



Centre for excellence  
for Children's Care and Protection

# Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees

Version 2 Guidance Manual

CELCCIS Protecting Children Team

June 2022



[www.celcis.org](http://www.celcis.org)

*building brighter futures*

# Table of Contents

<b>A. The Minimum Dataset Package .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. Minimum Indicators .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>C. Minimum Dataset Workbook .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>D. Minimum Dataset Report Template .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>E. Guidance on Data Collation, Analysis and Reporting Process .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>F. Guidance in Analysing Charts .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>G. Guidance in Analysing Tables.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>H. Guidance on Using the Scrutiny Questions.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>I. Frequently Asked Questions .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## A. The Minimum Dataset Package

The Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees is not simply a list of indicators. Instead it is a 'package' of resources that collectively support Scotland's 30 Child Protection Committees to collate, analyse and report on an agreed set of indicators in a consistent and meaningful manner.

The package consists of:

- 22 indicators (28 if including sub-indicators).
- A Microsoft Excel Workbook to support the collation and presentation of the data.
- A report template to support the analysis and reporting of the data.
- Guidance on how to:
  - Organise the data collation, analysis and reporting process.
  - Analyse the Minimum Dataset charts and tables.
  - Use the Scrutiny Questions.

## B. Minimum Indicators

The minimum indicators have been developed and agreed following extensive consultation with Child Protection Committees and national partners that include the Scottish Government, Care Inspectorate, Scottish Children’s Reporter Administration (SCRA), Police Scotland and NHS/ISD Scotland.

There are 22 indicators (28 if including sub-indicators) – see Figure B.1.

**Figure B.1: Minimum Indicators**

<b>EARLY STAGE CHILD PROTECTION ACTIVITY</b>	
1	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO POLICE SCOTLAND-RECORDED CHILD PROTECTION CONCERN REPORTS
2A	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO INTER-AGENCY REFERRAL DISCUSSIONS STARTING
2B	NUMBER OF INTER-AGENCY REFERRAL DISCUSSIONS STARTING
3	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO A JOINT INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW
4	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO CHILD PROTECTION MEDICAL EXAMINATION
<b>CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS</b>	
5A	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO INITIAL AND PRE-BIRTH CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS
5B	NUMBER OF INITIAL AND PRE-BIRTH CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS
<b>CONVERSION RATES</b>	
6A	CONVERSION RATE (%): IRD TO INITIAL AND PRE-BIRTH CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS
6B	CONVERSION RATE (%): INITIAL AND PRE-BIRTH CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS TO REGISTRATION
<b>CHILD PROTECTION REGISTER</b>	
7	NUMBER OF NEW CHILD PROTECTION REGISTRATIONS
8	NUMBER OF CHILD PROTECTION RE-REGISTRATIONS (BY 3, 6, 12 AND 24 MONTHS OF DEREGISTRATION)
9	NUMBER OF CHILDREN ON THE CHILD PROTECTION REGISTER
10	NUMBER OF CHILDREN DE-REGISTERED FROM THE CHILD PROTECTION REGISTER
<b>CHARACTERISTICS OF OUR VULNERABLE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</b>	
11	AGE OF CHILDREN PLACED ON THE CHILD PROTECTION REGISTER
12	CONCERNS RECORDED FOR CHILDREN PLACED ON THE CHILD PROTECTION REGISTER AT A PRE-BIRTH OR INITIAL CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETING

