

National Indicator	NI 1: Percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area				
Community Strategy Theme	Cohesion	3 year SCS outcome	Initiatives in place for gypsy and traveller communities to promote shared understanding 'International' celebrations take place in Suffolk that bring new and existing communities together		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	Seeks to promote social cohesion whilst Suffolk is having to deal with an increasingly multi cultural makeup (SACRE) Partnership target (WGYPT) There are two levels of perception involved – what people believe other people believe - making it a weaker indicator (SEBC) Vague and subjective (SPCT) Difficult to set target and very difficult affect in 3 years (SCDC) Prefer a broader target NI4 (One Ips, IBC) Meaningless indicator (SCC)				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	4	Number of responses prioritising this indicator		Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority	Suffolk Coastal scored well in 2006 – 87% (similar Suffolk Speaks Question)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally					
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?	NEW PLACE SURVEY SPATIAL - County and District REPORTED BY - SCC Very similar to existing BVPI survey LATEST TREND - BOTTOM QUARTILE (county average 80.7%). LAA target : Baseline (2006/07) 68%; Outcome (2009/10) 71%				
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	In Suffolk, the overall picture is one of cohesion, with the county average higher than the national. Ipswich and Waveney are the areas of the county where cohesion issues are most acute. If NI 1 and 4 are selected together the focus is on empowerment as well as cohesion. On NI 4, % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality, Suffolk is below the national average and so this would be a good combination of indicators.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Some data to give relative baseline making it possible to set a meaningful target.				
Risk	KEY CONCERN: Place survey which is only undertaken every 2 years (2008, 2010 etc) measurement in interim years is via a proxy RISK 1 - Final year of LAA2 is 2011 so measurement would be via a proxy which makes it difficult to compare to baseline and could make it harder to achieve				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	No, NI 2 considered better indicator	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, NI 2 recommended	

National Indicator		NI 2: Percentage of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood				
Community Strategy Theme		Active Citizenship and Civic Pride, Cohesion	3 year SCS outcome	Initiatives in place for gypsy and traveller communities to promote shared understanding 'International' celebrations take place in Suffolk that bring new and existing communities together		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Culture contributes to the achievement of this indicator. The Taking Part survey showed 'those participating in cultural activities were 20% more likely to know people in the neighbourhood and 60% more likely to believe that many of their neighbours can be trusted. (WSLSP) Safer neighbourhood teams are tackling this (FHDC)</p> <p>Not a perception, more capable of being embraced and more measurable than NI 1 (BELSP) Encompasses marginalised groups who often have multiple needs (Prob)</p> <p>More objective than NI 1, about the person answering the survey-not someone else (WDC) Key measure for social cohesion. Feeling of belonging is key to well being (SCC)</p> <p>Sense of community belonging engenders a sense of worth about historic environment, therefore increased satisfaction with the area (EH)</p> <p>Participating in culture promotes interaction between people of different backgrounds; 'Taking Part' survey evidences that users of libraries and museums are more satisfied with the places in which they live; 'Cabinet Office Paper; notes the importance of culture in the creation and maintenance of social capital (MLA)</p> <p>Meets SEBC vision for 2025 where local supports networks for the whole community are on hand to provide advice on emotional and physical wellbeing (SEBC)</p> <p>Inclusive concept (UCS) Important for social cohesion (SP) If NI 2 is achieved, then NI 1 will also have been achieved (SFC)</p> <p>Especially relevant for disabled people who often feel and indeed are excluded from their neighbourhood (Block 3 Board)</p> <p>Community/communities at ease with itself, community cohesion, measure of success for NI 6, 7 and 3 (VCS)</p> <p>NI 4 better indicator (SACRE) Can you affect in 3 years? (SCDC, SCLSP) Concerned about inclusion of either NI 1 or 2, but this seems most appropriate (B4Board)</p> <p>Prefer a broader target NI4 (One Ips, IBC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		25	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally						
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?		<p>NEW PLACE SURVEY SPATIAL - County and District REPORTED BY - SCC</p> <p>LATEST TREND - unknown till baseline survey is undertaken in Sept 2008. However, there were broader questions about general community asked in the 2006/07 BVPI general survey: i) % think that people from different backgrounds get on together: Suffolk 82% (County Av 80.7%); ii) % think that people don't treat each other with respect: Suffolk 38% (County Av 44%); iii) Overall satisfaction with local area: Suffolk 81% (County Av 77.8%).</p>				
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments	GO-East supports the inclusion of NI 1 (rather than NI 2) preferably together with NI 4 to achieve Cohesion and empowerment. NI 1 contains an element of cohesion which NI 2 does not and so is preferred. Suffolk cohesion scores were relatively high at 81.9%. Most districts scored better than 79% however both Waveney and Forest Heath are worse. Waveney has qualified for cohesion funding.				Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments	Difficult to set a meaningful and achievable target, but would allow focus on important issues and challenges for many new people moving into the area.					
Risk	<p>KEY CONCERN: No baseline information so any target will have to be set as a baseline plus %. RISK 1 - we may be performing well on this and so wouldn't want it as a target (also any stretch target for an indicator that we are already performing well on would be very hard to meet - example ASB target in LAA1) RISK 2 - without a baseline we are unable to set an informed target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it KEY CONCERN: Place survey which is only undertaken every 2 years (2008, 2010 etc) measurement in interim years is via a proxy RISK 3 - Final year of LAA2 is 2011 so measurement would be via a proxy which makes it difficult to compare to baseline and could make it harder to achieve</p>					
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, but perception target	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?		Yes, recommended for inclusion	

National Indicator	NI 6: Participation in regular volunteering			
Community Strategy Theme	Active Citizenship and Civic Pride, Greenest	3 year SCS outcome	Support programmes in place for the management of county wildlife sites and volunteering New projects established throughout Suffolk to increase volunteering and accessible natural green space	
a) Key findings from the consultation				
Summary of findings	<p>Range of opportunities for volunteering in the arts: helps promote social inclusion and develop talent via informal pathways into education and employment (AC)</p> <p>Scope for volunteering within heritage sector (EH)</p> <p>The cultural sector provides volunteering opportunities and contributes by increasing community capacity and providing experience that can enhance employability (MLA)</p> <p>Relates to volunteering in the environment (Green)</p> <p>An area where we can achieve considerable improvement across all partners, specifically with police specials and SNT support (Police)</p> <p>Critical for delivery of a number of cross-cutting themes and also supports community cohesion and active citizenships (Block 2 Board)</p> <p>Measure of active citizenship, indicator of ownership of strategic priorities, encouragement of community based solutions, in line with engagement, participation and involvement trends, non statutory indicator, additional non statutory resource (VCS)</p> <p>Strengthen the community as people take more pride and invest more personal capital (One Ips, IBC)</p> <p>Essential issue for local communities but data too narrow as only covers formal volunteering (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Acts as a first step towards returning to employment; Reduces isolation; Offers opportunities for social inclusion; Allows people who are not in employment to make a positive contribution (Block 3 Board, SFC)</p> <p>Formal volunteering an indication of a thriving third sector (WLSP)</p> <p>Assists promoting inclusion and well being (SCC)</p> <p>Volunteering plays a significant role in sustaining a vibrant, diverse, cultural and sporting community (SE)</p> <p>Beneficial to understand contribution of VCS to service delivery (WDC)</p> <p>Indicator doesn't measure one-off intense periods of volunteering (SEBC)</p>			
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	21	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority
Evidence for geographical priority				
b) Performance intelligence				
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally				
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?	<p>NEW PLACE SURVEY SPATIAL - County and District REPORTED BY - SCC</p> <p>LATEST TREND - (existing LAA target uses a different methodology). Baseline study conducted for LAA1: - 11% people (aged up to 65) undertake 'regular' formal volunteering in Suffolk. - The 50 to 64 age group is most likely to volunteer. - Lowestoft and Felixstowe have the highest rate of regular formal volunteering. - % of people undertaking regular volunteering at local level: Bury 7.5%; Felixstowe 10.4%; Ipswich 12.8%; Lowestoft 15.5%; Sudbury 8.4%</p>			
c) Additional information (if applicable)				
GO-East comments	Although this is an important area, GO-East hasn't selected this as a priority as Suffolk is in line with national performance. Suffolk has a higher proportion of people with a learning disability helped into voluntary work compared similar councils, but the CSCI letter recommends that the scheme be extended to include all vulnerable people and their supporters. This could be achieved via a local target and is supported by the GO.	Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N	
Scrutiny comments	Recommend that NI 5 also be considered. NI 6 may not be best measure for the third sector.			
Risk	<p>KEY CONCERN: No baseline information so any target will have to be set as a baseline plus %. RISK 1 - we may be performing well on this and so wouldn't want it as a target (also any stretch target for an indicator that we are already performing well on would be very hard to meet - example ASB target in LAA1) RISK 2 - without a baseline we are unable to set an informed target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it KEY CONCERN: Place survey which is only undertaken every 2 years (2008, 2010 etc) measurement in interim years is via a proxy RISK 3 - Final year of LAA2 is 2011 so measurement would be via a proxy which makes it difficult to compare to baseline and could make it harder to achieve</p>			
d) Target setting				
Suggested 2011 target				
Supporting info				
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Local target including formal and informal volunteering suggested rather than NI	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, local indicator to include formal and informal volunteering

National Indicator	NI 8: Adult participation in sport and active recreation (new definition)				
Community Strategy Theme	Healthy	3 year SCS outcome	Increased the number of people choosing healthier lifestyles in disadvantaged areas/communities Stopped the increase in the proportion of the population that are obese Increased participation in sport and physical activity in disadvantaged communities		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Supports the work of the county sport partnership and community sport networks (FHDC) 70% of adult population don't take part in physical activity (BELSP) Suffolk has the highest level of inactivity in the region at 52.7%;Contributes to NI 1, 5, 6, 19, 10, 11, 17, 56, 57, 117, 127, 137, 175, 198 (SE) Directly links to SEBC's priorities in Vision for 2025 where local support networks for the whole community are on hand to provide advice on emotional and physical well being; also supports commitment to promoting active and healthy communities (SEBC) A need for a significant culture shift to ensure that everyone becomes more active. There are few public health initiatives that have greater potential for improving health and wellbeing than increasing the activity levels of the population. People who are physically active reduce their risk of developing major chronic diseases by up to 50% and the risk of premature death by about 20-30%. People that exercised regularly lived for 14 years longer than those that did not (Medical Research Council 2008). Individuals who are inactive more than 1.9 times more likely to have a heart attack than their active contemporaries. Estimated that CHD costs the UK economy £7.9billion per year, those that physically active are also 40-50% less likely to develop some cancers and 33-50% less likely to develop type 2 diabetes (Block 3 Board) Supports health and wellbeing (SCDC, SCLSP, WDC) Link to active citizenship, anti-social behaviour and community inclusion (Block 2 Board) Assist family carers to have breaks by participation in sport, This is very positive respite (SFC) Fitness is a powerful tool to counter drug and alcohol abuse (One Ips, IBC) Critical in achieving long term vision for health and contributes to other outcomes (SCC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	19	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority	Suffolk Coastal 21.6% participation 2007 similar to national average (SCDC)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	ACTIVE PEOPLE SURVEY (Sport England - National Survey) SPATIAL - County and District REPORTED BY - Sport England LATEST TREND - 19.8% PARTICIPATION IN SPORTS ACTIVITY FOR SUFFOLK COMPARES TO 21% NATIONALLY				
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	Strongly support inclusion of this cross cutting priority. Adult obesity levels are 21.2% (Suffolk health profile 2007) Active people data 2006: Suffolk participation 3 x 30 mins moderate intensity (19.8%) is below the regional and national average (20.5% and 21%). This should be a county wide target but it should be noted that participation in Ipswich is 3 rd from bottom regionally at 16.6%, Waveney 17.2% and St Edmundsbury 19.2%.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Not identified as a high priority for Suffolk. More inclusive measures for health and wellbeing.				
Risk	No data				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, very strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, very strong support	

National Indicator		NI 13: Migrants English language skills and knowledge				
Community Strategy Theme		Inclusion	3 year SCS outcome	Improved access to English for speakers of other languages courses		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings	<p>Not necessarily linked to job opportunities (WSLSP) Good indicator but measure not ideal (SPCT) Very narrowly defined target and very limited scale issue (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Need to consider funding issues (SCC)</p> <p>Reducing scope for exploitation due to poor or illegal employment and/or work practices; significant population of migrant and vulnerable workers across Suffolk; relevant across Suffolk due to employment in manufacturing industries, particularly food processing, agriculture, hospitality and catering etc (HSE)</p> <p>If more courses were provided, would reduce to cost to public sector for translation (Prob)</p> <p>Libraries provide significant opportunities for migrants to improve language skills and knowledge. Opportunities provided include language courses, provision of culturally appropriate material and access to material in a safe and welcoming environment (MLA)</p> <p>Growing migrant population; ESOL brings benefits across our communities as well as reducing interpreters costs for organisations (Police)</p> <p>Essential for accessing services, employment opportunities etc (SP) Key to community cohesion and inclusion issues (Block 2 Board)</p> <p>Language is a barrier in many ways-impacts on enterprise, employment, training and education (One Ips, IBC)</p>					
	Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	12	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	1	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally						
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?		<p>SPATIAL - County and District REPORTED BY - SCC</p> <p>LATEST TREND - (Lyn Baran) no data on this. CYP are running a new report identifying pupils in maintained schools with English not as first language but they don't think this will help this indicator.</p>				
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments	This is quite a limited indicator which only measures language skills and knowledge. NI 1 can be used to better capture how people from different backgrounds get on well together although Migrant workers aren't specifically mentioned they are the most significant minority group in Suffolk.				Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments	Expert knowledge and more information required to choose between this, NI 116, NI 118, NI 140, NI 152 and NI 166. NI 166 and NI 116 are key for the Community Strategy.					
Risk	<p>KEY CONCERN: No baseline information so any target will have to be set as a baseline plus %. RISK 1 - we may be performing well on this and so wouldn't want it as a target (also any stretch target for an indicator that we are already performing well on would be very hard to meet) RISK 2 - without a baseline we are unable to set an informed target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it</p>					
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Supported but concern about indicator	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No. Fundamental issue, but indicator not appropriate. Possible local targets		

