Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe

Title of Measure	Polarity Good to be High ▲ or Low ▼?	Q4 Target 2011/12	Q4 Actual 2011/12	Q4 Status 2011/12	Q3 Target 2012/13	Q3 Actual 2012/13	Q3 Status 2012/13	Q4 Target 2012/13	Q4 Actual 2012/13	Q4 Status 2012/13	Compared to Q4 2011/12	Compared to Q3 2012/13
NI 32 Repeat incidents of domestic violence	•	30%	16%	HG	25%	14%	HG	25%	5%	HG	<b>↑</b>	<b>↑</b>
NI 40 Number of drug users recorded as being in effective treatment	<b>A</b>	413	419	LG	438	432	A					
Residential burglaries	<b>V</b>	1,762	2,061	HR	560	502	HG	475	600	HR	<b>1</b>	
NI 15 Serious violent crime rate	•	299	183	HG	37	36	LG	38	40	LR	<b>1</b>	Ψ
NI 16 Serious acquisitive crime rate	•	4,155	4,720	HR	1,143	1,129	LG	1,143	1,298	HR	<b>1</b>	Ψ
NI 184 Food establishments in the area which are compliant with food hygiene law	<b>A</b>	76%	71%	LR	76%	70%	LR	76%	68%	HR	•	Ψ
NI 191 Residual household waste per household (kg)	▼	135	136	A	135			135				
NI 192 Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	<b>A</b>	50%	43%	LR	50%			50%	46%	LR	<b>↑</b>	<b>1</b>
NI 195a Improved street and environmental cleanliness - Litter	<b>V</b>	6%	4%	HG	6%	15%	HR	6%	9%	HR	•	<b>^</b>
NI 195b Improved street and environmental cleanliness - Detritus	<b>V</b>	9%	4%	HG	9%	11%	HR	9%	14%	HR	•	Ψ
NI 195c Improved street and environmental cleanliness - Graffiti.	<b>V</b>	3%	7%	HR	3%	5%	HR	3%	6%	HR	<b>↑</b>	4
NI 195d Improved street and environmental cleanliness - Fly posting.	<b>V</b>	1%	1%	LG	1%	1%	LG	1%	2%	HR	•	4

## United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads

Title of Measure	Polarity Good to be High ▲ or Low ▼?	•	Q4 Actual 2011/12	Q4 Status 2011/12	Q3 Target 2012/13	Q3 Actual 2012/13		Q4 Target 2012/13	Q4 Actual 2012/13	Q4 Status	Compared to Q4 2011/12	Compared to Q3 2012/13
Response rate to residents' panel consultations	<b>A</b>	55%	57%	LG	57%			57%	No survey			
% who are satisfied with the way the Council runs things (Involvement Tracker)	<b>^</b>		No Tracker		60%	57%	A		No Tracker			
% who agree that the Council gives local people good VfM (Involvement Tracker)	<b>A</b>		No Tracker		38%	37%	A		No Tracker			
Council takes account of residents' views when making decisions (Involvement Tracker)	<b>A</b>		No Tracker		32%	31%	A		No Tracker			
% who feel that they can influence decisions affecting their local area (Involvement Tracker)	<b>A</b>		No Tracker		32%	26%	HR		No Tracker			
How well informed do residents feel (Involvement Tracker)	<b>A</b>		No Tracker		57%	54%	LR		No Tracker			
Number of trained neighbourhood champions	<b>A</b>	1,500	1,110	HR				2,000	919	HR	Ψ	

