

**Trial Evaluation Protocol: Strengthening Families, Protecting Children –
No Wrong Door Model - Difference-in-differences analysis**

Intervention Developer	North Yorkshire County Council
Evaluator	What Works for Children's Social Care
Principal Investigator	Aoife O'Higgins
Protocol Author(s)	Eva Schoenwald, Aoife O'Higgins, Hannah Collyer, Patrick Sholl, Michael Sanders
Type of Trial	Matched difference-in-differences analysis
Age or Status of Participants	Young people aged 12 - 17, that have been referred to Children's Social Care (some changes to sample apply, depending on outcome measure)
Number of Participating Local Authorities	4
Number of Children and Families	36,000
Primary Outcome(s)	Likelihood of becoming looked after within 18 months of referral
Secondary Outcome(s)	Days in care, number of placement changes, likelihood of being not in education, employment or training (NEET)
Contextual Factors	Local authorities had to apply to be part of the Innovation programme. Participation in the programme required an Ofsted rating of "requires improvement to be good" and high rates and/or rising numbers of looked after children over the last three years.
Version	Version 2.0 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusting sample population definition of NEET outcome to consider larger sample of young people that can be expected to be affected by the implementation of No Wrong Door. Adding additional sensitivity analysis to account for differences in age groups that different local authorities seem to be working with.

Table of contents

Table of contents	29
Background and Problem Statement	3
Strengthening Families, Protecting Children	3
No Wrong Door	3
Context	4
Impact Evaluation	6
Aims	6
Research questions	6
Design	7
Matching	9
Local Authority Level Matching	9
Exclusion Criteria	9
Matching on parallel trends	9
Individual-level Matching	10
Sample size / MDES calculations	12
Outcome measures	12
Primary outcome measure	13
Whether or not the child has become looked after	13
Secondary outcome measures	13
Days spent in care	13
Number of placement changes	13
Analysis plan	14
Primary Analysis:	14
Covariates	15
Handling missing data	16
Secondary Analysis	16
Sensitivity Analysis	17
Definition of treatment and control group	17
Definition of the sample population and treatment condition by CPP	17
Differential time effects	18
Regression specifications	19
Inclusion of trailblazer local authority	19
Triangulation of results	19
Cost Benefit Analysis	19
Timeline	21
Ethics & Participation	21
Registration	22
Data protection	22
Personnel	35

Background and Problem Statement

Strengthening Families, Protecting Children

This evaluation is part of Strengthening Families, Protecting Children (SFPC), a five-year Department for Education funded programme supporting 18 local authorities to improve work with families and safely reduce the number of children entering care. SFPC will support selected local authorities to adopt and adapt one of three [children's social care innovation programme](#) projects in their own area.

The three models are:

- Leeds Family Valued
- Family Safeguarding Hertfordshire
- North Yorkshire's No Wrong Door

What Works for Children's Social Care (WWCSC) is conducting a four-part evaluation for each model:

- A **pilot evaluation** in one 'Trailblazer' local authority (LA). This local authority is the first in this evaluation to implement the model. The pilot evaluation report is complete and can be found on our website.¹
- This is followed by an **impact evaluation** of the model in four subsequent local authorities, with a stepped wedge cluster Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) design.
- This is accompanied by an **Implementation and Process Evaluation (IPE)** across these same four local authorities, to understand the delivery during the rollout of the model.
- Given the challenges the COVID-19 pandemic poses to evaluating a stepped-wedge RCT, a **difference-in-differences analysis** will be conducted to provide an additional approach to analysing the programmes' effects and to increase the robustness of the impact evaluation estimates.

This document sets out the protocol for the difference-in-differences evaluation of No Wrong Door.²

No Wrong Door

No Wrong Door was developed in North Yorkshire with support from the Department for Education's Innovation Programme. Its delivery in North Yorkshire was evaluated by a team at Loughborough University in 2017.

The intervention involves creation of hubs which bring together an integrated range of accommodation options, services and outreach to support young people aged 12-25 who are looked after or on the edge of care, at risk of family or placement breakdown, stepping down from residential care to family based care or transitioning to independent living.

The hub staff team includes the following roles:

- A Manager and two Deputy Managers

¹ see: <https://whatworks-csc.org.uk/research-report/strengthening-families-protecting-children-no-wrong-door-pilot-evaluation-report/>

² The protocol for the IPE and RCT can be found under https://whatworks-csc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/WWCSC_NoWrongDoor_TP_Final_V1-1.pdf

- Hub Residential and Edge of Care Workers (key workers)
- Portfolio Leads who lead on areas such as education, rebuilding relationships, accommodation and transitions
- A Life Coach (Clinical Psychologist)
- Communication Support Worker (Speech & Language Therapist)
- Police Liaison Officer
- Hub Community Families / Relief Workers
- High Need Supported Lodgings / Relief Workers
- Business Support
- Case Support Worker
- Handy Person
- Police Intelligence Analyst
- Performance Analyst

Support is delivered through outreach to young people in existing family or foster care placements and through supporting young people placed in hub placement options including foster care and supported accommodation. Short or medium term residential placements are also used where needed, to support the long term goal of permanence in a family or community setting. Identification of suitable cases and referral to the hub is expected to be through social workers working with young people looked after or on the edge of care, although referral routes may vary according to local arrangements.

The integrated team supports the young person throughout their journey to avoid passing them from service to service. All staff are trained in restorative, strengths based approaches. Young people receive a core offer of support to help reduce high risk behaviour, build and restore relationships, support achievement, develop self-esteem, self-worth and resilience as well as to support transitions and appropriate crisis support.

No Wrong Door operates flexibly, bringing young people into the service quickly and supporting a slow transition out. A key non-negotiable of the programme is using residential care as a short-term intervention not a long term solution and a significant indicator is that young people are always progressing to permanence within a family or community. Successful delivery of the model is considered to be contingent on a service wide practice model and approach to decision making and risk which is restorative, solution-focussed, relationships and strengths based, as well as significant support from senior leadership.

A draft logic model setting out the contextual facilitators and barriers, interventions, mechanisms and outcomes for the No Wrong Door model, and the distinguishers, non-negotiables and core offer for No Wrong Door have also been developed³. The logic model is based on programme theory and not on prior evidence of impact. The logic model will be subject to refinement following completion of the pilot evaluation in Autumn 2020.

Context

³ The draft logic model and the distinguishers, non-negotiables and core offer for No Wrong Door are available in the Stepped Wedge Cluster Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) & Implementation and Process Evaluation (IPE) trial protocol under Appendix A and B respectively.

The IPE and RCT elements of the evaluation will be undertaken in the local authorities funded by the Department for Education to introduce No Wrong Door as part of the Strengthening Families, Protecting Children programme, with the exception of the Trailblazer authority who is participating in the pilot evaluation.

These local authorities started launching NWD from April 2020 with the intention of each subsequent authority starting implementation at 4 month intervals. The COVID19 pandemic disrupted this and four local authorities launched at the following dates⁴:

	Operationally Live	3 month follow-up data collected
Rochdale	April 2020	July 2020
Warrington	April 2021	July 2021
Norfolk	June 2021	September 2021
Redcar & Cleveland	September 2021	This was delayed to February 2022

At the point of rollout to the first local authority, Children’s Services in these authorities all have an Ofsted judgement of ‘requires improvement to be good’, except for Warrington which received a judgement of ‘good’ in 2019. These authorities were selected by the Department for Education to participate in the programme due to having high rates of children looked after compared to their local authority statistical neighbour median over the last 3 years, and/or rising rates of children looked after in each of the last 3 years.

In the difference-in-differences (DiD) analysis, we will use the four local authorities named above as our treatment group, and produce a comparison group from other local authorities that follow similar trends over time to these treatment local authorities.

The ongoing impact evaluation of No Wrong Door by What Works for Children’s Social Care uses a Stepped Wedge Cluster Randomised Controlled Trial design to estimate the impacts of No Wrong Door on children and families. While this design was chosen because of its robustness, the COVID-19 pandemic affects local authorities differently, making them less comparable in an RCT set-up without additional comparator local authorities.

Furthermore, there were a number of changes to the timings of implementation. This includes variation of the gaps between go live dates (some much longer (a year) and some much shorter (a month)) and the intended order in which LAs went live. Smaller gaps between the go-live dates mean that we have less data points in each stage of the implementation, which makes it harder to clearly attribute changes that occur over time to the implementation of the model. Two Local Authorities launched their outreach before their hub opened for placements, and for now we have counted them as live from that point as they are still likely to be having an impact on outcomes (if there is one) through just outreach

⁴ Originally, the model was planned to be rolled out in five local authorities. The fifth local authority, Leicester, will no longer be taking part in the SFPC programme. This will have implications for the evaluation. For the difference-in-differences analysis, we will lose some power as we are lacking an additional treatment local authority. This will be reflected in the power calculations further below. The implications for the stepped wedge RCT analysis will be discussed in an updated trial protocol that will be published over the next few months.