National Indicator		NI 18: Adult re-offending rates for those under probation supervision				
Community Strategy Theme		Safe	3 year SCS outcome	Reduce offending and re-offending particularly in young people		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Ability to measure this is still being developed centrally; will reflect the work wider than just PPOs who only represent a small percentage of probation case loads (Prob)</p> <p>Important indicator for communities and vulnerable groups (SPCT)</p> <p>Gap in priorities to develop improved strategies to develop racism and discrimination (One Ips, IBC)</p> <p>Baseline is 2003 (Block 2)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		6	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	1	Geographical priority Ipswich	
Evidence for geographical priority		Racists incidents in Ipswich have increased significantly 165 in 2007 compared to 110 previous year				
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		SPATIAL - County REPORTED BY - Probation Service LATEST TREND - Baseline Awaiting data				
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?						
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		Although this is an important area, GO-East hasn't selected this as a priority for Suffolk preferring instead NI 30 which would target the most prolific offenders committing the most harm in Suffolk.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments		Prefer NI 30 but would like to reconsider following consultation results.				
Risk		Need to check how well we are performing				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	No, more support for NI 30	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, NI 30 recommended instead	

National Indicator		NI 20: Assault with injury crime rate				
Community Strategy Theme		Safe	3 year SCS outcome	Reduced impact of the night time economy on communities and individuals		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Linked to night time economy (WSLSP)</p> <p>Linked to violence in a public place and night time economy strategies (FHDC)</p> <p>Relevant to sectors where violence to staff can occur (HSE)</p> <p>Long term issue of gang development, youth on youth and black on black crime (One Ips, IBC)</p> <p>Wider than purely night time economy issues; concern upon per 1,000 population as a measurement as 2001 census data does not necessarily reflect Suffolk's population. (police)</p> <p>CDRP priority (WDC)</p> <p>Based on 2001 census data do not reflect changes in population or include American Forces personnel (nor does recent ONS data) (Block 2 Board)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		10	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	1	Geographical priority	
					Newmarket, Bury St Edmunds and Sudbury (WSLSP) Forest Heath (FHDC)	
Evidence for geographical priority		Newmarket has largest nightclub capacity in the East in England (WSLSP) Suffolk Coastal compares well with other similar authorities on assaults (SCDC)				
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally						
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?		SPATIAL - CDRP REPORTED BY - Suffolk Police (APACS) LATEST TREND - (not exact target match) Actual bodily harm per 1,000: Babergh 0.73; Forest Heath 1.08; Ipswich 1.92 ; Mid Suffolk 0.82; St. Edmundsbury 1.09; Suffolk Coastal 0.81; Waveney 1.81 ; (England & Wales average 1.23 per 1,000)				
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		Alcohol is an issue in parts of Suffolk. Ipswich is ranked 6 th worst district in the region (of 48) and is above the national average on 10 of 14 categories, especially in alcohol related hospital admissions (under 18s) crime and binge drinking. St Edmundsbury is ranked 10 th and is above the national average on 6 indicators primarily around hospital admissions for under 18s. The GO would also support the inclusion of a local target to capture alcohol related violent crime to address night time economy issues.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments		Important in Ipswich, but unable to choose between NI 20, NI 28, NI 111 and NI 32.				
Risk						
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Highlighted particularly for West Suffolk, but concerns with data	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, Suffolk constabulary have a target set by the Police Authority for incidents in a public place involving drugs and alcohol – could also be local LAA2 target	

National Indicator		NI 28: Serious knife crime rate		
Community Strategy Theme		Safe	3 year SCS outcome	Reduced levels criminal damage and knife crime in Ipswich
a) Key findings from the consultation				
Summary of findings	<p>We do not believe that this is an issue that justifies specific focus for LAA; might be an appropriate local indicator, but current stats for Ipswich suggest that this is currently a reducing problem (Police)</p> <p>Could be a CDRP target (Block 2 Board)</p> <p>Could have negative impact on fear of crime - could be a local CDRP target (SCC)</p> <p>Long term issue of gang development, youth on youth and black on black crime (One Ips, IBC)</p>			
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	6	Number of responses prioritising this indicator		Geographical priority Ipswich (Block 2 Board)
Evidence for geographical priority	40% of knife crime is in Ipswich (Block 2 Board)			
b) Performance intelligence				
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally				
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?	SPATIAL - CDRP REPORTED BY - Suffolk Police (APACS) LATEST TREND – Suffolk ranked No. 10 in the country for best knife crime rates at 29 incidents where an injury was actually inflicted on the victim. Ipswich – 116 incidents involving a ‘sharp weapon’ represents 3.5% of all violent crime in the area.			
c) Additional information (if applicable)				
GO-East comments	The GO has not picked up that there is an issue with knife crime in Suffolk and this isn't recorded by CDRPs. Would like to see any evidence available before consider supporting inclusion of this indicator.			Is this NI a GO-East priority? N
Scrutiny comments	Unconvinced of the need for levels of knife crime to be included and unsure of relative importance of this indicator. Unable to choose between NI 20, NI 28, NI 111 and NI 32			
Risk	KEY CONCERN: Lack of local data RISK 1: Suffolk is the 10th best area in England and Wales for knife crime and so an overall stretch target could not be set for Suffolk (an overall stretch target for an area we are performing well in would be very difficult to achieve), however there is no local data so we can't identify and create targets for a specific area of concern (e.g. Ipswich)			
d) Target setting				
Suggested 2011 target				
Supporting info				
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	No, but possible CDRP or local target	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, current performance shows this is a reducing problem

National Indicator		NI 30: Re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders			
Community Strategy Theme		Safe	3 year SCS outcome	Reduce offending and re-offending particularly in young people	
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Good partnership target (WSLSP) Fits with local CDRP strategy and meets Cabinet Commitment of reducing crime and disorder; good opportunities for partnership working (SEBC) Focused measure (UCS) Leading edge indicator-supports NI18 (SCC) This small group of offenders cause disproportionate harm to our communities and a multi agency approach would be beneficial (Police) Majority of crimes committed by a minority of criminals (Block 3 Board, SFC) PPOs can have a disproportionate impact on crime figures affecting public feeling of wellbeing (SP) Key area of crime (SCDC, SCLSP) Ability to measure this accurately is problematic (Prob) Most appropriate for the economy (Block 4 Board) Involves wide range of activity and partnership intervention, also supports reduction in a range of other crime and ASB targets (Block 2 Board) POPO scheme already established in Suffolk; Linked to NI 40 Effective Drug Treatment and Acquisitive crime (FHDC) Part of existing programme (BELSP) Core CDRP work and misses the opportunity this target affords us. Gap in priorities to develop improved strategies to address racism and discrimination (One Ips, IBC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	21	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	9	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority	20% of offenders account for 40% of crime in Suffolk Coastal (SCDC)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally					
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?	SPATIAL - CDRP REPORTED BY - Suffolk Police (APACS) LATEST TREND - (<i>not exact target match</i>) LAA baseline performance suggests: there were 2.7 convictions per PPO (this is an average taken at June 06, 07 and 08). The same cohort will be measured in 12 months time to see whether the outcome target of a 15% improvement has been achieved. Awaiting baseline information				
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	Although not previously proposed by GO-East strongly supports the inclusion of NI 30. Targeting the most prolific offenders will support the achievement of NI16, NI 40 and NI 38. HO will shortly be providing baselines for all areas to GOs to help target negotiation.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments	Prefer this over NI 18. Fit with achieving desired outcomes of Community Strategy, appears to have a wider impact on communities and people's perceptions of crime. Would like to reconsider following consultation results.				
Risk					
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support	

National Indicator		NI 32: Repeat incidents of domestic violence				
Community Strategy Theme		Safe	3 year SCS outcome	Reduced domestic violence		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Good work already going on with victims, gap in working with perpetrators (WSLSP) Contributes to overall violent crime rates; repeat offending a significant factor in DV (FHDC) Impact of DV on safety and emotional wellbeing of children and young people is important (WGYPT) Fits local CDRP priorities and SEBC priorities where local support networks for the whole community are on hand to provide advice on emotional and physical wellbeing (SEBC) Clearly a need for a multi agency approach and one where we believe offences can be reduced (Police) DV numbers increasing (Block 2 Board) Important social barometer indicating community wellness and linked to drugs and alcohol (One Ips, IBC) Repeat incident rate in Suffolk is 38.7%-3 times that of other crimes, huge cost on criminal justice, physical/mental health care, children and young people services, housing and civil/legal costs-£43,311,200, essential partnership target (SCC) Need resources to deliver any improvements (Prob)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		22	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		SPATIAL - CDRP REPORTED BY - Suffolk Police (APACS) LATEST TREND - The current repeat incident rate in Suffolk of 38.7% (Q3 2007/08 - the 2007/08 milestone target is 27.9%). [Social Inclusion & Diversity - Our Priorities March 2008]: "Domestic violence accounts for 25% of violent crime in Suffolk with a repeat victimisation rate of 37%; however, domestic violence continues to remain significantly under reported".				
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?						
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		<p>In Suffolk, domestic violence is a factor in just over 25% of violent crime. From Suffolk's own strategic assessment, based on previous performance, it is anticipated that the repeat rate will continue to average between 30-40%.</p> <p>Information from Suffolk Constabulary indicates children were present or live in the household in over 45% of reported DV incidents so there are strong links to child safety.</p> <p>The Ipswich Domestic Violence Court is progressing well and inclusion of this indicator could help to support the roll out in the rest of the county.</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments		Unable to choose between NI 20, NI 28, NI 111 and NI 32, but recognise the importance of tackling repeat incidents of domestic violence.				
Risk						
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Yes, strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support	

National Indicator	NI 40: Drug users in effective treatment		
Community Strategy Theme	Safe	3 year SCS outcome	Reduced drug and alcohol crime and harm in the worst affected areas Increase in drug and alcohol treatment
a) Key findings from the consultation			
Summary of findings	<p>Particularly relevant given the launch of the 10 year drug strategy (Prob) Fits local CDRP priorities and SEBC priorities where local support networks for the whole community are on hand to provide advice on emotional and physical wellbeing (SEBC) Key impact on many other areas of social policy (UCS) Drugs issue in Lowestoft (WDC) Substance misuse is a key priority for WS CDRP, effective treatment only one aspect of this (FHDC) Alcohol is a greater issue (SCDC, SCLSP) Concern over 30% reduction in funding to Suffolk in future years, however there are still a hard core of individuals who's drug dependency causes difficulties across the board and an increase in effective treatment will reduce this impact (Police) Budget likely to be reduced in next three years, need partnership work to tackle the issue (Block 2 Board) This measure tells us nothing about the state of Ipswich (One Ips, IBC) Funding reductions (SCC)</p>		
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	18	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	4
Evidence for geographical priority	Geographical priority		
b) Performance intelligence			
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally			
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?	SPATIAL - County REPORTED BY - National Drug Treatment Monitoring System LATEST TREND - Existing target, Block 2 measures: the number of adult drug users in treatment. New target will measure the increase in the number of drug users in treatment recorded as being in effective treatment. Current performance (Q3 2007/08) 1,204 entering treatment against a milestone target of 1,863 - so this target is currently reported as "red" (LAA1)		
c) Additional information (if applicable)			
GO-East comments	The GO has not identified drug users in effective treatment as a priority for the LAA. This is based upon the current performance of the Drug and Alcohol Action Team and the Drug Interventions Programme.		Is this NI a GO-East priority? N
Scrutiny comments	Identified NI 38 as possible alternative. Questioned the meaning behind the word 'effective'.		
Risk	KEY CONCERN: NOTE - this depends on the definition of 'in effective treatment' as our current data is for 'in treatment'. But if we don't have any baseline information then any target will have to be set as a baseline plus %. RISK 1 - without a baseline we are unable to set an informed target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it RISK 2 – Budget for drug treatment is set to be cut each year for the next 3 years. Concerns about setting a stretch target for an area where we know funding is being reduced.		
d) Target setting			
Suggested 2011 target			
Supporting info			
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Mixed response	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group? No, future funding cuts make it difficult to set a stretched target

National Indicator		NI 51: Effectiveness of child and adolescent mental health (CAMHs) services				
Community Strategy Theme		Healthy	3 year SCS outcome	Increased number of people with positive mental health		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Links to attainment at school young people entering the youth justice system, participation in positive activities etc (WGYPT)</p> <p>Important long term individual and societal benefits (UCS)</p> <p>This is an area of under performance which puts young people at risk of harm. Recognised nationally and locally as an area requiring renewed and focussed activity (CTrust)</p> <p>15% of children and young people in Suffolk 'feel stressed almost all of the time' (local survey). National data suggests that 1 in 10 5-16 year olds suffers from some kind of mental ill health. This increases to 1 in 4 people who have suffered mental ill health by the age of 40 (Block 3 Board)</p> <p>Health priority (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Indicator of deprivation (WDC)</p> <p>Enable early intervention and assessment in appropriate settings (SFC)</p> <p>Performance shift needed (SCC)</p> <p>Concerned about measure (SPCT)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		19	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	2	Geographical priority West Suffolk (FHDC)	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally						
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?		SPATIAL - County REPORTED BY - SCC & PCTs LATEST TREND - This is a relatively new measure and is not suitable for LAA. There is a new outcome indicator being developed and we should wait for that. NI 51 is based on a self assessment score out of 16: we self-scored 13 for the 2 years it has been collected - alongside most LAs: this is banded good performance though all it tells you is that "protocols and plans are in place but are only partially implemented" across the 4 elements.				
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments					Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments		Recognise importance of issues but do not support the indicator as it is an interim measure to be replaced in 2009.				
Risk		CURRENT ISSUE: An outcome measure has been developed for this (the aim is to develop one from 2009 onwards). In meantime a proxy measure will be used. RISK 1: It is not possible to set a target until the measure has been developed (2009/10). To set an informed target we will need a baseline which will not be available immediately. By the time we have an indicator and baseline there will be little time to impact upon achievement of the target and so we have a increased likelihood of not achieving it				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Yes, strong support, but note concerns about indicator	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, very important issue for Suffolk and needs to be included despite change in indicator in 2009	

