
This is the author’s final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher’s version if you wish to cite from it.

[http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/142052/](http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/142052/)

Deposited on: 08 August 2018

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
[http://eprints.gla.ac.uk](http://eprints.gla.ac.uk)
Title

Linking routinely collected social work, education, and health data to enable monitoring of the health and healthcare of school aged children in state care (‘looked after children’) in Scotland: a national demonstration project.

Authors

David Clark¹, dclark5@nhs.net
Albert King², albert.king@gov.scot
Katharine Sharpe³, kathy.h.sharpe@btinternet.com
Graham Connelly⁴, g.connelly@strath.ac.uk
Lawrie Elliott⁵, lawrie.elliott@gcu.ac.uk
Lorna MD Macpherson³, lorna.macpherson@glasgow.ac.uk
Alex D McMahon³, alex.mcmahon@glasgow.ac.uk
Ian Milligan⁴, ian.milligan@strath.ac.uk
Philip Wilson⁶, p.wilson@abdn.ac.uk
David I Conway¹,², david.conway@glasgow.ac.uk
Rachael Wood¹,⁷, rachaelwood@nhs.net

¹ Information Services Division, NHS National Services Scotland, Gyle Square, 1 South Gyle Crescent, Edinburgh, EH12 9EB
² Education Analytical Services Division, Scottish Government, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ
³ School of Medicine, Dentistry, and Nursing, University of Glasgow, 378 Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow, G2 3JZ
4 CELSIS (Centre for Excellence for Looked After Children in Scotland), University of Strathclyde, Curran Building, 94 Cathedral Street, Glasgow, G4 0LT

5 Department of Nursing and Community Health, School of Health and Life Sciences Glasgow Caledonian University, Cowcaddens Road Glasgow, G4 OBA

6 Centre for Rural Health, University of Aberdeen, Old Perth Road, Inverness, IV2 3JH

7 Centre for Population Health Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Teviot Place, Edinburgh, EH8 9AG

Corresponding author:
Rachael Wood
Information Services Division
NHS National Services Scotland
Gyle Square
1 South Gyle Crescent
Edinburgh
EH12 9EB
rachaelwood@nhs.net
0131 275 7028
Abstract

Background and objectives

Children in state care (‘looked after children’) have poorer health than children who are not
looked after. Recent developments in Scotland and elsewhere have aimed to improve
services and outcomes for looked after children. Routine monitoring of the health outcomes
of looked after children compared to those of their non-looked after peers is currently
lacking. Developing capacity for comparative monitoring of population based outcomes
based on linkage of routinely collected administrative data has been identified as a priority.

To our knowledge there are no existing population based data linkage studies providing data
on the health of looked after and non-looked after children at national level. Smaller scale
studies that are available generally provide very limited information on linkage methods and
hence do not allow scrutiny of bias that may be introduced through the linkage process.

Study design and methods

National demonstration project testing the feasibility of linking routinely collected looked
after children, education, and health data.

Participants

All children in publicly funded school in Scotland in 2011/12.

Results

Linkage between looked after children data and the national pupil census classified 10,009
(1.5%) and 1,757 (0.3%) of 670,952 children as, respectively, currently and previously
looked after. Recording of the unique pupil identifier (Scottish Candidate Number, SCN) on
looked after children returns is incomplete, with 66% of looked after records for 2011/12 for
children of possible school age containing a valid SCN. This will have resulted in some
under-ascertainment of currently and, particularly, previously looked after children within the
general pupil population. Further linkage of the pupil census to the NHS Scotland master patient index demonstrated that a safe link to the child’s unique health service (Community Health Index, CHI) number could be obtained for a very high proportion of children in each group (94%, 95%, and 95% of children classified as currently, previously, and non-looked after respectively). In general linkage rates were higher for older children and those living in more affluent areas. Within the looked after group, linkage rates were highest for children with the fewest placements and for those in permanent fostering.

Conclusions

This novel data linkage demonstrates the feasibility of monitoring population based health outcomes of school aged looked after and non-looked after children using linked routine administrative data. Improved recording of the unique pupil identifier number on looked after data returns would be beneficial. Extending the range of personal identifiers on looked after children returns would enable linkage to health data for looked after children who are not in publicly funded schooling (i.e. those who are pre- or post-school, home schooled, or in independent schooling).
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Introduction

In Scotland, children in state care (referred to as ‘looked after children’) are those under supervision or accommodated by local authorities\(^1\)-\(^3\). Children can become looked after following a voluntary agreement with their parents or a compulsory process involving the Scottish Children’s Hearing System\(^4\) or the courts, and their requirement for such support can reflect care, protection, and/or offending needs. Looked after children may live at home with their parents under social work supervision (‘looked after at home’); with other family members or friends (‘kinship care’); with foster carers or prospective adopters; or in residential accommodation provided by the state (residential units, schools, and secure care)\(^5\).