(which reaches a larger number of young people than the placements will). One LA has experienced internal management issues that led to us completing the 3m data collection later than 3m.

In addition to this, it seems possible that there may be changes to the order in which local authorities go live. Changes to the order threaten the randomised nature of the design, which can lead to significant differences between local authorities that implemented the model first compared to those that implement at a later stage. This can make it harder to estimate a causal effect of the model. One local authority will also no longer be taking part in the programme, which leads to a loss of observations and additional information for the analysis of the stepped wedge design.

The difference-in-differences analysis can provide a second lense through which to analyse the impact of the programme, which rests on different assumptions and is thus not reliant on the order of implementation. Additionally, the difference-in-differences analysis will aim to take the differential effect of COVID-19 on different local authorities into account, by choosing comparator local authorities for each of the four local authorities implementing the No Wrong Door model, where the trends in outcomes before implementation of the model are most similar to the No Wrong Door local authority. This approach will thus identify comparator local authorities that have had similar developments in their outcomes for children and families before and during the pandemic, to make the groups as comparable as possible. For local authorities that have implemented the model before or during the pandemic, this matching approach will only provide limited improvements since the main effects of COVID-19 might only occur in the period that is not part of the matching dataset.

Impact Evaluation

Aims

No Wrong Door's delivery in North Yorkshire was evaluated by a team at Loughborough University in 2017.⁵ The original evaluation was conducted using a pre-post design and matched cohorts, largely not based on parallel trends for all outcomes. This limits the estimation of a causal effect of No Wrong Door on outcomes. The current evaluation uses a triangulation of results from a stepped wedge cluster randomised controlled trial approach and a difference-in-differences analysis to provide a more robust evaluation of the impacts of No Wrong Door when scaled to four other local authorities and provide an estimate of the impact on children and families on key outcomes.

Research questions

While the No Wrong Door model aims to affect multiple parties engaged with Children's Services, the key measure of the programme's success used in this evaluation, is whether it achieved one of its primary goals - namely reducing the number of children looked after. The population of interest for our primary research question are children aged 12-17 who have been referred to children's social care. We thus assess the following primary research question of interest:

1. What is the impact of No Wrong Door on the likelihood of children becoming looked after?

⁵ Lushey, C. Hyde-Dryden, G., Holmes, L. and Blackmore, J. (2017) Evaluation of the No Wrong Door Innovation Programme: Research report. Department for Education: London

Given the multifaceted nature of the model, we also expect to see changes in other important outcomes. We limit our analysis of additional outcomes to the impact of No Wrong Door on children in care. To provide a more thorough assessment of the model’s impacts, we address the following secondary research questions:

2. What is the impact of No Wrong Door on the number of days children looked after spend in care?
3. What is the impact of No Wrong Door on the placement stability of children in care?
4. What is the impact of No Wrong Door on the likelihood of children who are or have been in care recently being not in employment education or training (NEET)?

Design

The design of the analysis is a difference-in-differences (DiD) design. The unit of analysis is at the individual level to optimise the power to detect an effect within the constraints of the project.

In a DiD design, we are comparing the change over time in outcomes in the local authorities implementing No Wrong Door (“treatment group”) with the change in outcomes in comparator local authorities (“comparison group”). Each local authority implementing No Wrong Door will be matched to comparator local authorities that have not implemented No Wrong Door. More information on the matching procedure is detailed below.

This analysis is intended to complement the stepped wedge RCT analysis conducted by WWCS. The pandemic has affected the No Wrong Door local authorities to different degrees (e.g. in the form of delays to implementation, moving to remote working, etc.) Since an RCT relies on the assumption of treatment being random, this threatens the robustness of the RCT analysis for several reasons. Firstly, changes to the order of implementations can threaten the randomised element of the stepped wedge design. Secondly, shortening the gaps between local authorities going operationally live reduces our chance of being able to detect the impact of the programme as all four local authorities serve as the comparison group to each other. Thirdly, Covid may impact local authorities in different ways which causes concern for the design due to the small number of sites involved as it can change trends in outcomes over time and affect the degree of comparability between the four local authorities. In order to counteract these risk, a difference-in-differences approach will help by comparing local authorities with similar trends in outcomes before *and* during the pandemic (before the implementation of the No Wrong Door model in the selected authorities), thus making the comparator groups as similar as possible to the four local authorities implementing No Wrong Door.

The trial period referred to in the table below and throughout the report takes place from six months prior to the first local authority going Operationally Live and continues until six months after the final local authority goes Operationally Live.

Table 1: Outcome variables definition and measurement

Trial type and number of arms	Difference-in-differences
-------------------------------	---------------------------

Unit of analysis		Individual (child/young person)
Primary outcome	variable	Whether or not the child has become looked after
	measure	Coded 1 if the child has become looked after at any point within 18 months of the referral. Coded 0 if the child has not become looked after within this period.
	sample	Young people aged 12-17 (at referral) that have been referred within the trial period.
Secondary outcome 1	variable	Days spent in care
	measure	Discrete variable equal to the number of days that a young person has been in care in the first 24 months following the entry into care.
	sample	Young people aged 12-17 that have started a period of care within the trial period.
Secondary outcome 2	variable	Number of placement changes
	measure	Discrete variable equal to the number of placement changes a young person experiences during a period of care, excluding any placement changes to reunification or kinship care. The number of changes is recorded up to 24 months from the start of the first period of care in the trial period.
	sample	Young people aged 12-17 that started a period of care within the trial period.
Secondary outcome 3	variable	NEET status
	measure	Binary variable coded 1 if the young person is NEET after leaving care. This will be measured by the two activity records closest to leaving care (yearly data collection).
	sample	Young people aged 16- 20 that have left care at any point during the trial period and who qualify as a care leaver under the DfE definition of care leavers.

We will use administrative, secondary data for the analysis. The administrative data will be requested from the ONS' National Pupil Database (NPD) via the Secure Research Service (SRS).

Matching

Local Authority Level Matching

We match treatment local authorities to control local authorities that most closely resemble them in the prior trends in outcome variables before the implementation of No Wrong Door. We will then analyse individual-level data from the treatment and control local authorities.

Exclusion Criteria

We select control local authorities from all English local authorities with children's social care services excluding:

- Local authorities also using No Wrong Door (or due to start using No Wrong Door as part of the Innovation Programme).
- Local authorities which are likely to experience "contamination" from the local authorities implementing No Wrong Door as they are partners in the Partners in Practice programme⁶
- Local authorities for which we have fewer than two years of data prior to the implementation of their matched local authorities' implementation of No Wrong Door.

Matching on parallel trends

The identifying assumption in a DiD analysis is that there are parallel trends in outcomes between the treatment and comparator local authorities that would have continued if not for the implementation of the programme. While this assumption cannot be definitively proven, we can increase the likelihood by choosing as comparator local authorities the authorities whose trends in outcome variables match the treatment local authorities' as closely as possible prior to the introduction of No Wrong Door. We match on local authority level trends in primary and secondary outcomes for the two years prior to the intervention. Since we have access to very granular data via the ONS, we will match based on quarterly outcomes for the four years prior to the intervention, excluding cases that entered the sample population in the final 18 months prior to implementation⁷. Local authorities will be matched based on the actual outcome measures that will be used for the full analysis, aggregated to the local authority - quarter level. Quarterly outcomes will provide a higher quality of matching that also more accurately depicts the impact of COVID-19 on the individual local authorities.

We set out to find matches for each local authority for each outcome variable separately. Specifically, we match on the shortest normalised distance between the data for every treatment local authority and its potential comparators. The data is the change in the outcome variable between one quarter and the next (the outcome variable is standardised to take into account changes in the way that it is measured over the quarters) for all quarters in the two years prior to the introduction of No Wrong Door in the specific treatment local authority. For each treatment local authority, the lowest scoring pairs whose trends are also

⁶ Innovation Programme. Partners in Practice. <https://innovationcsc.co.uk/partners-in-practice/>.

⁷ This is done to avoid confounding pre-intervention trends with potential early treatment effects, as we observe some children over a period of up to 18 months. We run sensitivity analyses on our main analysis to gauge the extent of the under-estimation of treatment.

convincing when inspected visually will be first preference for matching.⁸ We will also test the robustness of the parallel trend assumption using placebo tests which are described in more detail below. Matching will be done with replacement, such that a single comparator could be used as a match for multiple treatment local authorities.