National Indicator	NI 56: Obesity among primary school age children in Year 6				
Community Strategy Theme	Healthy	3 year SCS outcome	Increased the number of people choosing healthier lifestyles in disadvantaged areas/communities Stopped the increase in the proportion of the population that are obese Increased number of people eating 5 a day in disadvantaged communities Increased participation in sport and physical activity in disadvantaged communities		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Contributes to ever child matters agenda; reliable data collection in this area has been problematic; help to develop joined up interventions bringing together physical activity, nutrition and counselling; linked to NI 157 and 110 (SE)</p> <p>National and local priority. Obesity is the single most important factor affecting children's health (CTrust)</p> <p>Supports work of community sports networks and school sports partnerships (FHDC) Key issue for future generations (MSDC)</p> <p>Greater prevalence of obesity in children in year six (WGYPCT) Major public health issue linked with future health problems (SPCT)</p> <p>Important long term individual and societal benefits (UCS) Benefits to communities if young people are able to participate in local activities (Police)</p> <p>Recognised problem (WLSP) Support healthy communities (SCDC)</p> <p>Supports priority outcome for health and well being (WDC) Important but there are also concerns about anorexia etc (One Ips, IBC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	20	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	10	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority	National protocols for this data prevent the establishment of sub-county targets (CTrust)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	SPATIAL - PCT REPORTED BY - PCTs LATEST TREND - This has been a national PI over the past 2 years, but has not been reported back in any datasets as yet. Our data for Suffolk is that in 2006 18.12% of Year 6 pupils weighed were obese, against a national average of 17.3%. Suffolk's 2007 figure is 16.22% (slight reduction in % measured) - no national comparative data yet available.				
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	Strongly support the inclusion of this indicator. Obesity levels in children and young people are of particular concern. Approximately 8.4% of children aged 5 are obese and 18% of children aged 11 are obese.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Identified as a priority, very important issue affecting long term health and wellbeing.				
Risk					
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support	

National Indicator		NI 62: Stability of placements of looked after children: number of moves				
Community Strategy Theme				3 year SCS outcome		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Evidence that moves in placements increase problems including risk taking behaviour (SPCT)</p> <p>Link to Safer Communities (Block 2 Board)</p> <p>Single agency issue, but aware of the wider impacts on communities when this stability is not available to LAC (Police)</p> <p>Key indicator of the success of local services of supporting children in care; performance is good and emphasis would be on maintaining this level of success (CTrust)</p> <p>Largely the work of one agency (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Performing well (One Ips, IBC)</p> <p>Single agency and current good performance (SCC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		8	Number of responses prioritising this indicator			
Evidence for geographical priority		Geographical priority Children from one district ae placed with an appropriate carer who often lives in another district, sub county targets will therefore not be relevant (CTrust)				
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		SPATIAL - County REPORTED BY - SCC LATEST TREND - PAF A1 "VERY GOOD" BAND RATING (Very Good Banding = 0 - 16%) 2004/05 9%; 2005/06 11%; 2006/07 8.7%				
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?						
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		We agree that stability of placements for looked after children should be picked up in Suffolk's LAA as a priority. However, the GO considers that NI 63 , which looks at length of placement, is a better indicator for Suffolk based upon current performance.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments		Recognised importance of this indicator and the long term impacts on the lives of young people and the communities they live in.				
Risk		CURRENT ISSUE: We are already performing well RISK 1: It is very hard to set achievable stretch targets for areas that we are performing well in. If we are already performing in the top quartile there is little room for improvement and so it is unlikely that we will be able to meet a stretch target (example ASB in LAA1)				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	No, important area but performance already 'very good'	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, single agency and current performance very good	

National Indicator		NI 80: Achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19																			
Community Strategy Theme		Learning and Skills	3 year SCS outcome	Performance at Key Stage 2 and Level 3 are at the national average																	
a) Key findings from the consultation																					
Summary of findings		<p>Encourages young people to stay in education (WSLSP/FHDC/BELSP) Cultural links through provision of enhanced curriculum (AC)</p> <p>Suffolk needs a skilled workforce (SACRE) Raises intermediate skills (WLSP)</p> <p>Educational level important in terms of health and wellbeing (SPCT) Increases employment opportunities and prevents disengagement at an early age (SP)</p> <p>Level 3 achievement is low given the GCSE outcomes at 16 and remains stuck despite a focus over the last 3 years; performance at level 3 limits those able to access degree level study (LSC)</p> <p>Focus on young people while they are in full time education in order to ensure they have the appropriate skills and qualifications to remain within Suffolk (Police)</p> <p>Suffolk performance is at or below statistical neighbours, has major impact on other important measure i.e. participation in higher education, working population qualifications, economic development (CTrust)</p> <p>Targets intermediate skills (WDC)</p> <p>Support young carers to reach at least this level of qualification in order to prepare them for a positive adulthood (Block 3 Board, SFC)</p> <p>In terms of performance Suffolk already in top quartile (SCDC)</p> <p>Prefer NI 91 (SCC)</p>																			
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		17	Number of responses prioritising this indicator		Geographical priority																
Evidence for geographical priority																					
b) Performance intelligence																					
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		SPATIAL - County REPORTED BY - DCSF (via schools) LATEST TREND – <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Suffolk</th> <th>SN</th> <th>National</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>43.5%</td> <td>42%</td> <td>39.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>46.8%</td> <td>46.8%</td> <td>43.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>47.8%</td> <td>48.4%</td> <td>44.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Year	Suffolk	SN	National	2004	43.5%	42%	39.8%	2005	46.8%	46.8%	43.3%	2006	47.8%	48.4%	44.3%
Year	Suffolk	SN	National																		
2004	43.5%	42%	39.8%																		
2005	46.8%	46.8%	43.3%																		
2006	47.8%	48.4%	44.3%																		
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?																					
c) Additional information (if applicable)																					
GO-East comments		<p>GO considers raising skills in Suffolk as one of the highest priorities for the LAA and imperative to unlocking Suffolk's economic potential. Ideally we would like to see NIs 80, 163 and 165 in the final agreement, to ensure that level's 2-4 are covered.</p> <p>If this is not achievable, we favour NI 80 and NI 163 over 165. The rationale being that the two indicators together cover the 14-19 achievement as well as the post 19 working age and that you need to improve level 2 as a priority over level 4 on the working age indicators. We need to prevent young people emerging into the adult population without qualifications.</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y															
Scrutiny comments		Unable to make recommendation between this and NI 163 and 165 due to lack of performance data and background information. Highlighted the importance of using these indicators to help improve Suffolk's current low level of attainment. NI 163 is the building block for higher education targets. NI 174 suggested as possible alternative.																			
Risk																					
d) Target setting																					
Suggested 2011 target																					
Supporting info																					
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Strong support, currently considered an area of poor performance, but we are still above national average, slightly lower than statistical neighbours & links to NI 91	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, NI 91 recommended for inclusion instead – is much broader than NI 80																

National Indicator	NI 91: Participation of 17 year-olds in education or training				
Community Strategy Theme	Learning and Skills	3 year SCS outcome	Improve participation by young people		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Suffolk performs well below it's statistical neighbours and has to achieve cultural change; relatively low continuation at 16 and high drop out at 17; if we can keep young people in learning we can raise the level of future adult skills in the workforce; reduce issues associated with youth unemployment and increase productivity (LSC)</p> <p>Key measure to focus attention on addressing NEET (UCS)</p> <p>Whilst participation at 16 is acceptable there is a significant drop out at 17; linked to the delivery of the apprenticeship promise and raising compulsory participation age to 19 (CTrust)</p> <p>Important to keep this age group engaged in education or training. Supporting young carers to reach their optimum as many do not highly achieve in school because of their caring role (Block 3 Board, SFC)</p> <p>Contributes to economic prosperity and relevant to other social issues (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Future workforce development (WDC)</p> <p>Supports self esteem and economic prosperity which work against drugs and crime (One ips, IBC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	21	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	5	Geographical priority	West Suffolk (FHDC)
Evidence for geographical priority					
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator - current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally					
New indicator - supporting performance information is available?	<p>SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – DCSF</p> <p>LATEST TREND - (not exact match - but participation trends from Dfes website): latest Suffolk figures 2005: 17 year olds in education or work based learning: 6,700 (pop est. 8,900) 75% compared to 2004 6,300 (pop est. 9,000) 70% (England average [2005] 76%)</p>				
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	Suffolk has fewer young people in learning than the regional and national average. Participation of 17 years-olds in education or training will help to reduce the proportion of young people in Suffolk that are not in education, employment or training (NEET). Suffolk is above the regional and national average for NEET. This indicator will also help impact on reduction of offending and anti-social behaviour.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Recognised this as a serious issue but possible alternatives such as NI 117.				
Risk					
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support	

National Indicator	NI 110: Young people's participation in positive activities				
Community Strategy Theme	Cohesion	3 year SCS outcome	All young people and adults are encouraged, and have the choice to volunteer their time in order to play a role in their communities		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Good partnership contribution (WSLSP) Arts Council products support deliver of this indicator (AC) Linked to anti-social behaviour (FHDC)</p> <p>Programmes to engage NEET in historic environment support this (EH) Important but 191 is a greater priority (LSC)</p> <p>Museums and libraries included within the definition of positive activities (MLA) Includes extended school activities (WLSLSP)</p> <p>Contributes to a range of priorities within the community strategy i.e youth offending, ASB, learning and skill, health inequalities; linked to NI 55, 56, 57 (SE)</p> <p>Considerable benefits in rural communities who appear to be disadvantaged at present; links to SNT (Police)</p> <p>Things for young people to do consistently feature as a top priority in citizen and young people's surveys; contributes directly to cohesion, informal learning, citizenship and other agendas (CTrust)</p> <p>It is important that young carers are able to participate in other to assist their development and transition to adulthood (Block 3 Board, SFC)</p> <p>Complements community safety agenda (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Supports self esteem and economic prosperity which work against drugs and crime (One ips, IBC)</p> <p>Difficult to measure (SCC)</p> <p>Will be extremely difficult to collect information against and could produce perverse outcomes (SEBC)</p> <p>Useful for those at socio-economic disadvantage; definition could be problematic (SPCT)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	24	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	7	Geographical priority	West Suffolk (FHDC) Suffolk Coastal (SCDC)
Evidence for geographical priority					
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	<p>SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – SCC</p> <p>LATEST TREND – A new indicator which CYP believe will be significantly re-written. CYP do not collect anything even approximate to this at the moment. At the CT Board meeting it was firmly stated that although this is a major area of interest it would not be used for LAA without a much clearer and tighter definition.</p>				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	Focusing on increasing young people's participation in positive activities will help to prevent and reduce offending and anti-social behaviour.				Is this NI a GO-East priority? Y
Scrutiny comments	Questioned the definition of 'positive' but agreed this is an important indicator. Could be used to harness the results f many activities and is important for long term health and wellbeing.				
Risk	KEY CONCERNS: A new indicator which CYP believe will be significantly re-written. CYP do not collect anything even approximate to this at the moment. At the CT Board meeting it was firmly stated that although this is a major area of interest it would not be used for LAA without a much clearer and tighter definition. RISK 1: The lack of clear definition and baseline data makes it very hard to set a realistic target and monitor progress, which would lower our chances of meeting the target				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Strong support but significant concerns about how this is measured	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support, but dependent on definition	

National Indicator	NI 111: First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10 – 17			
Community Strategy Theme	Safe	3 year SCS outcome	Reduce offending and re-offending particularly in young people	
a) Key findings from the consultation				
Summary of findings	<p>Already being tackled under POPO scheme; substantial links with NI 30 re-offending (FHDC)</p> <p>Link between dropping out of learning, offending and NEET; NEET is still a key challenge for Suffolk (LSC)</p> <p>Clear partnership target linked to ASB, alcohol, substance misuse, aspirations of young people and engagement in positive activities (WGYPT)</p> <p>Related to community security and prevention (SPCT)</p> <p>Multi agency approach could reduce the volume of entrants into YJS allowing probation and YOS to focus on more problematic individuals (police)</p> <p>Emphasis on prevention and resources linked to this target (WLSP)</p> <p>Allows activity to focus on preventative measures (WDC)</p>			
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	19	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority
Evidence for geographical priority				
b) Performance intelligence				
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	<p>SPATIAL - YOT areas REPORTED BY – SCC</p> <p>LATEST TREND – This is a quarterly report that has run from Jan 05. Aim is to achieve a year on year reduction: 2006/07 we achieved an 11.1% reduction. Up to Dec 07 (Q3) 1% increase.</p>			
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?				
c) Additional information (if applicable)				
GO-East comments	<p>The trend has been reducing numbers of first time offenders in Suffolk. However, there is a projected increase for quarter 1 07/08 which goes against the previous trend. At this time we do not consider this NI a priority for Suffolk but if performance continues to deteriorate we may consider it a future priority.</p> <p>GO-East support the inclusion of NI 19 Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders rather than 111. The steady increase in re-offending by young people is against the regional and national trend, it also concerns the second highest number of young people in the region. Reversing the trend requires a multi-agency approach.</p>			<p>Is this NI a GO-East priority?</p> <p>N</p>
Scrutiny comments	Unable to choose between NI 20, NI 28, NI 111 and NI 32.			
Risk				
d) Target setting				
Suggested 2011 target				
Supporting info				
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support