Around 15,400 children in Scotland were looked after at the end of July 2015, around 1.5\% of all children aged less than 18 years\(^6\). The health, educational, and wider social outcomes of looked after children are generally poorer than those of children who are not looked after\(^7\). Current Scottish Government policy strongly supports improving the experience and outcomes of looked after children\(^10\) and emphasises the need for robust routine data to enable monitoring of care provided and outcomes achieved\(^11\).

Currently, routine data returned by local authorities to the Scottish Government on children being looked after form the basis of an annual statistical publication on children’s social work\(^6\). In addition, the Scottish Government routinely links the looked after data to administrative data returned by local authorities on education provision to enable monitoring of the educational attainment and post school destinations of looked after children compared to all children\(^12\). Scotland has a wide range of high quality routine health data that can be used to monitor child health. Health records in general do not include information on
children’s looked after status hence they cannot be used in isolation to assess the health of
looked after children. Linkage of routine looked after and health data would open up the
possibility of robust population based monitoring of the health outcomes of looked after and
non-looked after children, and developing such a linkage has been identified as a priority\textsuperscript{11}.

Here we report the results of a national level demonstration project linking routinely available
looked after children data and health data for the first time in Scotland. To our knowledge,
this is the first time globally that such a national level, population based linkage study has
been undertaken. This paper reports the methodology and results of the linkage process: a
separate paper reports the results of a follow on analysis assessing the dental health of looked
after and non-looked after children using the linked data set created (submitted for
publication, available on request). With this paper we aim to provide information of use to
future researchers wishing to assess the health and healthcare of looked after children using
routinely available data.

\textbf{Methods}

We made use of three databases. These are described in full in Panel 1 and were (a) annual
looked after data returns submitted by local authorities to the Scottish Government providing
information on all children looked after by the local authority during the preceding academic
year (‘looked after data’), (b) the annual pupil census (again returned by local authorities to
the Scottish Government) which is the master index of all children in publicly funded schools
in Scotland at the start of each academic year (‘pupil census’), and (c) the Community Health
Index database which is the master patient index for the NHS in Scotland, continuously
maintained primarily from General Practitioner registration data (‘CHI database’/‘health
data’). Publicly funded schools comprise mainstream and special schools funded by the state
and managed by local authorities. Children who are home schooled or attending an
independent or charitable day or residential school or secure unit will not be included in the
pupil census, even if their school place is being funded by their local authority. The pupil
census contains the Scottish Candidate Number (SCN) for every pupil. The SCN is the
unique identifier used on all education records in Scotland. The looked after data should
contain the SCN if it is available, for example if the child is attending publicly funded school.
The Community Health Index database contains patients’ CHI number, the unique identifier
used on all health records in Scotland.

Panel 1 about here.

Linkage of records belonging to the same child across databases depends on the personal
identifiers held within the databases. There are insufficient personal identifiers (date of birth
and gender only) in the looked after data to enable robust direct linkage to the CHI database.
We therefore used Scottish Candidate Numbers (SCNs) included in looked after data from
2007/08 to 2011/12 to identify looked after children in the 2011/12 pupil census. We then
used the wider range of personal identifiers available within the pupil census (date of birth,
gender, and home postcode) to link this database to the CHI database. This resulted in a look
up file providing an SCN (with a flag to indicate looked after status) to CHI number look up
key for all children in publicly funded school in 2011/12 (see Figure 1). Further details of the
linkage process are provided as supplementary material. Note that the limited personal
identifiers available in looked after data returns mean that linking to the CHI database must
go through this intermediate step of the pupil census. It is currently not possible to link
looked after records for pre- or post-school children to their health records.

Figure 1 about here.
Categorisation of looked after status in the pupil census relies on accurate recording of children’s SCNs within the looked after data. We therefore first assessed the quality of recording of SCN on looked after data by examining the proportion of records for children of school age that contained any SCN or a valid SCN. The looked after data validation rules define a valid SCN as one of the correct length (nine digits) that contains a correct check digit.

We then assessed the proportion of currently, previously, and non-looked after children in the 2011/12 pupil census whose record could be safely linked to the child’s CHI number. Using demographic information contained within the pupil census we further assessed linkage rates by pupil age group, gender, Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile, ethnicity, and by school local authority area. The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation is a small area based measure of deprivation: individuals are assigned to deprivation quintiles based their postcode of residence. Finally, using information contained within looked after data we assessed linkage rates for currently looked after children by the cumulative number of looked after placements they had experienced (placements ending on or after 1st August 2007) and the type and legal reason underpinning their most recent placement. Linkage rates for currently and, separately, previously looked after children were compared to those for non-looked after children using 95% confidence intervals for the difference in two independent proportions. Similarly, linkage rates for particular categories of currently looked after children were compared to those in a relevant reference category (one placement since August 2007; looked after at home; and compulsory supervision through the Children’s Hearing system (resident at home)).
Once the linkage was completed, CHI numbers were used to identify and extract a range of routinely available dental health and healthcare data held by the NHS Scotland Information Services Division (ISD) to enable comparison of the dental health of school aged looked after children to that of their non-looked after peers. The results of this analysis are reported separately (submitted for publication, available on request). Approval for this study was obtained from the Scottish Government Education Analytical Services Division Data Access Panel and the NHS Privacy Advisory Committee. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Glasgow College of Medicine, Veterinary, and Life Sciences Ethics Committee: NHS ethical approval was not required.

