

RESOURCES																		
PI No.	Indicator	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Yearly trend-line	2022/23 Q1	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	2022/23 Q4	In-year trend	End of Year 2022/23	Better to be	Notes on measure (cumulative / quarterly / rolling), targets (annual / quarterly / longer-term & rationale) and benchmarking	Performance Commentary	If underperforming: Reasons for underperformance and mitigating actions	Directorate Lead	Performance Lead
<b>Manage our budget effectively and efficiently</b>																		
R1	Successful management of approved General Fund budget (General Fund Forecast Outturn Variance from Balanced Budget £m)	-5.5	-8.4	-1.1	-2.1		8.1	2.7	5.6	0		0	↓	Measure: Each quarter is an estimated year-end position, updated as the financial year progresses. ('-' = underspend; '+' = overspend) Target: Above (-£0m) Target rationale: Break even.	Q4 net General Fund outturn showing a balanced position following drawdowns to/from reserves and use of corporate contingencies. Outturn report due to CMB and Executive.	Majority of overspend is split between Children's, Adults, Environment and CWB, and corporately held pay pressures. Rising cost of energy is the principal pressure (Environment, CWB and council-wide). Other key pressures are children's social care placements, Adults' care packages, Adults' hospital discharge costs and commercial property income shortfall (CWB). Application of corporate energy provision, corporate energy and inflation reserve, social care reserve, budget risk and insurance reserve, capital financing reserve and corporate contingency budget to offset the overall gross outturn overspend.	Paul Clarke	Tony Watts
R2	Percentage of council tax collected in year.	96.1%	95.3%	93.7%	94.1%		24.9%	48.6%	71.0%	94.4%		94.4%	↑	Measure: Cumulative; current Q is an estimate Annual target: 95.3% by 31st March 2023 Profiled targets: Q1: 25.3%; Q2: 49.1%; Q3: 72.5%; Q4: 95.3% Target rationale: Annual and profiled targets are the collection rates achieved in 2019/20 (the last FY before COVID). Benchmark: Islington was the 6th best performing Inner London Council (2021/22) for uncollected council tax, with % due below the mean for Inner London (LG Inform). This does not account for demographic differences between boroughs.	We ended the year 0.9% below our profiled target for this quarter. Nevertheless this was an improvement on last year.  As we reported previously, we had already recognised that the earlier positive impact of the large "one-off" value of the energy rebates we credited to council tax accounts in Q2 would not be repeated in Q3 or Q4. And as the CoLC continued through Q3 & Q4 we were not able to make up the shortfall to the profiled target.	We deployed all the known legal and behavioural collection activities used by the other London Boroughs and we will continue to use these.  Unfortunately, once our legal enforcement and collection techniques have been exhausted we have no further means to compel payments of monies owed.	Paul Clarke	Andrew Spigarolo
R3	Percentage of business rates collected in year	96.6%	96.7%	93.0%	93.6%		28.1%	55.3%	77.8%	94.6%		94.6%	↑	Measure: Cumulative; current Q is an estimate Annual target: 96.7% by 31st March Profiled targets: Q1: 26.2%; Q2: 52.8%; Q3:76.1%; Q4: 96.7% Target rationale: Annual and profiled targets are the collection rates achieved in 2019/20 (the last FY before COVID). Benchmarks: Islington was the 6th best performing Inner London Council (2021/22) for uncollected business rates, with % due below the mean for Inner London (LG Inform). This does not account for demographic differences between boroughs.	We ended the year 2.1% below our profiled target. Nevertheless this was an improvement on last year.	We deployed all the known legal and behavioural collection activities used by the other London Boroughs and we will continue to use these.  Unfortunately, once our legal enforcement and collection techniques have been exhausted we have no further means to compel payments of monies owed.	Paul Clarke	Andrew Spigarolo