Supporting and protecting people who are most in need

Title of Measure	Polarity Good to be High ▲ or Low ▼?	Q4 Target 2011/12	Q4 Actual 2011/12	Q4 Status 2011/12	Q3 Target 2012/13	Q3 Actual 2012/13	Q3 Status 2012/13	Q4 Target 2012/13	Q4 Actual 2012/13	Q4 Status 2012/13	Compared to Q4 2011/12	Compared to Q3 2012/13
Reablement - % of adult clients who do not receive ongoing social care following a reablement service	<b>A</b>	70%	74.6%	HG	72%	79.3%	HG	72%	78%	HG	<b>1</b>	Ψ
% Overall satisfaction at reablement review is 'satisfied' or better	<b>A</b>		93%	HG		96%			95%		<b>1</b>	Ψ
NI 146 % of adults with learning disabilities in paid employment	<b>A</b>	18%	18.2%	LG	14.0%	13.9%	A	18.0%	18.7%	LG	<b>^</b>	<b>^</b>
E48 - equality of service provision		0.9-1.1	1.02%	HG	0.9-1.1	1.04	G	0.9-1.1	1.04	G		
NI 150 % of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in paid employment (same as NI 150 - name changed)	<b>A</b>	12%	6.1%	HR	10.0%	6.5%	HR	11.0%	11.3%	LG	<b>↑</b>	<b>^</b>
The proportion of clients (not carers, not MH for now) eligible for a personal budget during the year who had one (of any type).	<b>A</b>		New indicator in 2012/13		89.0%	77.9%	HR	100.0%	91.8%	LR		<b>↑</b>
% of people with learning disabilities living in their own home or with their families	•		New indicator in 2012/13		69.0%	65.9%	A	70.0%	68.7%	A		<b>^</b>
% of adults in contact with secondary mental health services living independently, with or without support	<b>A</b>		New indicator in 2012/13		88.0%	79.8%	LR	88.0%	79.4%	LR		•
Hospital delayed transfers of care (caused by social care) - all clients over 18 - rolling year	•		New indicator in 2012/13			4.8			4.0			<b>^</b>
Carers with Services (as % of total clients in community)	<b>A</b>		New indicator in 2012/13		38.0%	35.8%	LR	55.0%	69.2%	HG		<b>^</b>
% of sessions absent from school amongst school age CLA, in school year to date	<b>V</b>	12%	15.6%	HR	12%	7.6%	HG	12.0%	8.4%	HG	<b>1</b>	Ψ
Children Looked After: rate of permanent exclusions as % of Harrow CLA population	<b>V</b>	0.01%	0%	HG	0%	0%	HG	0%	0%	HG	<b>→</b>	<b>→</b>
Children Looked After: Rate of fixed term exclusions as % of Harrow CLA population	<b>V</b>	5%	17.64%	HR	5%	2.7%	HG	10.0%	8.5%	HG	<b>1</b>	Ψ
Termly rate of permanent exclusions as % of Harrow school population	•	0.03% (2011-12 spring term)	0.04%	HR	0.02%	0.04%	HR	0.03%	0.02%	HG	<b>↑</b>	<b>↑</b>

Title of Measure	Polarity Good to be High ▲ or Low ▼?	Q4 Target 2011/12	Q4 Actual 2011/12	Q4 Status 2011/12	Q3 Target 2012/13	Q3 Actual 2012/13	Q3 Status 2012/13	Q4 Target 2012/13	Q4 Actual 2012/13	Q4 Status 2012/13	Compared to Q4 2011/12	Compared to Q3 2012/13
Termly rate of fixed term exclusions as % of Harrow school population	•	0.78% (2011-12 spring term)	1.06%	HR	0.70%	0.81%	HR	0.97%	0.67%	HG	<b>^</b>	<b>^</b>
Termly rate of overall absence in primary schools	•	5.6% (summer term)	5.24% (spring term)	HG	4.5%	4.96%	HR	4.50%	4.73%	LR	<b>^</b>	<b>^</b>
Termly rate of overall absence rate in secondary schools	•	6.7% (summer term)	5.2% (autumn term)	HG	5.0%	5.33%	LR	5.00%	5.68%	HR	<b>^</b>	<b>4</b>
Secondary schools judged by Ofsted as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour	•	100%	100%	LG	100%	90%	LR	100%	90%	LR	<b>←</b>	<b>→</b>
Primary schools judged by Ofsted as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour	<b>^</b>	95%	100%	HG	95%	100%	HG	95%	100%	HG	<b>→</b>	<b>→</b>
% of new case contact episodes completed within 24 hrs	<b>^</b>	60%	66%	HG	70%	63.6%	LR	70.0%	61.0%	HR	<b>→</b>	<b>4</b>
Numbers of children with child protection plan for over 2 years	•	16	12	HG	10	10	LG	8	6	HG	<b>^</b>	<b>^</b>
Numbers of families who receive direct payments	<b>A</b>	50	84	HG	105	128	HG	105	135	HG	<b>^</b>	<b>^</b>
% of referrals to social care from partner organisations made using CAF	<b>A</b>	100%	27%	HR								
Initial assessments completed within 10 days	<b>A</b>	85%	71%	HR	85%	43.2%	HR	85.0%	51.9%	HR	<b>4</b>	<b>^</b>
(PAF C64) Timing of Core Assessments (NI 60)	<b>A</b>	83%	84%	LG	83%	63.7%	HR	83.0%	65.8%	HR	<b>+</b>	<b>^</b>
NI 19 Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders	<b>V</b>	no target	1.22									
NI 111 First time entrants to the Youth Justice system 10-17	•	no target	26									

