinants of future outcomes and no attainment can be achieved if a looked after child does not get to sit an exam. There is clearly a need for cooperation between local authorities, schools, and other partners with an interest, to improve the attainment of children looked after. This should be orchestrated through the children's trust partnership arrangements. The indicator includes those children looked after for at least one year and emphasises the council's corporate responsibility for the education of vulnerable children.

This indicator differs from 3072SC PAF CF/A2 and 3073SC, however, in that it provides snapshots of those looked after for at least a year at 30 September, as opposed to aggregate data on those who ceased to be looked after, after being looked after for any period, in the year prior to the relevant 31 March. It also includes unaccompanied asylum seeking children looked after for one year, whereas the other two indicators require such children to be looked after for at least two.

A high figure is an indicator of good performance and a low figure of poor performance.
This is a potentially volatile indicator because it can deal with quite small numbers of young people; small changes can have large consequences for the resulting indicator values. It is, nonetheless, a good guide to the extent to which a council is successfully helping its cohort of young people get to the exam room door.
As always with educational indicators, though, consideration needs to be given to the proportion of children educated out-of-authority. Sometimes the more proximate the council's corporate parenting support system is to the child, the more effective that support tends to be.
A sustained high, or improving, figure in this indicator, in the three years prior to the end of the relevant period, should feed through to an improved 3072SC PAF CF/A2 figure over time and, to a lesser extent, to an improved 3073SC.
Conversely, frequent moves between placements (2043SC PAF CF/A1), school absence (3074SC PAF CF/C24) offending (4015SC PAF CF/C18) and distance from home (3085SC PAF CF/C69) may be related to poor educational attainment.

Continued on following page

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3071SC - The percentage of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam

Rotherham

Related measures

2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165
3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167
3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4015SC PAF CF/C18: Final warnings/reprimands and convictions of children looked after - see p.194
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196
5022SC PAF CF/A4 Employment, education and training for care leavers [joint working] (BVPI 161) - see p.239

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3072SC - PAF CF/A2: The percentage of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with at least 1 GCSE at grade A*-G or a GNVQ (BVPI 50)

Rotherham

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	39.5	54.5	53.8	68.0
SN	51.9	47.5	51.5	50.2
Eng	48.6	50.4	53.0	55.1

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●
2003-07	0<25	25<45	45<50	50<70	70<=100

Data definition

Numerator

Of the young people in the denominator, the number who on leaving care had obtained at least 1 GCSE at grade A*-G or a GNVQ. [Source - SSDA903]

From 2003-04 the definition of this indicator changed to exclude children whose date of birth suggests that they would not have taken exams before leaving care and Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) who had been looked after for less than 2 years at the time that they left care.

For the year ending 31 March 2007, the data will be come from exams sat in the years 2004 or 2005 or 2006, depending on the age of the young person who ceases to be looked after.

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Continued on following page

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3072SC - PAF CF/A2: The percentage of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with at least 1 GCSE at grade A*-G or a GNVQ (BVPI 50)

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator provides data on achievement by LAC at all pass grades in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the council's corporate parenting in the area of attainment.

Educational attainment is one of the most important determinants of future outcomes and a measure that is supported by readily available information. There is clearly a need for cooperation between local authorities, schools, and other partners with an interest, to improve the attainment of children looked after. This should be orchestrated through the children's trust partnership arrangements. The indicator includes the majority of children looked after (for specific exclusions see the denominator), regardless of how long they have been looked after, as this emphasises the council's corporate responsibility for the education of vulnerable children.

Research has shown that the family and social backgrounds of looked after children suggest a higher likelihood of lower achievement and that looked after children achieve less well than their peers. Adverse factors in the backgrounds of children looked after, though, need to be taken into account. The high percentage of children with statements of special needs, for example, in the looked after population is an important element (around 27% in the looked after population compared to around 3% in the general school-age population). Other factors include not having English as a first language or coming from poorer families (as evidenced by use of free school meals).
See the DCSF website for tables on attainment analysed against some of these factors:
http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000640/ index.shtml.

The construction of this indicator is similar to 3073SC, but differs from 3071SC, in that it provides aggregate data on those who ceased to be looked after, after being looked after for any period, in the three years previous to the relevant 31 March, rather than a snapshot of those looked after for at least a year. It also only includes unaccompanied asylum seeking children when they have been looked after for at least two years, rather than one.

High figures indicate good performance and low figures, generally, indicate low performance.

This is, though, a volatile indicator because it often deals with quite small numbers of young people. Small changes can have large consequences for the resulting indicator values. In addition, the presence in the cohort of: young people looked after for a brief period, over whose education a council can have limited or non-existent influence; young people with severe disabilities, who are unable to take any exams; and young people with mental health issues, can also have a significant effect on a council's resulting indicator score. Consistent high performance in this indicator is, therefore, is difficult to maintain and is good evidence of a council's corporate parenting in relation to attainment.

As always with educational indicators, though, consideration needs to be given to the proportion of children educated out-of-authority. Sometimes the more proximate the council's corporate parenting support system is to the child, the more effective that support tends to be.

The most recent target set for children looked after to achieve 1 A*-G GCSE was the national Quality Protects target for 2002-03 of 75%. The England average for this indicator in 2005-06 was 53%, an increase on the previous year, but still well short of this target. Overall performance remains very distant from the comparable figure for the general population of 16 year olds which, in 2005, was 97%.

Performance on this indicator has made only slow progress because, often as a result of the small numbers involved and the fact that much depends on exactly when the young person ceases to be looked after, a good result in one year for a council does not necessarily lead to a good result the following year.

Frequent moves between placements (2043SC CF/A1), school absence (3074SC CF/C24) and offending (4015SC CF/C18) may be related to educational attainment. So too may distance from home (3085SC PAF CF/C69) and the timeliness of reviews (2064SC PAF CF/C68). Low scores in this indicator will feed through to employment, education and training for care leavers (5022SC PAF CF/A4).

Related measures

2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3071SC The % of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam - see p.163
3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167
3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4015SC PAF CF/C18: Final warnings/reprimands and convictions of children looked after - see p.194
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196
5022SC PAF CF/A4 Employment, education and training for care leavers [joint working] (BVPI 161) - see p.239

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3073SC - The percentage of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQs equivalent to grades A*-C

Rotherham

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	2.6	4.0	13.6	9.5	-
SN	5.7	6.5	3.6	7.8	11.5
Eng	7.5	7.2	8.0	8.5	9.8

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Of the young people in the denominator: the number who on leaving care had obtained at least 5 GCSE at grade A* - C or GNVQ at foundation or intermediate level equivalent to grade A*-C. Qualifications gained before the young person was looked after and qualifications from exams sat while the young person was looked after are included, even if the results were announced after the young person ceased to be looked after. Qualifications gained from examinations sat after the young person ceased to be looked after are not included.

[Source - SSDA903]

N.B. The p.i. data from 2002-2006 was sourced from data collected by CSCI.

The 903 data collection for 2006-07 was not configured to include GNVQ equivalencies. Consequently, Ofsted has collected GNVQ data and matched it with the relevant GCSE data from the 903 collection to calculate the final value for 2006-07.

Denominator

The number of young people who ceased to be looked after during the year to 31st March aged 16 or over regardless of how long they had been looked after but excluding:

* those aged 15 at 31 August in the preceding year who leave between 1 April and 31 May of the year and those aged 14 at 31 August in the preceding year who leave care before 31 March of the year;
* unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC) who have been looked after for less than two years at the time that they leave care; and
* young people who ceased being looked after who had only been looked after during the year under an agreed series of short term placements.

Each young person is counted only once, even if they ceased to be looked after more than once.

[Source - SSDA903]

For the year ending 31 March 2007, the data will be come from exams sat in the years 2004 or 2005 or 2006, depending on the age of the young person who ceases to be looked after.

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Continued on following page

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3073SC - The percentage of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQs equivalent to grades A*-C

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator provides data on the highest achieving LAC in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the council's corporate parenting in the area of attainment.
High figures indicate good performance and low figures indicate, generally, poor performance, though both need to be seen in relation to comparator data and great caution needs to be exercised in the assessment of a council's performance here.
This is a very volatile indicator because it often deals with quite small numbers of young people. Small changes can have large consequences for the resulting indicator values. In addition, the presence in the cohort of: young people looked after for a brief period, over whose education a council can have limited or non-existent influence; young people with severe disabilities, who are unable to take any exams; and young people with mental health issues, can also have a significant effect on a council's resulting indicator score.
As always with educational indicators, though, consideration needs to be given to the proportion of children educated out-of-authority. Sometimes the more proximate the council's corporate parenting support system is to the child, the more effective that support tends to be.
The PSA target on the education of looked after children, set in April 2003, set a target of at least 15% of children looked after achieve, in all local authorities, at least five GCSEs at A*-C. The England average for this indicator in 2005-06 was 8%. Overall performance remains very distant from the comparable figure for the general population of 16 year olds which, in 2006, was 59%.
Performance on this indicator has made only slow progress because, often as a result of the small numbers involved and the fact that much depends on exactly when the young person ceases to be looked after, a good result in one year for a council does not necessarily lead to a good result the following year.
Placements moves (2043SC CF/A1), distance from home (3085SC CF/C69), school absence (3074SC CF/C24) and offending (4015SC CF/C18) may be related to lower educational attainment. Similarly, low scores on frequency of review (2064SC CF/68) and participation at review (2022SC CF/63) may have an adverse effect. Lower scores in this indicator may feed through to a lower score in the indicator on employment, education and training for care leavers (5022SC PAF CF/A4).

Related measures

2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3071SC The % of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam - see p.163
3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165
3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4015SC PAF CF/C18: Final warnings/reprimands and convictions of children looked after - see p.194
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196
5022SC PAF CF/A4 Employment, education and training for care leavers [joint working] (BVPI 161) - see p.239

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3074SC - PAF CF/C24: The percentage of children who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months and were of school age, who missed a total of at least 25 days of schooling for any reason during the previous school year

Rotherham

	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07
LA	14.0	16.5	13.9	14.5	18.3	17.6	14.4
SN	10.2	15.1	14.8	16.2	14.8	14.9	15.1
Eng	12.1	11.8	12.0	12.4	12.3	12.6	13.3

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●	●
2000-07	0<5	5<10	10<15	15<20	20+

Data definition

Numerator

Of the children in the denominator, the number who missed a total of at least 25 days of education of any kind for any reason during the previous school year.
[Source - OC2 Question 2d]

Denominator

The number of children looked after at 30 September who had been looked after continuously at that date for at least 12 months and were old enough to receive full time schooling during the school year that ended in the previous July.
[Source - OC2 Question 2a]

N.B. In 2006-07, for this indicator and 3071SC, the data for 30 September 2006 relates to the school year 2005-2006, i.e. the school year that ended in July 2006.

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Continued on following page

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

3074SC - PAF CF/C24: The percentage of children who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months and were of school age, who missed a total of at least 25 days of schooling for any reason during the previous school year

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator is a measure of the effectiveness of the local authority as the corporate parent for the children it looks after. It attempts to ensure that they have the maximum opportunity to benefit from their education.

Access to school is a key factor in improving the stability of their lives. Continuous attendance will lead to improving education achievement. Local authorities, schools and other partners with an interest need to work together to ensure that when children become looked after they continue to access school, or that if a change of school is unavoidable, appropriate school provision is arranged before the care placement is finalised. Procedures should be in place to ensure that the absence of looked after children for any reason is closely monitored and dealt with appropriately.

The rates of looked after children missing 25 days or more of school are not directly comparable to data for all children in a council area. The data collected by the DCSF from schools on absence differentiate between authorised and unauthorised absence, whereas C24 does not. The data from schools do not allow the calculation of rates of children missing at least 25 days of school.

As always with educational indicators, though, consideration needs to be given to the proportion of children educated out-of-authority. Sometimes the more proximate the council's corporate parenting support system is to the child, the more effective that support tends to be.

Low figures generally indicate good performance and high figures generally indicate poor performance.

Where there has been a recent rise in the indicator value score, consideration needs to be given to whether the council is using a dedicated data collection resource, whether in-council or commissioned from a third party. Some preliminary research has shown that the advent of the use of such a resource increases the indicator value because it reveals the true figure.

Better data management and the gathering of better intelligence is evidence of good corporate parenting and it is this, rather than the increased value, on which assessment of performance should focus in this instance.

Consideration needs to be given to the proportion of children that may not have a school place for some time following a placement move, particularly where it was not anticipated. Also frequent moves between placements (2043SC PAF CF/A1) and offending (4015SC PAF CF/C18) may be related to school attendance. There may be connections between participation in, and timeliness of, reviews (4016SC CF/C63 & 2064SC PAF CF/C68) where school non-attendance should be addressed.

Low scores in this indicator will feed through to educational attainment (3071SC, 3073SC & 3072SC PAF CF/A2) and, later, to employment, education and training for care leavers (5022SC PAF CF/A4). Perhaps most notably there is a likely link between attendance, which is declining on average, and the very slow progress made by many councils in 3072SC PAF CF/A2.

Related measures

2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3071SC The % of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam - see p.163
3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165
3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4015SC PAF CF/C18: Final warnings/reprimands and convictions of children looked after - see p.194
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196
5022SC PAF CF/A4 Employment, education and training for care leavers [joint working] (BVPI 161) - see p.239

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

The percentage of fixed term exclusions for pupils with statements in mainstream schools (broken down into Primary and Secondary phase)

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Type	Year	Area	SN	Nat
Primary	2004	8.90%	8.90%	8.06%
	2005	8.32%	9.58%	8.50%
Secondary	2004	35.31%	30.58%	26.03%
	2005	28.06%	33.31%	28.70%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

0% = *Data not available*

= Less than 3 pupils

Data Definition:

A fixed period exclusion refers to a pupil who is excluded from a school but remains on the register of that school because they are expected to return when the exclusion period is completed. Where a student receives more than one fixed period exclusion during the year, each exclusion will be counted separately. Fixed term exclusions of less than a day are counted as one full day. Exclusion rates based on less than 3 pupils are not shown (indicated by #). This indicator shows the number of fixed period exclusions expressed as a percentage of the number (headcount) of pupils in the local authority. The national figures are DCSF published figures. They are median averages of the sum of each type of exclusion in all LAs, divided by the sum of the pupils in all LAs. However, the SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of all the % for all the local authorities statistical neighbours (as in 3099DE).

[**Source:** DCSF Termly Exclusions Survey (fixed-term exclusions). Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.]

Health warning:

Please use with caution: high exclusion rates are a measure of how an area deals with behavioural issues - but a high rate may not always be an indication that an area has particularly poor behaviour. All %s are based on low numbers of students.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3106DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

Section 5 school inspection judgement: How well learners with learning difficulties and disabilities make progress (primary, secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total	Grade				Total	Grade				Total	Grade						
		No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
2D	How well learners with learning difficulties and disabilities make progress																		
LA	no	68	9	38	21	0	13	1	5	4	3	4	1	1	2	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	52	257	125	13	112	10	44	52	6	32	6	15	10	1	767	152	49
LA	%		13	56	31	0		8	38	31	23								
SN	%		12	57	28	3		9	39	46	5								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about how well learners with learning difficulties and disabilities make progress. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

Percentage of pupils with a statement of SEN

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Year	LA	SN	Nat
2005	3.8%	2.8%	2.9%
2006	3.0%	2.9%	2.9%
2007	2.7%	2.8%	2.8%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available



Data Definition:

Data is taken from January for each year. The % is calculated by dividing the total number of children with statements of SEN by the total number of children. Figures includes Nursery, Primary, Middle, Secondary, Independent and Special schools, Pupil Referral Units, City Technology Colleges and Academies. The national figures are DCSF published figures. Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.

[Source: DCSF Schools' Census (SC).]

Health warning:

Please note that this data refers to the local authority where the pupil attends school, which may not be the local authority where they live. Numbers of statements should be reducing steadily over time. If not, this could be an indication that inclusion or funding policies are not being effective in supporting early intervention and would need following up in the inspection. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3095DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

DCSF SEN2 – number of new statements of SEN

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

No. of children for whom statements were newly made this year

Year	LA	Nat
2004	46	25,990
2005	60	24,040
2006	70	22,600

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

% of children with new statements placed in mainstream schools.

Year	LA	SN	Nat
2004	71.7%	73.9%	73.3%
2005	71.7%	78.4%	72.3%
2006	74.3%	65.4%	69.3%

.. = Data not available

 # = 1 or 2 pupils or a rate based on 1 or 2 pupils





Data Definition:

Data is taken from the SEN2 survey, which local authorities complete each January. This indicator refers to all new statements issued by the local authority in the calendar year (i.e. data shown for 2006 is taken from the January 2007 return). Data includes resourced provision/units/special classes in maintained mainstream schools and SEN units in maintained mainstream schools.

[Source:. DCSF SEN2 Survey 2005-2007. Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.]

Health warning: Please note that data refers to the local authority where the child lives (as they issue their statement), but they may go to a school in another local authority.

Numbers of new statements should be reducing steadily over time. If not, this could be an indication that inclusion or funding policies are not being effective in supporting early intervention and would need following up in the inspection. Comparisons with other LAs can be misleading because of different responses to the national drive to reduce the number of statements overall through early intervention and funding arrangements. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3063DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

BVPI – Percentage of new statements of SEN prepared within 18 weeks

Rotherham

Percentage of new statements of SEN prepared within 18 weeks, including and excluding 'exceptions'

	Area	Statistical Neighbours	Lower Quartile	England Median	Upper Quartile	Quartile position	Improving?
2003-04							
BVPI43a - % of statements of SEN issued within 18 weeks - excluding 'exceptions'	80.3%	95.0%	88.0%	95.0%	100.0%		
BVPI43b - % of statements of SEN issued within 18 weeks - including 'exceptions'	58.8%	55.3%	54.0%	73.0%	84.0%		
2004-05							
BVPI43a - % of statements of SEN issued within 18 weeks - excluding 'exceptions'	100.0%	96.5%	93.0%	98.1%	100.0%	Best Q'tile	Improving
BVPI43b - % of statements of SEN issued within 18 weeks - including 'exceptions'	77.8%	79.3%	65.9%	77.9%	90.2%	2nd Q'tile	Improving
2005-06							
BVPI43a - % of statements of SEN issued within 18 weeks - excluding 'exceptions'	100.0%	100.0%	95.7%	99.4%	100.0%	Best Q'tile	Improving
BVPI43b - % of statements of SEN issued within 18 weeks - including 'exceptions'	78.3%	88.5%	72.5%	85.9%	95.4%	3rd Q'tile	Improving

.. = Data not available

** = Doubts expressed about the reliability of the council's arrangements for producing the data.*

Data Definition:

Percentage of proposed statements of Special Educational Need issued by the authority in a financial year and prepared within 18 weeks including and excluding exceptions under the Education (Special Educational Needs) (England) (Consolidation) Regulations 2001 and set out in Annex A of the SEN Code of Practice.

Worst Q'tile | 3rd Q'tile | 2nd Q'tile | Best Q'tile

The end of the period is the date on which the authority issues the proposed statement or the date on which the authority notifies the parent that a statement is not necessary.
A Note in Lieu is not part of the statutory requirement but the Code of Practice makes it clear that it is good practice to issue one following the notice to parents.