CHILDREN INVOLVED IN RELATED PROCESSES	
13A	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY IRDs STARTING
13B	NUMBER OF AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEWS
14	NUMBER OF CHILDREN REFERRED TO CARE AND RISK MANAGEMENT (CARM) OR EQUIVALENT PROCEEDINGS
15A	NUMBER OF CHILDREN REFERRED TO THE CHILDREN'S REPORTER ON OFFENCE GROUNDS
15B	NUMBER OF CHILDREN REFERRED TO THE CHILDREN'S REPORTER ON NON-OFFENCE GROUNDS
16	NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH A CHILD PROTECTION ORDER GRANTED
CHILD PROTECTION PROCESS TIMESCALES	
17	PERCENTAGE OF INITIAL CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS HELD NO LATER THAN 28 CALENDAR DAYS FROM INTER-AGENCY REFERRAL DISCUSSION
18	PERCENTAGE OF PRE-BIRTH CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS TAKING PLACE NO LATER THAN AT 28 WEEKS PREGNANCY OR, IN THE CASE OF LATE NOTIFICATION OF PREGNANCY, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER THE NOTIFICATION OF CONCERN AND IN ANY CASE WITHIN 28 CALENDAR DAYS
19	PERCENTAGE OF INITIAL CORE GROUP MEETINGS HELD WITHIN 15 WORKING DAYS OF THE INITIAL CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETING
20	PERCENTAGE OF FIRST REVIEW CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS HELD WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF THE INITIAL CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETING
21	PERCENTAGE OF REPORTER'S DECISIONS MADE WITHIN 50 WORKING DAYS OF REFERRAL RECEIPT
PARENTAL OR CARER ATTENDANCE	
22A	PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL ATTENDANCE AT INITIAL CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS
22B	PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL ATTENDANCE AT INITIAL CORE GROUP MEETINGS

Each indicator has been selected because they meet the agreed parameters for the Minimum Dataset, which are as follows:

- Minimum Dataset indicators are to be collected, analysed and reported to Child (or Public) Protection Committees on a **quarterly** basis.
- Indicators are included on the basis that:
  - They **tell us something of value** about vulnerable children and young people and/or the child protection system.
  - They are updated on at least a quarterly basis and are **meaningful to analyse on a quarterly basis**.
  - There is **national understanding and consistency** on how indicators are defined and being collected.
- Alongside the Minimum Dataset indicators, **additional indicators** can be collected and analysed that relate to local processes or priorities.

Key points to note about the 22 indicators are:

- All are available on a quarterly basis – and it is recommended that:
  - Academic quarters (i.e. February-April; May-July; August-October; November-January) are used to align with the national Child Protection statistical return to Scottish Government.
  - Data is collated for (at least) the previous two years' quarters to show trends over time.
- Many are indicators that are already reported locally and/or are collated as part of the national Child Protection statistical return to Scottish Government.
- Many are indicators that reflect multi-agency processes, albeit the indicators may be collated from Social Work IT systems.
- Indicators from other agencies (e.g. Police Scotland and SCRA) have been included where robust and meaningful data is available for all of Scotland's 32 local authority areas on a quarterly basis.
- Some indicators may be new to a local area. For these indicators, the options are to:
  - Retrospectively review case files to collate data for previous quarters.
  - Reconfigure case management/reporting systems to start collecting data from now on.
- There is scope for Child Protection Committees to collect and report **additional indicators** that reflect local priorities (e.g. health, voice and participation, and outcomes data). It is recommended that any additional indicators are collated and reported using the Minimum Dataset package format by adding further Worksheets to the Workbook and pages/sections to the Report Template.

The value to Child Protection Committees of collating, analysing and reporting the minimum indicators are:

- The indicators provide clarity to Child Protection Committees on what indicators they should be collating, analysing and reporting on a quarterly basis.
- The indicators provide intelligence about the vulnerable children and young people and the workings of your local child protection system.
- The indicators support improvement activities as they help to:
  - Highlight local issues / priorities for local attention and action.
  - Monitor the impact of new approaches and/or improvement activities.
- The indicators increase the opportunities to benchmark and learn from other Child Protection Committees.

## C. Minimum Dataset Workbook

The Workbook, developed in Microsoft Excel to support use across Scotland's Child Protection Committees, is the place where the data for each of the minimum indicators is collated and then transposed into chart or table format.