Title of Measure	Polarity Good to be High ▲ or Low ▼?	Q4 Target 2011/12	Q4 Actual 2011/12	Q4 Status 2011/12	Q3 Target 2012/13	Q3 Actual 2012/13	Q3 Status 2012/13	Q4 Target 2012/13	Q4 Actual 2012/13	Q4 Status 2012/13	Compared to Q4 2011/12	Compared to Q3 2012/13
NI 117 16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, employment or training (NEET)	•	3.50%			3.6%	2.0%	HG	3.6%	2.0%	HG	Ψ	<b>→</b>
NI 155 Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)	<b>A</b>	285	408	HG	230	243	HG	275	278	LG	<b>4</b>	<b>^</b>
Total households accepted as homeless and in priority need	•	60	110	HR	105	84	HG	150	115	HG	<b>+</b>	Ψ
NI 156 Number of households living in temporary accommodation	•	420	400	LG	400	373	HG	400	360	HG	<b>^</b>	<b>^</b>
Number of households we assist with housing in the private rented sector	<b>A</b>	250	256	LG	260	207	HR	400	248	HR	<b>+</b>	<b>↑</b>
Number of cases where positive action is taken to prevent homelessness	<b>A</b>	1,000	1,133	HG	755	833	HG	1050	1051	LG	<b>+</b>	<b>^</b>
Council adaptations: average time from assessment to completion of work (weeks)	•	35	32	HG	35	21	HG	35.00	29.00	HG	<b>^</b>	Ψ
DFGs: average time taken from assessment to DFG approval date (weeks)	•	35	21	HG	35	10	HG	35	13	HG	<b>^</b>	Ψ
ex-BV212 Average time taken to re-let LA housing (days)	•	21	20.4	LG	21	35.8	HR	21	36.3	HR	<b>4</b>	Ψ
ex-BV64 Private dwellings returned into use	<b>A</b>	200	271	HG	150	166	HG	200	259	HG	<b>4</b>	<b>↑</b>

Supporting our town centre, our local shopping centres and businesses

Title of Measure	Polarity Good to be High ▲ or Low ▼?	Q4 Target 2011/12	Q4 Actual 2011/12	Q4 Status 2011/12	Q3 Target 2012/13	Q3 Actual 2012/13	Q3 Status 2012/13	Q4 Target 2012/13	Q4 Actual 2012/13	Q4 Status 2012/13	Compared to Q4 2011/12	Compared to Q3 2012/13
Visits to Museum - number of physical visits	<b>A</b>	12,000	6,324	HR		6,120			4,963		Ψ	Ψ
Visits to Leisure Centre - number of physical visits	<b>A</b>	200,000	285,495	HG	275,000	274,880	A	275,000	277,563	LG	<b>\</b>	<b>^</b>
Visits to Libraries - number of physical visits	<b>A</b>	315,000	310,533	A	315,000	283,848	LR	315,000	277,525	HR	<b>+</b>	Ψ
Deliver Harrow's long term spatial vision		Yes	Yes	HG	Yes	Yes	HG	Yes	Yes	HG	<b>→</b>	<b>→</b>
Hours of use of public library computers - no target	<b>^</b>	No target set	22,264			14,590			11,866		Ψ	Ψ
Town centre vacancy rate	▼	6.9	8.7	HR	8.30%	7.90%	LG	8.30%	8.30%	LG	<b>^</b>	<b>Ψ</b>
Percentage difference between Harrow and rest of London in respect of JSA claimants	<b>A</b>		New indicator in 2012/13		1.60%	1.60%	LG	1.60%	1.60%	LG		<b>→</b>

**Customer & corporate health perspective** 

Title of Measure	Polarity Good to be High ▲ or Low ▼?	Q4 Target 2011/12	Q4 Actual 2011/12	Q4 Status 2011/12	Q3 Target 2012/13	Q3 Actual 2012/13	Q3 Status 2012/13	Q4 Target 2012/13	Q4 Actual 2012/13	Q4 Status 2012/13	Compared to Q4 2011/12	Compared to Q3 2012/13
NI 14 Percentage avoidable contact within Access Harrow	•	20%	16%	HG	18%	19%	LR	18%	18%	LG	•	<b>^</b>
Average number of calendar days to respond to Ombudsman complaints	•	28	30	LR	28	22	HG	28	21	HG	<b>1</b>	<b>^</b>
% of complaints resolved to timescale	<b>A</b>	85%	87%	LG	90%	61%	HR	90%	91%	LG	<b>↑</b>	<b>^</b>
Resolution of issues at first contact - rate	<b>A</b>	80%	91%	HG	90%	90%	LG	90%	90%	LG	•	<b>→</b>
% of One Stop Shop customers surveyed satisfied/ very satisfied	<b>A</b>	95%	96%	LG	95%	96%	LG	95%	96%	LG	<b>→</b>	<b>→</b>
One Stop Shop average waiting time (min.sec)	•	15:00	15:00	LG	15:00	03:20	HG	15:00	04:40	HG	<b>1</b>	<b>\</b>
% of Contact Centre calls answered within 30 seconds	<b>A</b>	90%	90%	LG	90%	91%	LG	90%	83%	LR	•	<b>•</b>
% of customer calls successfully answered (<5% abandoned)	•	5%	3%	HG	5%	3%	HG	5%	5%	LG	•	<b>+</b>
% of emails answered in <72 hrs (Access Harrow)	<b>A</b>	95%	96%	LG	95%	96%	LG	95%	96%	LG	<b>→</b>	<b>→</b>
% of web forms answered in <24 hrs (Access Harrow)	<b>A</b>	95%	99%	LG	95%	99%	LG	95%	99%	LG	<b>→</b>	<b>→</b>
Average cost per transaction (£) (Access Harrow)	•	0.85	0.73	HG	£1.00	£0.84	HG	£1.00	£0.82	HG	•	<b>^</b>
Proportion of web forms and web visits as a percentage of overall contact	<b>A</b>	60%	65%	HG	60%	61%	LG	60%	61%	LG	•	<b>→</b>
Residents' satisfaction with the repairs service (%) (telephone based interviews)	<b>A</b>	88%	90%	LG	95%			95%	92%	A	<b>^</b>	
% of major planning applications approved	•		New measure 2012/13		60%	75%	HG	60%	75%	HG		<b>→</b>
% of householder planning applications approved	<b>A</b>		New measure 2012/13		90%	73%	HR	90%	73%	HR		<b>→</b>