NEW	Number of households (with balances) in council tax arrears (Council Tax Support & non-Council Tax Support)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15,597	12,354	11,078	7,172			↓	(Excludes arrears of those households who are no longer resident in the borough)	At the end of the year, over 7,000 (6%) households (with balances) are in council tax arrears, valued at £12.1m. 32% (3,938) of these households are on council tax support (and 43% of households receiving CTS are in CT arrears), with a debt valued at £3.9m. The % of CTS households with arrears increases through the bands (from 23% in Band A to 55% in the highest band), indicating that CTS has greatest impact in helping those households in lower band properties to avoid debt.  The average debt per household (CTS+ non CTS) increased slightly through the year as the value of arrears decreased, ending the year at £1,689. Average value of debt increases across the bands, ranging from just over £1,000 for Band A to nearly £2.5k for band H). Average debt for those in receipt in CTS is higher (£1,723), however the range is lower (from £1,422 in Band A to £1,942 in Band H). So, CTS could be seen to have the biggest impact in reducing the level of debt for those at higher bands).	Paul Clarke	Duwaine Browne	
	Percentage of households in council tax arrears (CTS and non-CTS)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14%	11%	10%	6%			↓					
	Value of council tax arrears (£m) (CTS & non-CTS)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	£ 17,947	£ 15,247	£ 13,702	£ 12,111			↓					
	Average value of debt (£) (non-CTS+CTS)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	£ 1,151	£ 1,234	£ 1,237	£ 1,689			↓					
	Number of households (with balances) in council tax arrears in receipt of CTS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,152	4,187	3,938	2,284			↓					
	Percentage of households in receipt of CTS with council tax arrears	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33%	43%	42%	43%			↓					
	Value of council tax arrears (£m) (with CTS)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	£ 4,636	£ 4,407	£ 4,144	£ 3,935			↓					
Average value of debt (CTS)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	£ 900	£ 1,052	£ 1,052	£ 1,723			↓						
R4 (New)	Treasury investments: Compliance with required prudential and treasury management indicators (eg. debt levels and exposure to credit risk, liquidity risk, interest rate risk and refinancing risk)								100%		N/A	100%	↑	Measure: Numbers of indicators with which we are compliant (total of 6 indicators) Target: 6 (100%) Target rationale: Aiming for 100% compliance	(Any areas of non-compliance to be described in the commentary) (Latest report October 2022)	Paul Clarke	Joana Marfoh	
R5 (New)	Percentage of invoices from local suppliers paid within 10 days	No data	No data	No data	No data		86%	87%	88%	87%	N/A	87%	↑	Measure: Quarterly Target: 90% Target rationale: A new measure, this target is a starter, intended to be ambitious yet achievable.	Performance has seen a slight increase over the year, averaging at 87%, 3% points short of the 90% target.	Paul Clarke	Andrew Spigarolo / Sonia Watson	
<b>Harness digital technology for the benefit of residents and staff</b>																		
R6 (New)	Number of successful cyber attacks	No data	No data	No data	No data		0	0	0	0	N/A	0	↓	Measure: Quarterly Target: 0 Target rationale: Aim is to prevent all cyber attacks	There were no successful cyber attacks this quarter.	N/A	Jon Cumming	Alan Checkley / Tim Rodgers
R7 (New)	Average number of priority 1 incidents per quarter which typically affect more than 100 staff or residents or significantly impairs applications or access.	N/A	N/A	14	15		8	5	7	11		8	↓	Measure: Number of outages per quarter. Annual figure is the average over all quarters. Quarterly target: under 12	Averaging under 4 per month so within performance expectations. As with last quarter most were caused by hosted platforms and infrastructure. We continue to work with our suppliers to review and understand their SLA's for dealing with outages.	N/A	Jon Cumming	Frank Purcell
<b>Make sure our workforce is diverse, skilled and highly motivated</b>																		
R8	Average number of days lost per year through sickness absence per employee (in previous 12 month rolling period)	10.8	10.7	7.4	8.0		8.5	8.4	8.0	8.6		8.6	↓	Measure: Rolling 12 month period. Target: 7.5 days (not adjusted to account for Covid absence). The target has not been adjusted to account for Covid sickness Benchmark: London Councils 2020/21 average 8.53 days (Councils' ranges are 3.93-12.8 days). CIPD Average days lost to sickness is 8.4 days. Target rationale: [A legacy target, pre-dating 2020]	Q4 sickness absence increased in the last quarter of 22/23 and is slightly above the benchmarks from London Councils (8.53 days) and the CIPD (Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development) average days lost to sickness which is 8.4 days. The top five reasons for sickness are mental health, musculo-skeletal, back and neck problems, COVID19 and infections. Working days lost has increased from the last quarter by 7.6%. The increase is predominantly due to Mental Health reasons which have increased by 13.9% this quarter compared to quarter 3.	