The Workbook has 10 Worksheets to collate the data for the 22 indicators (some Worksheets are designed to collate data for more than one indicator). Each Worksheet is organised with the same structure:

- **Local data** – the Worksheets provide cells for the local quarterly data to be inputted.
- **Suggested presentation** – across the Minimum Dataset, 8 charts and 6 tables have been constructed that help to translate and communicate the data to a wider audience. Where appropriate, the charts or tables contain:
  - More than one indicator to reflect the relationships between indicators.
  - Longitudinal data for the previous two years to illustrate any trends and/or anomalies in the quarterly data.
- **Definition** – a clear definition for each indicator is provided to support the consistent collection of data across Scotland's 30 Child Protection Committees.
- **Date reported** – for the majority of indicators, the aggregate number over the quarter is asked for. For others, the number at the end of the quarter is sought.
- **Source** – agency where data is most likely to be sourced from.
- **Rationale** – the rationale helps to explain why each indicator has been included as part of the Minimum Dataset, i.e. the rationale sets out why each indicator is valuable to collect, analyse and understand on a quarterly basis.
- **Scrutiny questions** – each indicator is supported by one or more scrutiny question(s) that may be used by Child Protection Committees to guide any further data and/or audit work where there is interest locally to do so.
- **Benchmarking options** – guidance is given on how the local data collected for each indicator can be used and/or calculated to enable comparisons to be made with national and other Child Protection Committees' data.

It is recommended that the Workbook is managed by a lead local data analyst/coordinator. More detail on this role is provided in Section E.

## D. Minimum Dataset Report Template

The main output of the Minimum Dataset package is the quarterly report that is prepared for and submitted to the Child Protection Committee.

The report is concise in format at 11 pages in length and:

- Begins with a front (Executive Summary) page that contains the headline messages for the Child Protection Committee to note. This could extend to 2 pages.
- Contains an Appendix with all the charts, tables and scrutiny questions.
- Concludes with a map/diagram of the local Child Protection Process (which local areas are encouraged to develop to reflect their own local processes); and a table that benchmarks the latest (annual), local data against the national Scotland data.

The 1-2 page 'Executive Summary' should focus on highlighting the key messages that the Child Protection Committee should be aware of and/or provide direction on. Prepared by the Data Sub-Group (or equivalent), the key messages or commentary should:

- Guard against providing written commentary on every indicator. Instead **focus on the most important data findings** (i.e. akin to exception reporting). For example, a notable trend or spike in an indicator's data in the last 1-2 quarters. It may be helpful to copy over a chart or table from the Appendix into this report to help highlight the data change.
- Where referring to a notable trend or spike, try to **explain the trend or spike** – noting this may require looking at the relationship between different indicators, additional data and intelligence not contained in the Minimum Dataset. The (optional) scrutiny questions may support you to consider the factors that might contribute to the data trend or spike.
- Where notable changes are identified and cannot be immediately explained, **consider what might be the ask of the Child Protection Committee**. For example, ask for decision or approval to:
  - Undertake further, more detailed analysis of the statistical data and other (e.g. audit) activity.
  - Respond to specific scrutiny questions.
  - Take action in the form of increased monitoring, initiate new training programme, etc.

Guidance on how to analyse the Minimum Dataset's 6 charts (plus 1 headline/ summary chart) and 4 tables is provided in Sections F and G.







## E. Guidance on Data Collation, Analysis and Reporting Process

The Minimum Dataset package has been designed to be a manageable means of collating, analysing and reporting meaningful child protection data to Child Protection Committees. There are however a number of steps that should be followed – see Figure E.1 – and these should be appropriately resourced and timetabled in each local area.

Of the five steps described in Figure E.1, time and resources should be prioritised to the ‘multi-agency analysis of the data’ as it is the multiple perspectives brought by partners that enliven the data.