**Results**

The quality of recording of Scottish Candidate Number (SCN) on looked after records for school aged children is shown in Table 1. A total of 20,771 children were included in the 2011/12 looked after return (i.e. were looked after at some point over that school year), of whom 16,859 were of possible or definite school age (defined as aged 4 to 19 years inclusive at the start of the school year). Of the 16,859, 13,357 (79.2%) children had any SCN recorded on their looked after record and 11,182 (66.3%) had a valid SCN recorded. The completeness of SCN recording varied by local authority. Whilst most authorities returned a valid SCN on at least 80% of looked after records for children of school age a minority had noticeably poorer completeness, for example 18% in Dumfries & Galloway and 26% in Glasgow City.

Table 1 about here.

The number of children in a publicly funded school in 2011/12 identified as currently or previously looked after, and the proportions for whom a safe link to the CHI database could
be made, are shown in Table 2 (see Supplementary material for a definition of ‘safe links’).

In total, 670,952 children were included in the 2011/12 pupil census. Of the 11,182 valid
SCNs included in the 2011/12 looked after returns, 10,009 were also included in the 2011/12
pupil census and these children (1.5% of all pupils) were classified as currently looked after.
SCNs may be included in the 2011/12 looked after returns but not the 2011/12 pupil census
if: the SCN recorded on the looked after return is incorrect; the child has left publicly funded
school and their historical SCN has been included on their looked after return, or; they are
home schooled or attending an independent school but have an SCN due to being registered
for examinations with the Scottish Qualifications Authority. An additional 1,757 (0.3%)
children in the 2011/12 pupil census were classified as previously looked after, that is their
SCN had been included in a previous (2007/08 to 2010/11) looked after return, but not the
2011/12 return. The remaining 659,186 (98.2%) children were classified as non-looked after.

Compared to non-looked after children, children in school in 2011/12 classified as looked
after were more likely to be of compulsory secondary school age (12-15 years) rather than
primary school (4-11) or post-compulsory secondary school (16-19) age. Looked after
children were also more likely to be male, much more likely to live in a deprived area, and
more likely to be of white British ethnicity (Table 2).

A safe linkage to the CHI database was achieved for 95.1% (626,732/659,186) of non-looked
after children. Linkage rates were marginally lower for children classified as currently
looked after (94.0%, 9,409/10,009) and similar for children classified as previously looked
after (95.3%, 1,674/1,757). Amongst non-looked after children, linkage rates to CHI were
slightly higher for secondary compared to primary school aged children and for those living
in more affluent areas. Similar patterns (with steeper discrepancies) were seen for looked
after children. Linkage rates showed only moderate variation by local authority for looked after and non-looked after children.

Table 2 about here.

The proportion of currently looked after children that could be safely linked to the CHI database by the characteristics of looked after care received is shown in Table 3. Linkage rates were lower for children experiencing a higher number of placements and for those in residential accommodation compared to those being looked after at home. Considering the statutory basis for children’s care, linkage rates were lower for children with an emergency court order and higher for those with a permanence order (a legal instrument enabling a permanent fostering arrangement or adoption) compared to those under compulsory supervision at home.

Table 3 about here.

**Discussion**

We used routinely collected looked after children and pupil census data to categorise children in publicly funded schools in Scotland in 2011/12 as currently, previously, or non-looked after. Recording of children’s Scottish Candidate Number on looked after data is incomplete hence some under-ascertainment of looked after children within the general school population will occur. We linked all children in the pupil census to the NHS Scotland master patient index (Community Health Index database) and demonstrated that a safe link to the child’s CHI number could be obtained for a very high proportion of looked after and non-looked after children (94% and 95% of children classified as currently looked after and non-looked after respectively).
Strengths and limitations

Categorising children in the pupil census as currently, previously, or non-looked after

Recording of the Scottish Candidate Number on looked after records is incomplete. We found that overall 79.2% of children of possible or definite school age had an SCN on their looked after record in 2011/12, with completeness varying markedly between local authorities. The recording of SCNs on looked after records by local authority staff is a manual administrative process. The variation in data quality between local authorities is therefore a reflection of differing operational practices that affect both data completeness and accuracy. We would not expect 100% completeness from any area as, even within the 4-19 year old age group, some children will not have started school, some will have left school, and some may be home schooled or attending independent mainstream or special schools.

Overall, fewer than 1% of all school children in Scotland are home schooled \(^{14}\) and around 4% attend an independent school \(^{15}\). The proportion of looked after children receiving these types of education is unknown, although it is likely, for example, that a number of looked after children are in independent specials schools.