We introduced many new initiatives in 22/23 and expanded our early intervention and prevention activities to support good mental and physical health for our workforce. Attendance is increasing at events and our Health and Wellbeing Steering group, made up from colleagues across the Council, has co-developed our Health and Well-being action plan. The Council's 2023-26 Workforce strategy puts Wellbeing and Resilience as one of its strategic priorities and we will offer many more health and well-being initiatives in the coming year. The focus on wellbeing is also a primary function of our new approach to performance development; Check Ins which was introduced in April. The Employee Relations team continue to support managers with the management of sickness absence cases and early interventions and will develop improved toolkits and training in the coming months.	Tamara Hanton	Elif Gunay / Neil Bowles / Lamin Ceasay

R9	Percentage of workforce who are agency staff (by FTE)	10.93%	10.63%	12.60%	11.84%		11.60%	11.86%	12.89%	13.19%	12.39%	↓	<p><b>Measure:</b> FTE of agency workers working on a representative day in the final month of the period as a % of the total FTE (LBI FTE + Agency FTE).</p> <p><b>Target:</b> 10%</p> <p><b>Benchmark:</b> London average = 15%</p> <p><b>Target rationale:</b> Aspirational</p>	Agency usage increased by 0.30% in Q4 from Q3. Usage has risen quarter on quarter for 2022/2023 but remains lower than the London average of 15%.	<p>Difficulties in the permanent recruitment market (skill shortages, rising salaries and the discrepancy between public &amp; private sector pay) have resulted in longer tenures for some roles and need for additional agency capacity. Organisational change is, in cases, preventing services from advertising permanent roles or committing to temp to perm conversions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total headcount increased each month of Q4 compared to Q3.</li> <li>- Total FTE increased by 9.46%</li> <li>- Number of hours submitted across Q4 increased by 1.75%</li> <li>- By job category, interim executive remains the highest spend with highest increase of £248k in Q4. This includes the transfer of workers which previously sat outside of the Matrix contract on high day rates and agency margins over 15%.</li> </ul> <p>Directorate People Plans are incorporating plans for temp to perm along with dedicated work between services and Strategic Resourcing Lead and an accelerated temp to perm approach.</p>	Tamara Hanton	Elif Gunay / Neil Bowles / Jennifer McGee
R10 (a)	a) Percentage of Black and Minoritised Ethnic staff within the top 5% of earners	20.2%	19.3%	21.50%	26.36%		27.3%	26.8%	28.3%	26.5%	27.2%	↑	<p><b>Measure:</b> Top 5 % of earners when employees are ranked in order of basic gross pay (fte). Measure is made at period end date.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> 21.7%</p> <p><b>Benchmark:</b> London Councils 2020/21 average 20.22%. (Councils' ranges are 9.3%-33.9%)</p> <p><b>Target rationale:</b> [Please provide reasoning behind target level]</p>	There is a slight increase of 0.8% since last year 21/22 figures. However, 27.2% remains above target and the London Councils average.	This remains a top priority for the Council, i.e. to improve representation at the senior levels through a combination of development opportunities, recruitment and cultural awareness. There is a commitment to specifically address racial inequality within our organisation by demonstrating leading practice and taking part in London Committee's programme to address racial inequality in the council and implementing the recommendations identified. We will assess ourselves against the success criteria and work towards evidencing 'established' and 'leading' practice across all 7 categories in the Race Inequality Standard. There continue to be a number of leadership and development programmes to	Tamara Hanton	Elif Gunay / Neil Bowles / Adelle Henry
