

# Local Government Outcomes Framework Feedback – South Kesteven DC

## Questions about use of the Framework

**How would you like to see the Framework used as a tool to support local authorities and local partners to deliver against key national outcomes? For example, undertaking quiet conversations with councils based on outcome trajectory, convening departments to coordinate support where there are concerns across multiple outcomes**

*We understand the LGOF to be primarily a mechanism to steer local authority activity, rather than a disciplinary performance regime like the Audit Commission, or what OFLOG was conceived to be within parts of the sector. We agree with MHCLG's recognition that greater local powers and capacity can offer potential for greater variance in priorities, service delivery and outcomes. Hence mechanisms are needed to ensure that all actors in a system of multi-level governance row in the same direction to deliver national standards and priorities. We agree with MHCLG's position that the LGOF will not set targets, inform league tables or impose new data reporting requirements on local authorities. Using LGOF performance as an accompaniment to existing assurance and inspection regimes is a sensible approach. The LGOF metric's generally measure area performance, rather organisational, as OFLOG did. This means that concerns over outcome trajectory is primarily a diagnosis of a left behind area, rather than automatically an indictment of poor local authority performance, although poor performance may be separately identified and may be a contributing factor. We would suggest keeping LGOF separate from more explicitly disciplinary mechanisms e.g. Best Value, and that all relevant partners should be convened to coordinate support and drive improvement.*

**How would your organisation use the Framework either in its own work or when working with partners?**

*South Kesteven DC would incorporate the LGOF into the our existing strategic planning and performance reporting processes. The current Corporate Plan 2024-27 already demonstrates high alignment with the LGOF policy areas. Service planning would be adjusted using the LGOF to further encourage service leaders to approach policy challenges in a holistic and cross cutting manner. For example, framing planned actions in alignment with the LGOF objectives.*

*In partnership working with other public sector partners, the district council role can be broadly be described as preventative, compared to the reactive role of other agencies. For example, our public protection services. The LGOF will be used to strategically steer partnership activity and provide a framework to link seemingly disparate workstreams together.*

*For partnership working within the district, where the Council plays the lead role, for example work with town & parish councils, local business and community groups etc. the LGOF will be used to frame, steer and coordinate activity. We would seek through the design of our neighbourhood area committees post LGR and other mechanisms to empower communities and neighbourhoods, as set out in the English Devolution White Paper, to create a nested*

*system where the LGOF is used to effectively replicate the relationship between MHCLG, central government departments and the local authority, on a hyperlocal level. For example using MSOAs as the basic building blocks for area committees, so that hyperlocal equivalents to the LGOF metrics can be presented and monitored.*

*To be clear the replicated relationship would be as follows: ‘The local authority, strategic authority, relevant government departments, non-departmental bodies, other public sector partners, civil society organisations could then rally themselves using the LGOF as a powerful signal to coordinate and develop a joined up policy response.’*

**7. Do you have views on how the Framework can best support local innovation, partnership working and long-term planning?**

*We note that the LGOF appears to be founded on a view of local authorities as governing relatively compact geographies, deeply connected to their place and if empowered would develop innovative solutions to local policy challenges. The LGOF then serving as a meta-governance mechanism to steer and stimulate this local activity in line with national priorities. In short, to ensure all actors are rowing in the same direction through problem focused interactions.*

*A concern is that another component of the MHCLG policy programme – the LGR workstream stands in potential tension with this. LGR will create significantly geographically larger authorities, in our area, effectively sub-regional in scale. This will inevitably negatively impact local connection and knowledge of place, regardless of compensatory mechanisms like area committees. A particular concern is the absence of geographic granularity in the LGOF in that scenario. Taking Lincolnshire, regardless of the final LGR configuration, the coast and the interior have very different performance and challenges. A LGOF that simply presents data for a sub-regional scale authority will flatten this difference, obscuring the challenges and limit the usefulness of the exercise. We would suggest that post LGR, MHCLG, the ONS and other bodies continue to capture and publish data on the old district footprints (where appropriate and feasible). This will enable central government to have a better view of local outcomes and allow the local authority to marshal local partners and deliver effective data driven policy interventions.*

<b>Priority Outcome 1: Homelessness and Rough Sleeping</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Prevent and reduce homelessness and rough sleeping</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
No. of households with children in temporary accommodation		X			
Number of families in B&B over 6 weeks		X			
% of duties owed where homelessness was prevented		X			
Number of people sleeping rough on a single night		X			
Number of people sleeping rough over the month who are long term		X			
<b>Priority Outcome 2: Housing</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Everyone has access to a decent, safe, secure, and affordable home</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Proportion of rental housing in LA area deemed decent		X			
Net additional dwellings		X			
House price to workplace-based earnings ratio			X		
Social housing demand [placeholder]			X		
Proportion of homes rated EPC C and above		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Completed remediation for unique buildings		X			
Enforcement action taken by local authorities against 11m+ buildings under the Housing Act 2004		X			
Total new homes delivered as a % of existing total area stock		X			
Percentage of planning applications decided on time (dwellings)					X
Private Rented Sector enforcement [placeholder]			X		
Proportion of LA-owned social housing deemed decent		X			
Year-on-year change in social rented dwellings held in LA HRA		X			