**Figure E.1: Data Collation, Analysis and Reporting Process**

Step	Activities Involved	Individuals Involved
<b>Workbook Completion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request minimum indicators data from IT systems and/or partners</li> <li>• Collate data into the Workbook</li> <li>• Prepare / update charts and tables in the Workbook</li> <li>• Option of adding annotations (e.g. lines and text boxes to illustrate when a new process was implemented, training delivered or a key event – such as the COVID-19 pandemic – occurred) to charts by using ‘Insert Shapes’ in Chart ‘Format’ tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process managed by local data analyst/coordinator</li> <li>• Input from local data providers</li> </ul>
		
<b>Initial preparation of the Quarterly Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy and paste charts (as ‘<u>pictures</u>’) and tables from the Workbook into the Report Template. Re-size charts as necessary but the charts should be pre-set with the right dimensions to fit the page margins</li> <li>• Carry out initial analysis of the key findings and messages to produce a first draft of the Quarterly Report</li> <li>• Circulate the first draft in advance of the multi-agency data meeting (see <i>next step</i>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial preparation (and analysis) carried out by:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Local data analyst/coordinator (copy and paste charts and tables)</li> <li>○ Child Protection Lead Officer/Service Manager (initial analysis of key findings and messages)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
		

<b>Multi-agency analysis of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convene a multi-agency data meeting to discuss and analyse the data, charts and tables</li> <li>• Discuss and agree the key findings, messages and implications for inclusion in the Quarterly Report. This should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Individuals / organisations providing their own interpretation of the data</li> <li>○ Use of other data, evidence or developments to explain key findings</li> <li>○ Use (where appropriate) of the Scrutiny Questions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Where a representative cannot attend, written/emailed commentary and analysis are sent to the local data analyst/coordinator in advance of the meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPC Performance Sub-Group (or equivalent multi-agency data meeting)</li> <li>• Group ideally comprises representatives from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Child Protection (e.g. Lead Officer)</li> <li>○ Social work (plus the local data analyst/coordinator)</li> <li>○ Health</li> <li>○ Education</li> <li>○ Police</li> <li>○ SCRA</li> <li>○ Third Sector</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Group would contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Knowledge of the IT system used and how data is recorded</li> <li>○ Operational knowledge of child protection systems and processes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
		
<b>Quarterly Report finalised and submitted to Child Protection Committee</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use and integrate the key findings, messages and implications agreed in the multi-agency data meeting within a finalised version of the Quarterly Report</li> <li>• Submit the report to the Child Protection Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final drafting undertaken by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Child Protection Lead Officer</li> <li>○ Local data analyst/coordinator</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
		
<b>Child Protection Committee analysis and direction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and discuss the key findings, messages and implications set out in the Quarterly Report</li> <li>• Provide feedback and direction to (e.g.) CPC Performance Sub-Group on priorities for further data work and/or improvement activity</li> <li>• Decide whether to share the report with the Chief Officers' Group</li> <li>• Consider whether to circulate the report with local workforces (particularly social work) to build awareness of local environment in which they are working</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child Protection Committee</li> </ul>

## F. Guidance in Analysing Charts

The majority of the Minimum Dataset indicators are presented as line charts so that the data is accessible to a wide audience. As set out above, where appropriate, the charts contain:


- More than one indicator to reflect the relationships between indicators.
- Longitudinal data for the previous four years to illustrate any trends and/or anomalies in the quarterly data. Four years of data, where available, is seen to be particularly important given the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown restrictions as this timeframe allows understanding of pre-pandemic trends.




To support the analysis of the 8 charts, Figures F.1 and F.2 below provide guidance on **how to navigate and interpret each chart**.

### Figure F.1: Navigating Each Chart

	Things to Pay Attention To
<b>What indicators are presented in the chart?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many indicators are presented in the same chart?</li> <li>• Are the indicators presented as lines or columns (see age by registrations)?</li> </ul>
<b>What axes are used in the chart?</b>	<p>The horizontal x-axis presents quarterly data for the last two years, but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the vertical y-axis showing (e.g. numbers or percentages)?</li> <li>• Are two different y-axes used in the same chart (e.g. number of conferences and % conversion rate)?</li> <li>• What scale has been used for the y-axis (e.g. has a specific scale been used, and does this scale exaggerate the findings in any way)?</li> </ul>