R10 (b)	b) Percentage of disabled staff within the top 5% of earners	5.8%	5.8%	7.6%	8.0%		8.4%	8.0%	6.6%	6.7%	7.4%	↑	<p><b>Measure:</b> Top 5 % of earners when employees are ranked in order of basic gross pay (fte). Measure is made at period end date.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> 6.3%</p> <p><b>Benchmark:</b> London Councils 2020/21 average 13.65% (Councils' ranges are 3.5%-26.35%)</p> <p><b>Target rationale:</b> [Please provide reasoning behind target level]</p>	Performance is down on the last year by 0.6% but is slightly above our target and shows an improvement from Q3 and Q4 when there was a decrease in performance. The percentage of people formally sharing a disability, 9.43% is higher than the average across London boroughs (6.25%).	We are a Level Two Disability Confident Employer, and working towards level 3 during this year. Disability and Wellbeing Officer post is leading on work and working collaboratively with Disabled Staff Forum to make improvements to disabled staff experience. We have significantly decreased the response time for our reasonable adjustments process and this work continues providing case management and support to colleagues. We are continuing to build a culture where people with disabilities can thrive and progress in their careers.	Tamara Hanton	Elif Gunay / Neil Bowles / Adelle Henry
<b>Be open and accountable</b>																	
R11	Percentage of new voter registrations processed	N/A	N/A	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	↑	<p><b>Target:</b> 100%</p>	The service performance remains the same as Q2 by continuing to meet the previous performance, processing 100% of new voter registrations.		Kerry Wickens	Georgia Kinsella
R12 (a)	Number of Freedom of Information (FOI) requests received	2055	2041	1639	1876		490	477	436	496	1899	N/A	No target	N/A		Leila Ridley	Brad Pearton
R12 (b)	Percentage of FOIs completed within target (20 working days)	80%	86%	79%	82%		89%	89%	89%	84%	88%	↑	<p><b>Target:</b> 90% (set by the Information Commissioner's Office)</p>	Q4 saw the highest number requests received during the year and was an increase of 60 requests on Q3. Q4 however, saw the lowest compliance for the year.	<p>Children's Services - CS FOIs often require information from various departments within the directorate and although held, is not always easily obtainable, resulting in delays.</p> <p>Environment - Environment receive the highest number of FOIs and often struggle to reach 90%. A number of changes to IGOs has further impacted compliance.</p> <p>Homes and Neighbourhoods - There has been a change in IGOs as well as an increase in complaints and MEs for this service which impacted the compliance. The IG team are providing additional support as required.</p> <p>The council has investigated a range of options to improve compliance and following the decision by CMB to centralise FOI and SAR management a consultation has been launched to create this team. The consultation is due to close on 12 May. A FTC role will be created in the central team with responsibility for ensuring the council increases its proactive publication so that information is more readily available to residents.</p>	Leila Ridley	Brad Pearton
R13 (a)	Number of Subject Access Requests (SARs)	574	340	242	319		84	100	98	89	371	N/A	No target	N/A	N/A	Leila Ridley	Brad Pearton
R13 (b)	Percentage of SARs completed within target (one calendar month)	70%	80%	79%	65%		70%	70%	77%	76%	73%	↑	<p><b>Target:</b> 90% (set by the Information Commissioner's Office)</p>	<p>Performance increased in Q4 was 1% lower than Q3, but was higher than Q1 and 2. At 76% the council was still well below the target of 90%.</p> <p>Seven directorates received SARs in Q4 and all achieved 100% compliance with the exception of Children's Services who were 55% (XX out of 40 requests answered in time) compliant and Homes and Neighbourhoods who were 89% (XX out of 27 requests answered in time) compliant.</p> <p>Children's Services continue to receive the highest number of requests in the council receiving approximately 50% of all the requests received and these are the most complex.</p>	<p>Children's Services - receive approximately 50% of all the SARs received in the council. These requests are often for historic social care files with are voluminous and complex. The process is timeconsuming as each file must be scanned (and each scan checked) before the files can then be reviewed/redacted and released.</p> <p>H&amp;N - received a high number of SARs as well as an increase in complaints and a new IGO which has impacted negatively on compliance.</p> <p>The council has investigated a range of options to improve compliance and following the decision by CMB to centralise FOI and SAR management a consultation has been launched to create this team. The consultation is due to close on 12 May.</p>	Leila Ridley	Brad Pearton
R14	High risk breaches reported to the Information Commissioners Officer (ICO)	0	1	1	5		0	0	0	1	1	↓	No target	One incident was reported to the ICO in Q4. The incident related to a spreadsheet showing contract spend over £5000 that was published to the council's website. The spreadsheet was not correctly redacted so that names and addresses of individuals were visible. This was closed with NFA from the ICO.	N/A	Leila Ridley	Brad Pearton