Once identified, the local authority pairs will be subject to further qualitative analysis to assess whether the matched authorities are likely to fulfil the common shocks assumption. According to this assumption, any event that occurs following the programme's implementation should affect each local authority equally (in other words, the parallel trends would continue to hold and deviations from parallel trends can be interpreted as a treatment effect). To test this assumption, we identify shocks that we expect to have repercussions in many local authorities (e.g. substantial serious case reviews that lead to reactions/changes in the entire sector) and assess whether the outcomes⁹ in the local authority pairs appear to respond similarly. Secondly, we will seek to identify shocks that are potentially more idiosyncratic and thus threaten the validity of the parallel trends and common shock assumptions. Finally, we will run sensitivity analysis using only data from when No Wrong Door was already implemented where we control for the common shock and its interaction with the presence of No Wrong Door. A significant coefficient of the interaction effect will indicate a potential violation of the common shock assumption. These shocks will have to be large enough and relevant enough to our outcome measures that we can assume they will affect the outcomes for a particular local authority. Examples of such shocks include:

- Introduction of a new (whole-system) practice model
- Serious case reviews with repercussions for the local authority
- Local safeguarding children board reports with consequences for the local authority.

The local authorities identified as the closest match for each outcome for the treatment local authority and where our additional analysis suggests that it is likely that the parallel trends and common shocks assumptions hold will then be considered the control local authorities for the respective outcome. We will analyse their pseudo-anonymised individual-level administrative data of the outcomes accessed via the Office for National Statistics (ONS) from 2017/18 (which is two years before any treatment local authority they are matched to started No Wrong Door) up until data from the 2023/24 year. If matches are not identified from the 10 closest neighbours, we accept that we cannot conduct the analysis for that treatment local authority and will exclude this local authority for the analysis.

Individual-level Matching

After matching at local authority level, we also match at an individual (child) level within the local authority matched pairs using coarsened exact matching (CEM¹⁰). We do so in order to decrease the imbalance on covariates between the treated and control individuals, allowing the identification of a better causal estimate.

⁸We visually inspect the pairs starting with the lowest scoring pair. If we find more than one parallel trend convincing, we will include more than one comparator LA. If none of the pairs are deemed adequate visual matches, then we will exclude the treatment LA from the analysis.

⁹ We will also seek to look at outcomes affected by a common shock that do not form part of the No Wrong Door research questions. This will enable us to disentangle the effects of a common shock from the effects of the intervention.

¹⁰ Iacus, S., M., King, G. & Porro, G. (2018, April 12). CEM: Software for Coarsened Exact Matching. CRAN. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/cem/vignettes/cem.pdf>

We chose CEM to match at an individual level because it allows analysts to specify ex ante the maximum acceptable imbalance. It also has a number of other desirable properties, for example, it removes the need for an additional process to restrict data to an area of common support, meets the congruence principle, is robust to measurement error, and is computationally fast (important given that the dataset will be large relative to computing power available). CEM works by first temporarily coarsening the control variables based on the user's selection so that the continuous variables are cut into categories (e.g. age as an integer coarsened to 0-5, 5-10, 10-15, 15-18 years) and categorical variables are combined (e.g. school year coarsened to primary school, senior school). All individuals are then assigned to strata with the same coarsened control variables. Strata which do not have at least one treatment and control individual are dropped.

We match on individual-level control variables within the same financial year (if this results in dropping too many observations, we will match on variables within the same time period - pre-treatment or post treatment). For the purpose of CEM, we specify the coarseness of the variables as:

- Gender (included as a binary indicators: 0=Not recorded/unborn, 1= male, 2=female, 3=indeterminate)
- Age of children at the time of referral (12-15, 16+)
- Ethnicity (major group¹¹)
- Disability (included as a binary indicator: 0=No, 1= Yes)
- Free school meal eligibility in the last six years or pupil premium eligibility if child is in reception, year 1 or year 2¹² (included as a binary indicator: 0=No, 1= Yes)
- Is child an Unaccompanied Asylum Seeker¹³ (included as a binary indicators, 0=No, 1= Yes)
- Whether or not the child has previously been made the subject of a CP (0, 1)

We make sure that individuals from each trial local authority are only matched to individuals from their specific comparator local authority (that has been identified as having parallel trends) in the CEM procedure. We only match individuals from the same financial year. If this means that a considerable share of treatment group observations have to be dismissed, we reserve the option to widen this criteria to match only individuals from the same period (before the implementation of No Wrong Door and after the implementation of No Wrong Door). Note that the coarseness is only for matching purposes and we describe our operationalisation of covariates for inclusion in the regression below. We report the proportion matched and the multivariate imbalance score which measures imbalance with respect to the joint distribution, including all interactions, of the covariates (Iacus, King and Porro, 2011)¹⁴. We then estimate the difference-in-differences regression weighted by the weights that equalise the number of treated and control individuals within each CEM stratum.

¹¹ The major ethnic groups are: White; Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups; Black, African, Caribbean or Black British; Asian or Asian British; Other ethnic group

¹² as all infant school children in government-funded schools are FSM eligible

¹³ UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UNHCR's Engagement with Displaced Youth, March 2013, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/5142d52d2.html> [accessed 14 June 2019] p28

¹⁴ Iacus, Stefano M., Gary King and Giuseppe Porro. 2011. "Multivariate Matching Methods that are Monotonic Imbalance Bounding." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106:345–361. <http://gking.harvard.edu/files/abs/cem-math-abs.shtml>.

Sample size / MDES calculations

	Values
MDES (Cohen's d)	0.075
MDES (percentage point difference)	0.019
Baseline measures	0.07
Intracluster correlations (ICCs) Local authority	0.00268
Alpha	0.05
Power	0.8
One-sided or two-sided?	Two-sided
Level of intervention clustering	Local authority
Number of clusters	4
Average cluster size (children per local authority per year)	1,200
Average cluster size (children per local authority across all time periods)	2,400
Number of years	2
Sample Size (children) Total	19,200

While power calculations ex ante for a DiD analysis have their shortcomings especially in terms of the precision of the calculations, the calculations above highlight a potential risk of being underpowered for this analysis.¹⁵ The main analysis will use a feasible GLS estimation, an approach which has been shown to increase power, to mitigate this risk. The results of the MDES calculations will be taken into account in the triangulation of the results and discussed accordingly in the final report.

Outcome measures

For the trial we will evaluate one primary outcome measure and three secondary outcome measures. Individual-level data will be collected from the ONS' National Pupil Database (NPD) via the Secure Research Service (SRS). Local authorities will not be involved in the data collection for the DiD analysis. Below we give an explanation and rationale of the outcomes outlined in the Design Table. In the instance of any unintentional inconsistencies, the above table definitions should take precedent in the analysis.

¹⁵ Please note that the power calculations are based on the commonly used approach for clustered difference-in-differences designs, but does not fully take into account the staggered roll-out of the programme. This means that the MDES might potentially be underestimated.

Primary outcome measure

Whether or not the child has become looked after

To answer research question 1, we will analyse whether young people (aged 12-17 who have been referred within the trial period) are more or less likely to become looked after within 18 months of being referred when No Wrong Door is implemented, compared to when it was not. The outcome measure is a binary variable, indicating whether or not a young person that is in our sample (defined above) has become looked after at any point within 18 months of their first referral in the trial period.

No Wrong Door staff work with young people edging to or on the edge of care. One of the goals of the programme is to keep young people out of the care system and safely with their families. Edge of care can be defined in various ways. The intervention developer, North Yorkshire, defined edge of care as “those children and young people who are at imminent risk of becoming looked after, due to significant child protection concerns, or to prevent a long term placement; or because they have ceased to be looked after and their needs are escalating”.¹⁶

Since the definition of edge of care can differ between local authorities, and the data availability for young people on the edge of care might not be readily available for the period before the programme was implemented, we resort to a wide population estimate using all young people that have been referred within the trial period as our baseline population. This will encompass the vast majority of children on the edge of care and will also capture cases that we would not be able to capture if we limited the population to a more narrow population (e.g. children on CPPs). This broad measure will shed some light on the wider, whole system effects of No Wrong Door. We will employ a more narrow population definition in our secondary and sensitivity analysis to explore different proxies of children on the edge of care given the data limitations.

Secondary outcome measures

In addition to the primary outcome, we will also seek to evaluate three secondary outcome measures.

Days spent in care

To answer research question 2, we use a discrete variable measuring the number of days an individual has spent in care over a period of 24 months from the start of the period of care. Larger values will be censored at 24 months. Our sample will be different to our primary sample (young people who are referred within the trial period), and will only consider young people who started a period of care within the trial period, and were aged 12-17 at the point of first entering care within the trial period.

Number of placement changes

To answer research question 3, we use a discrete variable measuring the number of times a young person changes placements during a period of care. Our sample will include any young people who started a period of care within the trial period, and were aged 12-17 at the

¹⁶ Lushey, C. et al.(2017): “Evaluation of the No Wrong Door Innovation Programme” - Children’s Social Care Innovation Programme Evaluation Report 51.

point of first entering care within the trial period. We will only count the number of placement changes within 24 months of beginning the initial episode of care.

The number of placement changes of young people in care can serve to measure the effectiveness of No Wrong Door in supporting a stable placement for individuals in care. The organised and appropriate support that is provided by No Wrong Door in a crisis is intended to help avoid placement breakdowns for young people in care. We will exclude any moves into kinship care or reunification with the family from our count since we believe these moves to be less harmful to the child than other types of moves.