Refusal to assess: where a request is refused, it should not be included in the count. If an order to carry out an assessment is later made by the SEN and Disability Tribunal (SENDIST), the authority must notify the child's parent that they will make an assessment within 4 weeks of the date of the order. (See Part IV, section 25 – (2) of the Consolidation Regulations 2001).
Further guidance: The **'exceptions'** are those set out in the Education (Special Educational Needs) (England) (Consolidation) Regulations 2001, paragraphs 12.5, 12.7 and 12.9. The regulations are reproduced in Annex A of the SEN Code of Practice 2001. See www.teachernet.gov.uk/SEN

Scope: Metropolitan Authorities, London Boroughs, Unitary Authorities, County Councils, Council of the Isles of Scilly, Common Council of the City of London.

[**Source:** Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) 43a and 43b]

Health warning: SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's statistical neighbours.

[Data contact: r-james@audit-commission.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3070AC]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

DCSF SEN2 - percentage of pupils with statements placed in special schools

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

School type	Year	LA	SN	Nat
Maintained mainstream schools	2006	45.1%	55.7%	50.6%
Resourced provision / units/ special classes in maintained mainstream schools	2006	6.5%	4.6%	8.4%
Maintained special schools	2006	43.1%	34.3%	33.5%
Non-maintained special schools, independent special schools and other independent schools	2006	3.8%	2.4%	4.7%
Other	2006	1.6%	1.4%	2.8%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

School type	Year	LA	SN	Nat
Maintained mainstream schools	2007	43.5%	52.7%	49.5%
Resourced provision / units/ special classes in maintained mainstream schools	2007	6.6%	4.1%	7.7%
Maintained special schools	2007	42.5%	38.3%	34.9%
Non-maintained special schools, independent special schools and other independent schools	2007	4.4%	2.6%	5.0%
Other	2007	3.0%	1.8%	2.9%

.. = Data not available



Data Definition:

Data is taken from the SEN2 survey, a census which local authorities complete each January. The 'Other' category includes children registered in early years education settings, hospital schools and pupil referral units, children for whom the authority maintains a statement of SEN who were educated other than in school and Children for whom the authority maintains a statement of SEN who were awaiting provision.

[Source:. DCSF SEN2 Survey 2006 & 2007. Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.]

Health warning:

As the overall % of pupils with statements decreases, only pupils with more severe needs will have a statement and more of these are likely to be in a special school. Figures will vary between different LAs depending on their inclusion policy. The LA should be able to provide more detailed analysis which would identify any groups over represented in any type of provision.

Please note that data refers to the local authority where the child lives (as they issue their statement), but they may go to a school in another local authority. Please treat this figure with caution. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3066DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

Percentage of permanent exclusions in relation to the number of pupils in special schools

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2004	0.57%	..	0.33%
2005	#	..	0.31%
2006	#	..	0.23%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available

 # = Exclusion rate based on less than 3 pupils



Data Definition:

A permanent exclusion refers to a pupil who is excluded and their name is removed from the school register. This indicator shows the number of permanent exclusions during the academic year expressed as a percentage of the number (headcount) of pupils in maintained and non-maintained special schools in the Local Authority. Data will be missing if the local authority does not have any schools of this type. Exclusion rates based on less than 3 pupils are not shown (indicated by #). This missing data means that SN figures could be misleading, so they are not provided (indicated by ..) Dual registered pupils are not included. The National figures are DCSF published figures. They are mean averages of the number of exclusions in all LAs, divided by the sum of the pupils in all LAs.

[Source: DCSF Pupil Level Annual School Census (permanent exclusions). Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.]

Health warning:

There should be no permanent exclusions of pupils in special schools because the statement review process should be used to identify placements which are no longer appropriate. The LA should be able to provide details of these exclusions if there are concerns.
Please use with caution - %s are based on low numbers of students. These figures are based on the local authority in which the pupil studies. This may not be the same authority in which they live, and who maintains their statement of Special Educational Needs.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3097DE]

ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING

Children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities data

Percentage of fixed term exclusions of more than one day in relation to the number of pupils in special schools

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2004	15.69%	17.29%	17.45%
2005	21.34%	15.61%	18.91%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available

 # = Exclusion rate based on less than 3 pupils



Data Definition:

A fixed period exclusion refers to a pupil who is excluded from a school but remains on the register of that school because they are expected to return when the exclusion period is completed. Where a student receives more than one fixed period exclusion during the year, each exclusion will be counted separately. Fixed term exclusions of less than a day are counted as one full day. This indicator shows the number of fixed period exclusions during the academic year expressed as a percentage of the number (headcount) of pupils in maintained special schools in the Local Authority. **Please note that non-maintained special schools are excluded.** Data will be missing if the local authority does not have any schools of this type. Exclusion rates based on less than 3 pupils are not shown (indicated by #). The National figures are DCSF published figures. They are mean averages of the number of exclusions in all LAs, divided by the sum of the pupils in all LAs. However the SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the local authorities' statistical neighbours.

[Source: DCSF Termly Exclusions Survey (fixed-term exclusions). Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.]

Health warning:

Fixed term exclusions may have risen in order to avoid permanent exclusions but should be used sparingly by special schools. The LA should be able to provide details of these exclusions if there are concerns.

Please use with caution - %s are based on low numbers of students. These figures are based on the local authority in which the pupil studies. This may not be the same authority in which they live, and who maintains their statement of SEN (where applicable). Due to changes in the data collection information on fixed period exclusions the data for this is not available for maintained special schools for 2006.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 3099DE]

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION

Youth offending information

Youth Offending Information **Rotherham**

Indicator: Recidivism - the rate of re-offending

	Number in cohort	Number Re-0ffending	YOT Performance	YJB Statistical Neighbour	England and Wales	Variation		
						Over time (a)	Against neighbour (b)	Against England & Wales(c)
2001 cohort after 24 months	160	85	53.1%	50.3%	48.0%	-	2.8%	5.1%
2002 cohort after 24 months	184	97	52.7%	49.3%	49.8%	-0.4%	3.4%	2.9%
2003 cohort after 24 months	178	91	51.1%	47.1%	49.7%	-1.6%	4.1%	1.4%

(a) Variation over time: % change between data periods. There is a 5% target for reducing re-offending based on the 2001 cohort
(b) Variation against statistical neighbour: % difference between YOT and statistical neighbour
(c) Variation against England & Wales: % difference between Youth Offending Team and national average

KPI Performance





Data Definition: Between October and December each year, a cohort of offenders is identified and the disposal or pre-court decision recorded. These offenders are tracked for 2 years and any re-offending recorded. The re-offending rate is calculated by dividing the number of those who re-offend into the total number in the cohort. Full counting rules are posted on the YJB website.

Source: Youth Offending Team case management systems & YJB MIS.
If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Nick Read on 020 7271 3068 Ref: 2061YJ

Youth Offending Information **Rotherham**

Indicator: The number of first time entrants to the Youth Justice System

Youth Justice Board
Bwrdd Cyfiawnder Ieuenctid

	YOT Area	YJB Statistical Neighbour	National	Variation (a)	Variation (b)	Variation (c)	
Jan-Mar 05	196	149	26,568	-	31.3%	n/a	(d)
Apr-Jun 05	151	133	25,652	-23.0%	13.7%	n/a	
Jul-Sep 05	123	127	23,505	-18.5%	-3.0%	n/a	
Oct-Dec 05	145	147	24,385	17.9%	-1.3%	n/a	
Jan-Mar 06	176	132	23,694	21.4%	33.0%	n/a	
Apr-Jun 06	151	140	23,201	-14.2%	7.5%	n/a	
Jul-Sep 06	154	124	21,067	2.0%	24.7%	n/a	
Oct-Dec 06	115	127	22,657	-25.3%	-9.6%	n/a	

(a) Variation over time: % change between data periods
(b) Variation against statistical neighbour: % difference between YOT and statistical neighbour
(c) Since this is an absolute measure, not a proportion of population, no average between the YOT England & Wales total is calculated

(d) The 2004-05 data is calculated using a proxy measure: the number of pre-court disposals (reprimands and final warnings) and number of direct entrants to court. From April 2005, the actual number of first time entrants is counted. Therefore the 2004-05 data may be slightly inflated compared to the 2005-06 data. Therefore comparisons cannot be made between 04/05 and 05/06.

KPI Performance



Variation



Data Definition: Reduce year on year, the number of first time entrants to the youth justice system by identifying children and young people at risk of offending or involvement in anti-social behaviour through a YISP or other evidence based targeted means of intervention designed to reduce those risks and strengthen protective factors as demonstrated by using ONSET or other effective means of assessment and monitoring. Full counting rules are posted on the YJB website.

Source: Youth Offending Team case management systems & YJB MIS.
If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Nick Read on 020 7271 3068 Ref: 2062YJ

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION
Youth Offending Information

YOT Inspection: Breach/recall action taken place within national standards timescale

YOT Inspection: Breach/recall action taken place within national standards timescale

	Rotherham (South Yorkshire)
Percentage fully or largely meeting standard	67%

Description of data

Data from HMI Probation led inspection of Youth Offending Teams from a representative sample. The area in brackets is the wider Criminal Justice Area in which the YOT is based. The majority of YOT areas match local authority boundaries - please refer to Appendix 2 to see the exceptions. If data is marked as 'Not available' this is because an inspection has not yet taken place in this area.

How is it calculated

Percentage of those whose breach/recall to custody action was in line with National Standards of Youth Justice Board of all those in breach/recall subgroup.

Health warning

Sample statistic rather than a reflection of all such cases in the YOT.

Data Source: HMI Probation, 2003-08 HMIP programme

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Kevin Ball: kevin.ball@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk and quote REF: 4017HO

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION
Youth Offending Information

YOT Inspection: Case supervisor actively liaise with others who provide interventions to YP

YOT Inspection: Case supervisor actively liaise with others who provide interventions to YP

	Rotherham (South Yorkshire)
Percentage fully or largely meeting standard	95%

Description of data

Data from HMI Probation led inspection of Youth Offending Teams from a representative sample. The area in brackets is the wider Criminal Justice Area in which the YOT is based. The majority of YOT areas match local authority boundaries - please refer to Appendix 2 to see the exceptions. If data is marked as 'Not available' this is because an inspection has not yet taken place in this area.

How is it calculated

Percentage of those case managers fully or largely meeting the inspection standard.

Health warning

Sample statistic rather than a reflection of all cases in the YOT.

Data Source: HMI Probation, 2003-08 HMIP programme

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Kevin Ball: kevin.ball@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk and quote REF: 4018HO

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION
Youth Offending Information

YOT Inspection: Most recent ASSET score - improvement over initial score

YOT Inspection: Most recent ASSET score - improvement over initial score

	Rotherham (South Yorkshire)
Percentage that have improved	65%

Description of data

Data from HMI Probation led inspection of Youth Offending Teams from a representative sample. Asset is a structured assessment tool to be used by YOTs in England and Wales on all young offenders who come into contact with the criminal justice system. It aims to look at the young person's offence or offences and identify a multitude of factors or circumstances – ranging from lack of educational attainment to mental health problems – which may have contributed to such behaviour. The information gathered from Asset can be used to inform court reports so that appropriate intervention programmes can be drawn up. The area in brackets is the wider Criminal Justice Area in which the YOT is based. The majority of YOT areas match local authority boundaries - please refer to Appendix 2 to see the exceptions. If data is marked as 'Not available' this is because an inspection has not yet taken place in this area.

How is it calculated

Simple percentage of those whose risk assessment score had improved whilst in supervision of the total sample.

Health warning

Sample statistic rather than a reflection of all cases in the YOT.

Data Source: HMI Probation, 2003-08 HMIP programme

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Kevin Ball: kevin.ball@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk and quote REF: 4019HO

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION

Participation and other activity information

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION
Participation and other activity information

Contact - Percentage of young people aged 13-19 reached by publicly funded Youth Services

Rotherham

% Reached

Year	Area	SN	Nat target	Nat Average
2004	24.7%	..	25.0%	23.8%
2005	24.2%	..	25.0%	25.1%
2006	27.8%	..	25.0%	27.6%

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area	SN	Nat target	Nat average
03/04	n/a	..	n/a	n/a
04/05	-0.5%	..	n/a	1.2%
05/06	3.6%	..	n/a	2.5%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Additional information:

No. of Young people reached

Year	Area
2004	5,761
2005	5,712
2006	6,648

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
03/04	n/a
04/05	-0.9%
05/06	16.4%

.. = data not available

n/a = not applicable



Data Definition: The current definition of a contact with a young person is that the face and name of the young person are known to the Youth Worker. It is an 'informed' contact where the Youth Worker is consciously building a relationship with the young person. It does not include all attendees of large scale events, and individuals are only counted once. The percentage of young people reached divides the young people reached aged 13-19 by the total 13-19 population. The DCSF target for this is 25%. The calculation does not take account of other young people in the 11-25 age group who may have used the service during the period. The Year-on-Year change calculations simply deduct one % from another.

[**Source:** Office of National Statistics (ONS) Mid Year Population Estimates of April 2003, 2004 and 2005 (June 2002 revised and re-published September 2004). National Youth Agency (NYA) Annual Audits of financial years 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06. Calculations performed by Ofsted.]

Health warning: Data is supplied by external parties and Ofsted are unable to validate its accuracy. The NYA's annual audit is a voluntary survey, and not all services choose, or are able, to submit data each year. The National figure is a median average based on submissions of 129 services for 2003-04, 128 for 2004-05 and 138 for 2005-06. Missing data means it is not possible to calculate a robust figure for statistical neighbours or show traffic lights.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 4021OF]

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION

Participation and other activity information

Ratio of full-time equivalent Youth Workers to young people aged 13-19

Rotherham

Staffing ratio

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2004	1: 421	..	1: 549
2005	1: 426	..	1: 651
2006	1: 406	..	1: 611

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area	SN	Nat
03/04	n/a	..	n/a
04/05	1.2%	..	-8.0%
05/06	-4.8%	..	-8.0%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Additional information:

No. of FTE Youth Workers

Year	Area
2004	55
2005	55
2006	59

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
03/04	n/a
04/05	0.2%
05/06	6.3%

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*



Data Definition:
Data is for 13-19 year olds only, and does not include other young people in the 11-25 age group, although they may choose to use the service. Youth Workers excludes volunteers. The full-time equivalent calculation combines qualified and unqualified, full-time and part-time Youth Workers.
[**Source:** Office of National Statistics (ONS) Mid Year Population Estimates of April 2003, 2004 and 2005 (June 2002 revised and re-published September 2004). National Youth Agency (NYA) Annual Audits of financial years 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06. Calculations performed by Ofsted.]

Health warning:
Data is supplied by external parties and Ofsted are unable to validate its accuracy. The NYA's annual audit is a voluntary survey, and not all services choose, or are able, to submit data. The National figure is a median average based on submissions of 144 services for 2003-04, 137 for 2004-05 and 144 for 2005-06. Missing data means it is not possible to calculate a robust figure for Ofsted's Statistical Neighbours or show traffic lights. The Youth Worker to young people ratio is an indication of the local authority's investment in the youth service. It is background information to help inspectors form a view of the service. However, it is not in itself an indication of the quality of the service provided, or its effect on young people. Caution should be employed when interpreting this indicator.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 4022OF]

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION

Inspection evidence

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION

Inspection evidence

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the equal opportunities, special needs, behaviour, and working in partnership with parents national standards; and childcare inspection judgements on Making a Positive Contribution

Rotherham

Actions imposed on new providers at the time of registration visit - all providers

Percentage of providers where actions were issued at registration visits between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total registration visits in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	175
Total registration visits in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1070
Total registration visits in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	29017

Actions imposed from Children Act (CA) inspections - all providers

Percentage of active providers where actions were issued at CA inspections between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006



Total CA inspections in Area between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	262
Total CA inspections in SN between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	1533
Total CA inspections in England between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006:	44576

Data Definition: Four aspects of childcare are judged in this indicator, corresponding to four of the fourteen CA standards: Standard 9 - Equal opportunities: The registered person and staff actively promote equality of opportunity and anti-discriminatory practice for all children. Standard 10 - Special needs, including special educational needs and disabilities: The registered person is aware that some children may have special needs and is proactive in ensuring that appropriate action can be taken when such a child is identified or admitted to the provision. Steps are taken to promote the welfare and development of the child within the setting in partnership with the parents and other relevant parties. Standard 11 - Behaviour: Adults caring for children in the provision are able to manage a wide range of children's behaviour in a way which promotes their welfare and development. Standard 12 - Working in partnership with parents and carers: The registered person and staff work in partnership with parents to meet the needs of the children, both individually and as a group. Information is shared.

Health Warning: Data only takes into account registration visits that have been finalised. The latest CA inspections of active providers that have been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. Since the December 2006 Local Authority Early Years Profile was published, the method used to capture registration actions has been revised and these figures reflect the change. Therefore, the percentage of providers with registration actions may differ slightly from the figures in the Profile and the Early Years APA briefing.

Area	SN	NAT

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION

Inspection evidence

Childcare registration and inspection actions on the equal opportunities, special needs, behaviour, and working in partnership with parents national standards; and childcare inspection judgements on Making a Positive Contribution

Rotherham

Judgements on quality gradings against Making A Positive Contribution for Children Act inspections of active providers between 1 April 2005 and 31 December 2006 (in percentages)



Data Definition: The judgements awarded vary according to the type of inspection and the type of provider. Therefore, the total numbers of judgements may differ between the Early Years indicators.
Health Warning: Data only takes into account the latest inspections of active providers, where reports have been been quality assured (checks complete) and have not been withheld from publication. “All day care” has been used to refer to a combination of full, sessional, out of school, crèche and multiple day care provisions.

Outstanding	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION

Inspection findings

Section 5 school inspection judgements: The extent to which learners make a positive contribution (primary, secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
3H	The extent to which learners make a positive contribution to the community																		
	LA no	68	19	40	9	0	13	2	7	4	0	4	1	1	2	0	104	16	7
	SN no	447	114	275	58	0	112	21	59	32	0	32	9	16	6	1	767	152	49
	LA %		28	59	13	0		15	54	31	0								
	SN %		26	62	13	0		19	53	29	0								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about how well learners make a positive contribution to the community. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION

Looked after children and care leavers data

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

4015SC - PAF CF/C18: The percentage of children aged 10 or over who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months, who were given a final warning/reprimand or convicted during the year for an offence committed whilst they were looked after, expressed as a ratio of the percentage of all children aged 10 or over given a final warning/reprimand or convicted for an offence in the police force area

Rotherham

	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07
LA	3.4	2.8	4.1	2.6	2.6	2.5	3.1
SN	2.3	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.2
Eng	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.4	2.5

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low							High	
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●	●
2000-07	·	0<1	1<3	·	·	·	.	3+	·

Data definition

Numerator

This is a ratio consisting of:

The number of children looked after at 30 September aged 10 or over, who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months and who had, during these 12 months, been given a final warning/reprimand for or convicted of an offence that had been committed while they were looked after.

[Source - OC2, Question 7b]

divided by

The total number of children looked after at 30 September aged 10 or over, who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months.

[Source - OC2, Question 7a]

Denominator

The proportion of all children (aged 10-17) living in the local police force area who had been given a final warning/reprimand or convicted for an offence during the previous calendar year.

[Source - the Home Office]

N.B. Data for 2005-06 has been updated with 2005 Home Office data. The resultant p.i. value, shown above, will differ to that published by CSCI in November 2006. Data for 2006-07 uses 2005 data.