National Indicator		NI 112: Under 18 conception rate				
Community Strategy Theme		Healthy	3 year SCS outcome	Reduced incidence of STIs		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings	<p>Teenage conception reduces likelihood to continue in learning and creates a cycle of low/underachievement (LSC) Links to NEET and raising aspirations of young people (WGYPT) Must not be complacent as UK rates high compared to rest of Europe (SPCT) Important long term individual and societal benefits (UCS) Impacts across the board; partnership working between police and health around NTE i.e. whilst drunk young women are likely to become pregnant as they and males become less responsible; linked to STIs (police) Despite relatively good performance compared to national figures, Suffolk still performs very poorly in comparison with other counties. The impact on young people's lives is dramatic and there needs to be a continued focus (CTrust) Supports more than 1 priority outcome (WDC) Time lag on data (SCDC, SCLSP)</p>					
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	15	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority	Lowestoft and Ipswich (CTrust)	
Evidence for geographical priority	Suffolk Coastal half the national rate (2005/06) (SCDC)					
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – SCC LATEST TREND – MEDIAN TO TOP QUARTILE (county average -13.1%). BVPI197 (05/06 -9.6%; 06/07 -15.5%; 06/07 target -25.0)					
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?						
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments	Teenage pregnancy rates are lower in Suffolk as a whole than the England average, however, the rates in Ipswich are significantly higher than the average. This indicator has been selected as part of the broader strategy to improve sexual health and would support the Healthcare Commission's annual health check which suggested access to genitor-urinary medicine (GUM) clinics needs attention across the county.				Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Very important area, but may not be relevant for Suffolk alone. Already a high input from Suffolk into this work, it is recognised as a national issue and may not be something that can be impacted locally.					
Risk	CURRENT ISSUE: There is a data time-lag of 14 months RISK 1 – The data time-lag means that we will not get the final data for 2011 until 2013. This time-lag makes it very difficult to assess the impact of our actions during the LAA time period and thus reduces the likelihood of us achieving the target.					
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, strong support, but need to be aware of time lag on data	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support, targeted in Ipswich and Lowestoft		

National Indicator		NI 116: Proportion of children in poverty				
Community Strategy Theme		Inclusion	3 year SCS outcome	Reduction in the number of children living in poverty		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Fundamental issue (MSDC) Significant cause of health inequality; measure may be a perverse incentive in which case best avoided (SPCT) Wide ranging measure that could effectively include others (UCS) Many young carers and children with disability live in poverty. Reducing poverty would increase aspirations and attainment (Block 3 Board, SFC) Could encompass some of the other targets (SP) Addressing child poverty impacts on the well being of children and family (One Ips, IBC) Links to getting parents back into work and links to average wages – increasing wages in low paid jobs (JCP) Need to consider how we impact on this (SCC) Measure counts number of children receiving a particular benefit, effectiveness measured by a fall in the number of claimants, this conflicts with the work of the children's information service and welfare rights service which both encourage families to take up benefit as a way of supporting them out of poverty (CTrust) Important issue but longer term issue than 3 years, as much influenced by central government as local partners (SCDC, SCLSP)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		15	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	4	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – DWP LATEST TREND – This data is not currently available from DWP (as per guidance from CLG). Baseline data as per definition should become available as from 2008/09.				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?						
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		Suffolk is amongst the worst performers in the take up of tax credits, although there have been ongoing concerns around the robustness of this measure in itself as an indicator of child poverty, so other measures must be taken account too. Suffolk's low wage economy, will also contribute towards this issue. There are other key areas of the children's agenda, such as delivery of children's centres, and the provision and uptake of formal childcare (other measures of addressing poverty) and on these Suffolk's performance is comparable to its statistical neighbours. In discussion with the LA about priorities for C&YP, child poverty was not identified as one of the highest in terms of current performance and need. Suffolk may decide that this should be a local priority and as a longer term aspiration. Child poverty has not been raised as a concern by the inspection processes.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments		Expert knowledge and more information required to choose between this group. NI 166 and NI 116 are key for the Community Strategy. NI 166 could be easily influenced by one or two instances of very high earnings. NI 116 would provide an alternative measure to temper this.				
Risk		KEY CONCERN: No baseline information so any target will have to be set as a baseline plus %. Some interim data is available which will give us an idea of performance but we won't have the exact figures. RISK 1 – without a baseline we are unable to set an informed target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Some support, but concern about possible conflict with current activity	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, key issue but numbers are very low and difficult to affect in 3 years. Economic targets NI 152 and 166 support the outcome	

National Indicator		NI 118: Take up of formal childcare by low-income working families				
Community Strategy Theme		Inclusion	3 year SCS outcome		Reduction in the number of children living in poverty	
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		Indirect measure (take up of child tax credit) and therefore not directly under the control of local services (CTrust) Very small target group, collection method not robust (SCDC, SCLSP)				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		3	Number of responses prioritising this indicator		1	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally						
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?		SPATIAL - Districts REPORTED BY – HMRC LATEST TREND – (data not available as per definition – until 08/09) – so this is only a guide: % families claiming working tax child benefits (2006): (www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats). Babergh 54.5%; Forest Heath 57.8%; Ipswich 55.6%; Mid Suffolk 54.7%; St Eds 55.7%; Suffolk Coast 54.6%; Waveney 54.9% England Average 55.8%				
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		GO-East does not feel that this is a relative priority for inclusion in Suffolk's LAA, based upon the data available. However it is currently under review by DCSF.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments		Expert knowledge and more information required to choose between this group. NI 166 and NI 116 are key for the Community Strategy.				
Risk		KEY CONCERN: No baseline information so any target will have to be set as a baseline plus %. Some guide data is available which will give us an idea of performance but we wont have the exact figures. RISK 1 – without a baseline we are unable to set an informed target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	No, limited support and no baseline data	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, limited support and no baseline data	

National Indicator		NI 121: Mortality rate from all circulatory diseases at ages under 75				
Community Strategy Theme		Healthy	3 year SCS outcome			
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Biggest inequalities exist in those with CVD; link to smoking, diet and exercise (WGYPT)</p> <p>One of the best indicators of population health and linked to health inequalities (SPCT)</p> <p>Circulatory disease is a major cause of premature death and health and inequalities in Suffolk (Block 3 Board)</p> <p>Nicotine, alcohol and drugs are all factors in CVD (One Ips, IBC)</p> <p>Good tracking device for healthy lifestyle issues including smoking (WLSF)</p> <p>Support family carers to look after their own health and wellbeing in preventing circulatory disease (SFC)</p> <p>Already perform well against national position (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Not able to impact in 3 years, include in long term Health and Well-being Strategy (SCC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		11	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	1	Geographical priority	
					Forest Heath (FHDC) Ipswich Town and Bridge (One Ips)	
Evidence for geographical priority		FH – Ageing population (FHDC) Suffolk Coastal rate of 54.04 regional 58.7 (SCDC)				
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – PCT/ONS LATEST TREND – The latest figures for Suffolk 2004-06 are 84 per 100,000 for heart disease and stroke. (www.erpho.org). However, in Suffolk there is a 40 per 100,00 difference (2004-06) between the least deprived and most deprived areas of the county. Essex 47, Norfolk 49, Cambs 38, Herts 48, Beds 55 (lower number = good performance, Suffolk ranked 2 nd)				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?						
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		The GO had previously identified NI 120 – All age all cause mortality for Suffolk, but is happy to support NI 121 as this has been identified by Suffolk as opposed to 120. We support the inclusion of an indicator around mortality and this would support the aim of the LAA to reduce inequalities. Significant inequalities exist in Suffolk. There is a 12.3 years difference in life expectancy between the highest and lowest wards in Suffolk, and an average of 8.5 years difference between wards in the same local authority area (ONS 2006). Life expectancy data shows that 12 electoral wards in Suffolk are amongst the 20% with poorest health in England and Wales and a further 60 in the 20% with best health (JSNA 2007). Mortality rate from circulatory disease in Suffolk is above the national average.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments		Inclusion of this indicator not supported as it appears to be a long term goal and would be hard to impact in three years, NI 120 or NI 123 suggested as alternatives.				
Risk		CURRENT ISSUE: There is a data time-lag of approximately 12 months RISK 1 – The data time-lag means that we will not get the final data for 2011 until 2013. This time-lag makes it very difficult to assess the impact of our actions during the LAA time period and thus reduces the likelihood of us achieving the target. CURRENT ISSUE: Long-term nature of indicator RISK 2 – The impact of preventative actions will not be seen until much later, making it very hard to impact directly on this target in the 3-year LAA period				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Some support, but concern about 3 year impact and time lag on data	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, not appropriate for a 3 year target. 10/20 year target to be included in Suffolk's Health and Well-being strategy	

National Indicator	NI 123: 16+ current smoking rate prevalence (New Definition: Stop smoking not smoking prevalence)				
Community Strategy Theme	Healthy	3 year SCS outcome	Increased the number of people choosing healthier lifestyles in disadvantaged areas/communities Reduced prevalence of smoking Reduced prevalence of smoking in disadvantaged areas		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>National, regional and county priority; FHDC already working with PCT on this (FHDC) Biggest cause of preventable ill health and linked to cancer and other long term conditions (WGYPT) In line with SEBC Health Strategy and the Cabinet Commitment to healthy and active communities (SEBC) One of the major causes of premature death (SPCT) Support healthy communities (SCDC) Supports health and well being priority outcome (WDC) Doing well in Suffolk (One Ips)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	13	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	4	Geographical priority	Disadvantaged areas
Evidence for geographical priority					
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	<p>SPATIAL - County/PCT REPORTED BY – PCT LATEST TREND – (www.erpho.org) : % smokers in Suffolk (prevalence) by district & compared with East of England (2006/07): Babergh 20.5% (low); Forest Heath 23.5% (average); Ipswich 26.8% (high); Mid Suffolk 19.9% (low); St Eds 22.5% (low); Suffolk Coastal 20.0% (low); Waveney 22.9% (average). Quitters per 100,000 population 2006/07 Suffolk PCT 429, all England average 401, Waveney PCT 374, EofE average 349. Suffolk PCT ranks 2nd out of 13 PCTs – Waveney 5th.</p>				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	<p>The draft JSNA Suffolk 2007 identifies smoking as “the biggest identifiable factor in health inequalities amongst different groups”. With GP data showing a prevalence in the range of 17.9% to 36%. The Suffolk Wards with the highest estimates of percentage of the population smoking were Harbour in Waveney, Haverhill South, and Gainsborough in Ipswich. These synthetic Ward estimates indicate what Wards can be expected to bear the burden of smoking attributable disease both now and in the future (The Smoking Epidemic in England, HDA, 2004).</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments					
Risk	RISK identified during LAA1 – ‘Focusing on the target means that we are focusing on meeting the target rather than reaching those most in need’. This is because the easiest way to achieve the target is to ‘easy to reach’ groups (e.g. via big companies) than deprived/‘hard to reach’ groups. Thus there is a risk that this target will not help reduce health inequalities unless specifically targeted in certain areas (suggest asking advice from Hilary Andrews)				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, significant support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, significant support	

National Indicator		NI 124: People with a long-term condition supported to be independent and in control of their condition				
Community Strategy Theme		Healthy	3 year SCS outcome	More people receive treatment and services closer to home when they need them, and feel listened to as an active partner in their service provision		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>In line with Adults Health and Wellbeing Plan; improves prospects and quality of life (FHDC)</p> <p>Good focus on joint working, links with expert patient programme and decreases hospital admissions (SPCT)</p> <p>Important long term individual and societal benefits (UCS)</p> <p>As people are living longer long term conditions can impact on their lives (WLSP)</p> <p>JSNA suggests with an increase in older population there will be more people living with limiting long term conditions (Block 3 Board)</p> <p>Important issue given the areas ageing population, but no baseline data available (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>A high percentage of family carers care for someone with a long term condition and therefore need to be supported in that role (SFC)</p> <p>Critical for independence and choice agenda. Growing number of people living with limiting long term illness (SCC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		12	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		<p>SPATIAL – County/PCT REPORTED BY – Healthcare Commission</p> <p>LATEST TREND – completely new indicator and baseline data will be sourced from the Healthcare Commission Primary Care Trust Patient Survey – still not clear whether this survey will be undertaken during 2007/08, but will definitely be undertaken in 2008/09.</p>				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?						
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		<p>This indicator is about providing more intensive support in the community for vulnerable people and covers all people. NI 125 is also being supported by GO and that has a focus on older people.</p> <p>Suffolk has lost a star in their Adult Social Care rating for 2007. They have dropped from 3 to 2 * with their capacity to improve seen as promising. The key areas for Suffolk to reflect on were: Strong managerial and political leadership; Personalised support in the form of direct payments, individual budgets and prevention; Good joint commissioning with health; Improving safeguarding and service quality and Well established and embedded plans that reflect national priorities for adult social care.</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments		Recognised as important for overall health and wellbeing.				
Risk		<p>KEY CONCERN: No baseline information so any target will have to be set as a baseline plus %. RISK 1 – we may be performing well on this and so wouldn't want it as a target (also any stretch target for an indicator that we are already performing well on would be very hard to meet – example ASB target in LAA1) RISK 2 – without a baseline we are unable to set an informed target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it</p>				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Yes, support, but note no baseline data	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, significant support	

National Indicator	NI 135: Carers receiving needs assessment or review and a specific carer's service, or advice and information				
Community Strategy Theme	Healthy	3 year SCS outcome	The views and needs of family carers are widely known and respected by stakeholders and the wider public		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Improves prospects and quality of life (FHDC)</p> <p>Estimated 98,000 family carers in Suffolk many of whom have not received an assessment and many more not supported in their role (Block 3 Board, SFC)</p> <p>Very narrow target, only about those carers assessed (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Not multi agency (SCC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	9	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority					
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally					
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?	<p>SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – SCC</p> <p>LATEST TREND – [www.csci.org.uk] : PAF C62 'number of carers receiving a 'carer's break' or 'specific carer's service' during the year following an assessment or a review as a % of clients receiving a community based service : [2006/07] Suffolk: 14.6%; County Council Average: 12.7%; All England Average: 11.7%; East of England Average: 9.7% : Suffolk's 2006/07 banding is "5" VERY GOOD.</p>				
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	<p>Census 2001 data identified over 66,000 unpaid family carers in Suffolk, 1603 of these being young people in the County, the capacity of services for carers will need to be improved.</p> <p>A small proportion of carers are receiving direct payments therefore there is a need for assessment or review. A relatively small proportion of people over 65 use direct payments to purchase intensive home support and so the burden falls on carers. Although good progress has been made in providing telecare to enable people to remain independent in their own homes, this needs to improve further.</p> <p>The GO strongly feels that NI 125 – Achieving independence for older people through rehabilitation / intermediate care should be also be included in Suffolk's LAA. Waiting times for home adaptations and equipment provision have remained static or increased in recent years.</p> <p>Suffolk has lost a star in their Adult Social Care rating for 2007. They have dropped from 3 to 2 * with their capacity to improve seen as promising. The key areas for Suffolk to reflect on were: Strong managerial and political leadership; Personalised support in the form of direct payments, individual budgets and prevention; Good joint commissioning with health; Improving safeguarding and service quality and Well established and embedded plans that reflect national priorities for adult social care.</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Priority area, carers are an important part of society and is a particular issue for young carers.				
Risk	CURRENT ISSUE: We are already performing well RISK 1: It is very hard to set achievable stretch targets for areas that we are performing well in. If we are already performing in the top quartile there is little room for improvement and so it is unlikely that we will be able to meet a stretch target (example ASB in LAA1)				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	No, performance already 'very good'	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, performance already 'very good'	

