

Best Value Performance Indicators 2002/03 A Comparison of Brent's Performance Report PRU -03/04- 12

POLICY & REGENERATION UNIT LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

TEL: (020) 8937-1030 FAX: (020) 8937-1050

Introduction & Index of Performance Indicators 2002 – 03

This document provides information on the way that the Council has performed by comparison with its audit family and neighbours.

All data is based on that provided through the ODPM (Office of the Deputy Prime Minster) and has been audited. The Council's audit family (of similar boroughs) and neighbours are listed below:

<u>Audit Commission Family:</u> <u>Neighbouring boroughs:</u>

Croydon Hammersmith & Fulham,

Ealing Barnet,
Enfield Camden
Haringey Westminster

Harrow Kensington & Chelsea

Hounslow Lewisham Lambeth

Waltham Forest

The following report contains:

- Graphs showing Brent's comparative performance for Best Value Performance Indicators 2002 - 03
- Colour coding to indicate comparative performance against all other London boroughs, shown as green for top quartile performance, red for bottom quartile performance and blue for performance that falls within the inter (normal performance) quartile range
- Each graph shows the upper, median and lower quartile values for each indicator, as well as the last two years performance where available

NB

Top quartile performance may mean high figures or low figures depending on the measure being examined for example, the council will want to <u>maximise</u> the proportion of council tax that it collects but it will want to <u>reduce</u> the number of people killed or seriously injured on our roads.

Each target shows Brent's comparative performance against a group of other authorities and against all London boroughs. As such our position changes year on year. This means that even if performance improves within the year, comparative performance may get worse if all other authorities have improved faster than Brent.

The table below shows the number of BVPI's classified as good, poor or OK (by use of the inter quartile range) for 2002 – 2003 and compares this to our comparative performance in 2001 – 2002.

CORPORATE SUMMARY

YEAR	Number of poor performing	Mid performance range	Number of good performing
2002/03 Total reportable Pl's 102	33 (32.3%)	51 (50%)	18 (17.6)
2001/02 Total reportable Pl's 124	58 (46.8%)	36 (29%)	30 (24.2%)

Difference	- 14.5%	+ 21%	- 6.6%

SERVICE AREA QUARTILE AND RANK SUMMARY

PERF	ORMANCE INDICATORS: COMPARATIVE		ATIVE PERFOR	MANCE	RANKING	
	ORATE CENTRE	HIGH	WIDDLE	LOW	UNLESS	ON BOROUGH'S STATED) 33 = WORST
Page:					2002/03	2001/02
1	BV 8 Percentage of undisputed invoices paid within 30 days				22	16
2	BV 9 The % Council Tax collected				30	25
3	BV 10 Percentage NNDR collected				31	26
4	BV 11a Percentage of senior management posts filled by women				20	N/A
5	BV 11b Percentage of top earners from ethnic minorities				6	N/A
6	BV 12 The number of working days lost due to sickness absence per quarter per employee				28	26
7	BV 14 Percentage Early retirements of the total workforce				10	14
8	BV 15 Percentage of ill health retirement of the total workforce				5	1
9	BV 16a The percentage of staff with disabilities of the total work force				3	10
10	BV 16b Percentage of economically active disabled people in LA area				N/A	N/A
11	BV 17a The percentage of staff from ethnic minorities of the total work force				1	3
12	BV 17b Percentage of economically active people from the ethnic minorities in LA area				2	N/A
13	BV 78a Speed of processing: Average time for new claims in days				28	21
14	BV 78b Speed of processing: Average time for new claims in days BV 78b Speed of processing: change in circumstances in days				27	24
15	BV 78cSpeed of Processing: change in cli callistances in days BV 78cSpeed of Processing: percentage of renewal claims processed on				20	25
	time					
16	BV 79a Accuracy of processing:				24	2
17	BV 79b Accuracy of processing: Percentage of recoverable overpayments				22 (out of	19 (out of 31)
	(excluding Council Tax Benefits) that were recovered in the year				31)	
18	BV 126 Domestic burglaries per 1,000 households				27	5
19	BV 127e Robberies per 1,000 population				27 (out of 31)	26 (out of 32)
20	BV 128 Vehicle crimes per 1,000 population				18	17 (out of 32)
21	BV 156 The percentage of LA buildings open to the public in which all public areas are suitable for and accessible to disabled people				7 (out of 32)	N/A
22	BV 157 The percentage of interaction with the public, by type, which are capable of electronic service delivery				25	N/A
23	BV 174 The number of racial incidents recorded by the LA per 100,000 population		N/A			s not report but cases