We found that 16% of the SCNs that were included in the 2011/12 looked after records were invalid. When looked after records are returned from local authorities to the Scottish Government, all submitted SCNs are checked to ensure they are the correct length (nine digits) and contain a correct check digit. In addition, a check is run to ensure that each SCN only occurs once in the dataset submitted by any individual local authority. However, although any records failing the validation checks are brought to the attention of the submitting local authority, if it is not possible to correct an error the record is still accepted into the national looked after dataset.
Incomplete or inaccurate recording of SCN on looked after returns means that some children
within the 2011/12 pupil census who were looked after during that academic year will have
been misclassified as non-looked after. It is not possible to precisely quantify the extent of
this under-ascertainment of ‘currently looked after’ children. The published national
statistics on looked after children in Scotland suggest that as at mid 2015, 1.6% (11,990 of
739,922) of the school aged population (children 5-17 years) were looked after. We
classified 1.5% of children in the 2011/12 pupil census as looked after at some point over that
academic year, suggesting only a modest degree of under-ascertainment of our currently
looked after group.

The degree of under-ascertainment of children in school in 2011/12 that were previously
looked after is likely to be substantially higher than that for currently looked after children.
Using all available looked after returns we estimate that approximately 13,000 school aged
children had been looked after at some point over the academic years 2007/08 to 2010/11
(but not 2011/12) and were still school aged during 2011/12. This provides a maximum
estimate of the number of previously looked after children we may have anticipated
identifying in the 2011/12 pupil census. In practice however we only identified 1,757
children in the 2011/12 pupil census as previously looked after. This is likely to reflect a
number of factors including that some of the 13,000 were not in a publicly funded school
either at the time they were looked after (for example they had not yet started school) or
during 2011/12 (for example they had left school early), or that their SCN was missing or
inaccurately recorded on their historical looked after record hence could not be identified in
the 2011/12 pupil census. The proportion of looked after returns for school aged children that
contained any SCN was 67% in 2007/08 (the first year covered by the return) and 53% in
2008/09. Since 2009/10 it has been consistently higher than 75%, although further improvement has been lacking in recent years.

Overall, it is highly likely that children in school in 2011/12 that we identified as currently or previously looked after were correctly classified however some of the children identified as non-looked after will in fact have been currently or, more likely, previously looked after. Any such misclassified children are likely to comprise a very small proportion of all ‘non-looked after’ children. In addition, any such misclassification will tend to minimise any differences observed between looked after and non-looked after groups, i.e. will conservatively bias any findings of health differences between looked after and non-looked after groups towards the null.

**Linking pupil census records to the Community Health Index**

Pupil date of birth, gender, and home postcode are the only personal identifiers available within the pupil census. Individuals’ names, a key variable usually used when linking together health records belonging to the same people, are not available. In addition, looked after children are likely to have relatively high residential mobility, with frequent changes of home postcode. Despite these challenges, we found that linkage rates for children in the currently looked after group were only marginally lower than those achieved for non-looked after children, with a safe link to a Community Health Index number found for 94% and 95% respectively.

Linkage rates were generally highest for older school children, probably reflecting the availability of more years’ pupil census data for older children and hence potentially multiple postcodes that could increase the chance of a match to that held on the CHI database. Linkage rates were also generally higher for children living in less deprived areas, which is
likely to reflect lower residential mobility amongst affluent groups. Amongst currently
looked after children, linkage rates showed some variation by placement number and type,
again generally suggesting that more stable living arrangements were associated with higher
linkage rates. The only exception to this was the relatively low linkage rate found for
children living in state provided residential accommodation: the reason for this is unclear.
Well established processes were used to link children’s identifiers held on the pupil census to
those in the CHI database. Of particular note, we have demonstrated previously that CHI
numbers accepted as safe links for particular SCNs are highly likely (>99%) to be correct.\(^{16}\)

The Scottish Candidate Number and Community Health Index number are both managed
nationally. As children move between local authority or NHS Board areas they retain the
same SCN and CHI number. Importantly when considering looked after children, children
also generally retain the same SCN and CHI number following adoption.

**Findings in light of existing literature**
The potential contribution of population based studies involving the linkage of routine
administrative data to elucidating the risk factors for, and outcomes from, state care in
childhood has been well recognised\(^{17,18}\). Several examples of studies based on linkage of
administrative state care/looked after children data are available. Studies linking to health
records have examined: risk factors for entering state care such as maternal characteristics
and neonatal health\(^{19,20}\) and prior hospitalisation for injuries\(^{21}\); outcomes of children in care
such as use of emergency/unscheduled health care\(^ {22}\), self harm and suicide\(^ {23}\), and overall
mortality\(^ {24}\); and secular trends in child maltreatment\(^ {25}\). Studies linking to data from other
sectors have examined wider social outcomes for children in state care, in particular
educational attainment\(^ {26,27}\). Published linkage studies generally come from Australia, North
America, or Scandinavia and include a sub-national sample and/or lack non-looked after controls. We are not aware of any previous published linkage studies that provide whole population data on looked after and non-looked after children at national level.