National Indicator		NI 139: People over 65 who say that they receive the information, assistance and support needed to exercise choice and control to live independently							
Community Strategy Theme		Healthy	3 year SCS outcome		There is a variety of service options available so that people can choose the way in which their health, support, care and wellbeing needs and wants are met				
a) Key findings from the consultation									
Summary of findings		<p>Will take of the views of the majority of older people who do not receive 'formal' services but are provided with support that they value from local government, its partners and the local community; access to cultural opportunity will be a vital element to this (MLA)</p> <p>Measures all round satisfaction (SPCT) Increasing number of older people living in Suffolk and drive to support more people at home (Block 3 Board)</p> <p>Key issue for an ageing population (SCDC, SCLSP) If we do this NI141 will follow (SCC)</p> <p>More inclusive and relevant than 141 (WSLSP) Limited to people over 65 (FHDC)</p> <p>Would be better if applied to all age groups; 45% of pensioners live in rural areas, 40% of those with limiting long term illness and 32% claiming disability living allowance (SACRE)</p>							
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		11	Number of responses prioritising this indicator		3	Geographical priority			
Evidence for geographical priority		Suffolk Coastal high % of older people							
b) Performance intelligence									
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		[www.nc.nhs.uk/publications]: Personal Social Service Survey of Home Care Users aged 65+ 2005-06 – whilst these results are “service user” and “social services” based on the new Place Survey will seek the views of the wider community and “future users”, it does provide a snapshot of user satisfaction with home care services in Suffolk. 1) Overall, how satisfied are you with the help from [Social Services] that you receive in your own home? Suffolk: 63% compared to 59% County Average 4) Do your care workers do the things that you want done? Suffolk: 70% compared to 65% County Average							
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?									
c) Additional information (if applicable)									
GO-East comments		<p>The GO is supportive of this indicator as it supports the broad independence agenda and will measure the impacts of health and social care. Although it is a really good and challenging indicator, it is measured by perception target through a place survey. We would be concerned if Suffolk didn't have an indicator around older people and independence given the demographics of Suffolk.</p> <p>The GO strongly considers that Suffolk should also include NI 130 – Social care clients receiving self directed support. Direct Payments to social care clients has improved, although over 65s tend to take up the scheme less than younger age groups. CSCI identified a need to increase direct payments to carers (CSCI letter 2007).</p> <p>Suffolk has lost a star in their Adult Social Care rating for 2007. They have dropped from 3 to 2 * with their capacity to improve seen as promising. The key areas for Suffolk to reflect on were: Strong managerial and political leadership; Personalised support in the form of direct payments, individual budgets and prevention; Good joint commissioning with health; Improving safeguarding and service quality and Well established and embedded plans that reflect national priorities for adult social care. The GO supports NI 139 over 141.</p>				Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N		
Scrutiny comments		Unable to make recommendation between this and NI 141. Very different, but equally valuable. Expert knowledge required.							
Risk		<p>KEY CONCERN: Place survey which is only undertaken every 2 years (2008, 2010 etc) measurement in interim years is via a proxy RISK 1 – Final year of LAA2 is 2011 so measurement would be via a proxy which makes it difficult to compare to baseline and could make it harder to achieve CURRENT ISSUE: We are already performing above national average</p> <p>RISK 1: It is very hard to set achievable stretch targets for areas that we are performing well in. If we are already performing in the top quartile there is little room for improvement and so it is unlikely that we will be able to meet a stretch target (example ASB in LAA1)</p>							
d) Target setting									
Suggested 2011 target									
Supporting info									
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement		Support, but perception indicator and current performance in related areas is good		Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?		No, NI 141 identified as more appropriate	

National Indicator		NI 140: Fair treatment by local services				
Community Strategy Theme		Inclusion	3 year SCS outcome	All people receive fair treatment		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Desire for Suffolk to be truly inclusive; needs to be a starting point where all our population has equal access to services (Police) Goes to the heart of whether we can engage and respond to all communities and individuals within Suffolk (Block 2 Board) Critical to tackling exclusion and promoting equality and relates to public service (One Ips, IBC) Family carers are disadvantaged by services because of their caring role and find it difficult to access services because of quality issues and inflexible appointments (Block 3 Board, SFC) Some elements beyond control of local partners e.g. how people are treated at work (SCDC, SCLSP)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		7	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	2	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally						
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?		New indicator, no existing performance data				
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		The GO supports NI 139 as opposed to NI 140. See comments for 139.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments		Expert knowledge and more information required to choose between this group. NI 166 and NI 116 are key for the Community Strategy. Careful wording of questions in place survey would be important.				
Risk		<p>KEY CONCERN: No baseline information so any target will have to be set as a baseline plus %. RISK 1 – we may be performing well on this and so wouldn't want it as a target (also any stretch target for an indicator that we are already performing well on would be very hard to meet – example ASB target in LAA1) RISK 2 – without a baseline we are unable to set an informed target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it KEY CONCERN: Place survey which is only undertaken every 2 years (2008, 2010 etc) measurement in interim years is via a proxy RISK 3 – Final year of LAA2 is 2011 so measurement would be via a proxy which makes it difficult to compare to baseline and could make it harder to achieve</p>				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Some support, but no baselines and perception indicator	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, important area but wrong measure – links to local target on access to services	

National Indicator		NI 141: Number of vulnerable people achieving independent living				
Community Strategy Theme		Healthy	3 year SCS outcome	Increased the number of services provided at home		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Independent living can help achieve other targets e.g. economic regeneration; linked to council's statutory requirement under Supporting People (FHDC)</p> <p>Ageing population is an issue (MSLSP) Focus on vulnerable (Police) Fits health and social care agenda (WLSP)</p> <p>Linked to others in NIS around accommodation and employment, but this is best indicator to demonstrate progress over 3 years (WGYPT)</p> <p>Fits with SEBC's Vision for 2025 where measures are in place to allow an ageing population to remain in their own homes for longer (SEBC)</p> <p>Measured through Supporting People but implicates a wide number of partners. Focuses on some of the most vulnerable people in society who find it difficult to obtain independent accommodation leading to poorer outcomes for customers i.e. health deteriorates and they remain in more costly and inappropriate housing. Will assist families to let go of individuals wanting to move away from home who have a special need or disability (Block 3 Board, SFC)</p> <p>Key priority for Supporting People and direct links to more than 1 priority outcome (WDC)</p> <p>Supports to provide appropriate housing for people with complex support needs (One Ips, IBC)</p> <p>Broader indicator than NI 139 (B4 Board) Only covers people receiving supported people services (SCDC, SCLSP)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		19	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	7	Geographical priority Ipswich	
Evidence for geographical priority						
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally						
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?		Existing KPI reported directly to CLG but not exact match. % of service users who have moved on from supported services in a 'planned' way. 2004 - 54.17%, 2005 - 73.21%, 2006 – 78.73%				
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		<p>GO East has not identified NI 141 as a priority for Suffolk. However, we strongly consider that indicator (NI 145) to assist the reduction of the number of Learning Disabled people in NHS long stay provision into more appropriate accommodation, which focuses on personalisation should be included in Suffolk's LAA. This was raised as an area of development within the annual review letter for 2006/07 and the council are starting to respond accordingly.</p> <p>The are a high number of Learning Disabled adults who normally reside in the council area who remain in the NHS In Patient accommodation but who are medically fit for discharge and are no longer in need of continuing hospitalisation. The people affected need to be moved to more appropriate accommodation.</p> <p>There are a relatively low proportion of registered places for learning disabilities per 1,000 people suggesting there maybe a lack of provision.</p> <p>Based on DOH concerns via the valuing people support team, SHA interest and CSCI feedback we would like Suffolk to include NI 145 in their LAA. This view is also supported by the Cabinet Office and by Communities and Local Government.</p> <p>Suffolk has lost a star in their Adult Social Care rating for 2007. They have dropped from 3 to 2 * with their capacity to improve seen as promising. The key areas for Suffolk to reflect on were: Strong managerial and political leadership; Personalised support in the form of direct payments, individual budgets and prevention; Good joint commissioning with health; Improving safeguarding and service quality and Well established and embedded plans that reflect national priorities for adult social care. The GO would support NI 139 over 141.</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments		Unable to make recommendation between this and NI 139. Very different, but equally valuable. Expert knowledge required.				
Risk		KEY CONCERN: Current data reliability issues with the baseline data RISK 1: Without reliable baseline data it is very difficult to set an reliable target, which reduces the likelihood of us achieving it				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Yes, strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support, but concerns about the indicator	

National Indicator	NI 148: Care leavers in employment, education or training			
Community Strategy Theme	Inclusion	3 year SCS outcome	Improved access to employment opportunities for individuals isolated from the labour market through disadvantage	
a) Key findings from the consultation				
Summary of findings	<p>Can be picked up in 91 – Participation of 17 year olds (LSC) Misses the problem-about suitable accommodation (One Ips, IBC) Already good, but could aim to do better(SCC) Fits with the 'promoting active communities' side of SEBC and vision for an appropriately skilled, productive, trained and adaptable workforce (SEBC) Good evidence that care leavers are at most risk of poor participation in later life. This target contributes to NI 91 (Ctrust) A group at risk of social exclusion (SCDC, SCLSP) Proactive support of very vulnerable group (WDC)</p>			
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	12	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	1	Geographical priority
Evidence for geographical priority				
b) Performance intelligence				
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – SCC LATEST TREND – PAF A4 NATIONALLY (2005/06) 5 Bandings – PERFORMANCE “VERY GOOD”. BVPI161 (05/06 73%; 06/07 60%; 06/07 target 78%).			
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?				
c) Additional information (if applicable)				
GO-East comments	Suffolk is above the regional and national average for NEET.			Is this NI a GO-East priority? Y
Scrutiny comments	Identified as a very important part of a wider issue.			
Risk	CURRENT ISSUE: We are already performing well RISK 1: It is very hard to set achievable stretch targets for areas that we are performing well in. If we are already performing in the top quartile there is little room for improvement and so it is unlikely that we will be able to meet a stretch target (example ASB in LAA1)			
d) Target setting				
Suggested 2011 target				
Supporting info				
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Support for, but performing well	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, performing well and picked up in NI 91

National Indicator		NI 152: Working age people on out of work benefits				
Community Strategy Theme		Economy, Inclusion	3 year SCS outcome	Increase wages and (high GVA) jobs in poorest areas		
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Need to improve services that can increase take up employment to reflect the needs of people on incapacity benefits (Prob) Can also contribute to improvement to people's mental and physical wellbeing (WGYPT)</p> <p>MLA provide opportunities for people to improve their skills which enhances their employability, this includes volunteering; libraries provide opportunities for people to find out about employment opportunities; tourism is major contributor to local economies; museums are major planks of the visitor economy (MLA)</p> <p>Good indicator of poverty generally (WDC) Supports self esteem and economic prosperity (One Ips, IBC) Support for all people to get appropriate work (SCC)</p> <p>JCP funding focused on employers and employment not people on benefits. Need to focus on those workless but not on benefits. Encouraging people to take up benefits will have a negative impact on this target, NI 151 better indicator (JC+)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		9	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	2	Geographical priority	
					Forest Heath (FHDC) Ipswich, Lowestoft (Block 4)	
Evidence for geographical priority		FHDC corporate priority Suffolk Coastal figure 8.7% - well below national (14.2%) and regional (10.9%) averages (SCDC) A recent Haven Gateway survey indicated Ipswich did not have high level of people out of work (One Ips)				
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally		SPATIAL - District REPORTED BY – Job Centre Plus LATEST TREND – SUFFOLK CLAIMANT RATE May 2007 [overall] 10.9% COMPARED WITH 14.2% NATIONALLY District level (ranked by highest number of claimants first) : Waveney 16.3%; Ipswich 15.2%; St Eds 9.3%; Babergh 8.8%; Suffolk Coastal 8.7%; Mid Suffolk 7.8%; Forest Heath 7.1% https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1967128610/report.aspx				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?						
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		The GO supports the inclusion of an indicator to focus on those areas where out of work benefit payments are problematic (i.e. Waveney and Ipswich). We have proposed NI 153 rather than 152 to focus on the worst performing neighbourhoods rather than a county wide target. Waveney has lowest employment rate – 72%, highest unemployment rate (6.3%) and claimant counts (3.5%). Some wards in Lowestoft as high as 9.3% JSA (Harbour) Some Ipswich wards also feature in relatively high JSA and Incapacity Benefit Claimant counts. If Suffolk proposes to use 152 instead, we would want to set targets for those localities where the issue is most relevant, rather than a countywide target, that is; Waveney and Ipswich.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments		Expert knowledge and more information required to choose between this group. NI 166 and NI 116 are key for the Community Strategy.				
Risk						
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Yes, possibly for specific areas, but note JC+ comments	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, targeted in specific areas	