**Resources Perspective** 

Title of Measure	Polarity Good to be High ▲ or Low ▼?	2011/12	2011/12	Q4 Status 2011/12	2012/13	2012/13	Q3 Status 2012/13	2012/13	2012/13	Q4 Status 2012/13	Compared to Q4 2011/12	Compared to Q3 2012/13
BV12 Proportion of working days lost due to sickness absence (includes schools)	•	7.14	7.35	A	7.14	7.82	LR	7.14	7.80	LR	<b>→</b>	
Proportion of working days lost due to sickness absence (excludes schools)	•		8.88			8.58			8.94		<b>→</b>	
Workforce with IPAD in last 12 months	<b>A</b>	95%	85%	HR	95%	89%	LR	95%	91%	A	<b>^</b>	<b>^</b>
Total debt collected, at year to date, as a % of total debt raised	<b>A</b>	75%	78%	LG	75%	67%	HR	75%	75%	LG	<b>→</b>	<b>^</b>
Average debtor days	•	88	12	HG	60	30	HG	60	22	HG	<b>→</b>	<b>↑</b>
% of invoices paid within 30 working days	•	95%	68%	HR	75%	76%	LG	75%	72%	A	<b>^</b>	<b>4</b>
% of SAP purchase orders raised before invoice date	<b>A</b>	90%	83%	LR	81%	88%	HG	81%	89%	HG	<b>^</b>	<b>↑</b>
NI 181 Time taken to process housing benefit/council tax benefit new claims and change events DWP DSO (days)	•	9	6.02	HG	9.00	8.55	HG	9.00	6.82	HG	<b>+</b>	<b>↑</b>
% forecast variation from net budget		0%	-85%	R	0.00%	-1.13%	G	0%	-0.6%	G	<b>^</b>	<b>1</b>
% forecast variation from budget: capital expenditure		0%	45%	R	0%	-25.60%	R	0%	-56.2%	R	<b>\Psi</b>	Ψ
BV9 Percentage of council tax collected	<b>A</b>	97.00%	97.80%	LG	85.00%	85.07%	LG	97.00%	97.70%	LG	<b>\Psi</b>	<b>^</b>
BV10 Percentage of non-domestic rates collected	<b>A</b>	96.75%	96.20%	A	86.75%	85.63%	A	97.00%	95.46%	A	<b>\</b>	<b>^</b>
% of cost centres for which SAP budget forecast completed	•		Not available at Q4		100%	86%	HR	-	Not required			
ex-BV66a LA rent collection and arrears: proportion of rent collected	<b>A</b>	98.50%	99.03%	LG	98.30%	97.79%	A	99.25%	98.39%	A	Ψ	<b>1</b>
Current rent arrears as % of rent roll	•	2.15%	1.64%	HG	1.55%	1.65%	LR	1.50%	1.58%	LR	<b>^</b>	<b>1</b>
Overall current tenants' rent arrears (£k)	•	450	401	HG	372	433	HR	350	414	HR	<b>+</b>	<b>^</b>
Overall leasehold service charge arrears (£k)	•	100	87	HG								
IT Service Desk availability	<b>A</b>	100%	99.96%	A	100%	100%	LG	100%	100%	LG	<b>^</b>	<b>→</b>
IT critical system availability	<b>A</b>	99.16%	99.76%	LG	99.16%	99.68%	LG	99.16%	99.25%	LG	<b>\Psi</b>	<b>4</b>
IT customer (internal) complaints - average per month	•	2	3.66	HR	2.00	7.00	HR	2.00	7.60	HR	<b>\Psi</b>	Ψ