Within the wider public health literature there is increasing recognition of the potential for incomplete or inaccurate data linkage to introduce considerable bias into studies and reporting guidelines for data linkage studies have been suggested. To date, however, studies reporting linked analyses of looked after children data generally provide minimal information on the linkage process or the quality of linkage achieved, and no discussion of potential bias that may be introduced through differential linkage rates for different groups, focusing instead on reporting the results of linked analyses.

Conclusions and recommendations

We have shown that it is possible using currently available routine looked after and education data to categorise children in publicly funded schools in Scotland into currently, previously, and non-looked after groups. Some under-ascertainment of looked after groups occurs, with some (particularly previously) looked after children misclassified as non-looked after.

Children categorised to looked after and non-looked after groups can be linked to their Community Health Index numbers (and hence to all routinely collected health data) with very high completeness and accuracy. We demonstrate some variation in linkage quality by factors such as local authority area and the complexity of children’s looked after journeys.

Overall our results suggest that linkage of currently available routine looked after, education, and health data is feasible and likely to provide linked data fit for epidemiological research purposes. We would caution that researchers working with linked data should always
scrutinise the quality of the underlying linkage and consider the extent to which bias introduced through the linkage process may exaggerate or minimise findings, particularly when making comparisons across subgroups. In general however, the health outcomes of looked after children are much poorer than those of non-looked after children hence differences are likely to be readily evident. This was demonstrated in our follow on analysis which showed much poorer dental health for looked after compared to non-looked after children, including after accounting for age, sex and deprivation differences.

Improvement to the completeness and accuracy of recording of the Scottish Candidate Number on looked after returns would improve the classification of children in the pupil census as currently, previously, and non-looked after. Due to the limited personal identifiers available on looked after records, it is not currently possible to link looked after data directly to the Community Health Index: the intermediate step of the pupil census is required. This means that it is currently not possible to link looked after records for preschool children, those who have left school, or those in non publicly funded schools to the children’s health data. Expanding the identifiers included on looked after returns to allow direct linkage to the CHI database, or indeed inclusion of a unique ‘citizen number’ on routine administrative data from all sectors, would present further opportunities to explore the health and healthcare of these groups, although any such developments would need to carefully balance the benefits of enhanced analysis opportunities against potential privacy risk.

Overall this novel linkage presents opportunities to develop further research on the health and healthcare of school aged looked after children compared to their peers, enabling scrutiny of whether recent policy and practice developments are resulting in discernible improvements and reduced inequalities. Researchers wishing to access linked routine health and looked
after data should contact the NHS Scotland Information Services Division research support service in the first instance\textsuperscript{34}.
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Tables
### Table 1: Quality of recording of Scottish Candidate Number on looked after children data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Looked after returns for 2011/12 for school aged children*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Containing any SCN</th>
<th>Containing a valid SCN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (%)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### All school aged looked after children

| Total | 16,859 (100%) | 13,357 | 79.2 | 11,182 | 66.3 |

#### Age group at start of school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group at start of school year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>8,592 (51%)</td>
<td>6,510</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>5,462</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>6,119 (36%)</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>2,148 (13%)</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9,128 (54%)</td>
<td>7,224</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,731 (46%)</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Local authority area responsible for child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority area responsible for child</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City</td>
<td>641 (4%)</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>541 (3%)</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>291 (2%)</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll &amp; Bute</td>
<td>241 (1%)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannanshire</td>
<td>206 (1%)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td>456 (3%)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City</td>
<td>723 (4%)</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td>495 (3%)</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>164 (1%)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>217 (1%)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>192 (1%)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh, City of</td>
<td>1,381 (8%)</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk</td>
<td>458 (3%)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>842 (5%)</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
<td>3,694 (22%)</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>563 (3%)</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>349 (2%)</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Councils</td>
<td>124 (1%)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>294 (2%)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>227 (1%)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ayrshire</td>
<td>575 (3%)</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>810 (5%)</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td>232 (1%)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Looked After Return</td>
<td>School Aged Children</td>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>Looked After Return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>784 (5%)</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Borders</td>
<td>212 (1%)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire</td>
<td>371 (2%)</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>643 (4%)</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>274 (2%)</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>416 (2%)</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>443 (3%)</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*School aged children defined as 5-20 years inclusive at the end of the period covered by the looked after return (July 2012) hence assumed to be 4-19 years inclusive at the start of the school year covered (August 2011 to July 2012).