National Indicator		NI 154: Net additional homes provided				
Community Strategy Theme		Cross-Cutting	3 year SCS outcome			
a) Key findings from the consultation						
Summary of findings		<p>Risk: this target will negatively impact on landfill waste, congestion and biodiversity if not planned/ managed (WGYPCT)</p> <p>Focus should be on affordability (NI 155) not total numbers (SEBC)</p> <p>Critical to economic development and social cohesion (USC)</p> <p>More housing to meet local needs and those of in migrants is a priority (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Supports priority outcome for housing (WDC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator		12	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	2	Geographical priority	
					Ipswich, Forest heath, St Eds as part of greater Cambs Sub region (EH) Ipswich and Felixstowe (SCDC)	
Evidence for geographical priority		Housing officer group recommend focus on Ipswich and Felixstowe – growth point areas				
b) Performance intelligence						
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally						
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?		Current performance not yet available. Housing completion data-actuals & RSS target: (SC 3849 actual, target 3060) (Wav 2146 actual, 1740 target) (MS 2692 actual, 2490) FH 1076 actual, target 1920) Ips 3868 actual, 4620 target) St Eds 2616 actual, 3000 target) (Babergh 1615 actual, 1680 target) (Suffolk 61218 actual, 61700 target)				
c) Additional information (if applicable)						
GO-East comments		<p>GO-East strongly supports the inclusion of NI 154 as an improvement target in the LAA.</p> <p>Inclusion of 154 signals strong partner commitment, brings increased flexibility in the use of funds in support of growth, and emphasises its importance to partners.</p> <p>Inclusion of this indicator in the LAA would also enable the lever of the Duty to Co-operate to be used to improve housing numbers and allow influence over quality and design and infrastructure – thus delivering more sustainable communities. Housing & Community Agency has been proposed for inclusion in the Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p>Not including 154 could weaken housing delivery overall, which in turn could undermine efforts to secure <u>affordable</u> housing and fail to address the affordability gap. If overall housing delivery falls below target (which is an increased risk if 154 not included in LAA) then:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Developers' contributions to affordable housing via s106 will be less; 2) Increased risk that housing needs will not be met and overcrowding, homelessness and use of temporary accommodation will continue to impact on the most vulnerable; 3) The affordability gap will not be narrowed with economic and social consequences; 4) Risk that regeneration through growth in key locations will not be achieved. 			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments		Recommended that if experts in this area agreed to this target it should be included. Need to consider possible duplication of regional target already in place.				
Risk		KEY CONCERN: Impact of a slowing economy RISK 1: The achievement of this target could be adversely effected by a slowing economy, which would make it harder to achieve				
d) Target setting						
Suggested 2011 target						
Supporting info						
e) Recommendation		Initial judgement	Yes, for Ipswich and Felixstowe	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, longer-term issue, next 3 years already planned and difficult to influence. Picked up by the housing and planning delivery grant and no added value if target is based on current projections	

National Indicator	NI 155: Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)				
Community Strategy Theme	Cross-Cutting	3 year SCS outcome			
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>MSLSP priority (MSLSP) Continuing need for rural affordable housing; second homes money not being used by SCC to support affordable housing (SACRE) Will help to reduce the number of households in temporary accommodation (WGYPT) Key priority for district councils; without affordable housing aspirations relating to the economy and sustainability will be undermined; housing also plays a key part of a broad range of health and welfare issues (SEBC) Housing is a major determinate of health and wellbeing (SPCT) Critical to economic development and social cohesion (USC) Big issue for rural communities which can result in young people leaving Suffolk; links to sustainable communities (Police) Housing must be built to life-time home standards and must be reasonably accessible (Block 3 Board) Supports priority outcome for housing (WDC) Link to independence, safety and homes for life (Block 2 Board) Many family carers are dependent on benefits and to promote accessible housing (SFC) Housing affordability key local issue but difficult to affect in less than 2 years; commencements would be more relevant (SCDC, SCLSP) Housing Officer Group (inc. all LAs) strongly recommend using a local indicator on commencements rather than completions as planning permissions allow 3 years for commencement and developers tend to leave affordable housing to last – completions therefore difficult to affect in 3 years</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	22	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	8	Geographical priority	Forest Heath, St Edmundsbury and Babergh (WSLSP/FHDC)) Suffolk Coastal (SCDC)
Evidence for geographical priority	Housing needs assessment for Suffolk Coastal identified a substantial need for affordable housing (SCDC)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally					
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?	Current performance data not available				
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	GO-East would be keen to see the inclusion of NI 155 as an improvement priority in addition to, but not instead of, NI154. The number of affordable homes delivered remains a key challenge. Although 18% of units in 05/06 were affordable delivery over a 5 year period averages out at 10%. The draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) target is 35%.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Recommended that if experts in this area agreed to this target it should be included. Need to consider possible duplication of regional target already in place.				
Risk	KEY CONCERN: Impact of a slowing economy RISK 1: The achievement of this target could be adversely effected by a slowing economy, which would make it harder to achieve				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Strong support, but local target on commencements recommended	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, but need to consider whether a local target on commencements rather than completions would be more appropriate as difficult to influence completions in the next 3 yrs	

National Indicator	NI 163: Working age population qualified to at least Level 2 or higher				
Community Strategy Theme	Economy	3 year SCS outcome	Suffolk's learning institutions are responsive to the training needs of businesses in high GVA sectors		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Supports low skills and incorporates NI 165 Level 4 (WSLSP/FHDC) Culture contributes through enhanced curriculum (AC)</p> <p>Skills are particularly issue for Suffolk and historic environment – 46% of firms in the region reported recruitment difficulties in relation to traditional craft skills (EH)</p> <p>Suffolk performs less well than the EofE and nationally on this; it will be critical to raise skills at all levels if we are to support the economic development ambitions, especially at technical and higher technical levels focusing on level 4; graduates will not drive the economy forward on its own; this indicator is broader in its focus than 165 and more relevant to the whole system problem that we have with adult skills; require systematic change and partner involvement beyond education and training sector to achieve the change needed. (LSC)</p> <p>Focus on achieving level 2 over the next few years with schemes such as train to gain: opportunity to tackle underlying low levels of qualifications in the working population which will act as a springboard for further improvements (WGYPT) Critical basic skills measure (UCS) Reaches minimum level of employability (WLSP)</p> <p>Libraries are places where skills courses and learning sessions can be delivered effectively; MLA are essential providers of informal and self supported learning opportunities; libraries directly support the Skills for Life programme and the People's Network ICT Training (MLA)</p> <p>Fits with SEBC's Vision for 2025 with an appropriately skilled, productive, trained and adaptable workforce; there are strong links between the education sector and local industry (SEBC)</p> <p>Increases likely to be slow as the majority of this group may not see continued education as important (SPCT)</p> <p>Assisting family carers who want to return to work to be qualified. Should enable more people to obtain better paid employment (Block 3 Board, SFC)</p> <p>Numeracy and literacy is a key issues for employers (SCDC, SCLSP) Most important in terms of economy (Block 4 Board)</p> <p>Identified in One Ipswich community strategy. Lack of real learning opportunity is a lead into crime and drugs (One Ips, IBC)</p> <p>Lowest levels in Eastern Region, where we can make the biggest impact. Linked to low skilled economy (SCC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	26	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	7	Geographical priority West Suffolk (WSLSP/LSC), Haverhill (SEBC) Suffolk Coastal (SCDC)	
Evidence for geographical priority	Suffolk Coastal Business Survey 2007 – Suffolk Coastal in third quartile (2006) (SCDC) 19.5% of Waveney working age population have no qualifications (WDC)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	Stats available from 2001 Census Data (ONS, Neighbourhood stats): [% population achievement at Level 2, age range 16-74]: Ipswich: 19.2%; Suffolk Coastal 20.9%; Babergh 21.4%; Mid Suffolk 21.7%; St Eds 20.9%; Forest Heath 18.7%; Waveney 18.3%; EofE Average 20.5%; All England Average 19.3%				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	<p>GO considers raising skills in Suffolk as one of the highest priorities for the LAA and imperative to unlocking Suffolk's economic potential. Ideally we would like to see NIs 80, 163 and 165 in the final agreement, to ensure that level's 2-4 are covered.</p> <p>If this is not achievable GO considers NI 80 and NI 163 as priorities over 165. The rationale being the two indicators together cover the 14-19 achievement as well as the post 19 working age and that you need to improve level 2 as a priority over level 4 on the working age indicators. We need to prevent young people emerging into the adult population without qualifications.</p> <p>Suffolk is 7th worst in our region out of 10 and below the regional average for those qualified to level 2. Forest Heath, Waveney and Suffolk Coastal are priorities (based on Leitch report 2005).</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Unable to make recommendation between this and NI 80 and 165 due to lack of performance data and background information. Highlighted the importance of using these indicators to help improve Suffolk's current low level of attainment. NI 163 is the building block for higher education targets. NI 174 suggested as possible alternative.				
Risk					
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, very strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, Skills base is a key issue for Suffolk	

National Indicator	NI 165: Working age population qualified to at least Level 4 or higher				
Community Strategy Theme	Economy, Skills	3 year SCS outcome	Suffolk's learning institutions are responsive to the training needs of businesses in high GVA sectors		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Skills are particularly issue for Suffolk and historic environment – 46% of firms in the region reported recruitment difficulties in relation to traditional craft skills (EH)</p> <p>Business success and life chances diminish without skills, OCSI research states that over 48,000 people in Suffolk are without qualification and 39% of these live in rural areas (SARCE)</p> <p>Fits with SEBC's Vision for 2025 which has a nationally recognised higher education system linked to a thriving UCS (SEBC)</p> <p>Critical focus given economic development importance on UCS (UCS)</p> <p>More tangible benefits at Level 4 (Police)</p> <p>Need these skills to support knowledge sectors where we want growth (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Most important in terms of economy (Block 4 Board)</p> <p>May increase as a result of 'importing' and may not be an indicator of improves access to learning (SPCT)</p> <p>Difficult to show measurable progress i.e. a cohort of degree candidates will be starting this year, with results known in final year of LAA (WGYPT)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	8	Number of responses prioritising this indicator		Geographical priority Suffolk Coastal (SCDC)	
Evidence for geographical priority	Major growth sectors for Suffolk Coastal – knowledge based e.g. ICT, Suffolk Coastal In third quartile (SCDC)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	Stats available from 2001 Census Data (ONS, Neighbourhood stats): [% population achievement at Level 2, age range 16-74]: Ipswich: 19.2%; Suffolk Coastal 20.9%; Babergh 21.4%; Mid Suffolk 21.7%; St Eds 20.9%; Forest Heath 18.7%; Waveney 18.3%; East of England Average 20.5%; All England Average 19.3%				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	<p>GO considers raising skills in Suffolk as one of the highest priorities for the LAA and imperative to unlocking Suffolk's economic potential. Ideally we would like to see Nis 80, 163 and 165 in the final agreement, to ensure that level's 2-4 are covered.</p> <p>Suffolk is 7th worst in our region out of 10 and is below the regional average for those qualified to level 4 (based on Leitch report (2005 data). Waveney and Ipswich are of particular concern.</p> <p>Although the GO considers this a priority for Suffolk, if pressed we would rank NI 80 and 163 over 165, as we believe that lower skills levels should be addressed first, although our ideal would be for all to be challenged at the same time.</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Unable to make recommendation between this and NI 163 and 80 due to lack of performance data and background information. Highlighted the importance of using these indicators to help improve Suffolk's current low level of attainment. NI 163 is the building block for higher education targets. NI 174 suggested as possible alternative.				
Risk					
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, significant support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, high level skills required to drive high GVA sectors of the economy	

National Indicator		NI 166: Average earnings of employees in the area			
Community Strategy Theme		Economy, Inclusion	3 year SCS outcome	Increase wages and (high GVA) jobs in poorest areas Increased average earnings in Suffolk	
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Good measure of increasing income and decreasing poverty (WSLSP/FHDC)</p> <p>3 wards in Babergh East LSP in second band of most income deprived in the district (BELSP)</p> <p>Supports strengthen the rural economy (MSLSP) Supports self esteem and economic prosperity (One Ips, IBC)</p> <p>Potential to demonstrate productivity impact which is important if we are to improve prosperity (LSC)</p> <p>Can be used to show progress in attracting high level jobs and ensuring people have the skills to fill them (WGYPT)</p> <p>Fits with SEBC's Vision for 2025 where unemployment will be below national levels and gross average earnings will be above the national average (SEBC)</p> <p>Known issue in Suffolk (SPCT) Key benchmark measure to assess economic performance (UCS)</p> <p>Good indicator for local prosperity (WLSP) Key element of economic prosperity (SCDC, SCLSP) Link to skills (B4Board)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	19	Number of responses prioritising this indicator		Geographical priority	Suffolk Coastal (SCDC)
Evidence for geographical priority	<p>Suffolk Coastal median earnings 498 per week, above regional average 450 per week but below national average 560 per week (SCDC)</p> <p>Relative decline between 2004-06 (WDC)</p> <p>Haven Gateway survey showed those in work are not paid well (One Ips)</p>				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – ONS (centre) LATEST TREND – Average earnings (2007) Suffolk (full time weekly pay gross £427 compared to £459 national average. Ipswich:£415, Babergh: £444, Suffolk Coastal £492, Waveney £401, Mid Suffolk £463, St Eds: £387, Forest Heath: £390				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	NI 166 – Average earnings of employees in the area is a proxy Gross Value Added (GVA) indicator. Earnings data for 2007 shows gross weekly pay in Suffolk of £419 which lags significantly behind the rest of the region (£450) and the UK (£456). This suggests that Suffolk is yet to begin closing the productivity gap with the region and the rest of the country and justifies the choice of NI 166 as an improvement priority for Suffolk.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Expert knowledge and more information required to choose between this group. NI 166 and NI 116 are key for the Community Strategy. Could be easily influenced by one or two instances of very high earnings. NI 116 would provide an alternative measure to temper this.				
Risk	KEY CONCERN: Technical data highlights issues for smaller authorities (which would potentially be applicable if we broke the data down to district level) – As estimates are based on survey data, they are subject to statistical margins of error. In many cases, these errors will be sizeable. Although the data is robust for large authorities, for smaller authorities it should be treated with caution. For a minority, even apparent changes over two years or more may not reflect real changes. RISK – Breaking the data down to district level may not be reliable making it very difficult to set and achieve targets				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, strong support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support	