NEET status

To answer research question 4, we use a binary outcome measure, indicating whether or not a young person who left care during the trial period is not in education, employment or training (NEET) in the first two years after leaving care. We only consider children who qualify as a care leaver under the DfE definition.¹⁷

-We measure children and young people repeatedly across a period of 24 months. The first measurement of the NEET status will be the activity status recorded closest after the young person left care. A young person is deemed part of the control group if they left care before the implementation of No Wrong Door, and deemed part of the treatment group if they left care after the implementation. The multidisciplinary teams working with young people through No Wrong Door and the support provided for education and employment are expected to reduce the rate of young people that are NEET.

We reserve the right to exclude age groups above the age of 18 if sufficient data on the NEET rate of individuals in this age group is not consistently available across the five local authorities. We will measure the NEET status within 24 months of leaving care.

Care should be taken in the interpretation of the results of our analysis. Each result (pertaining to a specific outcome measure) will help create a picture of the changes that are taking place because of the intervention. However, in isolation we should be wary of concluding strongly that one direction is good or bad but we will evaluate each analysis in the context of the others that we conduct. In combination, along with the findings of the associated process evaluation, this can shed further light on the factors driving these outcome changes. We will also reflect any remaining ambiguity accordingly in our reports.

Analysis plan

Primary Analysis:

We will estimate the impact of No Wrong Door on the primary outcomes of interest Y_{iat} in the following regression framework:

$$Y_{iat} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 NWD + \gamma X_{iat} + \rho Z_{at} + \theta Year_t + \delta LA_a + \varepsilon_{iat}$$

Where

- Y_{iat} is a binary indicator that equals 1 if the child entered care within 24 months of their first referral in the trial period, and 0 otherwise.¹⁸

¹⁷ Care leaver information is collected for children who left care and who were previously looked after for at least 13 weeks after their 14th birthday, including some time after their 16th birthday.

¹⁸ Population as described above.

- NWD_{iat} is a binary indicator equal to 1 if the child had its first referral during the trial period after the local authority implemented No Wrong Door (and 0 if before).¹⁹
- X_{iat} is a vector of individual and household level characteristics that may also influence the outcome, such as age of the child, gender, and free school meal eligibility.
- Z_{at} is a vector of time-varying local authority characteristics, such as the number of children receiving free school meals per local authority
- $Year_t$ are year dummy variables to capture time trends common to all authorities for each financial year.
- LA_a are LA fixed effects to capture average time invariant differences between local authorities
- ε_{iat} are heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors at time t for individual i, clustered at the level of the local authority (the level at which assignment takes place).

The unit of analysis is at the individual level to optimise the power to detect an effect within the constraints of the project. To account for serial correlation in our data and to increase power, we will use feasible GLS estimates employing a random effects model that accounts for cluster-robust estimates²⁰.

We will judge the statistical significance of the treatment effects applying a significance level of 5%. Due to the small number of clusters, we will employ a robust inference technique and bias corrections suggested by Brewer et al. (2013) that produce correctly sized tests even with few groups. Our sensitivity analysis will consider different evaluation approaches that are discussed in detail below.

Covariates

In order to increase the precision of our estimates, we include the following individual level and local authority covariates (where they are available), which, unless otherwise stated, will be gathered at the point of entry into the sample (point of referral for primary outcome, beginning of an episode of care, if available, for secondary outcomes).

Vector of individual level covariates of the child or young person

- Gender (included as a binary indicators for male, female, or other/undetermined)
- Ethnicity²¹
- Age (in months)
- Disabled status²² (included as a binary indicator: 0=No, 1= Yes)
- Eligibility for free school meals (included as a binary indicator: 0=No, 1=Yes, if pupil has ever been recorded as eligible for free school meals on Census day in

¹⁹ Children can only occur once in our evaluation, i.e. that we consider the first referral

²⁰ See Cameron & Miller (2015): A Practitioner's Guide to Cluster-Robust Inference. We use a linear regression if the baseline rate of our outcome is between 5 and 95%. If the baseline rate is outside of that range, we employ a logistic regression instead, as this model typically fairs better for binary outcomes with extreme baseline rates. We will consider conditional logit models to overcome the incidental parameters problem.

²¹ In the categories defined in the DfE's CIN census.

²² Hughes K, Bellis MA, Jones L, Wood S, Bates G, Eckley L, McCoy E, Mikton C, Shakespeare T, Officer A. Prevalence and risk of violence against adults with disabilities: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Lancet* 2012.

any Spring Census up to the pupil's current year), Pupil Premium eligibility (for Reception, Year 1 and Year 2)²³

- Is child an Unaccompanied Asylum Seeker²⁴ (included as a binary indicators, 0=No, 1= Yes)
- Number of previous child protection plans (where possible to collect)
- The main need for which child started to receive services for this referral (if applicable), as defined in the [CIN census](#) (included as a categorical variable: 0 = Not stated, 1 = Abuse or neglect, 2 = Child's disability/illness, 3 = Parental Disability/illness, 4 = Family in acute stress, 5 = Family dysfunction, 6 = Socially unacceptable, 7 = Low income, 8 = Absent parenting, 9 = Cases other than Children in Need)

In addition, we would have wanted to take into account families (e.g. through adding family fixed effects), however we are reasonably confident data will not be available, so we have refrained from including them.

Vector of time-varying local authority level covariates²⁵

- Proportion of children / young people eligible for Free School Meals (continuous variable based on all children in our sample)
- Proportion of children / young people white British (continuous variable based on all children in our sample)
- Presence of other Innovation Programmes - if the authority used programmes additional to No Wrong Door that had similar aims or that induced whole system change (e.g. Signs of Safety) (coded as binary variables)

Handling missing data

In cases of missing data, we will consider the possible reasons for its missingness and undertake statistical analyses to determine whether there are any patterns relating to other recorded covariates or to the treatment variable. We will drop observations with missing outcome variables, and will drop covariates that are missing at a rate greater than 30%. For covariates with lower levels of missingness, we will conduct multiple imputation where data is missing experimentally at random.

Secondary Analysis

For the binary secondary outcome, namely NEET status, as defined in the RCT Design Table above, we will use the same regression specification as for the primary outcome. We will choose between a logistic regression and a linear regression using the same decision criteria as for the primary outcome. Since we will measure young people's NEET status repeatedly over the 24 months after entering care (if they remain looked after or are within their first year of leaving care), we include individual random effects in the regression specification as well as indicator variables controlling for the time passed since entering care.

²³ We use Pupil Premium Eligibility for the first three years as every child is eligible for free school meals during this period.

²⁴ UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2013, March). *UNHCR's Engagement with Displaced Youth*. <https://www.refworld.org/docid/5142d52d2.html>, p28.

²⁵ We will request monthly data on these covariates from the local authorities. In the case that obtaining this more granular data proves impossible, we will use yearly data as a proxy. We will use the most recently available measurement that took place prior to the referral date.

For the secondary outcomes, number of days spent in care and number of placement changes, where the outcome measures are discrete variables, we will use a linear probability model. We will also control for the age of the child at the time of entering care for all secondary outcomes regressions. Other specifications remain as specified in the primary analysis.

Sensitivity Analysis

Definition of treatment and control group

We adopt a conservative approach in our primary analysis and define any child as part of the control group whose local authority had not implemented No Wrong Door at the date of the first referral (for the primary outcome) or commencement of a period of care (for secondary outcomes) within the trial period. This will most likely underestimate the treatment effect, since children in the control group might have been in contact with No Wrong Door at a later stage of the plan.

To analyse the magnitude of the treatment effect further, we run additional regressions using different treatment and control group definitions. We will look at different treatment definitions including:

- Children whose spent at least half their time on any open referrals in the trial period when the local authority had implemented No Wrong Door, i.e. if a child had 64 days of open referrals during the trial period, and had at least 32 of those days after the local authority had implemented No Wrong Door, they would be coded 1, otherwise coded 0.
- Children who spent at least 4 weeks across any open referrals during the trial period under No Wrong Door coded as 1, otherwise coded 0.

Definition of the sample population and treatment condition by CPP

We will employ an alternative sample population definition and treatment condition definition to re-estimate the effect of No Wrong Door on the likelihood of children and young people to become looked after. In order to do so, we will estimate the effect of No Wrong Door on the likelihood of children and young people who have started CPPs, becoming looked after within 18 months of the CPP start date. We will define our sample population as: young people aged 12-17 (at start of CPP) that have started a CPP within the trial period.

We will then define treatment conditions as:

- Control - young people whose first CPP in the trial period was when the local authority was running their business as usual model.
- Treatment - young people whose first CPP in the trial period was when the local authority was running No Wrong Door.

We will then measure whether these young people have become looked after within 18 months of starting the CPP. Our analysis will then be otherwise as stated in the primary analysis section above, but with covariates defined relative to the CPP start date (if they are available).