Island Councils comprise Orkney Islands, Shetland Islands, and Na h-Eileanan Siar.
Table 2: Linkage rate to CHI database for currently, previously, and non-looked after children in 2011/12 pupil census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIMD deprivation quintile</th>
<th>Currently looked after</th>
<th>Previously looked after</th>
<th>Non-looked after</th>
<th>All children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In pupil census</td>
<td>Linked to CHI</td>
<td>In pupil census</td>
<td>Linked to CHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>Difference (95% CI)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All children in pupil census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,009 (100%)</td>
<td>9,409 (94.0)</td>
<td>1,757 (100%)</td>
<td>-1.1 (-1.5, -0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group at start of school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>4,399 (44%)</td>
<td>4,121 (93.7)</td>
<td>924 (53%)</td>
<td>-0.8 (-1.5, -0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>5,235 (52%)</td>
<td>4,930 (94.2)</td>
<td>731 (42%)</td>
<td>-1.7 (-2.4, -1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>375 (4%)</td>
<td>358 (95.5)</td>
<td>102 (6%)</td>
<td>-0.4 (-2.6, 1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,319 (53%)</td>
<td>5,018 (94.3)</td>
<td>931 (53%)</td>
<td>-0.7 (-1.3, -0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,690 (47%)</td>
<td>4,391 (93.6)</td>
<td>826 (47%)</td>
<td>-1.5 (-2.2, -0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMD deprivation quintile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (most deprived)</td>
<td>4,224 (42%)</td>
<td>3,947 (93.4)</td>
<td>684 (39%)</td>
<td>-1.2 (-1.9, -0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,247 (22%)</td>
<td>2,131 (94.8)</td>
<td>514 (29%)</td>
<td>-0.3 (-1.3, 0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,606 (16%)</td>
<td>1,517 (94.5)</td>
<td>297 (17%)</td>
<td>-0.8 (-1.9, 0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,225 (12%)</td>
<td>1,152 (94.0)</td>
<td>159 (9%)</td>
<td>-1.3 (-2.6, 0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (least deprived)</td>
<td>620 (6%)</td>
<td>596 (96.1)</td>
<td>93 (5%)</td>
<td>0.3 (-1.2, 1.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference (95% CI)* indicates the difference in linkage rate between the group and the overall population, with the 95% confidence interval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>9,422 (94%)</td>
<td>8,861</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.8, -0.8</td>
<td>1,676 (95%)</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>587 (6%)</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5, 2.5</td>
<td>81 (5%)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3, 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority area of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City</td>
<td>372 (4%)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.1, 2.2</td>
<td>84 (5%)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>427 (4%)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-4.4, 0.2</td>
<td>75 (4%)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>212 (2%)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.9, 2.9</td>
<td>28 (2%)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll &amp; Bute</td>
<td>183 (2%)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>-6.3, 1.7</td>
<td>18 (1%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannanshire</td>
<td>154 (2%)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-4.1, 3.0</td>
<td>19 (1%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td>164 (2%)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-4.5, 2.1</td>
<td>108 (6%)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City</td>
<td>415 (4%)</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-2.6, 1.4</td>
<td>141 (8%)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td>314 (3%)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>-6.5, -0.5</td>
<td>44 (3%)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>94 (1%)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-12.1</td>
<td>-12.1, 0.4</td>
<td>20 (1%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>148 (1%)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>-4.3, 2.6</td>
<td>39 (2%)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>102 (1%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9, 6.3</td>
<td>16 (1%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2023 (in thousands)</td>
<td>2022 (in thousands)</td>
<td>Change (2023-2022)</td>
<td>Change %</td>
<td>Status of Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh, City of</td>
<td>795 (8%)</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>4459 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk</td>
<td>364 (4%)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>364 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>621 (6%)</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>45701 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
<td>1,479 (15%)</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>-115</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>365 (4%)</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>365 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>235 (2%)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>235 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Councils</td>
<td>84 (1%)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>84 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>210 (2%)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>210 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>145 (1%)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>145 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ayrshire</td>
<td>321 (3%)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>321 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>599 (6%)</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>599 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td>168 (2%)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>168 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>469 (5%)</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>469 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Borders</td>
<td>154 (2%)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>154 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Cases (2%)</td>
<td>Linkage Rate (1%)</td>
<td>Linkage Rate (2%)</td>
<td>Non-looked after (2%)</td>
<td>95% CI Non-looked after (2%)</td>
<td>95% CI Linkage (2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire</td>
<td>243 (2%)</td>
<td>95.5 (2%)</td>
<td>37 (2%)</td>
<td>14,024 (2%)</td>
<td>(3.2, 7.3)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2 (-2.4, 2.9)</td>
<td>0.2 (2%)</td>
<td>13,359 (2%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97.3 (2%)</td>
<td>2.0 (2%)</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-7.6, 0.9)</td>
<td>(-22.6, 8.0)</td>
<td>14,304 (2%)</td>
<td>13,627</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>409 (4%)</td>
<td>92.9 (4%)</td>
<td>71 (4%)</td>
<td>42,585 (6%)</td>
<td>(1.2, 6.7)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>-1.7 (-4.2, 0.8)</td>
<td>70 (4%)</td>
<td>40,291 (6%)</td>
<td>(1.2, 6.7)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2 (2%)</td>
<td>4.0 (2%)</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
<td>95.6 (3%)</td>
<td>57 (3%)</td>
<td>43,065 (6%)</td>
<td>(1.2, 6.7)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.4 (-1.3, 4.1)</td>
<td>56 (3%)</td>
<td>40,741 (6%)</td>
<td>(1.2, 6.7)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2 (2%)</td>
<td>4.0 (2%)</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>95.4 (3%)</td>
<td>56 (3%)</td>
<td>12,293 (2%)</td>
<td>(1.2, 6.7)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0.4 (-1.8, 2.6)</td>
<td>59 (4%)</td>
<td>11,843 (2%)</td>
<td>(1.2, 6.7)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2 (2%)</td>
<td>4.0 (2%)</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference between linkage rate for currently/previously looked after children and that for non-looked after children with 95% confidence interval