National Indicator	NI 171: VAT registration rate (Change in definition)				
Community Strategy Theme	Economy	3 year SCS outcome	Suffolk's business formation rate is at least 90% of the national average Maintain Suffolk's business survival rate		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Some businesses chose not to grow – this indicator won't pick up those small businesses. (WSLSP/FHDC)</p> <p>Focus should be on GVA rather than VAT registration (AC)</p> <p>Few businesses in rural areas VAT registered (BELSP)</p> <p>De-registrations are not covered here (SCLSP)</p> <p>Not appropriate, local target on sector growth (SCC)</p> <p>Libraries offer a range of support particularly to start-up and micro-businesses and social enterprises (MLA)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	4	Number of responses prioritising this indicator		Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority	Suffolk Coastal and County are below regional national average (SCLSP)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	VAT registration rate in Suffolk (2006) was 7.8 compared to 9.4 nationally. www.nomisweb.co.uk				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	<p>Business start-up rates have fallen well below the regional average since 2005, with Suffolk placed 8th out of 10. The start-up rates particularly low in Ipswich and Waveney.</p> <p>The new guidance on the national indicator set suggests that NI 171 will be expanded to include not just VAT registrations but PAYE registrations as well. This broadens the indicators remit but, we accept, will not cover the business population in its entirety. However, it is the best available measure of start-up activity despite having a new data set. Preliminary estimates for new business registrations occurring in 2007 are due in October 2008 and may be subject to revision in 2009.</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Unable to make recommendation between this and NI 172. Suggested NI 151 (overall employment rate) for consideration.				
Risk					
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	No, doesn't address Suffolk's issues, local target on growth in key sectors	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	No, not appropriate for Suffolk	

National Indicator	NI 172: VAT registered businesses in the area showing growth (Change in definition)				
Community Strategy Theme	Economy	3 year SCS outcome	Suffolk's business formation rate is at least 90% of the national average Maintain Suffolk's business survival rate		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>More likely to measure growth than 171 (WSLSP/FHDC)</p> <p>Supports strengthening the rural economy (MSLSP)</p> <p>Meets SEBC's Vision for 2025 where new enterprise and existing firms are encouraged to grow through attracting inward investment; supports future developments of Haverhill and Bury St Edmunds town centre and the rural economy (SEBC)</p> <p>Small business growth critical to the area (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Growth target preferable to judge prosperity within our communities (Police)</p> <p>Only available proxy for SME growth (WDC)</p> <p>Limited measure but useful; doesn't include business start up/survival (UCS)</p> <p>Not appropriate, local target on sector growth (SCC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	15	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	2	Geographical priority	Suffolk Coastal (SCDC)
Evidence for geographical priority	70% of Suffolk Coastal Businesses employ 4 or less people. Suffolk Coastal growth rate 0.88% national average 2.40% (2005/060 (SCDC)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally					
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?	www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk (Ipswich 2007): 2,430 enterprise units (190 with 20+ employees) compared to 2,445 units (195 with 20+ employees) in 2006. (Suffolk Coastal 2007): 4,750 units (345 with 20+ employees) compared to 4,655 units (340 with 20+ employees) in 2006. (Babergh 2007): 3,530 units (245 20+ employees) compared to 3,540 (240 20+ employees). (St Eds 2007): 4,195 units (425 20+ employees) compared to 4,090 units (420 20+ employees) in 2006. (Forest Heat 2007): 2,315 units (195 20+ employees) compared to 2,345 (200 20+ employees) in 2006. (Mid Suffolk 2007): 4,175 units (275 20+ employees) compared to 4,160 units (255 20+ employees) in 2006. (Waveney 2007): 3,380 units (310 20+ employees) compared to 3,325 units (310 20+ employees) in 2006. All England average 9.5% of units have 20+ employees in 2006 compared with 9.3% in 2007.				
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	<p>GO-East would be happy to see this indicator within the Suffolk LAA2, although has a preference for NI 171 on the basis of performance. Compared to start-up rates, survival rates are relatively good, with 75% of businesses registered in 2002 still operating in 2005, better than the regional (73%) and national (71.2%) averages. This was a marked improvement on previous year's figures.</p> <p>NI 172 is changing in a subtle but not unimportant way: The indicator is now about measuring the percentage of SMEs showing employment growth and uses the Inter-Departmental Business Register as a source (as does Business Link for reporting its market penetration rates).</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	N
Scrutiny comments	Unable to make recommendation between this and NI 171. Suggested NI 151 (overall employment rate) for consideration.				
Risk					
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Mixed views, possible local target focused on growth in key sectors	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, new definition of indicator more suitable for Suffolk	

National Indicator	NI 186: Per capita CO2 emissions in the LA area				
Community Strategy Theme	Greenest	3 year SCS outcome	Implementation of bus priority measures; Improved facilities for walking and cycling; Development of work and school travel plans; All new homes to be exemplary models of efficiency; An established green building network; Business, public sector, communities and individuals committed to reducing carbon emissions; More significant employers have green travel plans; Maintain current traffic levels within main town and on key corridors; All new business and housing developments obtain at least 10% energy from renewable energy		
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Linked to Suffolk Climate Action Plan; Data 2 years old – difficult to measure effectiveness of activity; growth bid for more activity around home energy was successful and will support this (FHDC) Difficult to influence in 3 years (One Ips)</p> <p>Partnership target; impact of predicted domestic and economic growth through RES/RSS and growth points to be minimised; hugely relevant to policy decisions on areas such as transport and housing development; central to actions to achieve Suffolk Climate Action Plan (Green)</p> <p>Strategic priority for MSDC (MSDC) Important Defra priority (NE) In line with Cabinet Commitment to clean and green borough (SEBC)</p> <p>PCT can contribute to sustainable agenda (SPCT) Local contribution to global issue (UCS)</p> <p>Global and local issue linked to greenest county (EA) Key element of green agenda (SCDC, SCLSP)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	16	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	5	Geographical priority	Suffolk Coastal (SCDC)
Evidence for geographical priority	Domestic CO2 emissions per capita 2.7 for Suffolk Coastal, national figure 2.5 (2006) (SCDC)				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	Local and Regional CO2 Emissions Estimates 2005 baseline data available from defra website. Per capita CO2 emissions in district area: (ranked as highest first) St Eds 11.4; Forest Heath 10.5; Mid Suffolk 9.7; Babergh 9.4; Suffolk Coastal 8.3; Waveney 7.3; Ipswich 6.3 East of England average: 7.8; ENGLAND average: 7.9				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	<p>GO East strongly supports the inclusion of this indicator. Suffolk's total emissions per capita are 9 tonnes per capita against a 2005 baseline, which places Suffolk as a mid-ranking performer within the region and only slightly better than the national average.</p> <p>Given Suffolk's strongly articulated ambition to be the greenest County, NI186 sends a clear signal in support of this environmental and community leadership. The inclusion of the indicator will enable Suffolk to be amongst those striving to demonstrate real improvements within the region and nationally in relation to the climate change mitigation agenda. It will also help Suffolk to achieve its stated aim to significantly accelerating progress towards its Climate Change Bill reduction targets for 2020 and 2050. Suffolk is well placed to demonstrate improvement over the three year period of the LAA against its existing baseline foot-print work.</p> <p>We accept that there is some 'lag' in the data set used for this indicator, but modelling work for target which factors in Suffolk's forecast housing, businesses and transport growth profile, and the use of relevant proxy indicators for monitoring are in the final stages of development and will be available soon. This issue should not detract from the importance of this indicator in the final agreement.</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Support the aspiration but would need to know much more information to support this particular indicator.				
Risk	CURRENT ISSUE: There is a data time-lag of approximately 18 months – 3 years RISK 1 – The data time-lag means that we will not get the final data for 2011 until 2013 at the earliest. This time-lag makes it very difficult to assess the impact of our actions during the LAA time period and thus reduces the likelihood of us achieving the target. CURRENT ISSUE: Long-term nature of indicator RISK 2 – The impact of preventative actions will not be seen until much later, making it very hard to impact directly on this target in the 3-year LAA period				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target	Defra expect LAs to achieve between 11% and 13% 2004-2010. Greenest County aims to stretch this to 15% contributing to 60% reduction by 2025 NB: different local & national baselines				
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, strong support, but note data time lag and difference in supporting data	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support	

National Indicator	NI 188: Adapting to climate change			
Community Strategy Theme	Greenest	3 year SCS outcome	Best approach to managing risk of flooding, drought and demand for water is identified, including map of coastal erosion risks Ipswich and Lowestoft have a funded programme of flood defence in place	
a) Key findings from the consultation				
Summary of findings	<p>Helps LAs to progress with adaptation plans in line with Nottingham Declaration, links to Climate Action Plan, supported by Cred (FHDC)</p> <p>Important for coastal authorities (NE)</p> <p>Links to greenest county agenda (SACRE)</p> <p>Provides a good broad indicator for partnership work across the county (SEBC)</p> <p>Central to the achievement of the Suffolk Climate Action Plan; supports NI 197 and 189 (Green)</p> <p>Climate change is now fact; Suffolk needs to be adapting and preparing for its effects (EA)</p> <p>A key element of the green agenda (SCDC)</p> <p>Area of high flood risk (WDC)</p>			
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	17	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority
Evidence for geographical priority				
b) Performance intelligence				
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?				
c) Additional information (if applicable)				
GO-East comments	<p>GO-East agrees that this should be included in the Suffolk LAA2, both to indicate commitment to Climate Change adaptation and because it compliments the inclusion on NI186 rather than over-laps with it.</p> <p>The EA have assessed Suffolk water supplies as unsustainable, in part of the county and in the rest there are no additional water resources available. Average water consumption in the Anglian Water region is currently 146 litres per head per day against a draft RSS target of 105 litres, therefore in an area expecting significant growth with limited water resources this issue should be a priority within the Greenest County element of the LAA</p>			Is this NI a GO-East priority? Y
Scrutiny comments	Support the inclusion of the indicator, is measurable and achievable.			
Risk	No Data			
d) Target setting				
Suggested 2011 target				
Supporting info				
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, significant support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support

National Indicator	NI 193: Municipal waste land filled				
Community Strategy Theme	Greenest	3 year SCS outcome			
a) Key findings from the consultation					
Summary of findings	<p>Important Defra Priority (NE)</p> <p>In line with Cabinet Commitment to a clean and green borough (SEBC)</p> <p>Good track record in this area (Green)</p> <p>Landfill space is becoming more and more restricted and expensive (EA)</p> <p>A key financial issue as well as a green issue for Suffolk (SCDC, SCLSP)</p> <p>Supports priority outcome for environment (WDC)</p>				
Number of responses that supported the inclusion of the indicator	16	Number of responses prioritising this indicator	3	Geographical priority	
Evidence for geographical priority	Waste landfilled = Suffolk Coastal 61.65%, Suffolk County 57.9%, national 65.24%				
b) Performance intelligence					
Existing indicator – current baseline and how does Suffolk perform compared regionally, nationally	SPATIAL – County REPORTED BY – SCC (WasteDataFlow) LATEST TREND – LAA data (which may be slightly different to the new measurement) – baseline (05/06) 67%; outcome (07/08) 64% - latest figure at Q2 07/08 already shows that the outcome has been easily achieved and the latest estimate is landfill down to 53.5%)				
New indicator – supporting performance information is available?					
c) Additional information (if applicable)					
GO-East comments	Suffolk's performance on household recycling and residual household waste has been consistently good over recent years. However, municipal waste to landfill is an area in which performance has remained static (at 60%); in spite of these other improvements. Given the high-levels of expected growth and limited landfill resources this is an area that we feel needs significant attention and an LAA priority.			Is this NI a GO-East priority?	Y
Scrutiny comments	Support the inclusion, would include commercial industrial waste as well as household and is therefore important.				
Risk	Not sure how we are performing nationally, but if we are performing well then makes achieving stretch targets harder (although this may be an area we want to stretch)? Other potential risk is that the Waste Partnership is well established and so adding to LAA may not add value				
d) Target setting					
Suggested 2011 target					
Supporting info					
e) Recommendation	Initial judgement	Yes, significant support	Recommended for inclusion by Core Group?	Yes, strong support	

Additional National Indicators

National Indicator	Rationale	Org/Partnership	Core group recommendation
3 – Civic Participation	Inline with engagement involvement of participation agendas, indicator of ownership of strategic priorities	VCS	
4 – Influencing decisions	Will give an indication of the bond between LAs and the community Ipswich is a community empowerment pilot area	FHDC, One Ips, IBC	Local and targeted in Ipswich (see P44)
5 – satisfaction in the local area	The historic environment can engender a sense of belonging and can therefore be a key factor in raising satisfaction	EH	
7 – Environment for a thriving 3 rd sector	Principle agencies in Suffolk state they want and value the third sector, however diversity if the sector needs to be recognised and their delivery supported	SACRE	
11 – Engagement in the Arts	Strong group of arts organisations in Suffolk that make a significant contribution. Creative industries are identified as one of its key growth areas.	Arts Council	
17 – Environment for improving third sector	Additional non-statutory provision, expansion of non-profit making services, maximising investment in services for Suffolk's people, inline with all party support for growth, promotion of community cohesion and integration	VCS	
39 – alcohol harm related admissions rates	Recognises the link between substance misuse and crime; alcohol misuse where no criminal offence has been committed also impacts on their families and communities	WGYPT	Local target suggested inc. A&E attendance (see P43)
57 – children and young people participation in high quality PE and sport	Opportunity to join with NI 8 and ensure a county approach to life long active learning; evidence shows that if young people lead an active lifestyle they are far more likely to continue this in adulthood although there is a substantial drop off at 16-24	SE	
113 – Chlamydia		MSLSP	
125-Achieving independence for older people	Rising number of older people couples with a move to enabling more people to remain living independently rather than entering residential care. All partners need to be engaged to ensure quality of life is addressed	SCC	Possible inclusion as a national indicator
129 – end of life access to palliative care enabling people to choose to die at home	Family carers under great pressure to care for people at home, need to be supported appropriately with relevant breaks	SFC	PCT has already chosen as a DoH priority
136 – people supported to live independently through social services	Applies to family carers who wish to work and care or return to work after dealing with a family crisis	SFC	
145-Adults with learning disabilities in settled accommodation	Approx 400 people with learning disabilities live in accommodation which is not settled. Step change urgently required. Can only be achieved through partnership working	SCC	Possible inclusion as a national indicator
146-Adults with learning disabilities in employment	Despite employment being a top priority for most people of working age with a learning disability less than 10% are in paid work. Step change needed to ensure employment practices are changed	SCC	
150 – adults in contact with secondary mental health services in employment	This would sustain their family situation both financially and emotionally and have a positive impact on self esteem and assist in maintaining a family environment	SFC	
151 – overall employment rate	JCP funding focused on employers and employment not people on benefits. Need to focus on those workless but not on benefits. Encouraging people to take up benefits will have a negative impact on this target, NI 151 better indicator (JC+)	JCP	
156 – temporary accommodation	Will help to relate information about affordable houses being built	FHDC, One Ips, IBC	
157 – processing of planning applications	The historic environment and English heritage are key to the efficient functioning of the planning process	EH	
162 – Entry level 3 in numeracy		UCS	
167 – Congestion	Key focus for FH, particularly in relation to congestion on the A11	FHDC	
180-Changes in housing benefit/council tax benefit	Indication if change in prosperity	WDC	
184-Food establishments compliant with food hygiene law	Supports priority outcome for health and well being	WDC	