Measuring unit

Ratio to one decimal place.

Continued on following page

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

4015SC - PAF CF/C18: The percentage of children aged 10 or over who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months, who were given a final warning/reprimand or convicted during the year for an offence committed whilst they were looked after, expressed as a ratio of the percentage of all children aged 10 or over given a final warning/reprimand or convicted for an offence in the police force area

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

Offending is both a factor in the past history of a significant number of children who become looked after and is a measure of the quality of care and support children receive once in care.

Caution should be exercised in the interpretation of this indicator. It is a complex ratio rather than a number of young people in the area as it compares final warnings/ reprimands or convictions for children looked after by each council with the rate for all children in the police force area, which may cover several adjoining councils. Those councils may either be advantaged or disadvantaged by the denominator.

Nearly one in three councils had relatively small numbers of looked after children, that is fewer than 10, that fell into the required category for inclusion in 4015SC PAF CF/C18 in 2005-06. Small changes in numbers can have large consequences to the end result and the measure may, therefore, be subject to large swings from year to year.

It is important to look separately at the numerator and denominator for this indicator. The trend data is also key, because a council may be successfully reducing its looked after numerator ratio while the denominator ratio for the police force area is reducing at a faster rate.

A figure of one shows that children looked after are given final warnings/reprimands or are convicted at the same rate as all children in the area; less than one would show children looked after are given final warnings/reprimands or convicted less than all children. Such low values would be unlikely and may be due to poor data quality. Consideration should always be given to the proportion of the relevant young people who are placed outside of authority and the extent to which data is captured effectively on these young people.

In 2005-06 the percentage of looked after children that received a final warning/reprimand or conviction (the numerator) remained at 9.3%. This is still above the previous PSA target level of 7.2% that was to be achieved by 2004. Although the looked after offending rate has been falling in the past few years, the rate of offending in the 10 to 17 year old population as a whole has fallen more sharply. Consideration, therefore, should be given to the trend of the looked after offending rate within the council as this is, by itself, good evidence of good (or, indeed, poor) performance.

There is a relationship between offending and educational attendance & attainment (3071SC, 3073SC, 3072SC CF/A2 & 3074SC CF/C24) and a young persons situation as a care leaver (5022SC CF/A4), as well as a potential one with the conduct of reviews (4016SC CF/C63 & 2064SC PAF CF/C68). The nature of the complex ratio that forms this indicator means that making a clear link is not straightforward, hence the need to consider the looked after component on its own.

Related measures

2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3071SC The % of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam - see p.163
3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165
3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167
3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196
5022SC PAF CF/A4 Employment, education and training for care leavers [joint working] (BVPI 161) - see p.239

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

4016SC - PAF CF/C63: The number of children and young people who communicated their views specifically for each of their statutory reviews as a percentage of the number of children and young people who had been looked after at 31 March for more than four weeks

Rotherham

	2005-06	2006-07
LA	70	91
SN	81	91
Eng	79	87

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●
2005-06	0<65	65<75	75<85	85<95	95<=100
2006-07	0<70	70<80	80<90	90<95	95<=100

Data definition

Numerator

Of the children in the denominator, the number of children who communicated their views for each of their statutory reviews in the year (for 2006-07 the last review in the year) using a range of mechanisms including personal participation, written or electronic communication or independent representation.

[Source - SSDA903 codes PN1,2,3,5,6]

Denominator

All children looked after at 31 March who had been reviewed during the year to 31 March. Excludes those who started to be looked after on or after 4 March in the latest year. It excludes children looked after under a series of short term breaks.

Children under the age of four (code PN 0) should be excluded.

[Source - SSDA903]

There was a change to CF/C63, in 2005-06, from the coverage of participation at the *most recent* review of each relevant looked after child to the coverage of participation in *all* reviews.

The denominator should consist of the number of looked after children who qualify and who were looked after at March 31 [i.e. not the number of reviews of those children in the preceding year]. Therefore, if a child who is looked after at 31 March 2007 has had three reviews in 2006-07 which meet the criteria for inclusion, the child is counted in the denominator, and the numerator should report only those children from the denominator all of whose reviews in the year involved their participation.

Children who reach four years of age during the year.

For children who reach four years of age during the year and who are due to have one or more reviews between their fourth birthday and the end of the year:

* The child should be counted in the denominator.
* The participation code[s] for the review[s] following their fourth birthday should determine their inclusion in the numerator.
* Any reviews before their fourth birthday and coded as PN0 should be disregarded.

Measuring unit

Percentage as a whole number

Continued on following page

MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

4016SC - PAF CF/C63: The number of children and young people who communicated their views specifically for each of their statutory reviews as a percentage of the number of children and young people who had been looked after at 31 March for more than four weeks

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

The indicator measures participation in the review process as a proxy for the measurement of the effectiveness of the monitoring of the care of looked after children.

The active participation of looked after children in planning their care should contribute to improved outcomes. To ensure that the views of looked after children and young people are listened to, good practice dictates that they should either attend and participate in the review meeting, or should at least be able to express their views by some other appropriate method. The indicator measures the percentage of looked after children who did so at all their statutory reviews. The definition of the indicator allows for a wide range of ways in which this might happen. Only if the child or young person does not attend or express their views by any other means are they considered not to have participated in the review.

There is a statutory obligation to review the cases of looked after children, first within 28 days of their becoming looked after, then within a further three months, and subsequently at intervals of no more than six months until they cease to be looked after. Councils need to ensure that the views expressed by children and young people are given due consideration and action taken where appropriate to achieve agreed outcomes for the young person.

Where children have not participated, councils also need to ensure that they have a good understanding of the reasons for this and plans in place to minimise non-participation. Consideration should be given to: the age of these children, in relation to the appropriate engagement of the very youngest children; children placed out-of-authority, in relation to the facilitation of effective participation of those distant from the council area; the extent to which children had a severe disability; and the extent to which the children did not want to participate in their review. All of these factors can have a bearing on the indicator value.

The extent to which a child participates in their reviews may have an impact on the outcomes for the child in key areas, as well as the indicators can cover them, such as health (1037SC CF/C19), offending (4015SC PAF CF/C18), educational attendance & attainment (3071SC, 3073SC, 3072SC CF/A2 & 3074SC CF/C24) and a young persons later situation as a care leaver (5022SC CF/A4)

Related measures

1037SC PAF CF/C19: Health of looked after children - see p.52
2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2060SC % of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker - see p.106
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3071SC The % of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam - see p.163
3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165
3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167
3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169
4015SC PAF CF/C18: Final warnings/reprimands and convictions of children looked after - see p.194
5022SC PAF CF/A4 Employment, education and training for care leavers [joint working] (BVPI 161) - see p.239
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Post-16 education and training data

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Post 16 education & training data

Percentage of young people by LA achieving level 2 & 3 by age 19

Rotherham

Percentage of young people by LA achieving level 2 by age 19

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2004	58.9%	60.3%	62.6%
2005	58.7%	63.3%	65.7%
2006	61.4%	64.5%	67.5%

Percentage of young people by LA achieving level 3 by age 19

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2004	33.6%	33.1%	39.8%
2005	34.3%	38.3%	43.3%
2006	37.4%	38.0%	44.3%





Data Definition:
This indicator shows the percentage of young people by LA achieving level 2 & 3. This includes those that were of 19 years of age at the end of the academic year which begins from September to the end of August of each year.

Source: Learning & Skills Council

Health Warning:
This indicator is not traffic lighted as Local authority figures are measured in a different way to national/regional/LLSC level figures. Please use with caution when comparing LA and national %s. Some of the LSC's data indicates which local Learning & Skills Council the young person studies in, but not which local authority. Around 3% (20,000 young people) are not accounted for. Statistical neighbour figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors, and are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's statistical neighbours.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 5038LS]

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Post 16 education and training data

Schools with sixth forms: average point scores of students entered for GCE/VCE A/AS and average point scores per GCE/VCE A/AS entry

Rotherham

Average point score of 16-18 year old students entered for GCE/VCE A/AS

A Level	Area	SN	Nat			Year-on-Year Change Area	SN	Nat
2002	231.42	267.60	263.66	V				
2003	248.19	276.09	265.66	V	02/03	16.77	8.49	2.00
2004	263.28	274.89	272.16	V	03/04	15.09	-1.20	6.50
2005	274.33	277.93	277.21	V	04/05	11.05	3.04	5.05
2006	**718.58**	**758.45**	**740.10**	V	05/06	n/a	n/a	n/a

Average point score per GCE/VCE A/AS

A Level	Area	SN	Nat			Year-on-Year Change Area	SN	Nat
2002	70.67	73.85	75.88	V				
2003	72.34	74.99	76.79	V	02/03	1.67	1.14	0.91
2004	73.31	74.27	77.52	V	03/04	0.97	-0.72	0.73
2005	76.48	74.63	78.36	V	04/05	3.17	0.36	0.84
2006	**194.95**	**198.52**	**202.62**	V	05/06	n/a	n/a	n/a

.. = *data not available* V = Validated data

n/a = *not applicable* U = Unvalidated data





Area SN NAT

Data Definition: Data only includes students in mainstream maintained schools. For data on level 3 qualifications in colleges please refer to indicator 5008OF. The average point score per student entered is calculated as the sum of the points awarded to each 16-18 year old student, divided by the number of 16-18 year old students studying in the schools in the area.
The average point score per examination entry is calculated as the sum of the points awarded to each 16-18 year old student, divided by the total number of entries.
[Source: DCSF Achievement + Attainment Tables]

Health warning: These figures include mainstream schools only (i.e. no special schools or independent schools are included). Therefore figures may be different from DCSF published figures.
Discontinuous data. Before 2006 the average point scores were based on the UCAS tariff. 2006 figures are based on the QCA tariff, a new scoring system that extends to cover all Level 3 qualifications. Details of the QCA scoring system can be found on DCSF website http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performancetables/16to18_06/d3.shtml. Therefore, extra care should be taken when comparing 2006 figure with those from previous years as they do not include the wider range of qualifications and are based on a different point scoring system.

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk.

Rotherham

Achievement rate by notional level for students aged 16-18 at the start of courses with the expected end years 2002/03, 2003/04, and 2004/05

	Area Starts excluding transfers			Area Rate (%)			National Rate[3] (%)		
Institution and Notional level	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05
GFE/Tertiary Colleges[4]									
Notional Level 3	1,459	2,043	1,004	76	73	80	80	82	84
Notional Level 2	1,449	1,997	1,107	74	75	82	73	77	80
Notional Level 1	1,436	2,036	1,372	78	78	79	73	77	80
Sixth Form Colleges[4]									
Notional Level 3	137	547	4,503	89	87	88	88	89	90
Notional Level 2	64	620	4,396	95	93	92	86	90	87
Notional Level 1	109	408	4,838	81	73	50	72	79	77
Specialist Colleges									
Notional Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	85	87	89
Notional Level 2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	76	77	82
Notional Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	76	75	77

continued on following page

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Post 16 education and training data

Indicator: Further Education institutions/sixth form colleges/specialist colleges: achievement data by level

Rotherham

Achievement rate by qualification type for students aged 16-18 at the start of courses with the expected end year 2004/05

Institution and Qualification Type[1, 2]	Area Starts excluding transfers	Area Rate (%)	National Rate[3] (%)
GFE/Tertiary Colleges[4]			
A Level Subjects	41	70	93
AS level Subjects	228	74	79
GNVQ Level 3	127	73	84
NVQ Level 3	72	77	81
Other Long Level 3	904	84	84
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	490	91	89
GNVQ Level 2	93	80	81
NVQ Level 2	500	86	82
Other Long Level 2	953	77	76
GNVQ Level 1	27	85	86
NVQ Level 1	188	91	87
Other Long Level 1	1,221	77	79
Sixth Form Colleges[4]			
A Level Subjects	1,818	94	96
AS level Subjects	2,893	84	87
GNVQ Level 3	73	94	92
NVQ Level 3	2	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 3	52	71	91
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	304	95	94
GNVQ Level 2	68	95	87
NVQ Level 2	2	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 2	34	68	73
GNVQ Level 1	12	88	91
NVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 1	97	46	76
Specialist Colleges			
A Level Subjects	n/a	n/a	n/a
AS level Subjects	n/a	n/a	91
GNVQ Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a
NVQ Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 3	n/a	n/a	89
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	n/a	n/a	n/a
GNVQ Level 2	n/a	n/a	89
NVQ Level 2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 2	n/a	n/a	81
GNVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a
NVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	74
Other Long Level 1	n/a	n/a	78

Source: Learning and Skills Council (LSC) - calculations performed by Ofsted

Data Definition:

1. Grades A-E for GCE A and AS Levels, Grades A*-G for GCSEs, pass, merit and distinction for GNVQs and achieved for NVQs, are classified as passes.
2. Qualifications are grouped according to their NVQ level or notional equivalent according to the categorisation of each qualification on the Learning and Skills Council's qualification database. Data are presented for long (>=24 weeks) qualifications at notional levels 1 (includes level E), 2 and 3. Key skills qualifications and qualifications with unknown, unspecified, mixed or invalid notional levels are excluded.
3. Where "n/a" appears, there were less than 500 starts nationally or there were too few colleges to produce a valid national rate.
4. Separate benchmarking data have been used for areas with very high widening participation factors.
5. n/a indicates that data for the relevant section is not applicable as there is no data for the relevant college type.
6. The student achievement rate is based on the local authority of where the young person studies, and not on the local authority of where the young person lives
7. Achievement rate is defined as the number of qualifications learners have fully achieved divided by the number of completed qualifications. This denominator includes those completers recorded with unknown outcomes in the ILR. Partial achievements are not included as achievements.

Health Warning

1. The data is for students aged 16-18, therefore excluding students aged 19+
2. The data excludes the Key Skills qualification

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk.

Please quote ref 5006OF

Rotherham

Success rate by notional level for students aged 16-18 at the start of courses with the expected end years 2002/03, 2003/04, and 2004/05

	Area Starts excluding transfers			Area Rate (%)			National Rate[3] (%)		
Institution and Notional level	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05
GFE/Tertiary Colleges[4]									
Notional Level 3	1,459	2,043	1,004	51	50	44	62	64	67
Notional Level 2	1,449	1,997	1,107	48	50	49	52	56	61
Notional Level 1	1,436	2,036	1,372	54	65	59	56	60	64
Sixth Form Colleges[4]									
Notional Level 3	137	547	4,503	82	77	81	79	80	82
Notional Level 2	64	620	4,396	79	78	74	70	74	73
Notional Level 1	109	408	4,838	67	58	38	60	67	64
Specialist Colleges									
Notional Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	64	65	69
Notional Level 2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	58	62	68
Notional Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	61	62	65

continued on following page

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Post 16 education and training data

Indicator: Further Education institutions/sixth form colleges/specialist colleges: success data by level

Rotherham

Success rate by qualification type for students aged 16-18 at the start of courses with the expected end year 2004/05

Institution and Qualification Type[1, 2]	Area Starts excluding transfers	Area Rate (%)	National Rate[3] (%)
GFE/Tertiary Colleges[4]			
A Level Subjects	41	63	86
AS level Subjects	228	49	65
GNVQ Level 3	127	39	60
NVQ Level 3	72	51	62
Other Long Level 3	904	43	60
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	490	51	64
GNVQ Level 2	93	61	67
NVQ Level 2	500	39	57
Other Long Level 2	953	52	60
GNVQ Level 1	27	63	68
NVQ Level 1	188	66	67
Other Long Level 1	1,221	58	64
Sixth Form Colleges[4]			
A Level Subjects	1,818	91	92
AS level Subjects	2,893	76	78
GNVQ Level 3	73	60	75
NVQ Level 3	2	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 3	52	56	72
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	304	75	78
GNVQ Level 2	68	82	74
NVQ Level 2	2	n/a	62
Other Long Level 2	34	50	62
GNVQ Level 1	12	58	74
NVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 1	97	35	63
Specialist Colleges			
A Level Subjects	n/a	n/a	n/a
AS level Subjects	n/a	n/a	77
GNVQ Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a
NVQ Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 3	n/a	n/a	68
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	n/a	n/a	n/a
GNVQ Level 2	n/a	n/a	73
NVQ Level 2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 2	n/a	n/a	69
GNVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a
NVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	60
Other Long Level 1	n/a	n/a	66

Source: Learning and Skills Council (LSC) - calculations performed by Ofsted

Data Definition:

1. Grades A-E for GCE A and AS Levels, Grades A*-G for GCSEs, pass, merit and distinction for GNVQs and achieved for NVQs, are classified as passes.
2. Qualifications are grouped according to their NVQ level or notional equivalent according to the categorisation of each qualification on the Learning and Skills Council's qualification database. Data are presented for long (>=24 weeks) qualifications at notional levels 1 (includes level E), 2 and 3. Key skills qualifications and qualifications with unknown, unspecified, mixed or invalid notional levels are excluded.
3. Where "n/a" appears, there were less than 500 starts nationally or there were too few colleges to produce a valid national rate.
4. Separate benchmarking data have been used for areas with very high widening participation factors.
5. n/a indicates that data for the relevant section is not applicable as there is no data for the relevant college type.
6.The student success rate is based on the local authority of where the young person studies, and not on the local authority of where the young person lives
7. Success rate is defined as the number of qualifications learners have fully achieved divided by the number of qualifications started, excluding transfers out. For programmes of study of two years or more, success is calculated across the whole programme, that is, from the start to the end of the qualification.

Health Warning

1. The data is for students aged 16-18, therefore excluding students aged 19+
2. The data excludes the Key Skills qualification

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk.