This approach limits the population of interest to children on CPPs only, and determines which children are treated or not based on the date that they begin their CPP. While this bears the risk of missing some of the children on the edge of care that No Wrong Door works with, it has the benefit of combining a more narrowly defined population of interest with a higher baseline rate. The outcome measure will serve as a comparison to the primary outcome measure which uses a wider baseline population, to complement and robustify the

findings. Since this will reduce the sample size but will not strongly reduce the number of cases that are actually at risk of becoming looked after, this approach can potentially increase the power of the analysis and decrease potential bias in the estimate. The results of this outcome measure will be compared with the results from the primary outcome measure.

Differential time effects

We do not consider time effects such as embedding periods in our primary analysis. It may be that No Wrong Door needs some time to be fully embedded and functional. In that case the treatment will show differential time effects. In this sensitivity analysis, we thus include differential treatment effects depending on the time No Wrong Door has been implemented in the local authority. The regression specification will be:

$$Y_{iat} = \beta_0 + \sum_{m=1}^M (NWD_{iat} \cdot T_m) \beta_m + \gamma X_{iat} + \rho Z_{at} + \theta Year_t + \delta LA_a + \varepsilon_{iat}$$

Where T_m is a binary indicator that equals one if the observation is from a local authority that has been implementing No Wrong Door for m periods (with s being the first period after implementation), and otherwise 0. The coefficients on the interaction effect will shed light on whether authorities experience increasing treatment effects the longer they run No Wrong Door.

We recognise that the estimation of differential time effects will likely be underpowered due to splitting the treatment effect into separate, time-dependent effects. Nevertheless, we consider this analysis as potentially providing a richer picture of the effects of No Wrong Door.

Widening the age group

At the time of updating the trial protocol, it seems that some No Wrong Door local authorities have expanded the age group of young people they are working with, beyond the 12 to 17 year old range previously envisaged. If this proves to be the case at the time of analysis, we will conduct an additional sensitivity analysis expanding the sample population's age range for all local authorities to a wider age group, taking into account the youngest age group any local authority is working with.

Decomposition

Since the go-live date of the No Wrong Door model differs by local authority, the "treatment timing" is staggered. In such staggered settings, the treatment estimate has a risk of bias if there is a heterogeneity in treatment effects over time. Heterogeneous treatment effects over time are likely in our setting, since local authorities will still increase implementation and get used to new ways of working after the go-live date. This can potentially lead to a larger effect of No Wrong Door on outcomes the longer the model has been implemented. To account for this risk of bias, we will run an additional sensitivity analysis using a decomposition put forward by Goodman-Bacon (2018) and will consider approaches such as the one put forward by Callaway and Sant'Anna (2020) if the decomposition suggests a significant risk of bias.

Regression specifications

In the event that the data distribution suggests a different model would be more suitable, we will run and report these models in addition. Specifically, this will include (but not be limited to) considering hurdle models when evaluating the impact on days in care and placement changes.

If the data on days spent in care turns out to be heavily censored, we will consider employing a tobit model instead of a linear probability model in our main regression specification for research question 2.

Inclusion of trailblazer local authority

As No Wrong Door was also implemented in the 'trailblazer' local authority Middlesbrough, we will include Middlesbrough as a treatment local authority in the sensitivity analysis and will evaluate how the main results change when adding this local authority to the treatment group. Adding an additional treatment LA will increase power, but might potentially overestimate the treatment effect. Trailblazer local authorities were selected to implement the model ahead of the remaining LAs whose implementation dates were randomised. As this different selection process might be correlated with underlying differences in the LAs, especially in terms of readiness to implement the model, we refrain from including the trailblazer in the stepped wedge RCT analysis as it would not meet the underlying assumption of randomised implementation dates.

Triangulation of results

Since we will conduct an analysis exploiting the stepped wedge design of the implementation as well as a DiD analysis, results will have to be triangulated to reach a conclusion of the impact evaluation of No Wrong Door. In the case that both evaluations align it will provide robust evidence of the potential impact of No Wrong Door. In such a case, we will reach an average estimate of the impact of No Wrong Door by pooling the two treatment effects to arrive at a single coherent estimate.

If however, the results diverge, care will have to be taken to draw adequate conclusions. We are conducting two types of analysis simultaneously and both have methodological challenges which will be affected by the roll-out of the programme and the ability to find suitable matches. If the assumptions underlying each quantitative method only hold for one of the approaches, we will rely primarily on these results to assess the models' impact. If the assumptions hold for both approaches, we will try to identify what accounts for the observed differences in results and will take these considerations into account when drawing conclusions.

Cost Benefit Analysis

Overall approach

We will evaluate the financial benefits and direct costs to local authorities of implementing the programme. We recognise that there may be other (social) benefits of the programme (e.g. to children who did not come into care) but this will not be the focus of our analysis. We will look at the costs and benefits over the entire observation period and will consider benefits based on our impact evaluation and actual costs, excluding any prerequisites. To quantify the benefits of the No Wrong Door programme, we will consider the cost savings for a local authority through fewer children coming into care. This will be based on a triangulation of literature and best practices. We will report a benefit cost ratio and the net present social value of the programme.

Benefits

Our main analysis focuses on the effects of No Wrong Door on children's social care outcomes. We will triangulate the found treatment effect for the primary outcome from the DiD and stepped-wedge RCT analysis as detailed in the previous section.

The main focus of this analysis will be on any savings or costs realised through a change in the number of children that become looked after (the primary outcome). This will be informed by the coefficient of our primary analysis and average cost estimates per looked after child. Monetised benefits will be calculated as follows:

Total un-monetised benefit per LA = average treatment effect²⁶ x average number of children in the sample per year per local authority

Total monetised benefit/LA = $\sum_{i=0}^4$ Total unmonetised benefit * £benefit/person * discount factor_i

The discount factor will deflate benefits to their corresponding value in the base year. The benefit per person will be determined by triangulating existing research on the savings associated with a child not going into care. This will be based on the weighted average cost of a child going into care by placement type.

We will only compute benefits of the programme if the point estimate of the corresponding regression is statistically significant. Note that this will focus on the savings realised by the (average) number of cases where children that were involved with statutory services did or did not go on to become looked after due to No Wrong Door. We will also gauge cost savings in other areas of children's social care measured by the secondary outcomes in our main analysis should the effect estimates be statistically significant.

There are a range of benefits that we will not monetise but that we will take into consideration when discussing the cost effectiveness of the intervention. These include effects on staff workload and wellbeing, outcomes for the wider family network and improved relationships. These benefits will be discussed taking into consideration the findings of the implementation and process evaluation in particular.

Cost components

To estimate the actual costs of the programme, we will share an online survey with designated leads at all participating local authorities. We will measure the categories below, and where possible identify whether these are prerequisites, start-up (one-off) costs or recurring costs. Where possible we will also identify whether there is overlapping use or prolonged life use of any goods. We will seek to establish actual rather than intended costs, by collecting this data from people involved in the study. However, where this data is not forthcoming, we will need to rely on the forecast or anticipated costs.

The cost data will include:

1. Personnel cost for the implementation of the programme, i.e. how much local authority staff time is used for delivery of the programme that required backfilling positions or hiring additional staff, and for which staff roles - time required * average salary for this staff role

²⁶ This is the treatment effect coefficient of the main regression in the primary analysis.

2. Training costs (both personnel costs²⁷ and any fees/license costs incurred)
3. Programme costs, e.g. fees and costs for programme components
4. Facilities, equipment and materials e.g. resources, printed materials, office supplies, computers, software, premises costs
5. Potential unintended consequences (e.g. an increase in the number of children on child protection plans, based on the findings of the full analysis) as identified in the logic model
6. Other programme inputs or hidden costs

Similar to the monetised benefits, costs will be deflated to the value in the base year. Personnel costs will be estimated by multiplying the number of hours by a typical hourly wage for an employee at the local authority in that role. The final cost estimate will be the sum of all costs listed above, discounted with respect to when they were incurred, averaged across all four local authorities.

We will seek to establish an overall cost of the programme and put the overall cost in context to the provided funding. We will seek to establish actual rather than intended costs, by collecting data directly from people involved in the study. However, where this data is not forthcoming, we will need to rely on the forecast or anticipated costs. This will be based on total cost to local authorities if they were to implement the intervention independently of funding and evaluation.

Timeline

Activity	Timeframe
First LA implements No Wrong Door	September 2020
Final LA implements No Wrong Door	September 2021 ²⁸
Observation period for the final participants from the population sample ends	February 2024
Data collected via ONS ²⁹	March 2025
Analysis (DiD) and triangulation of results between all three strands of analysis	2025/26
Reporting	2026

Ethics & Participation

We maximise the benefit of the evaluation by providing an additional lens to understand the impact, in particular getting closer to a causal estimate of the impact of No Wrong Door, which is informative for local authority decision-making as to whether or not to invest in No Wrong Door. We believe the risk of harm is very low. The data used is administrative data which is collected / created in the course of day to day children's social work, and no further

²⁷ E.g. hiring a trainer or hiring agency staff to cover the staff on training.

