

Placement Standards Specification v2.0

Category	Field	Description	Options	Rationale and design considerations	Open issues (if any)	Data interpretation caveats (if any)
Determinants of placement availability	Child ID	Please enter the unique ID used in your Case Mgmt System	ID no.	An identifier unique to each child within the LA, allowing linking between multiple referrals for the same child. No additional considerations raised during the Deep Dives		
	When do you need this placement by?	By when does the child need to find a home/be placed by?	Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Today • <5 days • >5days 	Captures the urgency of the placement request to help understand how notice given impacts what placement is found. A drop down is used because during deep dive and South West pilot discussions participants agreed that asking "date placement required by" was too subjective to be a useful indicator.	We are still learning what timeframe do providers think is most meaningful to whether they are able to accept a placement.	
	Number of siblings to place with	How many siblings should the child be placed together with? If child has no siblings/ does not need to be placed with siblings then input 0	number	Captures how many siblings the child should ideally be placed with according to their care plan to help identify demand for sibling group placements and the impact on placement found. Deep-dive discussions highlighted that sometimes siblings splits are part of a care plan; this field should capture what is intended in the care plan.		
	Preferred location for home search	Which area do we want to find a placement in? Free text for data entry for now, we will explore how to structure without creating excess work.	free text	Identifies whether local provision meets demand in children's preferred areas, highlighting where future provision may be needed to meet specific placement needs.	We are still learning the best way to record preferred placement location in a standard way. We have an interim solution in Excel lookup which lets officers copy paste regions from a predefined list, though an authoritative third-party list is still being explored based on the South West pilot and CMS vendor testing. We are focused on understanding what the right level of geographic specificity is likely to be.	
	PLACEMENT REQUIREMENTS					
	Communication, language and learning needs	Does the child have any communication, language or learning needs?	Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Not specified 	Included to capture how providers conceptualise need and how this translates into a decision as to whether or not to offer an available placement and at what price all other things being equal, based on initial user testing with a small focus group of providers. That is not the only way of thinking about needs, but it is the lens which is most appropriate to market analysis because it helps us understand what the key determinants are in whether placements are available or unavailable, and more or less expensive.	We are conducting further testing on this with providers to see what factors matter most to them when determining whether they are able offer a placement and at what price.	
	Specific communication and language requirements	Please enter all that apply, or none if not applicable.	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESOL • BSL • Makaton • Other • None 	As above	As above	
	Adaptation to the home	Are there any adaptations required to the home to accommodate the child's needs?	Y/N	As above	As above	
	Cultural needs (e.g. place of worship)	Any specific cultural needs that the home needs to be aware of such as importance of going to religious places or taking part in religious activities?	Options : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required • Not required • Not known • Other 	As above	As above	
	Who can the child be cared for alongside	Are there any restrictions on who else can live in the same home? Or, would it help to have them living with other young people? Please select the most appropriate option .	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solo placement recommended • With other children recommended • Only with other older children • Only with other younger children • No preference 	As above. Although during deep dive discussions, some concerns were raised about whether this can be captured reliably and relatively objectively, the initial pilot in the South West showed this was possible to capture.	As above	
Additional support	Can child live with pets/animals?	Can the child live in a home with pets or animals?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes-must • Yes-can • No • Not known 	Included to capture how providers conceptualise need and how this translates into a decision as to whether or not to offer an available placement and at what price all other things being equal, based on initial user testing with a small focus group of providers. That is not the only way of thinking about needs, but it is the lens which is most appropriate to market analysis because it helps us understand what the key determinants are in whether placements are available or unavailable, and more or less expensive. Deep dive discussions highlighted that this needed more nuance than Y/N, so in line with suggestions, have added . 'Yes – must, Yes – can, No, Unknown'.	As above	
	Additional Support	Please select any of the options of additional provision that apply or describe if "other".	Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional supervision • therapeutic support • a worker for respite • taxis to school • NA 	Included to capture how providers conceptualise need and how this translates into a decision as to whether or not to offer an available placement and at what price all other things being equal, based on initial user testing with a small focus group of providers. That is not the only way of thinking about needs, but it is the lens which is most appropriate to market analysis because it helps us understand what the key determinants are in whether placements	As above	
	Additional suport: if 'Other' (please specify)	If selected other, please specify what additional provision is required	free text	Allows identification of any additional support not captured above.	As above	
Deprivation of Liberty Order	Deprivation of Liberty Order	Does the child have a Deprivation of Liberty Order (DOL)	Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes / No 	Added based on input from South West pilot that this is a key determinant in whether a placement is offered, where and at price.	As above	