SIMD is Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation
Island Councils comprise Orkney Islands, Shetland Islands, and Na h-Eileanan Siar
Table 3: Linkage rate to CHI database for currently looked after children by characteristics of looked after care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently looked after</th>
<th>In pupil census</th>
<th>Linked to CHI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Difference (95% CI)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All currently looked after children in pupil census</td>
<td>10,009 (100%)</td>
<td>9,409</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of looked after placements since August 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,049 (60%)</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,762 (18%)</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>-0.6 (-1.9, 0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,052 (11%)</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>-1.5 (-3.2, 0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>1,146 (11%)</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>-1.8 (-3.4, -0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of most recent placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked After at home</td>
<td>4,285 (43%)</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship care</td>
<td>2,196 (22%)</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>-0.3 (-1.6, 0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster carers/other community</td>
<td>2,650 (26%)</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>0.3 (-0.8, 1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential accommodation</td>
<td>878 (9%)</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>-3.7 (-5.7, -1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal reason underpinning most recent looked after episode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory supervision through the Children's Hearing system (resident at home)</td>
<td>3,961 (40%)</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodated away from home on a voluntary basis</td>
<td>914 (9%)</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>-1.2 (-3.0, 0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory supervision through the Children's Hearing system (resident away from home)</td>
<td>3,415 (34%)</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>0.0 (-1.1, 1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency court order</td>
<td>189 (2%)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>-4.8 (-9.2, -0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanence order or awaiting adoption</td>
<td>675 (7%)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>2.1 (0.5, 3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/unknown</td>
<td>855 (9%)</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>-1.6 (-3.5, 0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference between linkage rate for particular category and the relevant reference category with 95% confidence interval
Since 2007/08, all 32 Scottish local authorities have been required to submit individual level data on looked after children to the Scottish Government. An annual return is made in November each year, providing information on all children looked after by the local authority at any point over the preceding school year (August to July).

Limited personal identifiers are included in the looked after returns, specifically the child’s date of birth, gender, ethnicity, their social work number (specific to that local authority only), and, if available, their Scottish Candidate Number (see below). Children’s names and home postcodes are not included.

Basic information on all episodes of looked after care provided by the local authority to the child (from birth) is also included, for example the start and end dates, legal reason, and type (e.g. at home, kinship care, foster care, etc.) of each placement.

Since 2006/07, all 32 Scottish local authorities have been required to submit individual level data on children attending publicly funded schools to the Scottish Government. An annual return is made in October each year, providing information on children in school at the start of that school year (census date mid September). Publicly funded schools comprise mainstream and special schools funded by the state and managed by local authorities. Children who are home schooled or attending an independent or charitable day or residential school or secure unit will not be included in the pupil census, even if their school place is being funded by their local authority. A wider range of personal identifiers is included in the pupil census return, specifically the child’s date of birth, gender, home postcode, ethnicity, and their Scottish Candidate Number (SCN). Pupil names are not included. The SCN is the unique pupil identifier used across Scotland. Pupils are assigned an SCN when they join a publicly funded school (typically at age 4/5 years) and/or are registered to undertake assessments administered by the Scottish Qualifications Authority. The SCN is recorded on all national level education datasets held by the Scottish Government, for example those on pupil attendance, exclusions, attainment, and post school destination.

Basic information on the education of each child is included in the pupil census, for example the school and school year attended and any recognised additional educational support needs.

The CHI database is NHS Scotland’s master patient index. It was introduced in one area of Scotland in the 1970s and has had national coverage since 1997. It covers all patients registered with a General Practitioner and others provided with care from NHS Scotland, for example individuals attending emergency services.

Full personal identifiers are included in the database, specifically patient full name, date of birth, gender, home postcode and their CHI number. The database is ‘live’ and updated as required by authorised staff. The NHS Information Services Division (ISD) receives a monthly snapshot download of the database for statistical and data linkage purposes. The CHI number is the unique patient identifier used in NHS Scotland. The CHI number is held on all national level health datasets held by ISD, for example those on hospital admission, Accident & Emergency department and outpatient attendance, community prescriptions, and child health reviews and vaccinations.

Very limited information on health care is included in the CHI database, for example the patient’s registered General Practice.