PERF	ORMANCE INDICATORS:	COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE		RAI	RANKING	
EDUC	ATION ARTS & LIBRARIES	HIGH	MIDDLE	LOW	UNLES	OON BOROUGH'S S STATED) 33 = WORST
Page:					2002/03	2001/02
24	BV 30 Percentage of 3 year olds with access to free education places				28	22
25	BV 33 Youth Service spend per head of population in target age range				15	11
26	BV 34a Percentage of primary schools with 25% of their places unfilled				29	18
27	BV 34b Percentage of secondary schools with 25% of their places unfilled				31	17
28	BV 36a Expenditure per pupil in schools: nursery & primary aged under 5				6	2
29	BV 36b Expenditure per pupil in schools: primary aged over 5				16	23
30	BV 36c Expenditure per pupil in schools: secondary				16	12
31	BV 38 Percentage of 15 year olds in schools achieving 5 or more GCSE A*-C				14	18
32	BV 39 Percentage of 15 year olds achieving 1 or more GCSE A* -G				9	3
33	BV 40 Percentage of schools achieving level 4 or above in key stage 2 maths				13	14
34	BV 41 Percentage of schools achieving level 4 or above in key stage 2 English				16	20
35	BV 43a The percentage of SEN statements completed within 18 weeks with exceptions				28	19
36	BV 43b The percentage of SEN statements completed without exceptions				23	17
37	BV 44 The percentage of permanent exclusions: all schools maintained				15	27
38	BV 45 The percentage of permanent exclusions: secondary schools				6 (out of 32)	10 (out of 32)
39	BV 46 The percentage of permanent exclusions: primary schools				11	11
40	BV 48 Schools subject to special measures				24 (out of 32)	31
41	BV 115 The cost per physical visits to libraries per 1,000 population				3	3
42	BV 117 Visits to libraries number per 1,000 population				19	20
43	BV 159 The percentage of permanently excluded pupils attending alternative tuition of: a) 5 hours or under				26 (out of 32)	19
44	BV 159 b) 6 - 12 hours				21 (out of 32)	19 (out of 32)
45	BV 159 c) 13 - 19 hours				21 (out of 32)	17 (out of 32)
46	BV 159 d) 20 hours or more				18 (out of 32)	N/A

PERF	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:		COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE			NKING
EDUC	EDUCATION ARTS & LIBRARIES		MIDDLE	LOW	(OF 33 LONDON BOROUG UNLESS STATED) 1 = BEST - 33 = WOR	
Page:					2002/03	2001/02
47	BV 170a The number of visits to/usage of museums per 1,000 population				22 (out of 29)	25 (out of 29)
48	BV 170 b The number of those visits that were in person per 1,000 population				29 (out of 29)	28 (out of 29)
49	BV 181a Percentage of 14 yr olds in LEA schools achieving level 5 or above in: English				14 (out of 32)	N/A
50	BV 181 b Percentage of 14 yr olds in LEA schools achieving level 5 or above in: Math's				12 (out of 32)	N/A
51	BV 181c Percentage of 14 yr olds in LEA schools achieving level 5 or above in: Science	_			17 (out of 32)	N/A

PERF	ORMANCE INDICATORS:	COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE			RANKING	
	RONMENTAL SERVICES	HIGH	WIDDLE	LOW	UNLESS	ON BOROUGH'S S STATED) 33 = WORST
Page:					2002/03	2001/02
52	BV 82a Total tonnage of household local waste arising: the percentage recycled				24	25
53	BV 84 Number of Kilogrammes of household waste collected per head				22	17
54	BV 86 Cost of waste collection per household				31	30
55	BV 91 Percentage of population served by kerb side collection within 1Km of recycling centre				18	1 st (100%) with 26 other boroughs
56	BV 96 Proportion of principal roads in a poor condition				14	13
57	BV 97a Proportion of non principal classified roads in a poor condition				26 (out of 32)	25 (out of 29)
58	BV 97b Condition of non principal unclassified roads in a poor condition				28 (out of 32)	19 (out of 25)
59	BV 99 i The total number of road accident casualties per 100,00 pop killed/serious injury				Ranking not available in reported totals	
60	BV 99 ii The total number of road accident casualties per 100,00 pop slight injury					t available in ed totals
61	BV 100 Number of days temp traffic controls on traffic sensitive roads				18 (out of 26)	22 (out of 26)
62	BV 106 Percentage new homes on brown field sites				30	33
63	BV 107 Planning costs per head of population				19 (out of 32)	22 (out of 32)
64	BV 109a Major Planning applications within guidelines, applications within 8 weeks				27	N/A
65	BV 109b Percentage of planning applications determined within target of 65% of minor applications approved within 8 weeks				7	N/A
66	BV 109c Percentage of planning applications determined within target of 80% of other applications approved within 8 weeks				3	N/A
67	BV 165 The percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people				22	24
68	BV 166 Score/Checklist of enforcement best practice for a) environmental health				22	15