Please quote ref 5007OF

Indicator: Further Education institutions/sixth form colleges/specialist colleges: retention data by level

Rotherham

Retention rate by notional level for students aged 16-18 at the start of courses with the expected end years 2002/03, 2003/04, and 2004/05

	Area Starts excluding transfers			Area Rate (%)			National Rate[3] (%)		
Institution and Notional level	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05
GFE/Tertiary Colleges[4]									
Notional Level 3	1,459	2,043	1,004	68	68	55	77	78	81
Notional Level 2	1,449	1,997	1,107	65	67	59	70	73	76
Notional Level 1	1,436	2,036	1,372	69	83	75	77	79	80
Sixth Form Colleges[4]									
Notional Level 3	137	547	4,503	92	89	92	90	90	91
Notional Level 2	64	620	4,396	84	84	80	81	83	84
Notional Level 1	109	408	4,838	83	80	75	83	84	83
Specialist Colleges									
Notional Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	75	75	77
Notional Level 2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	77	81	83
Notional Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	81	83	84

continued on following page

Indicator: Further Education institutions/sixth form colleges/specialist colleges: retention data by level

Rotherham

Retention rate by qualification type for students aged 16-18 at the start of courses with the expected end year 2004/05

Institution and Qualification Type[1, 2]	Area Starts excluding transfers	Area Rate (%)	National Rate[3] (%)
GFE/Tertiary Colleges[4]			
A Level Subjects	41	90	92
AS level Subjects	228	65	83
GNVQ Level 3	127	53	72
NVQ Level 3	72	67	77
Other Long Level 3	904	51	72
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	490	56	72
GNVQ Level 2	93	76	82
NVQ Level 2	500	46	69
Other Long Level 2	953	67	79
GNVQ Level 1	27	74	79
NVQ Level 1	188	73	78
Other Long Level 1	1,221	75	81
Sixth Form Colleges[4]			
A Level Subjects	1,818	97	96
AS level Subjects	2,893	90	90
GNVQ Level 3	73	64	81
NVQ Level 3	2	50	n/a
Other Long Level 3	52	79	79
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	304	79	83
GNVQ Level 2	68	87	85
NVQ Level 2	2	50	76
Other Long Level 2	34	74	85
GNVQ Level 1	12	67	81
NVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 1	97	76	84
Specialist Colleges			
A Level Subjects	n/a	n/a	n/a
AS level Subjects	n/a	n/a	85
GNVQ Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a
NVQ Level 3	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 3	n/a	n/a	76
GCSE Subjects (Grades A*- G)	n/a	n/a	n/a
GNVQ Level 2	n/a	n/a	82
NVQ Level 2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Long Level 2	n/a	n/a	85
GNVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	n/a
NVQ Level 1	n/a	n/a	82
Other Long Level 1	n/a	n/a	85

Source: Learning and Skills Council (LSC) - calculations performed by Ofsted

Data Definition:
1. Grades A-E for GCE A and AS Levels, Grades A*-G for GCSEs, pass, merit and distinction for GNVQs and achieved for NVQs, are classified as passes.
2. Qualifications are grouped according to their NVQ level or notional equivalent according to the categorisation of each qualification on the Learning and Skills Council's qualification database. Data are presented for long (>=24 weeks) qualifications at notional levels 1 (includes level E), 2 and 3. Key skills qualifications and qualifications with unknown, unspecified, mixed or invalid notional levels are excluded.
3. Where "n/a" appears, there were less than 500 starts nationally or there were too few colleges to produce a valid national rate.
4. Separate benchmarking data have been used for areas with very high widening participation factors.
5. n/a indicates that data for the relevant section is not applicable as there is no data for the relevant college type.
6. The student retention rate is based on the local authority of where the young person studies, and not on the local authority of where the young person lives
7. Retention rate is defined as the number of learners completed divided by the number of learners who started the qualification, excluding transfers out. For programmes of study of two years or more, retention is calculated across the whole programme, that is, from the start to the end of the qualification.

Health Warning
1. The data is for students aged 16-18, therefore excluding students aged 19+
2. The data excludes the Key Skills qualification

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk. Please quote ref 5008OF

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Post-16 education and training

NVQ success rate for all work-based learners living in the area and aged under 19 at the start of their programme (split by learning programme, gender, ethnicity and disability)

Rotherham

NVQ Success Rate for all work-based learners living in the area.

Traffic Lights have not been applied to this indicator

Overall success rate

Year	Area	National
2004	37.7%	46.0%
2005	46.3%	50.4%
2006	49.6%	56.7%

Year-on-year change

Year	Area	Nat
04/05	+8.7%	+4.5%
05/06	+3.3%	+6.3%

Timely success rate

Year	Area	National
2004	25.3%	28.2%
2005	26.0%	31.3%
2006	29.8%	36.7%

Year-on-year change

Year	Area	Nat
04/05	+0.6%	+3.1%
05/06	+3.9%	+5.4%





AREA □ NAT △

Success rate by learning programme

Programme	Overall	National	Timely	National
All-WBL NVQ	49.6%	56.7%	29.8%	36.7%
AA Framework	54.0%	46.3%	32.2%	28.2%
AA NVQ	64.0%	54.8%	38.0%	34.6%
A Framework	42.3%	53.1%	25.1%	33.6%
A NVQ	45.6%	58.3%	27.8%	37.4%
NVQ only	52.7%	56.7%	28.8%	39.6%

Success rate by learner characteristics

Characteristic	Overall	National	Timely	National
Male	51.2%	56.7%	30.0%	35.4%
Female	47.6%	58.1%	29.6%	38.2%
White	49.1%	57.7%	29.6%	36.9%
Non-white	68.4%	50.6%	42.9%	32.3%
LDD	45.3%	53.2%	26.2%	32.8%
Non-LDD	50.2%	57.8%	30.4%	37.2%

Data Definition:

In contrast to other school and college indicators presented in this toolkit, WBL analysis is based on the local authority where the young person lives, not the local authority where they study. The overall success rate measures the percentage of work-based learners who successfully completed their apprenticeship framework or the main NVQ element of their programme at any time. Learners are counted in the later of their planned end year and their actual end year. The timely success rate measures the percentage of work-based learners who successfully completed their framework or NVQ by their planned end date, or within one month of it. Learners are counted in their planned end year. For more details please see the LSC's Implementing Measures of Success: The Handbook.

The figures in all the success rate calculations are limited to learners aged under 19 as at 31st August in the year which they started their learning.

[Source: Learning & Skills Council Individual Learner Record. Data supplied to Ofsted by the Adult Learning Inspectorate.]

Health warning:

These figures use a different methodology from those which has historically been used by the LSC and the inspectorates. The change should not have a significant effect on performance at local authority level. The matching process used to generate the dataset for calculating this indicator means that not every learner could be allocated to a local authority which could have an impact on the figures.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Post-16 education and training

NVQ success rate for all work-based learners living in the area and aged under 19 at the start of their programme (split by learning programme, gender, ethnicity and disability)

Figures for disability/learning need are based on learners' self-declaration. A proportion, usually under 10%, of learners do not respond to the relevant questions. They are included in the non-disabled/learning need group.

Interpretation:

For apprenticeship programmes, the NVQ success rate figures show the success rate for the NVQ element of the framework. This includes the breakdown of success rates by learner characteristics.

The methodology used here is broadly equivalent to that used in FE colleges but takes account of the different nature of work-based learning programmes.

The disability/learning need figures do not distinguish between learners with a disability, those with a learning need and those with both. Typically, the number with learning needs is higher than those with a disability. In most cases, the learning needs identified are either moderate learning difficulties or dyslexia.

Many learners living in the area may be with learning providers based outside the local authority area.

In the ethnic group figures, the "white" category includes those classified as White-Irish and White-Other, as well as White-British. The "non-white" category includes all other ethnic groups, including those whose ethnic group was unknown or not stated.

There are considerable variations in NVQ success rates across different sectors within work-based learning. There are also significant differences in the proportions of learners with different characteristics within sectors. Variations in success rates between groups of learners with different characteristics may, therefore, relate in part to the different sectors they are learning in.

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk & quote REF: 5039AL

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Post 16 education and training data

Personal characteristics of Work-based learners living in the area aged under 19 (gender, ethnicity and disability)

Rotherham

Traffic Lights have not been applied to this indicator

Proportion of WBLs with Learning Difficulties and/or Disabilities

Year	Area	National
2004	23.4%	15.5%
2005	25.2%	15.2%
2006	23.2%	14.5%

Year-on-year Change

Year	Area	Nat
04/05	+1.8%	-0.3%
05/06	-2.0%	-0.6%

Proportion of WBLs by Gender

Year	Area		National	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
2004	61.5%	38.5%	61.6%	38.4%
2005	62.1%	37.9%	62.3%	37.7%
2006	66.9%	33.1%	62.2%	37.8%

Year-on-year Change

Year	Area		National	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
04/05	+0.6%	-0.6%	+0.7%	-0.7%
05/06	+4.8%	-4.8%	-0.1%	+0.1%

Proportion of WBLs by Ethnicity

Year	Area		National	
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White
2004	97.0%	3.0%	93.8%	6.2%
2005	95.8%	4.2%	94.0%	6.0%
2006	97.4%	2.6%	93.7%	6.3%

Year-on-year Change

Year	Area		National	
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White
04/05	-1.2%	+1.2%	+0.2%	-0.2%
05/06	+1.6%	-1.6%	-0.4%	+0.4%







Data Definition:

In contrast to other school and college indicators presented in this toolkit, WBL analysis is based on the local authority where the young person lives, not the local authority where they study. The number of work-based learners living in the area who were aged under 19 at 31st August in the relevant year with the relevant gender, ethnic group or disability/learning need status, as a percentage of all work-based learners living in the area within the same age group.

[Source: Learning & Skills Council Individual Learner Record. Data supplied to Ofsted by the Adult Learning Inspectorate.]

Health warning:

Figures for disability/learning need are based on learners' self-declaration and so they may be an underestimate. A proportion, usually under 10%, of learners do not respond to the relevant questions. They are excluded from the calculation.

Interpretation:

The disability/learning need figures do not distinguish between learners with a disability, those with a learning need and those with both. Typically, the number with learning needs is higher than those with a disability. In most cases, the learning needs identified are either moderate learning difficulties or dyslexia.

The learners do not necessarily live within the local authority where the learning provider is based. The registered address of the learning provider may be their head quarters rather than the site which the learner attended.

In the ethnic group figures, the "white" category includes those classified as White-Irish and White-Other, as well as White-British. The "non-white" category includes all other ethnic groups, including those whose ethnic group was unknown or not stated.

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk & quote REF: 3079AL

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Post 16 education and training data

Increase in the number of young people completing an apprenticeship

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2004	335	262	320
2005	347	380	440
2006	555	586	650

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area %	SN %	Nat %
2003/04	..	..	..
2004/05	3.6%	45.1%	37.6%
2005/06	59.9%	54.4%	47.7%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available



Data Definition: This indicator includes all learners up to the age of 24 (for consistency with national performance indicators). It shows the increase in the number of young people completing an apprenticeship.

[Source: Learning & Skills Council - http://www.lsc.gov.uk/providers/Data/statistics/learner/Apprenticeship_completions.htm

Health warning: The Local Authority is based on the home postcode of the learner, and only includes those learners who could be matched to an English local authority - 98-99% of the overall total. Figures are not shown where there are less than 10 completions in a local authority. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's statistical neighbours.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 5048DE]

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Inspections findings

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL - BEING
Inspection findings

Changes in Childcare providers and places (since April 2005 benchmark) – by types of provider

Rotherham

Number of settings and places in your local authority at 31 December 2006 and percentage change from 01 April 2005 by provider type

	Childminder	Full Day Care	Sessional Day Care	Out of School Day Care	Creche Day Care	TOTAL
Number of Childcare Settings	383	48	24	38	12	505
Joiners [1]	118	31	3	30	5	187
Leavers [2]	79	18	13	17	3	130
Net Change	39	13	-10	13	2	57
Percentage Change: Area	11.3%	37.1%	-29.4%	52.0%	20.0%	12.7%
Percentage Change: SN	-3.0%	15.3%	-7.8%	26.1%	6.9%	1.6%
Percentage Change: NAT	1.9%	13.8%	-9.8%	10.8%	12.1%	3.2%
Number of Registered Places [3]	1934	1800	533	1016	178	5461
Joiners	526	852	61	798	68	2306
Leavers	358	486	282	472	56	1654
Steady State [4]	38	-69	-16	-35	0	-82
Net Change [5]	207	298	-237	291	12	571
Percentage Change: Area	12.0%	19.8%	-30.8%	40.2%	7.2%	11.7%
Percentage Change: SN	-2.3%	15.9%	-7.9%	22.7%	14.0%	9.9%
Percentage Change: NAT	2.4%	15.2%	-9.2%	8.8%	11.6%	6.7%

[1] Joiners are childcare providers who have been newly registered; existing providers who have moved to a local authority from another local authority; and existing day care providers who have started to offer a new type of childcare provision.

[2] Leavers are childcare providers who have been deregistered due to cancellations or voluntary resignations; existing providers who have moved from a local authority to another; and existing multiple day care providers who have ceased to offer a particular type of childcare provision between 01 April 2005 and 31 December 2006.

[3] Registered Places are the maximum number of children that providers are registered to care for, not the number of places occupied, nor the number of children who may benefit from receiving places through providers offering sessions at different times of the day. The number of registered places is likely to be higher than the actual number of registered places as not all providers will immediately inform Ofsted that they have ceased their provision.

[4] 'Steady State' refers to changes in the number of places offered by existing providers.

[5] Net Change: numbers may not add up due to rounding.

Changes in Childcare providers and places (since April 2005 benchmark) – by types of provider

Early Years Definitions of Childcare Types

Childminder: A childminder is registered to look after one or more children under the age of eight to whom they are not related on domestic premises for reward and for a total of more than two hours in any day.

Full Day Care: Facilities that provide day care for children under eight for a continuous period of four hours or more in any day in premises which are not domestic premises. Examples are day nurseries and Children's centres, and some family centres.

Sessional Day Care: Facilities where children under eight attend day care for no more than five sessions a week, each session being less than a continuous period of four hours in any day. Where two sessions are offered in any one day, there is a break between sessions with no children in the care of the provider. This is intended to cover provision which offers children part-time care and the opportunity to engage in activities with their peer group, e.g. playgroups.

Out of School Care: Facilities that provide day care for children under eight which operate during one or more of the following periods: before school; after school; and during the school holidays. The total care provided is for more than two hours in any day and for more than five days a year. A main purpose of the provision is to look after children in the absence of their parents. This form of care can include children from three years old and children over eight may use it. Examples are summer camps, holiday play schemes, breakfast clubs, after school clubs. Open Access Schemes are included. These may be permanent of short term schemes and generally cater for older children, however, children aged five to seven may attend. The main purpose of the provision is to provide supervised play opportunities for children in a safe environment in the absence of their parents.

Crèches: Facilities that provide occasional care for children under eight and are provided on particular premises on more than five days a year. They need to be registered where they run for more than two hours a day, even when individual children attend for shorter periods. Some are in permanent premises and care for children while parents are engaged in particular activities, for example shopping or sport. Others are established on a temporary basis to care for children while their parents are involved in time-limited activities, for example a conference or exhibition.

Multiple Day Care Types: Some providers offer more than one type of day care, for example operating full day care and an out of school club. In this profile, these multiple day care types have been counted separately. In the other sections, they multiple day care types have been shown as single entities under their own category, to avoid double counting of inspections and actions issued.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Inspection Findings

How well do learners achieve? (Key Questions 1b and 1c)

Rotherham

Number of colleges inspected in Rotherham = 4

1b: The standard of learners' work in relation to their learning goals

	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
LA	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Nat	378	9	56	170	135	8	0	0

1c: Learners' progress relative to prior attainment and potential

	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
LA	4	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
Nat	379	11	50	154	150	14	0	0

Key		
	Grade 1	**Excellent**
	Grade 2	**Very good**
	Grade 3	**Good**
	Grade 4	**Satisfactory**
	Grade 5	**Unsatisfactory**
	Grade 6	**Poor**
	Grade 7	**Very poor**

Data definition

These judgements reflect the outcomes of the inspections undertaken between September 2001 and July 2005. This indicator records inspectors' judgements about how well learners achieve. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found here [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/docs/1037.pdf]. The figures represent the number of colleges inspected that received an excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, poor or very poor judgement. Please note figures may be blank where there were no colleges in the LA, or none were inspected during this period. If a college received a full re-inspection, the latest re-inspection judgements are shown.

[Source: ALI & Ofsted Post 16 Education & Training Inspection (2001-05 Common Inspection Framework)]

Health warning

Due to the small number of colleges inspected, care should be taken when drawing conclusions or making comparisons with the national figure. Not all colleges currently open will have been inspected during this framework and some may have closed since their inspection. The number of judgements may be less than the number of inspections if inspectors did not have sufficient evidence to record an outcome.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Inspection Findings

How well teaching and training meet individuals' needs and course or programme requirements (Key Question 2a)

Rotherham

Number of colleges inspected in Rotherham = 4

2a: How well teaching and training meet individuals' needs and course or programme requirements

	Total	Grade						
	No	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
LA	4	0	1	2	1	0	0	0
Nat	379	7	48	176	138	10	0	0

Key

Grade 1	**Excellent**
Grade 2	**Very good**
Grade 3	**Good**
Grade 4	**Satisfactory**
Grade 5	**Unsatisfactory**
Grade 6	**Poor**
Grade 7	**Very poor**

Data definition

These judgements reflect the outcomes of the inspections undertaken between September 2001 and July 2005. This indicator records inspectors' judgements about how well teaching and training meet individuals' needs and course or programme requirements. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found here [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/docs/1037.pdf]. The figures represent the number of colleges inspected that received an excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, poor or very poor judgement. Please note figures may be blank where there were no colleges in the LA, or none were inspected during this period. If a college received a full re-inspection, the latest re-inspection judgements are shown.

[Source: ALI & Ofsted Post 16 Education & Training Inspection (2001-05 Common Inspection Framework)]

Health warning

Due to the small number of colleges inspected, care should be taken when drawing conclusions or making comparisons with the national figure. Not all colleges currently open will have been inspected during this framework and some may have closed since their inspection. The number of judgements may be less than the number of inspections if inspectors did not have sufficient evidence to record an outcome.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Inspection Findings

How far programmes or the curriculum meet external requirements, and are responsive to local circumstances (Key Question 5B)

Rotherham

Number of colleges inspected in Rotherham = 4

5b: How far programmes or the curriculum meet external requirements, and are responsive to local circumstances

	Total	Grade						
	No	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
LA	4	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Nat	376	10	78	187	94	7	0	0

Key	
Grade 1	**Excellent**
Grade 2	**Very good**
Grade 3	**Good**
Grade 4	**Satisfactory**
Grade 5	**Unsatisfactory**
Grade 6	**Poor**
Grade 7	**Very poor**

Data definition
These judgements reflect the outcomes of the inspections undertaken between September 2001 and July 2005. This indicator records inspectors' judgements about how far programmes or the curriculum meet external requirements, and are responsive to local circumstances. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found here [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/docs/1037.pdf]. The figures represent the number of colleges inspected that received an excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, poor or very poor judgement. Please note figures may be blank where there were no colleges in the LA, or none were inspected during this period. If a college received a full re-inspection, the latest re-inspection judgements are shown.

[Source: ALI & Ofsted Post 16 Education & Training Inspection (2001-05 Common Inspection Framework)]

Health warning
Due to the small number of colleges inspected, care should be taken when drawing conclusions or making comparisons with the national figure. Not all colleges currently open will have been inspected during this framework and some may have closed since their inspection. The number of judgements may be less than the number of inspections if inspectors did not have sufficient evidence to record an outcome.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Inspection Findings

The access learners have to relevant, effective support on personal issues (Key Question 6c)

Rotherham

Number of colleges inspected in Rotherham = 4

6c: The access learners have to relevant, effective support on personal issues

	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
LA	4	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
Nat	375	24	95	213	43	0	0	0

Key

Grade 1	**Excellent**
Grade 2	**Very good**
Grade 3	**Good**
Grade 4	**Satisfactory**
Grade 5	**Unsatisfactory**
Grade 6	**Poor**
Grade 7	**Very poor**

Data definition

These judgements reflect the outcomes of the inspections undertaken between September 2001 and July 2005. This indicator records inspectors' judgements about the access learners have to relevant, effective support on personal issues. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found here [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/docs/1037.pdf]. The figures represent the number of colleges inspected that received an excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, poor or very poor judgement. Please note figures may be blank where there were no colleges in the LA, or none were inspected during this period. If a college received a full re-inspection, the latest re-inspection judgements are shown.