²⁸ Estimated date, subject to changes due to the implications of COVID-19

²⁹ The DfE's individual-level statistics on the CIN and CLA census become available to researchers with a one year lag, e.g. the statistics on children in need from the April 2020-March 2021 year will be available from March 2022 onwards.

collection of data is required. The analysis does not involve innovative technology, denial of service, large-scale profiling, biometric data, genetic data, data matching, invisible processing, tracking or targeting of individuals for marketing purposes. The outputs will be presented as summary statistics and will be checked for statistical disclosure.

The low risk of harm mostly comes from the possibility of harm if the individual were identified (very unlikely) following a data breach (also very unlikely). We mitigate the risk of a data breach by using the ONS' secure research service (SRS). Data will be stored on the ONS' systems. Access to the data will be limited to the project team at WWCS; all researchers have undergone rigorous data protection training. It is very unlikely that the data requested will enable re-identification because we only ask for the data necessary to undertake the analysis and this contains no "instant identifiers" (e.g. name, address etc) or "meaningful identifiers" (which would allow matching to other datasets with more information).

The trial protocol has undergone an ethics review by a member of WWCS's Evaluation Advisory Board.

Registration

The trial will be pre-registered on OSF (Open Science Framework, <https://osf.io/>) run by the Centre for Open Science (<https://cos.io/>).

Data protection

1. Purpose for processing

The purpose of processing the data is to evaluate the impact of the No Wrong Door model of social work practice. Our main analysis looks at how introducing the model has an impact on the likelihood of children being taken into care, we also consider other related outcomes.

The main benefit of the processing is that it will add to the evidence base around whether No Wrong Door “works” and assist local authorities in understanding whether they should invest in it. This aligns with WWCS’s mission to: generate, collate and make accessible the best evidence for practitioners, policy makers and practice leaders to improve children’s social care and the outcomes it generates for children and families. The intended effects on individuals are downstream to improved social care.

Data that is used will already be part of the usual processes of collection in children’s social care (or education) for the council. We limit ourselves to asking for administrative data that has to be recorded for statutory returns. No further data will be collected.

More details

- Transfer of the pseudonymised individual-level data from the local authority to What Works for Children’s Social Care via a secure transfer channel (e.g. Egress). The sharing will be governed by a data sharing agreement and data will not be shared with third parties.
- Data cleaning and merging
- Data validation
- Data analysis (including descriptive statistics and regression analysis)
- Data presentation and reporting (including summary and regression tables, and graphs - small numbers will be suppressed to avoid statistical disclosure).
- Data will be stored on an encrypted hard drive which will be locked in an electronic safe. Access will only be granted to research team members.

Data will be deleted securely 5 years after the final project report is published. Although the data is sensitive, since the data is pseudonymised prior to transfer, we do not anticipate there to be processing of a high risk nature in terms of negative impact to the individual or breaches of personal sensitive data.

More details can be found in each of the trial protocols available on WWCS’s website.

2. Relationships of parties

The No Wrong Door Model was developed in **North Yorkshire** with support from the **Department for Education’s Innovation Programme**. Its delivery in North Yorkshire was evaluated by a team at **Loughborough University**. **WWCS** was awarded the contract to evaluate the Intervention.

The DfE is funding the evaluation and research of the Intervention upon implementation. The categories of personal data and the methodology for capture and use of personal data to produce an evaluation report shall be determined by **WWCS**.

Local Authorities (Rochdale, Norfolk, Warrington, Redcar) are the delivery partner for the Intervention program within their local authority.

For the purposes of facilitating the capture of personal data and smooth running of the evaluation **WWCS** shall liaise with **Local Authorities (Rochdale, Norfolk, Warrington, Redcar)**.

3. Categories of Data Subject(s) and Personal Data

Category

Number per Category

- Children (aged under 13) = Approximately 50,000 data subjects
- Children (aged 13 and over) = Approximately 50,000 data subjects
- Teachers = 0
- Parents / Legal Guardian(s) = Approx. 25 data subjects
- Carers = Approx. 25 data subjects
- Social Workers = Approx. 50 data subjects
- Allied Professionals = Approx. 50 data subjects
- Other - Please specify/add:

Data Categories

Highlighted = Child's Data
 Non-highlighted = Non-Child's Data
 (Choose both if applicable)

- Name
- Home address
- Email address
- Phone number
- Date of birth
- Age
- Passport information
- Photographs
- Social Worker Case Files
- Social Worker ID
- Interview Answers
- Interview Recordings
- Unspecified Disclosures
- Emotional Difficulties
- Parental Emotional Difficulties
- Behavioral Difficulties
- English Additional Language
- CIN, CPP or CLA Status
- Child's Social Worker's Name
- Borough / Council
- Pseudonymised Data
- Driver's license number
- National insurance number
- Information about dependents
- Records of correspondence

GDPR Special Categories

- Medical or health information
- Racial or ethnic origin
- Sexual orientation
- Sex life
- Biometric Data (e.g., fingerprints, facial recognition)
- Genetic Data
- Religion / Beliefs
- Political opinion
- Trade Union Membership

Equality Act - Protected Characteristics

- Sex
- Age
- Disability
- Special Educational Needs
- Instances of harm
- Sex life
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity

Sensitive Category Data

- Criminal record or offence information
- Proceedings for any offence committed or alleged
- Bank, payment card or tax information
- Other - Please specify/add: Ethnicity of children

School Information

- Job title
- Employee ID number
- Compensation / salary information
- Occupational health information
- CCTV surveillance footage
- Online or offline monitoring or tracking
- Location data
- Call recordings
- Log-in details / passwords
- Other - Please specify/add:

- Name of School
- Attendance
- Placement Information
- Exclusions
- Punctuality
- Eligibility for Free School Meal
- Academic Achievement
- Other - Please specify/add:

4. Method of collection and transfer

Method of Collection

- Live in-person interview(s)
- Live virtual interview(s)
- (Interview(s) Recorded)
- Online survey (completed by child)
- Online survey (completed by adult on behalf of child)
- Online survey (completed by adult)
- Paper-based survey
- Written notes
- Sharing of Case Files/Notes

- Sharing of Administrative Data file(s) by one party to another
- Live in-person observation
- Live virtual observation
- Recorded observation(s)
- Observation document(s)
- Accessed via another party's Internet-based Information Management Tool/System
- Other - Please specify/add:

Method of Transfer

- Secure/Encrypted Email
- SFTP File Transfer
- Access given to an Internet-based Information Management Tool/System
- Limited access given to a secure Google Drive Folder
- Limited access given to a secure MS SharePoint Folder
- Limited access given to a secure MS Teams Site
- Other - Please specify/add: - data accessed via the ONS' secure research service (SRS)

5. Type(s) of dataset

Survey(s)

- Baseline
- Interim
- Longitudinal
- Endline

Administrative Data

- Baseline
- Interim
- Longitudinal
- Endline

Other

- Case Files
- Other - Please specify/add:

Qualitative - Interview(s)

- Baseline
- Interim
- Longitudinal
- Endline (possibility these will not happen)

Qualitative - Focus Group(s)

- Baseline

- Interim
- Longitudinal
- Endline (possibility these will not happen)

Qualitative - Observation(s)

- Baseline
- Interim
- Longitudinal
- Endline (possibility these will not happen)

6. Data Sharing requirements

The Department for Education (DfE) shares data with **What Works for Children’s Social Care** when WWCS’s ONS accredited researchers access the ONS Secure Research Service (SRS) database. **DfE** do not allow any data to be removed from the SRS and there is a separate application for access document the DfE require for their accountability to provide access to data rather than using a Data Sharing Agreement.

Local Authorities (Rochdale, Norfolk, Warrington, Redcar) sharing data with **What Works for Children’s Social Care** for the purpose of making contact with the data subjects to arrange interviews and send invitations. The Local Authorities will also share individual-level, pseudonymised data with **WWCS** for analysis.

For the alleviation of doubt:

Local Authorities (Rochdale, Norfolk, Warrington, Redcar) shall be an independent controllers for the duration of the evaluation unless they should liaise with **WWCS** and jointly determine and/or facilitate the methodology of capture and transfer of personal data for the purposes of the evaluation. In that circumstance **Local Authorities (Rochdale, Norfolk, Warrington, Redcar)** shall be Joint Controller(s) with **WWCS** for those activities.

*For the purpose of adding the individual-level, administrative data captured from the evaluation to a Data Archive, upon completion of the evaluation **WWCS** shall become the sole data controller for all data captured within and associated with the evaluation of the Intervention and the evaluation report.*

7. List of processing activities

1. To improve the evidence base in children’s social care and to conduct research in this area, which will benefit children and young people, local authorities - in particular senior leaders who make decisions about practice models - as well as the Department for Education in future funding decisions.
2. We use the information to understand what the impact of the No Wrong Door model of social work practice affects children and young people, and their families, and add to the evidence base around whether No Wrong Door “works” and assist local authorities in understanding whether they should invest in it.
3. The data we process includes special category data, specifically the ethnicity of the children and young people, and their disability status. This is because processing this special category data will help ensure our research is as accurate and informative as possible.
4. To be pseudonymised so data can be put into an archive database for it to inform further research and secondary studies for the betterment of society. (At this point the data could no longer be deleted).