185 – Co2 reduction from LA operations	LAs should be seen to be leading by example on there carbon footprint; linked to greenest county	EA, One Ips, IBC	
187 – Fuel Poverty	All LAs working on this illustrating its importance; Links to 121, 186, 188; Growth bid for more activity around home energy was successful supporting this indicator	FHDC One Ips (Town and bridge) IBC	
189-Flood and coastal erosion	Supports priority outcome for environment	WDC	
191 – residual household waste per head	Should be aiming to encourage and expand on current performance	EA	
192-Household waste recycled and composted	Supports priority outcome for the environment	WDC	
194-Local air quality		One Ips, IBC	
195-Street cleanliness	Supports priority outcome for the environment	WDC	
197 – Biodiversity	Linked to greenest county initiative; will help to establish green reputation over and above other local authorities; would help LAA sustainability appraisal; will help demonstrate new statutory duty for biodiversity (Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); Suffolk has a good BAP partnership, however there is insufficient funding to monitor all county sites on a frequent basis Possible target 50% of county wildlife sites under active conservation management . Suffolk has a rich and valid wildlife which is under threat from climate change, development pressures and changes in agricultural support mechanisms. We should be aiming to become excellent not just average (SCC)	NE, SCC	Greenest County working group to work on a more relevant local target for biodiversity
	Vital part of the natural and historic environment and key to creating the greenest county; included in Norfolk and Essex LAA; Suffolk is nationally and internationally recognised for its species and habitats; step can be demonstrated through new support programmes, volunteering, biodiversity mapping etc; Suffolk wants to be 'exceptional'; to maintain Suffolk as superb county for wildlife and landscape and for people to enjoy, a great deal of partnership work needs to be completed; only 23% of sites are in a conservation management scheme and 20% have had management advice or guidance in the last 5 years;	Green Block 2 Board	
	Underpins many of the outcomes in the greenest county drive	EA	

Local Indicators

Indicator	Number of responses in support	Comments	Core group recommendation
Volunteering	22	<p>Subject to data being available</p> <p>Linked to tourism</p> <p>Builds local capacity</p> <p>Supports developing citizenship and community cohesion, is broader than NI 6</p> <p>Enables disabled people to make a contribution to the communities</p> <p>Compliments NI6</p> <p>Given public expenditure constraints, a key issue for communities</p> <p>Strengthened communities as people take more pride</p>	Block 2 to work up detailed measure
Alcohol	17	<p>Linked to ASB crime</p> <p>Not able to measure and doesn't include those that ambulance deal with that never reach hospital</p> <p>Supports drive to increase awareness of the effect on communities of drug and alcohol abuse</p> <p>Should read A&E attendance, data quality at IHT and WSH needs further investigation. JPH data sound</p> <p>Maybe drugs and alcohol harm related admissions</p> <p>Alcohol bigger destructive substance than drugs but has failed to attract sufficient funding from government; needs a holistic approach</p> <p>CDRP target</p> <p>Prevalence of street drinking in Lowestoft</p> <p>Link to crime, ASB, and health</p>	Block 2 to work up detailed measure, A&E attendance cannot be measured
Access	17	<p>Rural isolation issues</p> <p>Particular emphasis on rural services</p> <p>Encourage a focus on effectiveness/value of services/facilities rather than just access</p> <p>Particularly relevant to the development of green spaces</p> <p>Access should include physical access, access to information, communication, public transport. Disabled people should not be disadvantaged by their disability or where they live.</p> <p>Links to rural and those without access to a car</p> <p>High number of rural communities</p> <p>Ensure family carers of all ages can access services and not be disadvantaged because of their caring role</p>	Block 3 to work up detailed measure, possibly a basket of indicators
Greenhouse gases	10	<p>Extra reporting burden-difficult? Costly?</p> <p>Reflects different levels and types of emissions in different parts of the county i.e. a rural agricultural area and the post of Felixstowe</p> <p>Doesn't allow for comparator national performance to be assessed</p>	NI 186 already agreed, is this local indicator required? Greenest County working group to discuss
Flood and Coastal erosion	14	<p>Historic environment under serious threat</p> <p>Reflective of NI 189 and particularly important to the east of the county</p> <p>Management of the coast is going through a critical phase and NI 189 is too narrow</p> <p>Area of high flood risk</p>	Greenest County working group to work up detailed measure

Additional Local Targets

Indicator	Rationale	Organisation/Partnership	Core Group recommendation
Carers		West Suffolk LSP	
Climate Change		West Suffolk LSP	
NI 11	Strong group of arts organisations in Suffolk that make a significant contribution. Creative industries are identified as one of its key growth areas. If not part of up to 35.	Arts Council	
Violence and criminal damage	Key issue for FH	FHDC	
% of people who feel that they are well informed about local priorities and services		FHDC	
Number of Suffolk buildings on EH register of buildings at risk	28 buildings on register, 13 of which at immediate risk	EH	
Participation in the historic environment	Contribution to economy	EH	
% of communities across Suffolk engaged in Community led action planning	Enables communities to identify what is important to them and to take action through self help activities	SACRE	
NI 7 – Environment for a thriving 3 rd sector	May offer greater opportunity for more innovative working	WGYPCT	
NI 175 – Access to services		WGYPCT	Local indicator to be worked up (See P43)
Economy – Growth in key sectors	Focus of Economic Strategy and SCS, no appropriate national indicator	Block 4 Board	Block 4 to develop detailed measure
NI 55 – childhood obesity Year r	Can be used as a baseline for trends for NI 56, can also pick up delivery plans re breastfeeding, weaning, early years and preschool partnership work	WGYPCT	NI 56 identified NI for childhood obesity
Adults and mental health	Appropriate NI measure not available Need early intervention for vulnerable individuals. Need to provide low level intervention and prevention activity. Area for partnership working	WGYPCT, SCC	Block 3 to develop detailed measure
Decrease the percentage of days work missed due to mental health problems	Lack of adult mental health indicator is worrying, very difficult to get something measurable. Mental health problems are a significant contributor to work sickness absence	SPCT	
Aggregation of NI 9, 10 and 11	Sport England East would support the inclusion of a joined up cultural indicator, the SCS clearly states the impacts and benefits of culture in delivering against a range of cross-cutting themes	SE	
Access to cultural services	If access to services and facilities is not adopted then we would urge a measure which encourages improvement of cultural services especially in the situation where new delivery models and relationships are being developed	MLA	
Older people are safe within their own homes from both internal and external risk	Projected numbers of older people in Suffolk (44% increase of people aged 85 and over from 2001 – 2011) coupled with a drive to keep and care for people in their own homes means that the risk group for harm is increasing. Without a step change in our response there will be an increase in the number of falls, distraction burglars, bogus traders, accident and fire injuries, accidental deaths and people living in poverty (Homes Shield)	B3Board B2Board	Block 3 to develop detailed measure
Empty private sector homes brought back into use	Helps community cohesion and builds confidence in locality	WDC	
Number of people in temporary accommodation	Good indicator of housing stress	WDC	
Crime in a public place where drugs or alcohol are a factor (target to mirror local	CDRP strategic assessments have indicated that this is an issue cross Suffolk. It needs partnership work or is likely to become an increasing issue.	Block 2 Board	Already worked up

Police Authority target)			
189 – Flood risk		EA	
To promote family carer sensitive employment practice to enable them to stay in work or return to work	Need to encourage this not only in statutory organisations but also in the business sector. This should be done in conjunction with the VCS	SFC	
To identify and support young carers within school and the education environment in line with DDA priority and the CAF priority	Identification and support of young carers is essential to attain their potential and protect their health and wellbeing. If unsupported they can often remain caring as an adult and again miss out on opportunities in the future.	SFC	
To identify all family carers and promote early intervention to sustain positive health and wellbeing and enable people to remain independent and in control of their own lives	Providing directly accessed services both within the statutory and voluntary sector acts as an early intervention support thus reducing the risk of crisis intervention	SFC	Means to an end not an end in itself – will support the delivery of other outcomes
NI 21-dealing with local concerns about ASB	Quality of life is adversely affected by the minority. Will ensure community engagement	One Ips	
NI 195-Improve street cleanliness	Help tackle problem of needle finds-a growing problem in central, south east and south west wards	One Ips	
NI4-% influence decisions locally	Ipswich is a community empowerment pilot area-show leadership	One Ips	Local and targeted in Ipswich
Increased participation in culture	To measure breadth of cultural and sporting activity	SCC	

Additional indicators that GO East want including

Local	GO Priority	Rationale
NI 185	Y	This is proposed as a local target. Should Suffolk adopt NI 186 as a designated target in their LAA, they would not need to include 185 as a local as it is effectively incorporated into 186.
NI 189 L	Y	Flood and Coastal erosion issues are very important and were initially proposed as a designated target by GO-East, for Suffolk. The recent tidal-surge, and longer term coastal management issues make this an imperative issue for all coastal areas. After discussion with representatives of the Greenest County group and because of the Integrated Coastal Zonal Management pilot we would be happy to see this as a local measure.

National	GO Priority?	GO-East comments
NI 4	Y	On NI 4, % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality, Suffolk is below the national average and so together with NI 1 this would be a good combination of indicators.
NI 19	Y	GO-East support the inclusion of NI 19 Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders rather than NI 111. The steady increase in re-offending by young people is against the regional and national trend, it also concerns the second highest number of young people in the region. Reversing the trend requires a multi-agency approach.
NI 47	Y	DfT proposed this indicator for the Suffolk LAA based on KSI performance data up to and including 2006, which showed performance behind trajectory to meet existing targets. Relative to other transport related indicators this is considered one of two priorities. We appreciate that more recent local data shows a dramatic drop in the number of people KSI in Suffolk, although it has been suggested that this data may be against trend and be related to the wetter summer in 2007.
NI 63	Y	Stability of placements for looked after children should be picked up in Suffolk's LAA as a priority. The GO considers that this indicator, which looks at length of placement, is a better indicator than NI 62 for Suffolk based upon current performance.
NI 125	Y	The GO strongly feels that this indicator – Achieving independence for older people through rehabilitation / intermediate care should be also be included in Suffolk's LAA. Waiting times for home adaptations and equipment provision have remained static or increased in recent years. Suffolk has lost a star in their Adult Social Care rating for 2007. They have dropped from 3 to 2 * with their capacity to improve seen as promising. The key areas for Suffolk to reflect on were: Strong managerial and political leadership; Personalised support in the form of direct payments, individual budgets and prevention; Good joint commissioning with health; Improving safeguarding and service quality and Well established and embedded plans that reflect national priorities for adult social care.
NI 130	Y	The GO strongly considers that Suffolk should include this indicator – Social care clients receiving self directed support. Direct Payments to social care clients has improved, although over 65s tend to take up the scheme less than younger age groups. CSCI identified a need to increase direct payments to carers (CSCI letter 2007). Suffolk has lost a star in their Adult Social Care rating for 2007. They have dropped from 3 to 2 * with their capacity to improve seen as promising. The key areas for Suffolk to reflect on were: Strong managerial and political leadership; Personalised support in the form of direct payments, individual budgets and prevention; Good joint commissioning with health; Improving safeguarding and service quality and Well established and embedded plans that reflect national priorities for adult social care.
NI 145	Y	The GO strongly considers that this indicator to assist the reduction of the number of Learning Disabled people in NHS long stay provision into more appropriate accommodation, which focuses on personalisation should be included in Suffolk's LAA. This was raised as an area of development within the annual review letter for 2006/07 and the council are starting to respond accordingly. There are a high number of Learning Disabled adults who normally reside in the council area who remain in the NHS In Patient accommodation but who are medically fit for discharge and are no longer in need of continuing hospitalisation. The people affected need to be moved to more appropriate accommodation.

		<p>There are a relatively low proportion of registered places for learning disabilities per 1,000 people suggesting there maybe a lack of provision.</p> <p>Based on DOH concerns via the valuing people support team, SHA interest and CSCI feedback we would like Suffolk to include NI 145 in their LAA. This view is also supported by the Cabinet Office and by Communities and Local Government.</p> <p>Suffolk has lost a star in their Adult Social Care rating for 2007. They have dropped from 3 to 2 * with their capacity to improve seen as promising. The key areas for Suffolk to reflect on were: Strong managerial and political leadership; Personalised support in the form of direct payments, individual budgets and prevention; Good joint commissioning with health; Improving safeguarding and service quality and Well established and embedded plans that reflect national priorities for adult social care.</p>
NI 153	Y	<p>The GO supports the inclusion of an indicator to focus on those areas where out of work benefit payments are problematic (i.e. Waveney and Ipswich). We have proposed NI 153 rather than 152 to focus on the worst performing neighbourhoods rather than a county wide target.</p> <p>Waveney has lowest employment rate – 72%, highest unemployment rate (6.3%) and claimant counts (3.5%). Some wards in Lowestoft as high as 9.3% JSA (Harbour)</p> <p>Some Ipswich wards also feature in relatively high JSA and Incapacity Benefit Claimant counts.</p> <p>If Suffolk proposes to use 152 instead, we would want to set targets for those localities where the issue is most relevant, rather than a countywide target, that is; Waveney and Ipswich.</p>
NI 175	Y	<p>Suffolk’s performance against this national indicator is low relative to all other Counties in the region and therefore has been proposed by GO-East. The level of rurality in Suffolk is accepted, as is the length of Suffolk’s road network however this is not dissimilar from other county areas.</p> <p>Previous discussions with SCC officers regarding this indicator led to a proposal for a local indicator based upon an existing LTP target. The plausibility of this approach will require further testing.</p>