### Figure F.2: Interpreting Each Chart

What is Each Line / Indicator Showing?	Illustration	Suggested Focus of Commentary
<b>Static / horizontal line (i.e. no notable trends or</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For quarterly reports, in most cases, there is little need to provide commentary for these indicators.</li> <li>• There are, however, exceptions to this rule, such as when the static data are indicative of long-term, endemic issues that need to be addressed; or when a change might have been expected due to the impact of a previous event or intervention. In these scenarios,</li> </ul>

<b>peaks and troughs)</b>		the commentary should acknowledge the static line and provide an indication as to the lack of change/improvement.
<b>Consistent trend of increase or decrease</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For quarterly reports, these indicators merit a small amount of commentary as these trends are likely long-term and already known to the Child Protection Committee.</li> <li>• The small amount of commentary should acknowledge the (long-term) trend and offer an evidence-based explanation for the increase or decrease.</li> <li>• Greater commentary should, however, be given where the trend is known to be different to trends of other related indicators (e.g. number of planning meetings decreasing but number of registrations increasing) or to the trend of the same indicator in another geographical area (derived from benchmarking, where possible).</li> <li>• Explanation may derive from other indicators (e.g. timescales have slipped because numbers and workload demands have increased), previous events or interventions.</li> </ul>
<b>Irregular pattern</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For quarterly reports, these indicators merit a small amount of commentary as these irregular patterns are likely long-term and already known to the Child Protection Committee.</li> <li>• Where possible, the commentary should identify any 'hidden' trends or periodic changes (e.g. emergent peaks and troughs in particular quarters) and offer an evidence-based explanation for the irregular pattern.</li> </ul>
<b>Distinctive change in pattern in the last 1-2 quarters</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For quarterly reports, these indicators are most important to report and explain as these are recent changes that the Child Protection Committee should be made aware of, understand and monitor.</li> <li>• It is important to provide commentary that acknowledges this recent change and offer an evidence-based explanation for the change.</li> <li>• The commentary should highlight where the recent change is known to be different to trends of other related indicators (e.g. number of planning meetings recently decreasing but number of registrations recently increasing) or to the trajectory of the same indicator in another geographical area (derived from benchmarking, where possible).</li> <li>• The commentary should also provide an indication of whether the change might be expected to continue and, if so, why.</li> </ul>

## G. Guidance in Analysing Tables

A select number of the minimum indicators are presented as tables – either because the large volume of data makes it challenging to present as a chart (e.g. % of concerns recorded at registration) or the numbers are small and could be lost when presented alongside other data (e.g. number of re-registrations or Child Protection Orders).

To support the analysis of the 6 tables, Figures G.1 and G.2 below provide guidance on **how to navigate and interpret each table**.

**Figure G.1: Navigating Each Table**

	Things to Pay Attention To
<b>What indicators are presented in the table?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many indicators are presented in the same table?</li> <li>• Are the indicators absolute numbers (e.g. number of re-registrations) or percentages (e.g. % of concerns recorded at registration)?</li> <li>• Acknowledge the reason for using a table rather a chart to present the data. For example, the numbers are important to analyse but are typically small in volume (e.g. number of re-registrations or Child Protection Orders), and so can be lost/hidden in multi-indicator charts; or there is too much data to present in a chart (e.g. % of concerns recorded at registration).</li> </ul>
<b>What time periods are used in the table?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is quarterly and/or annual data presented?</li> <li>• Is it aggregate data over the quarter or snapshot data (e.g. number of children on the Child Protection register at end of the quarter)?</li> </ul>

**Figure G.2: Interpreting Each Table**

What is Each Line/Indicator Showing?	Suggested Focus of Commentary
<b>Static data (i.e. no notable trends or peaks and troughs)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For quarterly reports, in most cases, there is little need to provide commentary for these indicators.</li> <li>• There are, however, exceptions to this rule, such as when the static data are indicative of long-term, endemic issues that need to be addressed; or when a change might have been expected due to the impact of a previous event or intervention. In these scenarios, the commentary should acknowledge the static data and provide an indication as to the lack of change/improvement.</li> </ul>
<b>Consistent trend of</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For quarterly reports, these indicators merit a small amount of commentary as these trends are likely long-term and already known to the Child Protection Committee.</li> </ul>