PERF	ORMANCE INDICATORS:	COMPAI	RATIVE PERFOR	MANCE	RANKING		
ENVI	RONMENTAL SERVICES	HIGH	WIDDLE	LOW	UNLESS	ON BOROUGH'S S STATED) 33 = WORST	
Page:					2002/03	2001/02	
69	BV 166 b) trading standards				12	4	
70	BV 178 Percentage total length of footpaths/other rights of way which				9 (out of 20)	10 (out of 20)	
	are easy to use						
71	BV 179 The percentage of standard searches carried out in 10 working				10	13	
	days						
72	BV 180b Average street lamp circuit wattage				4	N/A	
73	BV 186a Principal roads not needing major repairs per km of principal road				6	N/A	
74	BV 186b Non- principal roads not needing major repairs per km of non				8	N/A	
	principal road						
75	BV 187a Condition of Footways (percentage of footpaths needing repairs)				6	N/A	
76	BV 188 Planning Decisions delegated to officers				6	N/A	

PERF	ORMANCE INDICATORS:	COMPA	ARATIVE PER	FORMANCE	RAN	KING
HOU	SING SERVICES	HIGH MIDDLE LOW		LOW	(OF 33 LONDON BOROUGH'S UNLESS STATED) 1 = BEST - 33 = WORST	
Page:					200/03	2001/02
77	BV 62 The proportion of unfit private sector dwellings made fit or demolished as a direct result of action by local authority				10 (out of 31)	11 (out of 32)
78	BV 63 Energy efficiency: the average SAP rating				27 (out of 31)	26 (out of 31)
79	BV 64 The number of private sector vacant dwellings that are returned into occupation or demolished as a direct result of action by the LA				23 (out of 30)	25 (out of 30)
80	BV 66a Local authority rent collection and arrears: proportion of rent collected				11 (out of 30)	17 (out of 30)
81	BV 74a Tenant satisfaction: Overall service by landlord				28 (out of 30)	N/A
82	BV 74b Over all satisfaction with landlord: black & ethnic minority tenants				22 (out of 28)	N/A
83	BV 74c Over all satisfaction with landlord: non black & ethnic minority tenants				26 (out of 30)	N/A
84	BV 176 The number of domestic violence refuge places per 1,000 population which are provided or supported by LA				11	2
85	BV 183a The average length of stay in bed and breakfast accommodation				13	N/A
86	BV 183b The average length of stay in hostel accommodation				14	N/A
87	BV 184a LA homes which were non-decent at the start of the year				18 (out of 30)	N/A
88	BV 184b Percentage change in proportion of non-decent LA homes in the year				16 (out of 30)	N/A
89	BV 185 The % response to non-emergency repairs where appointments were made and kept				7 (out of 30)	N/A

PERF	ORMANCE INDICATORS:	COMPA	ARATIVE PERF	FORMANCE	RANKING	
SOCI	SOCIAL SERVICES		MIDDLE	LOW	(OF 33 LONDON BOROUGH'S UNLESS STATED) 1 = BEST - 33 = WORST	
Page:					2002/03	2001/02
90	BV 49 (PAF A1) Stability of placements: children looked after with 3 or more placements during the year				28	32
91	BV 50 The Percentage of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with at least 1 GCSE/GNVQ				25 (out of 32)	31 (out of 32)
92	BV 51 Cost of service for children looked after as a gross weekly expenditure per looked after child in foster/children's home care				29	20
93	BV 52 Cost of intensive social care for adults by reference to the average gross weekly cost of providing care for adults & elderly people				13	28
94	BV 53 Intensive home care per 1,000 population aged 65 or over				18	19
95	BV 54 Older people helped to live at home per 1,000 population aged 65 and over				29	30
96	BV 55 Clients receiving a review as a percentage of adult clients receiving a service				10	2
97	BV 56 (PAF D39)The percentage of items of equipment delivered within 3 weeks				33	30
98	BV 58 (PAF D38) The percentage of people receiving a statement of their needs and how they will be met				19	30
99	BV 161 Employment, education and training for care leavers				16	29
100	BV 162 Reviews of child protection cases				30	29
101	BV 163 (PAF C23)Adoptions of children looked after				24	19
102	BV 182 Users satisfied with help from Social Services				12	N/A
103	BV 190 Users who said that if they asked for changes to services those changes were made				27	N/A