For each of the databases, validation is built into the data recording/submission process. For the looked after and pupil census returns, additional data quality assurance is undertaken by the Scottish Government and local authorities are required to confirm the validity of returns.
Study cohort: children in publicly funded school in Scotland during school year 2011/12

Included in 2011/12 pupil census (taken Sep 2011)
N=670,952 (100%)

Cohort categorised by Looked After status
SCNs included in looked after returns for 2007/08 to 2011/12 (submitted Nov 2008-2012) identified to categorise study cohort members as:

- Currently looked after
  SCN included in 2011/12 pupil census and 2011/12 looked after return
  N=10,009 (1.5%)

- Previously looked after
  SCN included in 2011/12 pupil census and (one of) the 2007/08 to 2010/11 (but not the 2011/12) looked after returns
  N=1,757 (0.3%)

- Not looked after
  SCN included in 2011/12 pupil census but none of the 2007/08 to 2011/12 looked after returns
  N=659,186 (98.2%)

Personal identifiers extracted for all pupils from 2011/12 pupil census
For children in school in previous years, identifiers also extracted from 2006/07-2010/11 pupil censuses as available
Pupil date of birth, gender, home postcode

Probabilistic linkage of available identifiers (each SCN/child, each available census†) to CHI database
CHI database as at September 2012

Overall best match CHI number for each SCN/child in school in 2011/12 identified and categorised as:

- Safe/accepted link to CHI made
  N=637,815 (95.1%)

- No safe/accepted link to CHI made
  N=33,137 (4.9%)
We used standard probabilistic record linkage methods to link pupil census records to the CHI database. The algorithms and decision rules used are used by NHS Information Services Division (ISD) for routine linkage of health records and have previously been extended to link education and health records. The algorithms return a suggested overall ‘best match’ CHI number for each SCN/child within the pupil census and assign each best match CHI number to a predetermined match category based on: (a) the closeness of match between each of the personal identifiers held on the pupil census and the CHI database for the respective SCN and CHI numbers and, (b) how closely the ‘next best match’ CHI number suggested for a particular SCN rivals the ‘best match’. Best match CHI numbers assigned to certain pre-specified match categories were accepted as safe links for the relevant SCNs. Best match CHI numbers assigned to other match categories were rejected and the relevant SCNs were considered not to link to a CHI number (see Supplementary table 1).

As shown in Figure 1, we had personal identifiers (date of birth, sex, and home postcode) for all children in the 2011/12 pupil census and this group formed our study population. In addition, we also received pupil census records for each of the previous five years (2006/07 to 2010/11) each containing the personal identifiers for each child/SCN at the time of that census. Therefore, pupils who were older could have up to six sets of identifiers (including, for example, up to six home postcodes) associated with their SCN for linkage to the CHI. Different postcodes included in the census for a particular child in different years could reflect genuine change (i.e. the child had moved house during the year) or data error (i.e. one or other of the recorded postcodes was erroneous).
The CHI database snapshot, taken for linkage to the pupil census records in September 2012, contained for every person in the database at least their current home postcode as recorded at their GP Practice as well as their last previous known postcode. In some instances, for example where a patient had moved NHS Board boundaries within Scotland, additional CHI records for that person would capture further postcodes, which were also available for linkage.

Each set of pupil census identifiers for each SCN/child was linked to the CHI database as at Sep 2012 to generate up to six ‘best match’ CHI numbers for each child. The postcode recorded within any census record could match to any of the postcodes available within a CHI record. The overall best match CHI for each SCN/child was then taken as that with the highest overall match category. In case of ties, the best match CHI from the most recent census year was taken as the overall best match for that child.

Making use of all available identifiers, in particular multiple postcodes, in this way provides an opportunity to overcome administrative mismatches between the pupil census and CHI database. For example, if a GP practice was unaware that a child had moved house, a match may be made between the postcode held on a previous pupil census to that on the CHI database. This flexibility may be particularly important for looked after children who have high residential mobility and multiple possible ‘home’ addresses.

Since the linkage for this study was carried out, ISD has made additional enhancements to the processes used when linking education and health records. For example, ISD can now capture patients’ full postcode histories from the CHI database (see http://www.isdscotland.org/Products-and-Services/eDRIS/Docs/20150421-Linking-ScotXed-.
Further developments are underway involving linkage to the national indexing spine and establishment of 'read-through' indexes to allow more efficient regular linkage of education and health records.
### Supplementary table 1: Linkage of pupil census records to CHI database: detailed results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match category</th>
<th>Best match CHI for a particular SCN: match between personal identifiers held on pupil census and CHI database</th>
<th>Best match CHI compared to next best match CHI for a particular SCN</th>
<th>Best match CHI considered a safe/acceptable link for the SCN?</th>
<th>Number of children in 2011/12 pupil census in this category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>Unrivalled</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Unrivalled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Intermediate rival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Close rival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Close rival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Tied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Unrivalled</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Rivalled</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Tied</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Unrivalled</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Rivalled</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Tied</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Other combination of close matches/high overall linkage score</td>
<td>Unrivalled</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Other – considered a non-match</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>16,914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Close match on date of birth indicates 2 out of 3 (of DD, MM, YY) agreed; close match on postcode indicates 6 out of 7 characters agreed.

Unrivalled means the next best CHI had a much lower linkage score than the best match CHI.

Tied means that the next best CHI had the same linkage score as the best match CHI; other categories are intermediate.