<p><b>increase or decrease</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The small amount of commentary should acknowledge the (long-term) trend and offer an evidence-based explanation for the increase or decrease.</li> <li>• Greater commentary should, however, be given where the trend is known to be different to trends of other related indicators (e.g. number of planning meetings decreasing but number of registrations increasing) or to the trend of the same indicator in another geographical area (derived from benchmarking, where possible).</li> <li>• Explanation may derive from other indicators (e.g. timescales have slipped because numbers and workload demands have increased), previous events or interventions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Irregular pattern</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For quarterly reports, these indicators merit a small amount of commentary as these irregular patterns are likely long-term and already known to the Child Protection Committee.</li> <li>• Where possible, the commentary should identify any 'hidden' trends (e.g. emergent peaks and troughs in particular quarters) and offer an evidence-based explanation for the irregular pattern.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Distinctive change in pattern in the last 1-2 quarters</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For quarterly reports, these indicators are most important to report and explain as these are recent changes that the Child Protection Committee should be made aware of, understand and monitor.</li> <li>• It is important to provide commentary that acknowledges this recent change and offer an evidence-based explanation for the change.</li> <li>• The commentary should highlight where the recent change is known to be different to trends of other related indicators (e.g. number of planning meetings recently decreasing but number of registrations recently increasing) or to the trajectory of the same indicator in another geographical area (derived from benchmarking, where possible).</li> <li>• The commentary should also provide an indication of whether the change might be expected to continue and, if so, why.</li> </ul>

## H. Guidance on Using the Scrutiny Questions

The Minimum Dataset Report Template includes 39 scrutiny questions (see Figure H.1). These are **supplementary and optional** to the core task of analysing the minimum indicators on a quarterly basis.

The purpose of the scrutiny questions is to:

- Encourage analytical curiosity and discussion among Child Protection Committee (or performance sub-group) members, so enabling greater consideration of what the data is telling them (and what the data does not).
- Guide Child Protection Committee (or performance sub-group) members on how and where to direct any in-depth or exploratory data work.
- Help explain any notable trends or anomalies that are identified in the analysis of the minimum indicators.