8. Data Protection Lawful basis for processing

GDPR Article 6.1

(Choose all that apply)

- (a) Consent
- (b) Contract
- (c) Legal obligation
- (d) Vital interests
- (e) Public task
- (f) Legitimate interests

GDPR Article 9.2

(Processing of Special Categories of Personal Data and Protected Characteristics - choose all that apply)

- (a) Explicit Consent
- (b) Employment, social security and social protection (if authorised by law)
- (c) Vital interests
- (d) Not-for-profit bodies
- (e) Made public by the data subject
- (f) Legal claims or judicial acts
- (g) Reasons of substantial public interest (with a basis in law)
- (h) Health or social care (with a basis in law)
- (i) Public health (with a basis in law)
- (j) Archiving, research and statistics (with a basis in law)

(if choosing (b), (h), (i) or (j) this shall be in accordance with the conditions of the UK [Data Protection Act 2018 Schedule 1 Part 1](#))

(If choosing (g) this must be in accordance with the conditions of the [Data Protection Act 2018 Schedule 1 Part 2](#) and outlined in section 7)

Explanation of Lawful Basis

Ethical practices within research require informed consent to be gathered for the data subject's participation in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Intervention and for research to be conducted using their personal data.

For the avoidance of doubt, informed ethical consent shall be regarded as a sufficient safeguard for the processing of personal data including the capture and storage of personal data up to the point analysis of the data is being conducted. Once analysis is being conducted, depending on the dataset in use, a data subject is unable to withdraw consent insomuch as this would detrimentally affect the analysis process intrinsic to the research being conducted therefore reliance on consent as the legal basis for personal data processing is not appropriate.

Where ethical consent has been withdrawn by a data subject, where possible and dependent on the stage of the research process, each party agrees to discontinue the processing of the data subject's personal data and either fully delete, partially delete, pseudonymise or anonymise all identifiers associated to the data.

In this circumstance the lawful basis for processing that was communicated to data subjects was GDPR Article 6.1(f) "Legitimate Interest of the Data Controller". WWCS processes personal data for the benefit of society which is therefore admissible for this activity and only after the research has concluded will the lawful basis for processing become GDPR Article 6.1(e) and GDPR Article 9.2(j) and DPA18 Schedule 1 Part 1.4(a),(b)&(c) for special category data including data considered to be a protected characteristic under the UK Equality Act 2010.

What Works for Children's Social Care (WWCS) is acting upon the instructions from the DfE in accordance with Annex K of the Grant Offer Letter to WWCS, where it is stated that WWCS acting as a Processor on behalf of the DfE as Data Controller, and the subject matter of the processing "is needed in order that the Processor WWCS can effectively deliver the grant to provide a service to the Children's Social Care sector".

WWCS is therefore acting under the authority vested upon it by the DfE as its funder which appropriately corresponds to WWCS conducting its research under Article 6.1(e) of the UK GDPR:

"Processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest."

Upon completion of the evaluation and associated research the lawful basis WWCS, as sole independent controller, shall rely on, for the purpose of archiving and any subsequent secondary analysis of the data, GDPR Article 6.1(e), and GDPR Article 9.2(j) and DPA18 Schedule 1 Part 1.4(a),(b)&(c) for special category data including data considered to be a protected characteristic under the UK Equality Act 2010.

Data archived within the WWCS instance of the Office for National Statistics Secure Research Service ("ONS SRS") for the purposes of secondary research on the data within this evaluation shall be non-identifiable data and governed under the UK Digital Economy Act 2017 and the UK Statistics and Registration Service Act 2007.

9. Handling of Data Subject Rights

- If a Data Subject makes a request to exercise rights under the Data Protection Laws ("**Rights Request**") to either WWCS and/or DfE, the organisation that receives that Rights Request ("**Receiving Party**") shall notify the other within 5 Business Days of receiving the Rights Request.
- Each organisation agrees to carry out any searches and investigations in relation to those systems and records under its control, which may be required in order to enable the organisations to comply with the Rights Request.
- The other organisation provides the Receiving Party with a copy of all personal data arising from the searches undertaken at least 10 Business Days prior to the deadline for responding to the data subject.
- The Receiving Party reviews the information arising from its own searches and the information provided to it by the other organisation(s) and determines how to comply with the Rights Request and shall draft a response to the requesting data subject ("**Draft Response**").
- The Receiving Party notifies the other organisation(s) of any steps or actions it needs to take in order to comply with the Rights Request and sends a Draft Response to the other organisations prior to the deadline for responding to the data subject.
- The other organisation(s) provide comments on the Draft Response and confirm agreement to the Draft Response prior to the deadline for responding to the data subject.
- The Receiving Party shall send the Draft Response to the requesting Data Subject on or in advance of the deadline for responding to the Data Subject.

10. Data protection contact(s) for data subjects

Organisation: WWCS
Job title: Data Protection Officer
Name: James Robson
Email Address: dpo@whatworks-csc.org.uk

Organisational Contact

Organisation: WWCS
Job title: Director of Research
Name: Aoife O'Higgins
Email Address: aoife.ohiggins@whatworks-csc.org.uk

11. Accuracy

WWCS shall be responsible for ensuring that the Personal Data collected is accurate and appropriately kept up to date.

12. Security Provisions

WWCS implement appropriate technical and organisational measures to ensure a level of security appropriate to the risk, taking into account the state of the art, the costs of implementation and the nature, scope, context and purposes of processing as well as the risk and varying likelihood and severity for the rights and freedoms of natural persons.

WWCS, where possible, reduce or eliminate the identifiability of Personal Data including but not limited to the deletion, pseudonymisation and anonymisation of such data throughout the research.

WWCS has conducted a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for the research being conducted. The outcome of this is the risk to the rights and freedoms of data subjects due to the processing of their data for the research is low.

13. Handling of data incidents and data breaches

- If WWCS and/or DfE become aware of a Personal Data Breach they notify each other within 24 hours of becoming aware of the Personal Data Breach and share relevant information with each other to mitigate the breach.
- The organisation that suffered the Personal Data Breach, whether itself or via a processor that it engaged, immediately uses its best endeavours to end the Personal Data Breach and to mitigate the impact of the Personal Data Breach on data subjects.
- WWCS and/or DfE will then work together to establish the level of risk to data subjects which also determines if the Personal data Breach must be reported to the UK Information Commissioner's Office, and if the level of risk is high, report the Personal Data Breach to the affected data subjects.
- Any data incident or Personal data Breach is logged in a breach register which will be held by all organisations as required by the GDPR.

14. Supervisory authority for project

The supervisory authority/Data Protection Authority for the processing of personal data as part of this research is the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) in the UK.

15. Who has access to the data

Only What Works for Children’s Social Care researchers working on this evaluation will have access to the data.

During the collection of personal data and subsequent research, access to Personal Data and Shared Personal Data will be managed by What Works for Children’s Social Care.

Upon completion of the research WWCS shall securely transfer the Personal Data and Shared Personal Data to WWCS’s Data Archive.

Please name the individuals within WWCS who will have access to the data once it has been collected:

1. Hannah Collyer
2. Eva Schoenwald
3. Janae Goodridge-Downer
4. Amar Alam
5. Abby Hennessey
6. Allysa Eden
7. Eve Smyth
8. Jessie Gwyther
9. David Rodriguez
10. Oana Gurau

16. Provision of data privacy notice(s)

The organisation that collects Personal Data and any Personal Data that will be shared with any other organisation for the purposes of the research project is known as the “Collecting Party”. An organisation is a Collecting Party when they are collecting personal data directly from a data subject or data subjects, or from a third party who is supplying the personal data to that organisation specifically for the research project.

The Collecting Party is responsible for making sure data subjects are provided a Data Protection Notice (DPN) setting out all of the information required under Article 13 or 14 of the GDPR. Article 13 requires a DPN to be provided to data subjects when the data is collected directly from a data subject(s) and Article 14 requires that a DPN is provided to data subjects when the data is not collected directly from data subjects.

A copy of the Data Privacy Notice is available on the WWCS website.

Explanation of provision of a Data Privacy Notice:

For this evaluation What Works for Children’s Social Care shall be the Collecting Party/organisation who will provide the Data Privacy Notice to data subjects.

Data Subjects participating in the research shall receive a copy of the data privacy notice from WWCS via email before interviews take place and access is given to a privacy notice as a hyperlink at the beginning of each survey. Where WWCS does not have the contact details of data subjects WWCS will publish the Privacy Notice on its website. This is in line with the requirements of Article 14 of the UK GDPR

17. Retention Period

All data will be processed for the duration of the research project and each organisation minimises Personal Data where it is no longer required. Each organisation only holds Personal Data for a defined retention period outlined in an agreement with them and is responsible for their own secure destruction of the Personal Data they hold. Each

organisation requires the other(s) give at least 30 days' prior written notice if they intend to delete any Personal Data before a defined retention period. Each organisation has agreed to notify WWCS in writing of the confirmation of destruction/deletion of Personal Data processed for the project and has agreed to evidence destruction/deletion to other Parties upon request at the end of the defined retention period.