[Source: ALI & Ofsted Post 16 Education & Training Inspection (2001-05 Common Inspection Framework)]

Health warning

Due to the small number of colleges inspected, care should be taken when drawing conclusions or making comparisons with the national figure. Not all colleges currently open will have been inspected during this framework and some may have closed since their inspection. The number of judgements may be less than the number of inspections if inspectors did not have sufficient evidence to record an outcome.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Inspection Findings

The overall effectiveness and efficiency

Rotherham

Number of colleges inspected in Rotherham = 4

The overall effectiveness and efficiency of the college

	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
LA	4	0	2	0	1	1	0	0
Nat	368	18	54	138	137	17	4	0

Key

Grade 1	**Excellent**
Grade 2	**Very good**
Grade 3	**Good**
Grade 4	**Satisfactory**
Grade 5	**Unsatisfactory**
Grade 6	**Poor**
Grade 7	**Very poor**

Data definition

These judgements reflect the outcomes of the inspections undertaken between September 2001 and July 2005. This indicator records inspectors' judgements about the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the college. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found here [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/docs/1037.pdf]. The figures represent the number of colleges inspected that received an excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, poor or very poor judgement. Please note figures may be blank where there were no colleges in the LA, or none were inspected during this period. If a college received a full re-inspection, the latest re-inspection judgements are shown.

[Source: ALI & Ofsted Post 16 Education & Training Inspection (2001-05 Common Inspection Framework)]

Health warning

Due to the small number of colleges inspected, care should be taken when drawing conclusions or making comparisons with the national figure. Not all colleges currently open will have been inspected during this framework and some may have closed since their inspection. The number of judgements may be less than the number of inspections if inspectors did not have sufficient evidence to record an outcome.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Inspection Findings

Adequacy of provison/Serious weaknesses in provision

Rotherham

Number of colleges inspected in Rotherham = 4

Adequacy judgement:

The inspection team is agreed that this college makes provision that is **not adequate** to meet the reasonable needs of those receiving it

	Total No	Judgement Yes	Judgement No
LA	4	0	4
Nat	386	22	364

Serious weaknesses judgement:

Provision in one or more areas which is **less than** satisfactory

	Total No	Judgement Yes	Judgement No
LA	4	0	4
Nat	386	96	290

Data definition

These judgements reflect the outcomes of the inspections undertaken between September 2001 and July 2005. This indicator records inspectors' judgements about the adequacy and serious weaknesses of provision. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found here [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/docs/1037.pdf]. The figures represent the number of colleges inspected that received a 'yes' or 'no' judgement. Please note figures may be blank where there were no colleges in the LA, or none were inspected during this period. If a college received a full re-inspection, the latest re-inspection judgements are shown.

Serious weaknesses judgement:

If the judgement is **'yes'**, the inspection team is agreed that althoughit makes adequate provision overall, this college has provision in one or more areas (overall curriculum area and/or WBL) that is less than satisfactory.

[Source: ALI & Ofsted Post 16 Education & Training Inspection (2001-05 Common Inspection Framework)]

Health warning

Due to the small number of colleges inspected, care should be taken when drawing conclusions or making comparisons with the national figure. Not all colleges currently open will have been inspected during this framework and some may have closed since their inspection. The number of judgements may be less than the number of inspections if inspectors did not have sufficient evidence to record an outcome.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Inspection Findings

Leadership and Management

Rotherham

Number of colleges inspected in Rotherham = 4

The leadership and management of the college

	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	5
LA	4	0	1	3	0	0
Nat	386	43	156	158	26	3

Key

Grade 1	**Outstanding**
Grade 2	**Good**
Grade 3	**Satisfactory**
Grade 4	**Unsatisfactory**
Grade 5	**Very weak**

Data definition
These judgements reflect the outcomes of the inspections undertaken between September 2001 and July 2005. This indicator records inspectors' judgements about the leadership and management of the college. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found here [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/docs/1037.pdf]. The figures represent the number of colleges inspected that received an outstanding, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory or very weak judgement. Please note figures may be blank where there were no colleges in the LA, or none were inspected during this period. If a college received a full re-inspection, the latest re-inspection judgements are shown.

[Source: ALI & Ofsted Post 16 Education & Training Inspection (2001-05 Common Inspection Framework)]

Health warning
Due to the small number of colleges inspected, care should be taken when drawing conclusions or making comparisons with the national figure. Not all colleges currently open will have been inspected during this framework and some may have closed since their inspection. The number of judgements may be less than the number of inspections if inspectors did not have sufficient evidence to record an outcome.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL - BEING

Inspection findings

Section 5 school inspection judgements: effectiveness, quality and achievement (16-19 education in secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Secondary 16 - 19					Special 16 - 19					Total no.of LA maintnd. schls*	
		Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Sec	Spec
1A How effective, efficient and inclusive is the provision of education, integrated care and any extended services in meeting the needs of learners?													
LA	no	7	0	4	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	16	7
SN	no	28	8	6	14	0	12	3	6	3	0	152	49
LA	%		0	57	43	0							
SN	%		29	21	50	0							
2A How well do learners achieve?													
LA	no	7	0	4	3	0	2	1	1	0	0		
SN	no	28	5	8	15	0	12	3	6	3	0		
LA	%		0	57	43	0							
SN	%		18	29	54	0							

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about provision of education to 16 to 19 year olds. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL - BEING

Inspection findings

Section 5 inspection judgements: quality of provision and leadership and management (16-19 education in secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Secondary 16 - 19 Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Special 16 - 19 Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total no.of LA maintnd. schls* Sec	Spec
4A How effective are teaching and learning in meeting the full range of learners' needs?													
LA	no	7	0	3	4	0	2	1	0	1	0	16	7
SN	no	28	5	10	13	0	12	2	7	3	0	152	49
LA	%		0	43	57	0							
SN	%		18	36	46	0							
4B How well do the curriculum and other activities meet the range of needs and interests of learners?													
LA	no	7	1	5	1	0	2	1	0	1	0		
SN	no	28	8	12	8	0	12	3	7	2	0		
LA	%		14	71	14	0							
SN	%		29	43	29	0							
4C How well are learners cared for, guided and supported?													
LA	no	7	0	6	1	0	2	1	1	0	0		
SN	no	28	9	16	3	0	12	6	6	0	0		
LA	%		0	86	14	0							
SN	%		32	57	11	0							

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about quality of provision and leadership and management. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve. Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL - BEING

Inspection findings

Section 5 inspection judgements: quality of provision and leadership and management (16-19 education in secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Secondary 16 - 19					Special 16 - 19					Total no.of LA maintnd. schls*	
		Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Total No	Grade 1	2	3	4	Sec	Spec
5A How effective are leadership and management in raising achievement and supporting all learners?													
LA	no	7	0	5	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	16	7
SN	no	28	8	9	11	0	12	4	6	2	0	152	49
LA	%		0	71	29	0							
SN	%		29	32	39	0							
5D How well equality of opportunity is promoted and discrimination tackled so that all learners achieve as well as they can													
LA	no	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
SN	no	2	1	1	0	0	5	2	2	1	0		
LA	%		0	100	0	0							
SN	%		50	50	0	0							

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about quality of provision and leadership and management. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspection. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 8th June 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve. Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL - BEING

Inspection findings

Section 5 school inspection judgements: The extent to which schools enable learners to achieve economic well-being (primary, secondary and special schools)

Rotherham

S5 judgement		Primary					Secondary					Special					Total number of LA maintained schools*		
		Total	Grade				Total	Grade				Total	Grade						
		No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	No	1	2	3	4	Pri	Sec	Spec
3I	How well learners develop workplace and other skills that will contribute to their future economic well-being																		
LA	no	68	13	25	30	0	13	1	7	4	1	4	1	2	1	0	104	16	7
SN	no	447	75	210	150	12	112	11	49	48	4	32	9	15	7	1	767	152	49
LA	%		19	37	44	0		8	54	31	8								
SN	%		17	47	34	3		10	44	43	4								

* Excludes 'open but due to close' schools

Data definition: This indicator records inspectors' judgements about schools enabling learners to achieve economic well-being. A full description of how these judgements are made by inspectors can be found in the relevant handbooks for school inspections. The figures represent the number of inspected schools that received outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate judgements. The percentages shown are the proportion of schools inspected who received each grade. Data includes Section 8 inspections deemed Section 5 inspections. Total number of LA maintained schools are from January 2006 and taken from the DCSF's school numbers Statistical First Release. They are provided for information only.

[Source: Ofsted - Section 5 Inspection data]

Health warning: Care should be taken in interpreting this data as it is based on a sample of schools and so may not be representative of all schools in the local authority. This data reflects the outcomes of Section 5 inspections undertaken between September 2005 and the 13th July 2007, when the latest data was received.
As data may take up to two months to be confirmed, some data from this period may still be in moderation or incomplete, which could alter the final distribution of judgements. This is more likely to be from inspections awaiting confirmation of special measures or notice to improve.
Due to the small number of special schools in most LAs it is not possible to make robust comparisons between the LA and SN figures. Therefore the percentage figures for special schools are not represented as part of this analysis. The judgements and grading scales in the Section 5 inspection framework cannot be mapped exactly to those made under previous frameworks, and no attempt should be made to do this.

Grade 1=Outstanding Grade 2=Good Grade 3=Satisfactory Grade 4=Inadequate

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Employment and NEET data

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Employment and NEET data

department for children, schools and families

Indicator: Connexions Partnership data: Number and proportion of 16-19 year olds not in education, employment or training (NEET).

Rotherham

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator.

Age	Year	Area No. Adjusted EET	Area No. Adjusted NEET	Area %	SN %	Nat %
16-18	04-05	25,639	2,760	9.7%	10.1%	8.0%
	05-06	26,135	2,880	9.9%	10.5%	8.2%
	06-07	27,565	3,351	10.8%	9.9%	7.7%
19	04-05	..	..	..	9.8%	8.3%
	05-06	9,578	915	8.7%	9.2%	8.1%
	06-07	9,590	984	9.3%	9.3%	8.2%

.. = Data not available

Data Definition: Young people can only be counted in the NEET group once they have completed compulsory education. Data is taken from the Partnership's submissions of November to January for each year. The numerator is the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET), and the denominator is the number of young people who are NEET + number of young people who are EET. The figures for this indicator are average figures taken from November to January of each year. The data is for a single local authority and not the whole Partnership area.

[Source: Connexions Customer Information System - CCIS, supplied to Ofsted by DCSF]

Health warning: Young people undertaking personal development opportunities are counted as NEET for the purposes of this indicator. All NEET and EET figures are adjusted by the DCSF to allow for young people whose current activity is not known. This assumes that: -

8% of young people who are previously in employment education or training, but who have lost contact with the service, are NEET, and;

58% of young people who were previously NEET, but who have lost contact with the service, are NEET.

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk. Please quote ref 5041DE.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Employment and NEET data

department for
children, schools and families

Indicator: Increase in participation rates of 17 year olds in education and training

Rotherham

	Year	Area %	Nat %
Maintained schools	2003	17.0%	22.0%
Independent schools	2003	..	6.0%
Sixth form college	2003	12.0%	8.0%
Other FE	2003	20.0%	23.0%
Total FT Education	2003	49.0%	59.0%
Work Based Learning	2003	10.0%	9.0%
Part-time education	2003	7.0%	6.0%
Total Education and WBL	2003	66.0%	74.0%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator.

	Year	Area %	Nat %
Maintained schools	2004	20.0%	23.0%
Independent schools	2004	..	6.0%
Sixth form college	2004	11.0%	8.0%
Other FE	2004	19.0%	23.0%
Total FT Education	2004	50.0%	60.0%
Work Based Learning	2004	11.0%	9.0%
Part-time education	2004	8.0%	5.0%
Total Education and WBL	2004	69.0%	74.0%

	Year	Area %	Nat %
Maintained schools	2005	18.0%	23.0%
Independent schools	2005	..	6.0%
Sixth form college	2005	13.0%	9.0%
Other FE	2005	21.0%	25.0%
Total FT Education	2005	52.0%	63.0%
Work Based Learning	2005	11.0%	8.0%
Part-time education	2005	5.0%	5.0%
Total Education and WBL	2005	68.0%	76.0%

.. = Data not available

Data Definition: This indicator shows the % participating in each type of education and training. Training only covers Work Based Learning (training funded by the government). It does not include other forms of training that are privately or employer funded, as robust information is not available at LA level.

[Source: DCSF: Participation rates Statistical First Release]

Health warning: The local participation estimates for end 2005 academic year is the latest published information available. Local estimates lag a year behind national estimates as the LSC's Individual Learner Record (ILR) data is not sufficiently complete at that stage to produce reliable local authority figures. The figures include only those young people in full time education and work based learning, and those in other forms of education and training (employer funded training, private training organisations, etc) are excluded. This indicator measures those that had their 17th birthday within the academic years highlighted above. Figures for the 14 individual Inner London LAs cannot be estimated reliably so data is not shown. Figures will not match Connexions data shown in this dataset.

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk. Please quote ref 5047DE.

department for
children, schools and families

Connexions Partnership data: Proportion of 16-19 year olds whose current activity is not known

Rotherham

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator.

Age	Year	Area No.	Cohort Average	Area %	SN %	Nat %
16-18	04-05	..	..	..	4.6%	8.4%
	05-06	1,035	9,200	11.3%	6.0%	6.6%
	06-07	863	9,462	9.1%	6.8%	6.9%
19	04-05	..	..	..	15.3%	32.3%
	05-06	1,556	3,615	43.0%	22.1%	23.3%
	06-07	1,406	3,524	39.9%	20.9%	23.7%

.. = Data not available

Data Definition: The numerator is the number whose activity is not known, and the denominator is the total cohort recorded on Connexions Customer Information System (CCIS). Young people who have lost touch with services, or whose records are not up to date, are recorded as "activity not known". A low % will give assurance that tracking requirements are being followed. The data is for a single local authority and not the whole Partnership area.

[Source: Connexions Customer Information System - CCIS, supplied to Ofsted by DCSF]

Health warning: The period that the data measures is taken as the average between April and March for each year excluding July to September: these 3 months are excluded because a significant proportion of young people will be in transition between activities.

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk. Please quote ref 5042DE.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Employment and NEET data

department for children, schools and families

Indicator: Connexions Partnership data: 16-19 year olds joining the NEET Group

Rotherham

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator.

Age	Year	Area No. Joiners	Average NEET Unadjusted	Area %	SN %	Nat %
16-18	04-05	..	..	..	275.5%	288.6%
	05-06	1,918	732	261.9%	264.6%	289.8%
	06-07	1,194	874	136.7%	132.5%	131.5%
19	04-05	..	..	..	144.4%	183.5%
	05-06	161	88	183.2%	136.5%	173.7%
	06-07	288	129	224.1%	140.5%	185.8%

.. = *Data not available*

Data Definition: Young people are classed as being in this age group once they have completed compulsory education. Data is a cumulative total of young people who joined the NEET group in the financial years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-2007. The % calculation divides the cumulative number of young people joining NEETs by the average number of 16-18 year old NEET. The denominator uses the unadjusted NEET figure. A high % figure indicates a lot of movement into and out of this NEET group. The data is for a single local authority and not the whole Partnership area.

[Source: Connexions Customer Information System - CCIS, supplied to Ofsted by DCSF]

Health warning: The way the data is counted changed in April 2006. The figure will be lower than in previous years as Connexions no longer count very short duration NEET. Destination is compared with previous month and only where different does an instance of joining/leaving NEET occur. This will exclude those who are in employment for one month, and who leave that job and find another within the next reporting period.

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk. Please quote ref 5043DE.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Employment and NEET data

department for children, schools and families

Indicator: Connexions Partnership data: 16-19 year olds leaving the NEET group to re-engage in employment, education or training

Rotherham

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator.

Age	Year	Area No. EET	Average NEET Unadjusted	Area %	SN %	Nat %
16-18	04-05	..	..	..	162.4%	153.7%
	05-06	1,143	732	156.1%	147.6%	153.7%
	06-07	1,060	874	121.3%	113.0%	120.2%
19	04-05	..	..	..	88.3%	74.5%
	05-06	74	88	84.2%	63.6%	74.6%
	06-07	32	129	24.9%	18.0%	15.2%

.. = *Data not available*

Data Definition: Young people are classed as being in this age group once they have completed compulsory education. Data is a cumulative total of young people who left the NEET group in the financial years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 to re-engage in education, employment or training. The calculation divides the cumulative number of young people leaving the NEET group to become EET by the average number of 16-18 year old NEETs. A high % figure indicates a lot of movement into and out of the NEET group. Data is for a single local authority, and not the whole Partnership area. As young people could enter and leave the NEET group during the year, the percentage figure could be over 100%.

[Source: Connexions Customer Information System - CCIS, supplied to Ofsted by DCSF]

Health warning: This indicator uses the unadjusted NEET figure. The way the data is counted changed in April 2006. This figure will be lower than in previous years as it no longer counts very short duration NEET. Destination is compared with previous month and only where different does an instance of joining/leaving NEET occur. This will exclude those who are in employment one month, leave that job and find another within the next reporting period.

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk. Please quote ref 5044DE.

Indicator: Connexions Partnership data: Young people at particular risk of becoming NEET

Rotherham

16-19 teenage mothers who are in education, employment or training (EET).

Year	Area No.	Recorded on CCIS	Area %	SN %	Nat %
04-05	..	..	..	6.0%	20.3%
05-06	22	198	11.1%	22.3%	25.5%
06-07	63	289	21.8%	26.0%	30.3%

16-19 NEET with Learning Disabilities & Difficulties

Year	Area No. Adjusted EET	Area No. Adjusted NEET	Area %	SN %	Nat %
04-05	..	..	..	7.7%	15.0%
05-06	632	140	18.1%	19.4%	15.7%
06-07	1,083	223	17.1%	19.5%	15.1%

16-18 NEET by ethnic group category

Where the % NEET is above SN, it will be highlighted in red.

	Year	Area No. Adjusted NEET	Area No. Adjusted EET	Area NEET %	SN NEET%	Nat NEET %
White	05-06	1,202	10,618	10.2%	10.7%	8.5%
White and Black Caribbean	05-06	#	13		15.1%	17.1%
White and Black African	05-06	#	4		7.5%	10.7%
White and Asian	05-06	#	25		9.3%	7.4%
Other Mixed Background	05-06	#	15		7.1%	11.0%
Black Caribbean	05-06	#	7		7.2%	13.2%
Black African	05-06	#	26		2.9%	7.4%
Other Black Background	05-06	#	7		7.1%	11.4%
Indian	05-06	..	14		4.6%	3.9%
Pakistani	05-06	48	436	9.9%	5.3%	8.3%
Bangladeshi	05-06	..	2		15.3%	9.4%
Other Asian Background	05-06	#	20		10.7%	8.3%
Chinese	05-06	..	15		2.0%	2.1%
Other	05-06	#	20		10.7%	8.3%
No Ethnicity Information	05-06	112	1,229	8.4%	15.2%	5.9%
Total	05-06	1,383	12,451	10.0%	10.4%	8.2%

	Year	Area No. Adjusted NEET	Area No. Adjusted EET	Area NEET %	SN NEET%	Nat NEET %
White	06-07	1,312	10,947	10.7%	10.4%	8.1%
White and Black Caribbean	06-07	#	13		10.9%	14.5%
White and Black African	06-07	..	7		7.2%	8.6%
White and Asian	06-07	#	28		7.0%	6.6%
Other Mixed Background	06-07	..	19		9.7%	10.0%
Black Caribbean	06-07	..	6		14.1%	10.7%
Black African	06-07	#	27		3.0%	5.7%
Other Black Background	06-07	#	5		10.4%	9.3%
Indian	06-07	..	24		2.8%	3.1%
Pakistani	06-07	49	429	10.3%	6.1%	7.8%
Bangladeshi	06-07	..	3		16.7%	8.3%
Other Asian Background	06-07	#	21		7.5%	4.7%
Chinese	06-07	..	13		0.5%	1.7%
Other	06-07	65	721	8.3%	8.0%	6.2%
No Ethnicity Information	06-07	#	127		9.8%	5.2%
Total	06-07	1,436	12,390	10.4%	10.0%	7.7%

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Employment and NEET data

department for
children, schools and families

Indicator: Connexions Partnership data: Young people at particular risk of becoming NEET

Rotherham

.. = *Data not available*

= *Less than 10*

Data Definition: For the 16-19 teenage mothers calculation, the numerator is the number of 16-19 year old mothers in employment, education or training, and the denominator is the number of 16-19 year old mothers recorded on CCIS. However, for the LDD calculation, the numerator is the number of 16-19 year olds with learning disabilities or difficulties (LDD) who are NEET, and the denominator is the number of 16-19 year olds with LDD NEET + EET. Similarly, on the ethnic group calculation, the numerator is the number of 16-18 year olds who are NEET and the denominator is the number of 16-18 year olds EET + NEET. The data for each year is taken as of December. Data is for a single local authority, and not the whole partnership area. Data is suppressed where there are less than 10 NEETs in the LA in a particular ethnic group.