**Figure H.1: Minimum Dataset Scrutiny Questions**

REPORT SECTION	SCRUTINY QUESTIONS
<b>EARLY STAGE CHILD PROTECTION ACTIVITY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many child protection concerns have been received from health, education and other sources?</li> <li>• (If social work provide IRD data) How many children have been subject to two or more IRDs in the last 12 months?</li> <li>• Have all core agencies (health, police and social work) attended the initial IRD meeting?</li> <li>• If Child Protection Investigations is a distinct local process, how many children were subject to Investigation in the quarter?</li> <li>• How many and/or % of the JIIs used the Scottish Child Interview Model?</li> <li>• What was the breakdown by Child Protection Medical Examination type?</li> <li>• What were the outcomes of the Child Protection Medical Examination (i.e. what harm or abuse was identified)?</li> </ul>
<b>CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were there large family groups of (e.g. 3 or more) brothers and sisters subject to Initial and Pre-Birth Child Protection Planning Meetings?</li> </ul>
<b>CONVERSION RATES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the conversion rates telling us – e.g. about thresholds?</li> <li>• If CP Investigation is a distinct local process, what are the conversion rates for?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o IRD to CP Investigation</li> <li>o CP Investigation to CP Planning Meeting</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What reasons/factors led to children not progressing to further child protection processes; and are the needs of these children being met?</li> </ul>
<p><b>CHILD PROTECTION REGISTER</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many transfer in registrations have been received – and what are the characteristics of those children (including the originating local authority area / country)?</li> <li>• How many temporary registrations/notifications have been received?</li> <li>• What factors have led to the number of children on the Child Protection Register increasing and/or decreasing (e.g. number of registrations versus length of time on register versus number of de-registrations)?</li> <li>• How long have children been on the Register (e.g. how many/what proportion have been registered for more than 1 year)?</li> <li>• How long had children been registered at time of de-registration (e.g. less than 6 months; 7-12 months; 13-24 months; and 2 years plus)?</li> <li>• What were the reasons for deregistration? What percentage of children had 'improved home situation' so keeping children and families together?</li> <li>• What has changed in these children's lives since they were de-registered?</li> <li>• What supports have been provided in the post de-registration period?</li> <li>• How many times have the children previously been registered (e.g. multiple occasions)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>CHARACTERISTICS OF OUR VULNERABLE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What factors explain any change(s) in the age profile? For example, improved awareness and identification of concerns among age-specific workforces; impact of a recent Learning Review; impact of wider social, economic or service-related factors; etc.?</li> <li>• For pre-birth registration, how does the number of registrations compare with annual maternity health indicators, e.g. number of babies diagnosed with neonatal abstinence syndrome or foetal alcohol syndrome?</li> <li>• Does local service provision reflect the age profile (and development stage needs) of newly registered children?</li> <li>• How does the concerns profile at registration compare with the concerns profile at earlier stages of the child protection process (e.g. IRD)?</li> <li>• What factors explain any change(s) in the concerns profile? For example, genuine emergent concerns, training on specific concern(s) leading to increased identification, changes in how concerns are recorded, or impact of a recent Learning Review?</li> <li>• Does local service provision reflect the most prevalent concerns identified?</li> <li>• How do the concerns interact with wider Public Protection (e.g. Adult Support and Protection) concerns?</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent are parental concerns (e.g. domestic abuse; parental drug or alcohol use) shared with other Public Protection groupings to inform wider service planning?</li> </ul>
<b>CHILDREN INVOLVED IN RELATED PROCESSES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where CARM quarterly numbers are high, suggest consideration of other CARM measures set out in Framework for Risk Assessment Management and Evaluation with children aged 12-17</li> <li>What are the sources of the referrals to the Reporter?</li> <li>How many referrals to the Reporter have come from Child Protection Planning Meeting or other multi-agency child protection and risk management processes?</li> <li>How many and/or what proportion of Child Protection Orders were applied for but not granted? What were the reasons for them not being granted?</li> </ul>
<b>CHILD PROTECTION PROCESS TIMESCALES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where timescales are not being met, what are the reasons for this? For example, are they due to delays that are in the child's interests, or due to the availability of resources?</li> <li>How do timescales locally compare with the national target of 78% of decisions made by the Reporter about a referral within 50 working days of receipt?</li> <li>Where the target is not being met, what are the reasons for this? For example, are they due to delays that are in the child's interests, or due to the availability of resources?</li> </ul>
<b>PARENTAL OR CARER ATTENDANCE AT INITIAL CHILD PROTECTION PLANNING MEETINGS AND INITIAL CORE GROUP MEETINGS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where there was no parental/carer attendance, what were the reasons for this?</li> <li>Are both parents/carers attending – particularly the parent/carer where the risk lies and/or who need to change their behaviour?</li> <li>To what extent are parents/carers active contributors to the meetings – i.e. what is the quality of their participation?</li> <li>How are services engaging non-attending parents/carers with child protection planning?</li> <li>What was the level of professional attendance and participation at meetings?</li> </ul>

In summary, the focus should be on the quarterly collation, analysis and reporting of the minimum indicators. However, one or more scrutiny question(s) can be used when the Child Protection Committee (or performance sub-group) deem it valuable to undertake more in-depth analysis into a specific data theme or pattern.

# I. Frequently Asked Questions

## What is the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees?

The Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees is an agreed set of quarterly indicators for reporting to Scotland's Child Protection Committees.

The Minimum Dataset forms part of a 'package' that supports data collection, analysis and reporting across Child Protection Committees. The package includes a Microsoft Excel Workbook to support local data analysts to collect, input and present the data; and a Report Template for the data and analysis to be reported to Child Protection Committees.

## What is the purpose of the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees?

The Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees responds to both national and local priorities.