Defined Retention Period and Destruction

Retention Period:

The delivery of the final report is scheduled for 2026.

WWCS/All parties recognise there is a possibility for the scheduled date of final report delivery to change. Should this happen this will be reflected in a Grant Variation Letter between the parties subject to this agreement. The new agreed date of delivery of the final report will be the point at which the timeframe for when deletion begins.

What Works for Children's Social Care confirms it shall delete all Personal Data and Shared Personal Data 5 years after the delivery of the final report. The agreed date for What Works for Children's Social Care's deletion of all evaluation and research data shall be Autumn 2033.

Where **Local Authorities (Rochdale, Norfolk, Warrington, Redcar)** are independent controllers, they shall determine their own retention period for the data it collects in accordance with any statutory or professional retention periods applicable in that Party's respective country and/or industry.

WWCS shall become the sole independent controller of the data collected for the evaluation that will be placed into the Data Archive.

Where WWCS has become sole controller of the data it shall anonymise all personal data in preparation for indefinite retention as part of its archiving process into a **WWCS** secure server location or the **WWCS** archiving instance within the ONS SRS database for further research to be conducted for the benefit of society as a whole. All data held on the ONS SRS is subject to rigorous quality assurance, de-identification and access certification processes in accordance with the requirements of the Digital Economy Act 2017.

Methodology for Monitoring Destruction/Deletion:

WWCS confirms data deletion dates will be recorded by its Data Protection Officer. The data deletion date will be saved in the **WWCS** Data Protection Framework.

Methodology of Destruction/Deletion:

WWCS confirms data will be securely deleted using the most up to date technology at the time of deletion.

If you would like further information or explanation about this please contact us at dpo@whatworks-csc.org.uk.

18. Data Processors

Where an organisation engages a third-party to process any personal data for the project, that third party is known as a "Data Processor" and each organisation has agreed to enter into a

Data Processing Agreement (DPA) with each third-party. The DPA incorporates all the provisions required under [Article 28](#) of the GDPR. Each organisation remains fully liable for the acts and omissions of the third-party processor(s). Each organisation is also responsible for being able to provide copies of DPAs upon request to any other organisation involved in the project.

19. Data Location

Data Location(s)

- United Kingdom (UK)
- European Economic Area (EEA)
- [Name country outside UK/EEA]

[If outside UK/EEA please confirm appropriate safeguard transfer:

- Adequacy
- Transfer Risk Assessment (TRA) & International Data Transfer Agreement (IDTA)
- EU Standard Contractual Clauses + UK Transfers Addendum
- Binding Corporate Rules Location = (TBC)]

Data Access Location(s)

- United Kingdom (UK)
- European Economic Area (EEA)
- [Name country outside UK/EEA]

[If outside UK/EEA please confirm appropriate safeguard transfer:

- Adequacy
- Transfer Risk Assessment (TRA) & International Data Transfer Agreement (IDTA)
- EU Standard Contractual Clauses + UK Transfers Addendum
- Binding Corporate Rules Location = (TBC)]

20. Data Protection ID (internal reference)

#2006

21. Archiving

WWCSC seeks better outcomes for children, young people and families by bringing the best available evidence to practitioners and other decision makers across the children’s social care sector. It achieves this objective by supporting and/or funding social care intervention programmes in order to conduct real-world evidence-based research on the effectiveness of the intervention programmes it supports.

The data archive continues WWCSC’s service to the Social Care sector as is its remit from the funding it receives from the UK Department for Education. Creating an accessible data archive means the data collected from our evaluations can be used to conduct re-analysis, additional new analysis, including meta-analysis and the ability to merge and use the data for new research to be conducted within the aim of having a positive social impact to society as a whole.

Research data from a large proportion of the evaluations WWCSC either conducts or commissions, is stored in perpetuity, to be accessed (on formal request and subsequent WWCSC approval) by researchers. Researchers may or may not be employed or commissioned by WWCSC.

WWCSC has conducted Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) on its Data Archive and sought outside consultation from the Information Commissioner’s Office, the Department for Education and the Office for National Statistics who also house the data. The outcome of the

DPIA is that the capture and use of data within the Data Archive and for future research is of low risk to data subjects.

Should the data for this project be appropriate for the Data Archive it will have been indicated earlier in this document. The nature of the processing is for transfer to a secure Data Archive, the indefinite storage within a secure Data Archive location and the subsequent re-use of data for research purposes based on ethical and ONS and separate WWCS approval for the access and re-use of the data.

The WWCS Data Archive is stored in the Office for National Statistics' (ONS) Secure Research Service (SRS). The ONS acts as a processor for WWCS when storing the WWCS Data Archive in the SRS. WWCS has entered into a legally binding Data Processor Agreement with the ONS, which will comply with the requirements of Article 28 of the UK GDPR.

The SRS data location is in the UK and the source of the data for the archive will be a combination of WWCS and external evaluation partners funded and commissioned by WWCS which are also located in the UK. The retention of the data in the Data Archive is indefinite. There is no sharing of data outside the SRS due to the security protections and methodology for accredited subsequent access which is highly regulated by the ONS through their "5 safes" framework.

The data in the SRS is of a highly sensitive nature as it will relate to children in the social care environment, parents, teachers, social workers and related third party representatives, and, depending on the context of the research the data relates to, could contain special categories of data including but not limited to ethnicity, health, religion, sexual orientation and/or parental background and abuses that may have been suffered.

No data in the SRS will be directly identifiable to any data subject to which it relates through a process of decoupling, reducing where possible, de-identifying, pseudonymisation and/or anonymising data where possible. The nature of the de-identification process will have similarities for each dataset, although may also have differences so that each dataset remains usable but the data in the SRS remaining not directly identifiable.

22. Definitions:

Data Controller means the natural or legal person, public authority, agency or other body which, alone or jointly with others, determines the purposes and means of the processing of personal data.

Joint Controller means where two or more controllers jointly determine the purposes and means of processing. They shall in a transparent manner determine their respective responsibilities for compliance with the obligations of the GDPR.

Independent Controller means each controller shall determine the purposes and means of processing of the personal data being processed independent of each other and each have their own data controller responsibilities for the processing of that data.

Data Processor means the natural or a legal person, public authority, agency or other body which processes personal data on behalf of a Data Controller.

Personal Data means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person ('data subject').

Shared Personal Data means any Personal Data captured that shall be shared with other parties named in this agreement. Shared Personal Data may not, in all circumstances, mean all Personal Data collected for the Agreed Purpose.

Data Subject means a natural person who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identifier such as a name, an identification number, location data, an online identifier or to one or more factors specific to the physical, physiological, genetic, mental, economic, cultural or social identity of that natural person.

Processing means any operation or set of operations which is performed on personal data or on sets of personal data.

Recipient means a natural or legal person, public authority, agency or another body, to which the personal data are disclosed, whether a third party or not.

Data Protection Laws means all applicable data protection and privacy legislation, regulations and guidance including the UK General Data Protection Regulation ("GDPR") and the Data Protection Act 2018 and the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003; and any guidance or codes of practice issued by the ICO from time to time (all as amended, updated or re-enacted).

Joint Controller Arrangement ("JCA"): means an arrangement between two or more controllers who jointly determine the purposes and means of processing. The JCA shall in a transparent manner determine each controller's respective responsibilities for compliance with the obligations of the GDPR.

Personal Data Breach means a breach of security leading to the accidental or unlawful destruction, loss, alteration, unauthorised disclosure of, or access to, Personal Data transmitted, stored or otherwise processed.

Receiving Party or Parties means the party or parties who receive data shared for a specific purpose by another Party, the Sharing Party. The Receiving Party or Parties become the Controller or joint Controllers of the data.

Sharing Party means the Party sharing data they are the Controller of with one or more parties, the Receiving Party or Parties.

Data Archive: means the storage location used by WWCS to retain de-identified, pseudonymised and/or anonymised evaluation data for use in subsequent research projects by WWCS and/or external researchers. The WWCS Data Archive location is the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Secure Research Service (SRS) based in the UK accredited under the Digital Economy Act 2017 (further information can be found on our website).

Trial/Research Protocol means a document that describes the objectives, design, methodology, statistical considerations and aspects related to the evaluation.

Personnel

The evaluation is funded by the Department for Education and will be undertaken by What Works for Children's Social Care (WWCS). The Principal Investigator is Michael Sanders (Executive Director, WWCS). Data collection, analysis and reporting will be led by David Rodriguez (Research Associate, WWCS) and overseen by Eva Schoenwald (Senior researcher, WWCS).