[Source: Connexions Customer Information System - CCIS, supplied to Ofsted by DCSF]

Health warning: For the LDD and ethnic indicators the NEET and EET figures are adjusted by the DCSF to allow for young people whose current activity is not known. This assumes that:

8% of young people who are previously in employment, education, or training, but who have lost contact with the service, are NEET, and;

58% of young people who were previously NEET, but who have lost contact with the service, are NEET.

The total for 2006 omits the number that refused to give their ethnicity as this figure was not available for preceding years.

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk. Please quote ref 5045DE.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Employment and NEET data

department for children, schools and families

Indicator: Connexions Partnership data: Proportion of young people completing year 11 who continue in learning

Rotherham

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator.

Year	Area No. of those continuing in learning	Number completing Year 11	Area %	SN %	Nat %
04-05	3,126	3,772	82.9%	82.6%	84.9%
05-06	3,086	3,706	83.3%	84.0%	85.9%
06-07	3,263	3,874	84.2%	84.7%	87.2%

.. = Data not available

Data Definition: This indicator is calculated by dividing the numerator of the number of year 11 completers continuing in learning and dividing it by the denominator which is the number of year 11 completers.

[Source: Connexions Customer Information System - CCIS, supplied to Ofsted by DCSF]

Health warning:

Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk. Please quote ref 5046DE.

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Housing data

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Housing data

Length of stay in bed & breakfast and Length of stay in hostels (BVPI 183a &183b)

Rotherham

	Area	Statistical Neighbours	England Upper Quartile	England Median	England Lower Quartile
2003-04					
Length of stay in bed & breakfast	0.7	3.5	1.2	5.0	9.1
Length of stay in hostels	0.0	4.9	0.0	9.0	21.3
2004-05					
Length of stay in bed & breakfast	0.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	5.0
Length of stay in hostels	0.0	4.0	0.0	8.0	18.0
2005-06					
Length of stay in bed & breakfast	0.3	2.1	1.0	3.0	4.3
Length of stay in hostels	0.0	0.1	0.0	6.7	17.0

(weeks)
* = Doubts expressed about the reliability of the council's arrangements for producing the data
# = Not provided
N/A = Not applicable or null accepted

Data definition

BVPI 183
The average length of stay in (i) bed and breakfast accommodation and (ii) hostel accommodation of households which include dependent children or a pregnant woman and which are unintentionally homeless and in priority need.
This indicator should only include households that fulfil both of the following criteria:
1. Households that include dependent children or a pregnant woman for whom a local housing authority duty under s.193 of the Housing Act 1996 has come to an end at some point during 2003/2004.[16a]
And
2. Households that have spent some time in (i) bed and breakfast or (ii) hostel accommodation arranged by a local housing authority at any point pursuant to the homelessness application that gave rise to the s. 193 duty referred to above.
Note this means that some households may need to be included even though they have not spent anytime in ether (i) bed and breakfast or (ii) hostel accommodation during 2003/2004.
Bed and breakfast accommodation should be the total of Bed and breakfast hotels; Other nightly paid/privately managed accommodation; shared facilities (meals provided) and Other nightly paid/privately managed accommodation: shared facilities (but no meal(s) provided) as defined on the P1E forms from April 2002 onwards.
Hostel accommodation should be classified using the definitions for Hostels (including reception centres and emergency units) on the P1E forms from April 2002 onwards.
Length of stay should be cumulative amount of time spent by the household in (i) bed and breakfast or(ii) hostel accommodation as a discharge of homelessness duties arising from one homelessness application.
Note that this includes any periods that may have been separated by stays in other forms of temporary accommodation.
Measurement should commence on the date when the household first entered this form of accommodation(eg, to discharge the s.188 duty). Note that this will not necessarily be the date on which the authority decided that the s.193 duty was owed (it may be before or after). As the indicator relates to the cumulative period spent by the household in(i) bed and breakfast and (ii) hostel accommodation it should include any relevant time before the start of the financial year 2003/2004.
Time spent by a homeless household in self contained accommodation (where the household does not share any washing, cooking or bathing facilities etc) should not be included in the calculation of the average.
In referral cases, where the notified local authority accepts the s. 193 duty, for the purpose of this BVPI that authority need not count the time spent by the household in question in accommodation provided by the notifying local authority.
Average should be calculated as the mean length of stay and should have one figure in whole weeks.
The figures should be calculated and presented separately for (i) bed and breakfast stays and (ii) hostel stays.
Note: All authorities should measure this BVPI.
Target setting: Local. In setting local targets, best value authorities should have regard to the Bed and Breakfast Units target that by March 2004 no homeless family with children should have to live in a B&B hotel except in an emergency, and even then for no more than 6 weeks.
Scope: Metropolitan Authorities, London Boroughs, Unitary Authorities, District Councils, Council of the Isles of Scilly, Common Council of the City of London.

[**Source:** Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) 183a and 183b]

Health warning: SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

[Data contact: r-james@audit-commission.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 5019AC & 5020AC]

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Household circumstances data

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Household circumstances data

The proportion of children, aged 0-4 and 5-14, living in households where no-one is working

DWP Department for Work and Pensions

Rotherham

% Dependent on Workless Benefits

Age	Year	LA	SN	NAT
Aged 0 to 4	2003	25.1%	25.1%	20.6%
	2004	25.5%	26.8%	22.0%
	2005	24.5%	25.9%	21.4%
Aged 5 to 14	2003	22.3%	22.2%	19.5%
	2004	22.7%	23.0%	20.2%
	2005	21.7%	22.3%	19.7%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available





Area □ SN ◇ NAT △

Data Definition:

These are the % of children dependent on 'Workless' Benefits; i.e. Income Support, Jobseekers Allowance, Severe Disablement Allowance and Incapacity Benefit. The LA % figure is the total number of children aged 0-4 or 5-14 living in households where no one is working, divided by the total cohort of children aged 0-4 or 5-14. The National figure is calculated the same way, but by using totals for all local authorities. Statistical neighbours figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors (Ofsted statistical neighbours have been used). They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's SNs.

[**Source:** DWP Information Directorate]

Health warning:

Due to the introduction of child tax credits in 2003 there was concern that the numbers of children being recorded on the system was deficient. In 2005 a different methodology was adopted for creating data for the surestart programme. This involved using Child Benefit data scans to match to claimants data. This methodology was then used to rework the 2004 data.

The total cohort of children aged 0-4 & 5-14 is taken from the 2001 census. The actual numbers of children for 2003, 04 & 05 may differ.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 5021DW]

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Looked after children and care leavers data

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

5022SC - PAF CF/A4: The ratio of the percentage of those young people who were looked after on 1 April in their 17th year (aged 16), who were engaged in education, training or employment at the age of 19 to the percentage of all young people in the population who were engaged in education, training or employment at the age of 19 (BVPI 161)

Rotherham

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	0.62	0.65	0.82
SN	0.67	0.69	0.80
Eng	0.70	0.76	0.76

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low				High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●
2004-07	0<0.4	0.4<0.5	0.5<0.6	.	0.6+

Data definition

Numerator

The number of young people who were looked after who were in contact within the period 3 months before to 1 month after their 19th birthday and were engaged in education, training or employment, whether full time or part time as a percentage of all young people who were looked after whose 19th birthday is defined as follows (each young person is counted only once even if they ceased to be looked after more than once):
The number of young people whose 19th birthday falls in the year ending 31 March of the reporting year 't', who were:
a. looked after on 1 April year 't-2' at the age of 16 and who ceased to be looked after before their 19th birthday; or
b. who were looked after and turned 17 on the 1 April year 't-2' and who ceased to be looked after before their 19th birthday
Young people who had been looked after on 1 April of year 't-2' under an agreed series of short term placements are excluded.
[Source - SSDA903]
For 2006-07, data is on young people looked after on 1 April 2004.
The responsibility for obtaining, recording and returning this information rests with the council that had looked after the young person

Denominator

The percentage of young people in the population aged 18-24 at the time they are surveyed for the Labour Force Survey who were education, training or employment divided by all those young people aged 18-24 surveyed.
[Source - Labour Force Survey (ONS)]

Measuring unit

Ratio to two decimal places [NB ratio may be a value greater than 1]

Continued on following page

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

5022SC - PAF CF/A4: The ratio of the percentage of those young people who were looked after on 1 April in their 17th year (aged 16), who were engaged in education, training or employment at the age of 19 to the percentage of all young people in the population who were engaged in education, training or employment at the age of 19 (BVPI 161)

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

Research shows that care leavers experience high levels of unemployment and are at risk of homelessness and social exclusion. This indicator shows the performance of local authorities in improving outcomes for young people leaving their care, so that they are enabled to achieve, to make a positive contribution and to be offered the opportunity to secure their future economic well being.

Using the new definition of this indicator, introduced in 2004-05 – which applies a denominator of the percentage of local young people in education, employment and training to the percentage of care leavers in education, employment and training, to produce a ratio of one to the other - an outturn ratio of 0.92, for example, shows that the level of care leavers in education, employment and training is at 92% of the level of young people in education, employment and training in the local population.

Data for the percentage of all young people in employment, training or education were derived from the Labour Force Survey. Since these figures are from a survey and relate to the population aged 18-24 rather than at age 19 they are subject to a margin of error. More importantly, the denominator covers a wider age-range than the numerator because the LFS is a national sample survey and limiting results to those aged 19 at council level could produce unreliable results. Ideally the LFS would have sufficient coverage to provide an estimate for 19 year olds at a local level so that the comparison with data on formerly looked after children at age 19 could be as precise as possible. Sample error, however, would be too great for this and hence the 18-24 year old cohort is used. Data on the regional and national variation in the percentage of 19 year olds in employment, education and training in 2003 suggests that the difference between single years of age is not marked.

Numbers of young people in the numerator may be small in some smaller councils and the measure therefore subject to large swings from year to year. Nearly one council in three had fewer than 20 care leavers in the numerator for 2005-06. Small changes in the 19 year-old cohort can have large consequences for the end result.

To be counted as 'in touch' for the purposes of this item, there should be "contact" between the council and the young person sometime within the timeframe of 3 months before and one month after the young person's 19th birthday. Consideration might be given the nature of that contact and the extent to which it is meaningful or perfunctory. Account should also be taken of the reluctance of the young people to be 'in touch'; this can have a very strong influence on this indicator.

Consideration needs to be given to the type, duration and quality of the education, employment or training that it being received by the care leavers, as well as the extent to which it will assist the young people in later life.

Although there are links with this indicator to the education and offending history of the relevant young people, the most direct connections can be made with the indicators cover pathway plans and personal advisers (2038SC) and the suitability of care leavers accommodation (5037SC). High scores on all three would indicate the possibility of good outcomes for the young people; low scores would indicate the reverse. Any significant variations between these indicators should prompt further questions about the data, and the practice that lies behind it.

Related measures

2038SC % of eligible, relevant and former relevant children that have pathway plans, have been allocated a personal adviser and are resident outside the council's boundaries - see p.82

3071SC The % of children looked after who were pupils in year 11 who were eligible for GCSE (or equivalent) examinations who sat at least one GCSE or equivalent exam - see p.163

3072SC PAF CF/A2: Educational qualifications of children looked after [joint working] (BVPI 50) - see p.165

3073SC The % of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or GNVQ equivalent - see p.167

3074SC PAF CF/C24: Children looked after absent from school [joint working] - see p.169

4015SC PAF CF/C18: Final warnings/reprimands and convictions of children looked after - see p.194

4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196

5037SC % of care leavers at age 19 who are living in suitable accommodation (as judged by the council) - see p.241

ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELL-BEING
Looked after children and care leavers data

department for children, schools and families

5037SC - Percentage of care leavers at age 19 who are living in suitable accommodation (as judged by the council)

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	100.0	80.8	56.5	75.8	78.6	83.3
SN	60.2	76.2	80.7	86.1	84.7	89.7
Eng	69.4	74.5	79.6	83.9	87.9	87.3

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Of the young people in the denominator, the number whose accommodation was deemed to be 'suitable'.
[Source - SSDA903]

Denominator

The number of young people whose 19th birthday falls in the year ending 31 March of the reporting year 't', who were:
a. looked after on 1 April year 't-2' at the age of 16 and who ceased to be looked after before their 19th birthday; or
b. who were looked after and turned 17 on the 1 April year 't-2' and who ceased to be looked after before their 19th birthday
Young people who had been looked after on 1 April of year 't-2' under an agreed series of short term placements are excluded.
[Source - SSDA903]

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

If the council does not know what has happened to the young person, the person should be included in the denominator but not in the numerator of this component of the indicator.

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator measures suitability of accommodation as a proxy for the effectiveness of care leaving services.

To be counted as 'in touch' for the purposes of this item, there should be "contact" between the council and the young person sometime within the timeframe of 3 months before and one month after the young person's 19th birthday. Consideration might be given the nature of that contact and the extent to which it is meaningful or perfunctory.

There are no hard and fast rules on whether accommodation is deemed 'suitable'; the decision will depend on the circumstances of the individual case, and councils have to use their judgment. The classification set out in the 903 Frequently Asked Questions is intended to give an indication of the kinds of accommodation that would generally be considered 'suitable' or 'unsuitable'.

Accommodation is to be regarded as suitable if it provides safe, secure and affordable provision for young people. It would generally include short-term accommodation designed to move young people on to stable long-term accommodation, but would exclude emergency accommodation used in a crisis. Accommodation that clearly exposes the person to risk of harm or social exclusion by reason of its location or other factors should be coded as 'unsuitable'. Accommodation that is 'Emergency accommodation' (e.g. night shelter, direct access, emergency hostel), 'Bed and breakfast' or 'In custody' (categories V, W, and X) should usually be considered 'unsuitable'.
The suitability of the accommodation, though, is a subjective judgement and consideration should be given to the council's evidence supporting such judgement.

Related measures

2038SC % of eligible, relevant and former relevant children that have pathway plans, have been allocated a personal adviser and are resident outside the council's boundaries - see p.82
5022SC PAF CF/A4 Employment, education and training for care leavers [joint working] (BVPI 161) - see p.239

SERVICE MANAGEMENT

Social care

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6003SC - KIGS BU07: Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget per capita

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	216	231	259	278	311	327	359
SN	199	212	236	265	297	319	340
Eng	208	223	254	282	311	334	352

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator
Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget
[Source - RA form first table sum of lines 20-18 inclusive, column 1]

Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]

Measuring unit
£ per head

Guidance/interpretation

If an area's budget for children's services varies significantly from its comparator group reasons for this need to be explored. Significantly higher budgets suggests a strong commitment to children's services, but need to explore value for money and partners' contributions.

There may be patterns of local expenditure on children's services, especially in relation to pooled budgets with partner agencies under the children's trust arrangements, relevant to this indicator.

Related measures

6005SC KIGS BU01: PSS budget for children and families per population aged under 18 - see p.245
6006SC KIGS EX61: Gross expenditure on services to children per capita aged under 18 - see p.246
6009SC KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18 - see p.247
6010SC PAF CF/E44: Relative spend on family support - see p.248
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251
6045SC KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18 - see p.261

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote ref: 6003SC]

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6004SC - KIGS EX12: Percentage of (PSS) actual expenditure on provision for children and families

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	20.7	20.9	20.3	21.8	22.2	21.1	21.2
SN	22.3	22.8	23.1	24.7	25.7	25.7	25.5
Eng	22.3	22.9	23.0	24.6	25.2	25.3	25.7

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
Total gross expenditure on children and families services (excluding supporting people).
[Source - PSS EX1 Incl SSMSS sheet line B1 column S]
Denominator
Total gross expenditure on personal social services (excluding supporting people).
[Source - PSS EX1 Incl SSMSS sheet line I1 column S]
Measuring unit
Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

The percentage in this measure should reflect differences in deprivation between councils.
There may be patterns of local expenditure on children's services, especially in relation to pooled budgets with partner agencies under the children's trust arrangements, that may impact on this indicator.

Related measures
6003SC KIGS BU07: Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget per capita - see p.243
6005SC KIGS BU01: PSS budget for children and families per population aged under 18 - see p.245
6006SC KIGS EX61: Gross expenditure on services to children per capita aged under 18 - see p.246
6009SC KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18 - see p.247
6010SC PAF CF/E44: Relative spend on family support - see p.248
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251
6045SC KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18 - see p.261

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6005SC - KIGS BU01: PSS budget for children and families per population aged under 18

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	213	234	265	294	329	362	392
SN	214	238	265	308	350	394	439
Eng	244	258	291	336	380	420	448

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
PSS budget for children and families.
[Source - RA form first table line 21 column 1]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area.
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
£ per head

Guidance/interpretation
This measure provides some indication of councils' intended financial commitment to children's social care services. It will not identify overspends in the year - see 6006SC KIGS EX61 for outturn data. It will reflect the differences in costs incurred in different parts of England. It will also reflect differences in deprivation.

There may be patterns of local expenditure on children's services, especially in relation to pooled budgets with partner agencies under the children's trust arrangements, that may impact on this indicator.
A trend of rising budgets may reflect work on realigning budgets to ensure they reflect actual spend and/or priorities. Alternatively this could indicate weak budgetary control. Significant budget reductions are likely to impact on service delivery and will need further exploration.

Related measures
6003SC KIGS BU07: Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget per capita - see p.243
6004SC KIGS EX12: % of Personal Social Services (PSS) actual expenditure on provision for children and families - see p.244
6006SC KIGS EX61: Gross expenditure on services to children per capita aged under 18 - see p.246
6009SC KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18 - see p.247
6010SC PAF CF/E44: Relative spend on family support - see p.248
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251
6045SC KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18 - see p.261

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6006SC - KIGS EX61: Gross expenditure on services to children per capita aged under 18

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	235	252	271	303	356	367	393
SN	235	257	287	331	382	415	451
Eng	256	280	315	361	400	427	454

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
Total gross expenditure on children and families services (excluding supporting people).
[Source - PSS EX1 Incl SSMSS sheet column S line B1*1,000]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area.
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
£ per head

Guidance/interpretation
This measure will reflect the differences in costs incurred in different parts of England. It will also reflect differences in deprivation. There may be patterns of local expenditure on children's services, especially in relation to pooled budgets with partner agencies under the children's trust arrangements, that may impact on this indicator.
Any significant variation between an area's budget for children's social care services and its comparator group needs to be explored. Significantly higher spend suggests a strong commitment to children's services, but there is a need to explore value for money and partners' contributions. A high level of spend does not always result in more effective services delivering better outcomes. Conversely, significantly lower budgets suggest a lack of commitment to children's social care services and the impact of this on the range and quality of services and outcomes for children and young people will need to be explored.