Category	Field	Description	Options	Rationale and design considerations	Open issues (if any)	Data interpretation caveats (if any)
Determinants of placement availability						
	PLACEMENT RECOMMENDATION					
	Foster Care suitability	Is foster care the most preferred home for the child as deemed by the SW? Please select the most appropriate response for foster care suitability.	Options : <ul style="list-style-type: none">PreferredSuitable but not preferredUnsuitableNot specified	Captures what the preferred placement is, to allow comparison between preferred and actual placement.		
	Residential Care suitability	Is residential care the most preferred home for the child as deemed by the SW? Please select the most appropriate response for residential care suitability.	Options : <ul style="list-style-type: none">PreferredSuitable but not preferredUnsuitableNot specified	As above		
	Supported Accomodation suitability	Is supported home care the most preferred home for the child as deemed by the SW? Please select the most appropriate response for supported home suitability.	Options : <ul style="list-style-type: none">PreferredSuitable but not preferredUnsuitableNot specified	As above		
	RISKS					
	Risk to child: Self-harm	Is the child known to be at risk of self-harm?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	Included to capture how providers conceptualise need and how this translates into a decision as to whether or not to offer an available placement and at what price all other things being equal, based on intial user testing with a small focus group of providers. That is not the only way of thinking about needs, but it is the lens which is most appropriate to market analysis because it helps us understand what the key determinants are in whether placements are available or unavailable, and more or less expensive. Based on deep dive discussions and learning from the SW pilot, we have changed the options from a list of 3 (high, moderate, low) to a binary (risk present or not) to reflect concerns that a 3 part list introduced too much subjectivity for the data to be useful. To note: the level of nuance and context around the risks that is captured in the referral form will remain a decision for each LA.	We are conducting further testing on this with providers to see what factors matter most to them when determining whether they are able offer a placement and at what price.	
	Risk to child: Sexual exploitation	Is the child known to be at risk of sexual exploitation?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to child: Criminal exploitation	Is the child known to be at risk of criminal exploitation?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to child: Drug and alcohol use	Is the child known to be at risk of drug and alcohol use?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to child: Eating disorder	Is the child known to be at risk of an eating disorder?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to child: Going missing	Is the child known to be at risk of going missing?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to others or property: Physical harm	Is there a known a risk of physical harm to others?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to others or property: Sexual harm	Is there a known risk of sexual harm to others?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to others or property: Fire-setting	Is there a known risk of fire-setting?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to others or property: Harm to animals	Is there a known risk of harm to animals?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to others or property: Criminal exploitation	Is there a known risk of criminal exploitation for others in the home?	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No known riskRisk Present	As above	As above	
	Risk to others or property: Other (please specify)	Please add a description of any other risks identified in terms of risks to others or property	free text			

Category	Field	Description	Options	Rationale and design considerations	Open issues (if any)	Data interpretation caveats (if any)
Describes actual placement	ACTUAL PLACEMENT					
	Total weekly cost (actual weekly fee paid)	What is the total weekly fee associated with the placement? (excluding VAT)	number	This field captures the total weekly fee, rather than the core fee, as deep dive discussions highlighted concerns that definitions of 'core' fee varied considerably region by region (and LA by LA). Further, it was emphasised in discussions that this should be the fee paid, rather than the fee agreed at the point of IPA, due to the likelihood that there may be considerable changes between the two figures. This aligns with the long-standing pre-existing practice in at 24 existing local authorities in the North West, and it is similar to approaches being trialed in 2 other regions.	We are still learning the optimal point in time to capture cost data, as timing can affect data quality and accuracy. We are exploring a small study to understand more about the level of variation.	This figure should be treated as an estimate, and caution should be used in applying it to benchmarking exercises while we are still learning more about how to capture this data in a reliable and accurate way.
	Placement Location	Which area did we find a placement in? First 3-4 digits of postcode.	Number	This field allows a high level description of the location which can be compared to the preferred location. While the precise location can be extracted through the provider URN, the inclusion of this field ensures location is captured for non-registered placements.		
	Preferrability of placement location	Was the placement in a preferred location?	Yes/No	To provide further clarity on whether location was preferred, given the subjectivity around location noted above, this field has been added to give additional accuracy around whether the location was preferred, all else equal.		
	Education continuity	Was child's education disrupted as a result of this placement?	Options <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes• No	This field has been added to provide further nuance around whether the placement was preferred, all else equal, and in line with suggestions raised during deep dive discussion about the importance of educational continuity (in many, but not all placements). This is also in line with DfE's current practice of capturing educational continuity as a key stability measure.		Education disruption can sometimes be according to a care plan.
	Provider URN (linked to Ofsted)	Provider URN linked to Ofsted registration.	free text	Allows the placement to be linked to Ofsted data about the provider, including location.		
	How many siblings were placed together?	How many siblings were placed together.	Integer	Captures how many siblings were actually placed together to allow comparison with how many it was intended would be placed together. Based on deep dive discussions and learning from the SW pilot, the question was changed from 'were siblings split' to 'how many children were placed together', to reflect that the original question didn't distinguish between sibling splits that were in the care plan, and those that were not.	Still exploring how to reliably track individuals within a sibling group. One option is to introduce a pseudonymous Sibling Group ID, but the practical approach and consistency across LAs are yet to be defined.	Some sibling splits may be in the care plan.
	Placement Type	Record the type of placement the child received either foster, residential or supported accommodation.	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Residential• Foster• Supported Accommodation	This standard uses three categories identified as key for sufficiency planning decisions based on discussions with commissioners (based on comparison between preferred and actual placement types). To note: a more detailed breakdown of what type of placement a child has is recorded as part of the SSDA903 data submission; this is not intended to replace that.	We will continue to test with commissioners what categories for comparison between preferred and actual placement are most useful for sufficiency planning and will update this field if/as needed.	
	QUALITY ASSURANCE					
Quality Assurance	Name of officer (referral)	Name of officer recording information related to the referral	free text	Provides information that allows for quality assurance and review of data entry practices. This will support LAs to improve the fidelity, completeness and accuracy of data gathering practices over time. There is no expectation that officer names would be shared beyond the LA recording the data.		
	Date data entry (referral)	Date data relating to referral was captured	Date	as above		
	Name of officer (placement)	Name of officer recording information related to the actual placement	free text	as above		
	Date of data entry (placement)	Date data relating to the actual placement was captured	Date	as above		
	Name of officer (placement cost)	Name of officer recording placement cost data	free text	as above		
	Data of data entry (placement cost)	Data placement cost data was captured	Date	as above		