At the national level, the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees responds to an action within the **Scottish Government's Child Protection Improvement Programme**. The action highlighted the need to deliver robust data sets to support child protection improvement; develop a national resource for advice on using child protection data for local planning and service development; and expand analytical capacity.

At the local level, there has been longstanding interest across Scotland's Child Protection Committees in enhancing their use and analysis of child protection statistics. The Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees facilitates this because it includes:

- Longitudinal line charts containing multiple indicators to enable trends and relationships between indicators to be identified.
- Scrutiny questions to support Child Protection Committees in their analysis and sense-making of their data.
- Guidance on how Child Protection Committees can compare their data with and use this to help learn from other Child Protection Committees.

Spanning both the national and local, the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees also helps respond to a key area within the **Joint Inspections of Services for Children and Young People** led by the Care Inspectorate. In particular the Minimum Dataset supports Quality Indicator 1.1 (Improvements in the safety, wellbeing and life chances of children and young people in need of care and protection) of the **Quality Framework for Children and Young People in Need of Care and Protection**.

## How does the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees differ from the Shared Dataset for Vulnerable Children and Young People?

In April-May 2018, there was a national consultation on a draft Shared Dataset for Vulnerable Children and Young People. This larger dataset contained both Child Protection

and Corporate Parenting / Looked After and Accommodated Children indicators to respond to the movement across Community Planning Partnerships towards integrated children's services, and that Joint Inspections of Services for Children and Young People inspect child protection and corporate parenting.

Following the consultation response, the Scottish Government, Care Inspectorate and CELCIS decided that the corporate parenting statistical work be paused, partly due to the relatively recent establishment of Corporate Parenting Boards (or equivalent) across Community Planning Partnerships, but that the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees work be advanced.

As of April 2022, there has been no further consideration of whether a Shared Dataset for Vulnerable Children and Young People spanning both themes is aspired to.

### **How has the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees been developed?**

The development of the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees has been led by CELCIS' Protecting Children Team, working in partnership with Scotland's Child Protection Committees, the Scottish Government, the Care Inspectorate, Police Scotland and the Scottish Children's Reporter Administration (SCRA).

To develop Version 1, three Child (or Public) Protection Committees – Dumfries & Galloway, East and Midlothian, and Falkirk – played a particularly significant role as test partners in its development.

To support and inform the Version 2 update, ten Child (or Public) Protection Committees volunteered as development partners on behalf of CPC Scotland. These were: Aberdeen City, Aberdeenshire, Dumfries & Galloway, Dundee City, East Dunbartonshire, Edinburgh, Falkirk, Fife, South Ayrshire and South Lanarkshire.

### **Is it mandatory for Scotland's Child Protection Committees?**

It is not mandatory for Scotland's Child Protection Committees to use the Minimum Dataset. However, the effective use of data is a key area within the **Joint Inspections of Services for Children and Young People** and use of the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees can support this.

### **Should local areas only collect, analyse and report on the indicators contained within the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees?**

Local areas are encouraged to collect, analyse and report additional indicators to their Child Protection Committees that relate to local processes or priorities. Health, voice and participation, and outcome indicators are all potential areas to be considered.

**How does the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees align with the annual Children’s Social Work Statistics return to the Scottish Government?**

There is close alignment between the two as many of the indicators collected annually for the Scottish Government Children’s Social Work Statistics are included in the Minimum Dataset for Child Protection Committees, noting that these indicators are collected on a more frequent (quarterly) basis in the Minimum Dataset to provide more timely data.

The Minimum Dataset also encourages local areas to use the same August to July academic quarters/reporting year as the annual Scottish Government Children’s Social Work Statistics return.

### **About CELCIS**

CELCIS is a leading improvement and innovation centre in Scotland. We improve children's lives by supporting people and organisations to drive long-lasting change in the services they need, and the practices used by people responsible for their care.

### **For more information**

**Visit:** [www.celcis.org](http://www.celcis.org) **Email:** [celcis@strath.ac.uk](mailto:celcis@strath.ac.uk) **Tel:** 0141 444 8500