Related measures
6003SC KIGS BU07: Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget per capita - see p.243
6004SC KIGS EX12: % of Personal Social Services (PSS) actual expenditure on provision for children and families - see p.244
6005SC KIGS BU01: PSS budget for children and families per population aged under 18 - see p.245
6009SC KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18 - see p.247
6010SC PAF CF/E44: Relative spend on family support - see p.248
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251
6045SC KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18 - see p.261

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6009SC - KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	6	12	2	2	3	4	20
SN	29	33	36	41	50	51	59
Eng	37	42	46	52	60	64	70

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

[Source - PSS EX1 Incl SSMSS sheet line BC7 column S * 1,000]

Denominator

The population aged under 18 in the council area.
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]

Measuring unit

£ per head

Guidance/interpretation

This measure will reflect the differences in costs incurred in different parts of England (see pp.110-111 of the PAF volume 2005-06 (CSCI, November 2006)). It will also reflect differences in deprivation.

There may be patterns of local expenditure on children's services, especially in relation to pooled budgets with partner agencies under the children's trust arrangements, that may impact on this indicator.

Some of the variation in this measure may be accounted for by different interpretations of the guidance for PSSEX1, particularly in what is included in 'other children's services' (PSSEX1 row BE3) and in attribution of 'overheads' via SSMSS.

Any significant variation between an area's budget for children's social care services and its comparator group needs to be explored. If expenditure on family support is significantly lower than comparators this may be due to strong cost effective commissioning arrangements to deliver preventative services, and /or effective pooled budgets with partners. In the absence of these, low expenditure on family support indicates insufficient family support services which is likely to result in more children being looked after and/or more children with child protection plans.

High spend on family support should be helping to reduce the numbers of looked after children and/or children with child protection plans. If these numbers remain high it suggests that family support services are ineffectively targeted.

Related measures

6003SC KIGS BU07: Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget per capita - see p.243
6004SC KIGS EX12: % of Personal Social Services (PSS) actual expenditure on provision for children and families - see p.244
6005SC KIGS BU01: PSS budget for children and families per population aged under 18 - see p.245
6006SC KIGS EX61: Gross expenditure on services to children per capita aged under 18 - see p.246
6010SC PAF CF/E44: Relative spend on family support - see p.248
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251
6045SC KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18 - see p.261

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6010SC - PAF CF/E44: Gross expenditure on children in need but not looked after, as a percentage of gross expenditure on all children's services

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	21	31	28	29	32	35	39
SN	30	35	37	37	38	37	37
Eng	32	37	38	38	39	39	40

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands	Low								High
	●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●	●
2000-07	·	0<27	27<32	32<43	·	.	43<48	48<=100	·

Data definition

Numerator

That part of the denominator that represents expenditure on children in need but not looked after.
[Source - PSS EX1]

Incl SSMSS column I (Gross total cost (Current expenditure including capital charges): Total (including joint arrangements)) lines (BC7 (Total family support services) + BD2 (Youth offender teams) + BD3 (Other youth justice services) + BE1 (Adoption services) + BE3 (Other other children's and families services) + 50% of BE2 (Leaving care services) + a proportionate share of BA1 (Commissioning and social work)).

Denominator

Gross total cost for all children's services during the year.
[Source - PSS EX1]
Incl SSMSS column I (Gross total cost (Current expenditure including capital charges): Total (including joint arrangements)) line B1 (Total children's and families services).

Measuring unit

Percentage as a whole number

Guidance/interpretation

This indicator acts as a proxy for access to preventative services. Adequate provision of such services can prevent children being looked after later. A low figure would indicate that a council was providing a relatively small amount of preventative services.

There may be patterns of local expenditure on children's services, especially in relation to pooled budgets with partner agencies under the children's trust arrangements, that may impact on this indicator.

The most recent Children in Need census data, for 2005, may provide some historical evidence on the balance between costs of looked after children's services and other costs.

Any significant variation between an area's budget for children's social care services and its comparator group needs to be explored.
If expenditure on family support is significantly lower than comparators this may be due to strong cost effective commissioning arrangements to deliver preventative services, and /or effective pooled budgets with partners. In the absence of these, low expenditure on family support indicates insufficient family support services which is likely to result in more children being looked after and/or an increase in the number of children with child protection plans.
High spend on family support should be helping to reduce the numbers of looked after children and/or children with child protection plans. If these numbers remain high it suggests that family support services are ineffectively targeted.

Continued on following page

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6010SC - PAF CF/E44: Gross expenditure on children in need but not looked after, as a percentage of gross expenditure on all children's services

Rotherham

Related measures

6003SC KIGS BU07: Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget per capita - see p.243
6004SC KIGS EX12: % of Personal Social Services (PSS) actual expenditure on provision for children and families - see p.244
6005SC KIGS BU01: PSS budget for children and families per population aged under 18 - see p.245
6006SC KIGS EX61: Gross expenditure on services to children per capita aged under 18 - see p.246
6009SC KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18 - see p.247
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251
6045SC KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18 - see p.261

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6022SC - KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	127	125	145	141	164	156	155
SN	112	124	130	151	174	193	204
Eng	119	129	142	161	176	187	195

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator
Total gross expenditure on looked after children + secure accommodation.
[Source - PSS EX1 lines (BB5 + BD1) * 1,000]

Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area.
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]

Measuring unit
£ per head

Guidance/interpretation

The numerator covers expenditure by the council on services for looked after children other than social work. It includes the costs of children's homes and boarding schools as well as fostering, lodgings, independent living and a range of specialist placements, and all associated overheads.

This measure will in part reflect whether the council is in a low or high cost area. It will also reflect the characteristics of the population of the area. If the area is relatively deprived expenditure may be higher - see commentary on 6024SC CF/B8. Similarly the rate will reflect the make-up of children looked after by the council: if there are high proportions of adolescents or disabled children expenditure per head may be higher. If, however, a significant proportion of the looked after children are placed at home with parents the rate may be lower.

If the number of disabled children receiving support is significantly lower than comparators this suggests that an inadequate range of support is in place.

Related measures

2042SC KIGS CH39: Children looked after per 10,000 population aged under 18 - see p.92
6003SC KIGS BU07: Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget per capita - see p.243
6004SC KIGS EX12: % of Personal Social Services (PSS) actual expenditure on provision for children and families - see p.244
6005SC KIGS BU01: PSS budget for children and families per population aged under 18 - see p.245
6006SC KIGS EX61: Gross expenditure on services to children per capita aged under 18 - see p.246
6009SC KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18 - see p.247
6010SC PAF CF/E44: Relative spend on family support - see p.248
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251
6045SC KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18 - see p.261

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6024SC - PAF CF/B8: Average gross weekly expenditure per looked after child in foster care or in a children's home.

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	426	478	468	536	558	532
ACA Grp 1	486	529	575	644	693	731
Eng	487	560	618	676	716	753

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Bands for ACA group 1

	Low				High
	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●
2001-02	£0<£333	£333<£357	£357<£476	£476<£532	>=£532
2002-03	£0<£348	£348<£373	£373<£498	£498<£556	>=£556
2003-04	£0<£366	£366<£393	£393<£524	£524<£585	>=£585
2004-05	£0<£383	£383<£411	£411<£548	£548<£612	>=£612
2005-06	£0<£394	£394<£423	£423<£564	£564<£630	>=£630
2006-07	£0<£409	£409<£439	£439<£585	£585<£653	>=£653

Data definition

Numerator

Gross total cost for children looked after in foster care and children's homes during the year.

[Source - PSS EX1 Incl. SSMSS column I (Gross total cost (Current expenditure including capital charges): Total (including joint arrangements)) lines BB1 (Children's homes) + BB3 (Fostering services).

Denominator

The total number of weeks children (other than asylum seeking children) spent in foster care, children's homes, residential schools and placed for adoption (placement codes A1, A2, F1 to F6, H3 to H5 and S1 as defined by the SSDA903 collection) during the year.
Children's homes include community homes, voluntary homes and hostels and private registered children's homes.
Any placements that formed part of an agreed series of short term-placements (under the provisions of Reg. 13 of the Arrangement for Placement of Children (General) Regulations, 1991) and any time spent in respect of respite care are included.
Calculation based on the total number of days of care divided by 7.

[Source - PSSEX1]

Measuring unit

£ per week

Continued on following page

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Social care

6024SC - PAF CF/B8: Average gross weekly expenditure per looked after child in foster care or in a children's home.

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

The cost of services is an important aspect of efficient delivery of services. Other things being equal, such as quality and all children's needs being adequately met, a lower cost is generally held to be more efficient. With this indicator the overall cost of looking after children (in residential or foster care) can be assessed allowing for potential changes in costs of particular forms of care such as fostering, arising from changes to quality and supply. Performance against all of the measures in the cost and efficiency performance area will be taken as evidence of progress against the improvement in social care efficiency target of at least 2.5% year-on-year required at a national level by the Government.

This indicator can be improved by commissioning foster care and residential care at lower unit cost and, more importantly, by shifting the pattern of care away from residential to foster care. Moving children from residential to foster care may increase the unit costs of both as more dependent children are cared for in both settings, but still decrease CF/B8.

This measure will reflect the differences in costs incurred in different parts of England. It will also reflect differences in deprivation.

There may be patterns of local expenditure on children's services, especially in relation to pooled budgets with partner agencies under the children's trust arrangements, that may impact on this indicator.

High costs may indicate that high numbers of looked after children are being placed with expensive independent providers. If this is the case need to explore the strategy to address it.

High costs may also be linked to the cost of covering high levels of sickness absence among residential staff. It is also possible for high costs to occur when numbers looked after reduce, because the cohort remaining may have a proportionately greater need for specialist placements, which are likely to be more expensive.

Unlike all other indicators that relate to children looked after, this one includes data on children in receipt of respite care. Consideration could be given to these elements if costs have risen considerably year on year without an obvious change in overall numbers of children looked after or an increase in the use of fostering agencies.

Related measures

2068SC PAF CF/B79: % of children aged at least 10 and under 16 who were in foster placements or placed for adoption - see p.101
6003SC KIGS BU07: Total Personal Social Services (PSS) budget per capita - see p.243
6004SC KIGS EX12: % of Personal Social Services (PSS) actual expenditure on provision for children and families - see p.244
6005SC KIGS BU01: PSS budget for children and families per population aged under 18 - see p.245
6006SC KIGS EX61: Gross expenditure on services to children per capita aged under 18 - see p.246
6009SC KIGS EX77: Expenditure on family support services per capita aged under 18 - see p.247
6010SC PAF CF/E44: Relative spend on family support - see p.248
6022SC KIGS EX62: Gross expenditure on children looked after per capita aged under 18 - see p.250
6045SC KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18 - see p.261

SERVICE MANAGEMENT

Education

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Youth Services Data

Youth Service budget as a percentage of the overall education budget

Rotherham

Budget %

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2005	1.45%	1.40%	1.29%
2006	1.41%	1.33%	1.25%
2007	1.47%	1.40%	1.28%

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area	SN	Nat
04/05	n/a	n/a	n/a
05/06	-0.05%	-0.07%	-0.04%
06/07	0.07%	0.07%	0.03%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Additional information:

Youth Service budget £

Year	Area
2005	£2,386,506
2006	£2,496,484
2007	£2,654,320

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
04/05	n/a
05/06	4.61%
06/07	6.32%

.. = *data not available*

n/a = *not applicable*

Education budget £

Year	Area
2005	£164,237,129
2006	£177,677,309
2007	£179,955,872

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
04/05	n/a
05/06	8.18%
06/07	1.28%



Data Definition: The Youth Service and Education budgets were submitted to the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) prior to the start of the year, and do not reflect any differences between planned and actual expenditure which may have occurred during the year. They are net figures so do not include any additional income which may be brought in from other sources. The Youth Service budget is the amount of money the local authority elected to allocate to the Youth Service. It includes central costs not directly attributable to the service, such as recharges for computing and legal services, and other uncontrollable costs. In contrast to the financial data presented elsewhere from the National Youth Agency (NYA), the DCSF figures seek to represent the resource invested in providing the service, rather than the resource available for youth work.

[**Source:** Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) - Section 52 budget submissions by local authorities for financial years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07. Calculations performed by Ofsted.]

Health warning: The National figure is a median average based on submissions of all 150 (149 in 2004-05) Youth Services. Youth Service budget as a % of the Education budget is an indication of the local authority's investment in the youth service. It is background information to help inspectors form a view of the service. However, it is not in itself an indication of the quality of the service provided, or its effect on young people. Caution should be employed when interpreting this indicator. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 6025OF]

SERVICE MANAGEMENT

Youth Services Data

Youth Service budget per young person aged 13-19

Rotherham

Budget per person

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2005	£101.02	£88.24	£81.47
2006	£104.35	£88.87	£82.47
2007	£110.95	£93.58	£87.51

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area	SN	Nat
03/04	n/a	n/a	n/a
05/06	3.3%	0.7%	1.2%
06/07	6.3%	5.3%	6.1%

Additional information:

Youth Service budget £

Year	Area
2005	£2,386,506
2006	£2,496,484
2007	£2,654,320

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
03/04	n/a
05/06	4.6%
06/07	6.3%

.. = *data not available*

n/a = *not applicable*



Data Definition: Data is for 13-19 year olds only, and does not include other young people in the 11-25 age group, although they may choose to use the service. The Youth Service budget is the amount of money the local authority elected to allocate to the Youth Service. It was submitted to the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) prior to the start of the year, and does not reflect any differences between planned and actual expenditure which may have occurred during the year. It is a net figure and so does not include any additional income which may be brought in from other sources. However it does include central costs not directly attributable to the service, such as recharges for computing and legal services, and other uncontrollable costs. In contrast to the financial data presented elsewhere from the National Youth Agency (NYA), the DCSF figures seek to represent the resource invested in providing the service, rather than the resource available for youth work.

[**Source:** Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) - Section 52 budget submissions by local authorities for financial years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07. Calculations performed by Ofsted. The Office of National Statistics (ONS) Mid Year Population Estimates of April 2003, 2004 & 2005. Calculations performed by Ofsted.]

Health warning: The National figure is a median average of the budgets per young persons of all 150 (149 in 2004-05) local authorities. Net budget per young person is an indication of the local authority's investment in the youth service. It is background information to help inspectors form a view of the service. However, it is not in itself an indication of the quality of the service provided, or its effect on young people. Caution should be employed when interpreting this indicator. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

Well above | Above | In line | Below | Well below

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 6026OF]

SERVICE MANAGEMENT

Youth Services Data

Youth Service budget as a percentage of the Youth and Community sub block budget

Rotherham

Budget %

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2005	87.0%	80.5%	74.6%
2006	87.0%	82.9%	76.6%
2007	85.0%	82.2%	78.1%

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area	SN	Nat
04/05	n/a	n/a	n/a
05/06	0.0%	2.4%	2.0%
06/07	-1.9%	-0.7%	1.5%

Additional information:

Youth Service budget £

Year	Area
2005	£2,386,506
2006	£2,496,484
2007	£2,654,320

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
04/05	n/a
05/06	4.6%
06/07	6.3%

Youth and Community sub block budget £

Year	Area
2005	£2,744,421
2006	£2,870,328
2007	£3,121,507

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
04/05	n/a
05/06	4.6%
06/07	8.8%

.. = *data not available*

n/a = *not applicable*



Data Definition: The Youth Service and Youth and Community budgets were submitted to the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) prior to the start of the year, and do not reflect any differences between planned and actual expenditure which may have occurred during the year. They are net figures so do not include any additional income which may be brought in from other sources. The Youth Service budget is the amount of money the local authority elected to allocate to the Youth Service. It includes central costs not directly attributable to the service, such as recharges for computing and legal services, and other uncontrollable costs. In contrast to the financial data presented elsewhere from the National Youth Agency (NYA), the DCSF figures seek to represent the resource invested in providing the service, rather than the resource available for youth work.
[**Source:** Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) - Section 52 budget submissions by local authorities for financial years, 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07. Calculations performed by Ofsted.]

Health warning: The National figure is a median average of the percentages of all 150 (149 in 2004-05) local authorities. Youth Service budget as a % of the Youth and Community sub block budget is an indication of the local authority's investment in the Youth Service. It is background information to help inspectors form a view of the service. However, it is not in itself an indication of the quality of the service provided, or its effect on young people. Caution should be employed when interpreting this indicator. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

Well above | Above | In line | Below | Well below

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 6027OF]

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Youth Services Data

Net cost of each young person aged 13-19 reached

Rotherham

Cost per person

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2004	£359.44	..	£302.23
2005	£384.40	..	£287.53
2006	£349.62	..	£286.45

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area	SN	Nat
03/04	n/a	..	n/a
04/05	6.9%	..	-4.9%
05/06	-9.0%	..	-0.4%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Additional information:

No. of Young people reached

Year	Area
2004	5,761
2005	5,712
2006	6,648

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
03/04	n/a
04/05	-0.9%
05/06	16.4%

.. = *data not available*
n/a = *not applicable*

Net expenditure

Year	Area
2004	£2,070,738
2005	£2,195,700
2006	£2,324,275

Year-on-Year Change

Year	Area
03/04	n/a
04/05	6.0%
05/06	5.9%



Data Definition: Data is for 13-19 year olds only, and does not include other young people in the 11-25 year age group who may have used the service. The net cost is the amount of money the local authority elected to allocate to the Youth Service. It is the actual expenditure rather than the budget, but does not include any additional income which may have been brought in from other sources. In contrast to the data submitted to the DCSF under Section 52, it excludes central costs not directly attributable to the Youth Service. This includes recharges for computing and legal services, and other uncontrollable costs.
[**Source:** National Youth Agency (NYA) Annual Audits of financial years 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06. Calculations performed by Ofsted.]

Health warning: Data is supplied by external parties and Ofsted are unable to validate its accuracy. The NYA's annual audit is a voluntary survey, and not all services choose, or are able, to submit data. The National figure is a median average based on submissions of 148 services for 2003-04, 126 for 2004-05 and 138 for 2005-06. Missing data means it is not possible to calculate a robust figure for Ofsted's Statistical Neighbours or show traffic lights. Net cost per young person reached is an indication of the local authority's investment in the youth service. It is background information to help inspectors form a view of the service. However, it is not in itself an indication of the quality of the service provided, or its effect on young people. Caution should be employed when interpreting this indicator.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 6028OF]

SERVICE MANAGEMENT

Staffing and related data
Recruitment & Retention

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6050SC - PAF MR/D74: Practice learning: The number of assessed social work practice learning days per whole time equivalent social worker for employees working in children's services

Rotherham

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	8.4	16.9	19.7	32.6
SN	11.3	14.1	14.3	18.0
Eng	9.6	10.7	12.9	14.4

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Data definition

Numerator

(i) Number of assessed social work days directly provided by the council
Days are normal working days for the setting in which practice learning is taking place.