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & WELLBEING**

PI No.	Indicator	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Yearly trend-line	Better to be	2022/23 Q1	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	2022/23 Q4	In-year trend	Notes on measure (cumulative / quarterly / rolling), targets (annual / quarterly / longer-term & rationale) and benchmarking	Performance Commentary	If underperforming: Reasons for underperformance and mitigating actions	Directorate Lead	Performance Lead
<b>Corporate Indicators</b>																	
<b>Improving the resident experience - ensuring that residents can access what they need in a way that works for them</b>																	
FT13	% of residents satisfied with outcome of their calls & visits <i>Amendment Q4 % of residents deemed to be satisfied with outcome of their calls</i>	92%	93%	96%	98%		↑	98%	97%	96%	95%		Cumulative measure assessed by team managers in monitoring reviews of calls across the service.	Performance in this area is based on quality checks undertaken by Team Managers on a selection of resident calls. In Q4 190 calls were monitored. We are currently looking into ways to enable residents themselves to evaluate the quality of service and interaction with the Council. This will be made possible by the new telephony system, together with the introduction of quality surveys for front of house services		Manny Lewis	Teresa McLaren
FT14	Number of telephone calls offered (received) through Access Islington Call Centre	421,550	387,257	388,738	409,918		↓	99,084	193,530	274,875	368,919		Cumulative measure Target: <b>Lower than same period in previous year</b> <b>2021/22 benchmark:</b> Q1: 113,171 Q2: 224,926 Q3: 315,898 Q4: 409,918	The figures show we received less calls compared to 21/22 for the period up to Q3 of 315,898. We continue to experience ongoing issues with IT systems affecting the web and online payments. To address these issues we have been working closely with IDS to address and reduce the impact. Additional demand has also been created as a result of the energy rebate.	The new IVR system has been implemented and we expect this to lead to further service improvements	Manny Lewis	Teresa McLaren
FT15	Number of telephone calls answered through Access Islington Call Centre	396,211	344,707	312,571	295,334		↑	74,336	137,147	196,039	265,888		Cumulative measure (year to date) Target: <b>85%</b> <b>2021/22 benchmark:</b> Q1: 77,231 (68%) Q2: 143,491 (64%) Q3: 215,334 (68%) Q4: 295,334 (72%)	72% of calls were answered against the target of 85% which is the same as 2021/22. Managers are continuing to target individual and service performance to reduce call waiting times, average handling times and after call work (ACW) back to pre-Covid levels. The changes with the IVR system have resulted in lower abandonment and waiting times	During Q4 there were system issues on 20 days with varying times and impact on resident experience. From April, intermittent performance of online systems and various mailouts to residents have prompted intense periods of calls. We are working with IDS and services to address and reduce the impact.	Manny Lewis	Teresa McLaren
	Percentage of telephone calls answered through Access Islington Call Centre	94%	89%	80%	72%		↑	75%	71%	72%	72%						
FT16	Number of online transactions – measuring increase in online transactions/self-serve	179,938	169,272	189,967	210,380		↑	48,157	99,849	148,325	196,344		Cumulative measure (year to date) Target: <b>Higher than same period in previous year</b> <b>2021/22 benchmark:</b> Q1: 54,699 Q2: 112,531 Q3: 161,901 Q4: 210,295	All figures reviewed and updated in Q4. The figures show a decrease of 13,951 for 2022/23 compared to 210,295 in 2021/22 across online services. Parking, Council Tax and Street Environment Services (SES) saw the biggest reductions in the number of online transactions in 2022/23. <b>Parking</b> decrease reflects the number of residents signing up for Ring Go online accounts (individual transactions are not recorded). <b>Council Tax</b> decrease is due to residents potentially carrying out multiple transactions on Gov Tech system. <b>SES</b> is lower as it followed a peak in 2021/22 for bin containers and bags.	Earlier in the year, intermittent performance of online systems impacted on residents being able to self serve online. We worked with IDS and services to address and reduce the impact.	Manny Lewis	Teresa McLaren