Assessed days mean those that are part of students' assessment for their social work degree or the Diploma in Social Work. This does not include time spent in preparation for practice nor observation of practice.
plus

(ii) Number of social work assessed days directly supported by the council in the voluntary, private sectors or in other sectors such as health, education.
The number of practice learning days is the total number of days this support directly enables to happen in these sectors.

'Support' includes the provision of a practice assessor or financial support given specifically for practice learning by the local authority. (It does not include days spent observing practice for example).

(From 2005-06): Practice placements developed by a Learning Resource Centre Network (LRCN) where there is match-funding by the council, either in terms of payment or hosting of staff may be included in part (ii).

If a Local Authority provides training for Practice Assessors from voluntary or private organisations, the number of days training provided by the Local Authority should be included in this figure.
[Source - KS1]

Denominator

The number of whole time equivalent field social workers (excluding agency staff) employed by the local authority to work with children and in post on 30 September.

[Source - SSDS001]

Whole time equivalent figures for staff coded to lines 2.30-2.33, 2.35. Note, line 9.3, whilst included in KIGS ST12, is not included here.

Measuring unit

Rate in working days per whole time equivalent to one decimal place

Continued on following page

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6050SC - PAF MR/D74: Practice learning: The number of assessed social work practice learning days per whole time equivalent social worker for employees working in children's services

Rotherham

Guidance/interpretation

Development of sufficient quality, quantity and diversity of practice learning opportunities for social work students is critical for the successful delivery of the new social work degree. The focus on this information is part of the wider aim to encourage councils to make the link between effective service delivery, robust human resource strategies and a strong learning culture.

A higher number of days is likely to support better service management grades than a lower number. There is no benchmark figure. Look for significant variation from SN and the national picture.

Related measures

6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262

6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264

6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265

6016SC The % of residential child care workers who have achieved level 3 in the NVQ 'Caring for Children and Young People' - see p.266

6017SC The % of social workers and residential managers working with children who need to obtain the child care PQ who have achieved the PQ1 award in child care - see p.267

6020SC KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.268

6021SC KIGS ST12: Social workers and care managers specifically for children (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.269

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6045SC - KIGS EX66: Gross expenditure on adoption service per capita aged under 18

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	7	13	12	15	17	23	22
SN	7	8	10	11	13	14	14
Eng	7	9	10	12	14	16	17

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator
Total gross expenditure on adoption services.
[Source - PSS EX1 line BE1 * 1,000]

Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area.
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]

Measuring unit
£ per head

Guidance/interpretation

For most children the best place to grow up is with their birth parents. Where this is not possible, society has a clear responsibility to provide children with stability and permanence in their lives. The Government believes that more can and should be done to promote the wider use of adoption which offers the only legally secure placement for children unable to return to their birth families.
Councils may differ in their accounting practice in relation to adoption expenditure. Guidance for PSSEX1 (CIPFA Service Expenditure Analysis related to the Best Value Accounting Code of Practice, 2004) states that the numerator should include adoption allowances paid

Outcomes for children who are adopted are generally good. If children cannot live within their birth or extended family then adoption needs to be considered. If spend on adoption services is significantly lower than comparators this suggests a lack of commitment to promoting adoption which will be reflected in low numbers of children being adopted and being placed for adoption.

The rate of expenditure will also reflect the cost profile of the council area, deprivation levels and associated numbers of children looked after and children adopted in the year. The rate will also reflect continuing commitments to adoptive families in terms of adoption allowances and other support services.

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6011SC - Percentage of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year

Rotherham

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	24.52	12.30	15.20
SN	10.27	10.73	8.44
Eng	12.39	11.48	10.86

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

The number of all social care directly employed staff defined in the denominator that left during the year (12 months to 30 September). Count each staff member who left once only. Count them as one whether they were working full time or part time. To simplify the data collation, no attempt has been made to apportion senior management or other staff groups (administrative staff) to children's services. If groups of staff have been transferred out to other agencies during the year e.g. under a s31 agreement they should be excluded from the numerator.

[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Denominator

The total number of social care directly employed staff at the end of the year (i.e. at 30 September) who are working specifically with children and families.

[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Measuring unit

Percentage to two decimal places

NB: this former DIS measure has been subdivided to seek data specifically on staff working with children and families: DIS 3118 reported on the whole workforce for the council.

Guidance/interpretation

High staff turnover may indicate significant or wider problems that can impact adversely on services (see 2016SC, 2020SC, 2022SC, 2024SC, 2028SC, 2034SC, 2036SC, 2043SC, 2060SC, 2064SC, 3085SC, 4016SC)

If, for example, turnover levels are high, the reasons for this and the area's strategy to address it need to be explored.

Continued on following page

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6011SC - Percentage of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year

Rotherham

Related measures

2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2022SC PAF CF/C64: Timing of core assessments - see p.65
2024SC % of children and young people on the child protection register who are not allocated to a social worker - see p.68
2028SC PAF CF/A3: Re-registrations on the Child Protection Register - see p.71
2034SC PAF CF/C20: Reviews of child protection cases (BVPI 162) - see p.76
2036SC PAF CF/C21: Duration on the Child Protection Register - see p.79
2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2060SC % of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker - see p.106
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6020SC KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.268
6024SC PAF CF/B8: Cost of services for children looked after - see p.251

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6012SC - Percentage of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September

Rotherham

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	15.9	18.1	9.8
SN	8.3	7.9	9.8
Eng	12.1	12.5	11.0

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

The number of vacant social care directly employed posts which councils are seeking to fill or will seek to fill at 30 September. If a post is "filled" by agency or temporary staff, include it if the intention at 30 September is to fill or seek to fill it on a permanent basis.
[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Denominator

The total number of social care directly employed posts at 30 September who are working specifically with children and families.
[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

NB: this former DIS measure has been subdivided to seek data specifically on staff working with children and families: DIS 3119 reported on the whole workforce for the CSSR.

Guidance/interpretation

High vacancy levels may indicate significant or wider problems that can impact adversely on services (see 2016SC, 2020SC, 2022SC, 2024SC, 2028SC, 2034SC, 2036SC, 2043SC, 2060SC, 2064SC, 3085SC, 4016SC).
If, for example, vacancy levels are high, the reasons for this and the area's strategy to address it need to be explored.

Related measures

2016SC KIGS CH142: % of referrals that are repeat referrals within 12 months - see p.60
2020SC % of initial assessments within 7 working days of referral - see p.63
2022SC PAF CF/C64: Timing of core assessments - see p.65
2024SC % of children and young people on the child protection register who are not allocated to a social worker - see p.68
2028SC PAF CF/A3: Re-registrations on the Child Protection Register - see p.71
2034SC PAF CF/C20: Reviews of child protection cases (BVPI 162) - see p.76
2036SC PAF CF/C21: Duration on the Child Protection Register - see p.79
2043SC PAF CF/A1: Stability of placements of children looked after (BVPI 49) - see p.96
2060SC % of looked after children with a named social worker who is qualified as a social worker - see p.106
2064SC PAF CF/C68: Timeliness of reviews of children looked after - see p.94
3085SC PAF CF/C69: Distance children newly looked after are placed from home - see p.161
4016SC PAF CF/C63: Participation of looked after children in reviews - see p.196
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6015SC - Percentage of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	1.80	1.90	3.20	3.50	3.27	5.68
SN	2.18	2.59	3.07	3.12	3.87	3.81
Eng	2.07	2.37	2.77	3.70	3.64	3.79

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Include any training required by statute or regulation, any qualification on the TOPSS/ QCA/ QAA national qualification framework and the following arising from these types of training:
1 Direct costs of tuition, trainers, course fees, assessments
2 Training section staff and overheads
3 Costs of the employees' time whilst on course
4 Work-based assessor/ internal verifier/ external assessor/ external verifier costs, including training
5 Registration and portfolio production costs
6 Assessment centre infrastructure costs
7 Course administration, examination costs, books, manuals, software and equipment

This excludes any training not in the TOPSS/ QCA/ QAA national qualifications framework, training costs not related to the service provided e.g. accountancy qualifications, cost of replacement staff for staff engaged in training.
[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Denominator

Including salaries, NI, pension contributions, expenditure on self-employed contractors whose work is directly relevant to the service provided e.g. care workers but excluding cost of external PAYE administration, cost of pensions administration, recruitment costs, IT costs on PAYE and other human resource management, expenditure on self-employed contractors whose work is not directly related to the service provided e.g. external auditors)

[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Measuring unit

Percentage to two decimal places

NB: this former DIS measure has been subdivided to seek data specifically on staff working with children and families: DIS 3121 reported on the whole workforce for the CSSR.

Guidance/interpretation

Ensuring staff are appropriately trained is an important component of the quality of a service.

Related measures

6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6016SC The % of residential child care workers who have achieved level 3 in the NVQ 'Caring for Children and Young People' - see p.266
6017SC The % of social workers and residential managers working with children who need to obtain the child care PQ who have achieved the PQ1 award in child care - see p.267
6020SC KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.268
6021SC KIGS ST12: Social workers and care managers specifically for children (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.269
6050SC PAF MR/D74: Practice learning - see p.259

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (020 7421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote ref: 6015SC]

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6016SC - The percentage of residential child care workers who have achieved level 3 in the NVQ 'Caring for Children and Young People'

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	8	10	11	10	22	30
SN	36	44	46	53	55	59
Eng	29	33	39	46	50	56

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Of the people in the denominator, the total number who, at 31 March, had obtained level 3 in the NVQ 'Caring for Children and Young People', at any time

[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Denominator

The total number of staff working for the local authority as residential childcare workers at 31 March who needed to be trained to NVQ level 3. Exclude staff who have already been trained to a higher level.

[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Measuring unit

Percentage as a whole number

NB: this question was formerly QP14

Guidance/interpretation

Ensuring staff are appropriately trained is an important component of the quality of a service.

Related measures

6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262

6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264

6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265

6017SC The % of social workers and residential managers working with children who need to obtain the child care PQ who have achieved the PQ1 award in child care - see p.267

6020SC KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.268

6021SC KIGS ST12: Social workers and care managers specifically for children (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.269

6050SC PAF MR/D74: Practice learning - see p.259

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6017SC - The percentage of social workers and residential managers working with children who need to obtain the child care PQ who have achieved the PQ1 award in child care

Rotherham

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	10.0	7.6	9.0	6.1	8.0	30.8
SN	22.9	30.6	36.8	41.3	33.2	41.6
Eng	20.8	25.6	32.7	36.3	37.1	41.0

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Of the people in the denominator, the total number who, at 31 March, had achieved the PQ1 award (Post Qualifying Award for Social Workers)

[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Denominator

The total number of social workers and residential managers employed by the authority at 31 March to work with children who need to obtain the new child care PQ. Exclude staff who have already been trained to a higher level.

[Source: CSCI/Ofsted data collection]

Measuring unit

Percentage to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation

Ensuring staff are appropriately trained is an important component of the quality of a service.

Related measures

6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265
6016SC The % of residential child care workers who have achieved level 3 in the NVQ 'Caring for Children and Young People' - see p.266
6020SC KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.268
6021SC KIGS ST12: Social workers and care managers specifically for children (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.269
6050SC PAF MR/D74: Practice learning - see p.259

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6020SC - KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	21.5	22.1	24.7	28.9	23.6	23.1	24.8
SN	18.7	19.6	21.7	23.5	26.8	27.4	27.5
Eng	18.8	19.2	20.8	22.7	24.6	26.0	27.5

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition

Numerator

Children's social care operational staff (WTE)
[Source - SSDS001 Lines (2.30 to 2.39 + 2.90)

Denominator

The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000.
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]

Measuring unit

Rate per 10,000 to one decimal place

Related measures

6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265
6016SC The % of residential child care workers who have achieved level 3 in the NVQ 'Caring for Children and Young People' - see p.266
6017SC The % of social workers and residential managers working with children who need to obtain the child care PQ who have achieved the PQ1 award in child care - see p.267
6050SC PAF MR/D74: Practice learning - see p.259

SERVICE MANAGEMENT
Staffing and related data

6021SC - KIGS ST12: Social workers and care managers specifically for children (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17

Rotherham

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
LA	13.1	14.2	15.2	15.8	12.6	12.2	13.2
SN	13.8	14.7	15.6	15.2	15.2	15.3	16.0
Eng	13.3	13.4	14.2	15.0	15.6	16.0	16.9

. = Data not applicable
.. = Data not available
- = Data suppressed due to small numbers



Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

Data definition
Numerator
[Source - SSDS001 Lines (2.30 to 2.33) (WTE)]
Denominator
The population aged under 18 in the council area divided by 10,000
[Source - ONS mid year estimates]
Measuring unit
Rate per 10,000 to one decimal place

Guidance/interpretation
This indicator is expressed as a rate of workers in relation to the relevant population. A higher rate is likely to be better than a lower rate with a positive impact on capacity. There is no benchmark figure. Look for significant variation from SN and the national picture.

Related measures
6011SC % of SSD directly employed staff for children that left during the year - see p.262
6012SC % of SSD directly employed posts for children and families vacant on 30 September - see p.264
6015SC % of SSD gross current expenditure on staffing for children and families which was spent on training the council's directly employed staff working with children and families during the financial year - see p.265
6016SC The % of residential child care workers who have achieved level 3 in the NVQ 'Caring for Children and Young People' - see p.266
6017SC The % of social workers and residential managers working with children who need to obtain the child care PQ who have achieved the PQ1 award in child care - see p.267
6020SC KIGS ST03: SSD operational staff working specifically for children's services (WTEs) per 10,000 population aged 0-17 - see p.268
6050SC PAF MR/D74: Practice learning - see p.259

SERVICE MANAGEMENT

Staffing and related data

Percentage of unfilled full-time vacancies in relation to number of teachers in post as at January

department for children, schools and families

Rotherham

Year	Area	SN	Nat
2004	0.6%	0.5%	0.7%
2005	0.6%	0.4%	0.7%
2006	1.5%	0.4%	0.6%

Traffic lights have not been applied to this indicator

.. = Data not available



Data Definition:

This indicator shows the number of advertised vacancies in maintained nursery, primary, secondary and special schools for full-time permanent appointments (or appointments of at least one term's duration) as a percentage of teachers in post ie full-time regular teachers in (or on secondment from) maintained nursery, primary and secondary schools, plus full-time regular divided service, peripatetic, advisory and miscellaneous teachers. Vacancies being filled on a temporary basis of less than one term are counted as vacant posts.
The Statistical Neighbours figure is a median average of the percentage figures for each of the local authorities' neighbours.

[Source: DCSF annual 618G survey (http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/management/ims/datacollections/618G/LA_618G_documentation/) Statistical Neighbours comparisons calculated by Ofsted.]

Health warning:

There is no benchmark figure. A lower percentage is better than a higher percentage with positive impact on capacity. The number of years for which the data has been collected is small and therefore trends cannot yet be clearly determined.
Analysis is based on small numbers of vacancies. For this reason data does not have traffic lights. Please use with caution when comparing local authorities with Statistical Neighbours or the National figures. SN figures have been added by Ofsted to assist inspectors. They are median averages of the %s for all of the LA's Statistical Neighbours.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk - Please quote REF: 6049DE]

APPENDICES

Statistical Neighbours

APPENDIX 1

National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) statistical neighbours

List of NFER statistical neighbours for Rotherham

Rotherham

Doncaster
Redcar and Cleveland
Wigan
Barnsley
Tameside
Hartlepool
St. Helens
Wakefield
Dudley
Telford and Wrekin

Statistical neighbour models provide one method for benchmarking progress. For each LA, these models designate a number of other LAs deemed to have similar characteristics. These designated LAs are known as statistical neighbours. Any LA may compare its performance (as measured by various indicators) against its statistical neighbours to provide an initial guide as to whether their performance is above or below the level that might be expected. Statistical neighbour comparisons are usually presented in addition to a National comparison.

The NFER's Children's Services statistical neighbours benchmarking groups were published in February 2007 and are designed to be used across all children's services data. Please see the DCFS website for further information on the model: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/STA/t000712/index.shtml. They replace the old Ofsted and CIPFA groups previously used by Ofsted and CSCI.

The NFER groups will be used on the majority of indicators in JAR and APA datasets from July 2007; affecting all versions of the 2007 APA datasets, and JAR toolkits from block 16 onwards. Key exceptions are indicators from the Healthcare Commission, Youth Justice Board and HMI Probation, as data may not be at local authority level.

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1B

Map showing the position of the local authority and its statistical neighbours

(NfER statistical neighbours)


Rotherham and its Statistical Neighbours (NFER)
Hartlepool
Redcar and Cleveland
Wakefield
Wigan
Barnsley
Doncaster
Tameside
St. Helens
Rotherham
Telford and Wrekin
Dudley

APPENDIX 2

Youth Justice Board statistical neighbours

List of Youth Justice Board statistical neighbours for Rotherham

Rotherham

Doncaster
Barnsley
Wigan
Halton & Warrington
St. Helens
Bridgend
Wakefield
Walsall
Stockton-on-Tees

The list above shows each Youth Offending Team (YOT) and the 9 other YOTs in its family. The first YOT listed is the closest 'relative'; the last YOT listed is the most distant 'relative'.

The majority of YOT areas match local authority boundaries. Please see below for the exceptions, and check whether this affects your local authority or its statistical neighbours.

YOT area	Local Authorities covered by the data
Leicestershire	Leicestershire and Rutland
Wessex	Isle of Wight, Hampshire, Southampton and Portsmouth
Cornwall	Cornwall and Isles of Scilly
South Tees	Redcar and Cleveland, and Middlesborough
Tower Hamlets and City of London (one YOT)	Tower Hamlets and City of London
Halton and Warrington (one YOT)	Halton and Warrington
Shropshire Telford and Wrekin (one YOT)	Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin
Reading and Wokingham (one YOT)	Reading and Wokingham
Bournemouth and Poole (one YOT)	Bournemouth and Poole
Worcestershire and Herefordshire (one YOT)	Worcestershire and Herefordshire

If you have any queries concerning this data please contact Nick Read on 020 7271 3068

APPENDIX 3

Association of Consulting Actuaries (ACA) statistical neighbours

List of ACA statistical neighbours for Rotherham (used for social care indicator 6024SC)

Rotherham

Barnsley
Blackburn with Darwen
Blackpool
Bournemouth
City of Derby
City of Nottingham
City of Plymouth
City of York
Cornwall
Cumbria
Darlington
Derbyshire
Devon
Doncaster
Dorset
Durham
East Riding of Yorkshire
Gateshead
Hartlepool
Herefordshire
Kingston Upon Hull
Lancashire
Leicester City
Leicestershire
Lincolnshire
Middlesbrough
Newcastle Upon Tyne
Norfolk
North East Lincolnshire
North Lincolnshire
North Tyneside
North Yorkshire
Northumberland
Nottinghamshire
Poole
Redcar and Cleveland
Rutland
Sheffield
Shropshire
Somerset
South Tyneside
Staffordshire
Stockton on Tees
Stoke-on-Trent
Suffolk
Sunderland
Telford and Wrekin
Torbay
Worcestershire

[Data contact: Shyam Pillai (0207 421 5959) jarandapadata@ofsted.gov.uk