<b>Priority Outcome 3: Multiple Disadvantage</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Improve the lives of adults experiencing multiple disadvantage</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Proportion of people in substance use treatment also experiencing at least one other overlapping disadvantage, achieving significant progress in treatment [Placeholder]		X			
Households with accommodation secured at end of prevention/relief duty for households also experiencing at least two areas of overlapping disadvantage [Placeholder]		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Proportion of prison leavers with a substance misuse need engaged in treatment within three weeks of release		X			
Number of households unable to be supported at domestic abuse safe accommodations due to being unable to meet additional needs		X			
<b>Priority Outcome 4: Best Start in Life</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Improve early child health, family support and early education to give every child the best start in life</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Children with a good level of development up to 5 years old		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Access to early education – take-up rate for 15 hour offer for 2-year-olds receiving additional forms of support		X			
Access to early education – take-up rate for 15 hour (universal) offer for 3 and 4-year-olds		X			

<b>Priority Outcome 5: Every Child Achieving and Thriving</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Support all children and young people to achieve and thrive in school, at home and in their communities</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
KS2 attainment - % of pupils meeting expected standards of reading / writing / maths, LA maintained schools		X			
KS4 attainment – Attainment 8, LA maintained schools		X			
% of young people (age 16- 17) not in education, employment or training		X			
SEN attainment - % of SEN pupils meeting expected standards of reading / writing / maths at KS2		X			
Young people supported to move into education, employment or training – SEN post-16 destinations		X			
Overall absence rate for SEN pupils		X			
Absence rates – persistent and severe absence		X			
First time entrants to youth justice system		X			
% of youth offenders reoffending		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
% of SEND pupils supported in mainstream schools		X			
Participation in sport and physical activity (age 5 - 16)		X			
Ofsted report card - outcomes in LA maintained schools [placeholder]			X		
Participation in youth services [Placeholder]			X		

<b>Priority Outcome 6: Keeping Children Safe &amp; Family Security (Children's Social Care)</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Keep children safe in secure and loving homes and help more families to thrive together</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Rate of looked after children per 10,000 children (for unaccompanied asylum seeking children and non-unaccompanied asylum-seeking children)		X			
Persistent absence for Children in Need Only (CINO), Child Protection Plans Only (CPPO) and Children Looked After (CLA)		X			
Educational attainment at KS2 (expected standard in read / writing / maths) and KS4 (average attainment 8) for CINO, CPPO and CLA		X			
% of children who cease being looked after due to moving into Special Guardianship Order (SGO) or Child Arrangements Order (CAO)		X			
% of child protection plans which were a second or subsequent plan		X			
% of child protection plans which were longer than 2 years		X			
% of looked after children with 3 or more placements during the year		X			
% of children living in foster, residential care, or secure children's homes		X			
% of care leavers in education, employment or training		X			
% of care leavers in suitable accommodation		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
% of Children Services spend not on CLA			X		
Workforce vacancy rate		X			

<b>Priority Outcome 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: People live healthier lives for longer and health inequalities are reduced</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Healthy life expectancy at birth		X			
Slope index of inequality in life expectancy at birth		X			
Smoking: % of successful quitters		X			
Drugs & Alcohol: Rate of alcohol specific mortality (directly standardised rate per 100,000)		X			
Sexual Health: Under 18 conception rate		X			
Child health: % achieving a good level of development at 2-2.5 year review		X			
Oral health: % of 5-year-olds with experience of visually obvious dental decay		X			
Obesity: year 6 obesity prevalence		X			
Physical Inactivity: % of adults who are physically inactive		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Smoking: % of local population who smoke provided with support to quit		X			
Drugs & Alcohol: Proportion of the opiate and/or crack prevalent population (15-64) and the alcohol dependent population (18 and over) that are not in treatment (unmet need)		X			
Sexual Health: HIV testing rate per 100,000		X			
CVD prevention: Proportion of NHS health checks completed across the eligible population		X			

<b>Priority Outcome 8: Adult Social Care – Quality</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Care users and carers experience high quality adult social care that is provided by a skilled workforce</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Care recipient quality of life (adjusted for LA impact)		X			
Carer quality of life		X			
Overall satisfaction of carers with social services (for them and the person they care for)		X			
Overall satisfaction of care recipients with their care and support		X			
Proportion of section 42 safeguarding enquiries where a risk was identified, and the reported outcome was that the risk was reduced or removed		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Workforce turnover: Proportion of staff in the formal care workforce leaving their role in the past 12 months		X			
<b>Priority Outcome 9: Adult Social Care – Independence</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Care users are supported to stay independent in their homes where possible, and have choice and control over their support</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Proportion of people who received reablement during the year, who previously were not receiving services, where no further request was made for ongoing support		X			
Proportion of people receiving long-term support living in their home or with family		X			
Proportion of people who use services who report having control over their daily life		X			
Proportion of care users and carers who have found it easy to find information about services/support		X			
Proportion of carers who report that they have been involved in discussions about the person they care for		X			
Proportion of people using social care who receive direct payments		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Access to LA arranged or funded care by age and setting (nursing, residential and community) per 100,000 adults in England		X			



<b>Priority Outcome 10: Adult Social Care - Neighbourhood Health / Integration</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Care users are supported by joined up health and social care services at a neighbourhood level</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Proportion of people 65 and over discharged into reablement and who remained in the community within 12 weeks of discharge		X			
Number of adults (18-64) whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential and nursing care homes		X			
Number of adults (65+) whose long-term support needs are met by admission to residential and nursing care homes		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
None Proposed			X		
<b>Priority Outcome 11: Neighbourhoods</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: People feel safe and included in their local community and are satisfied with their local area as a place to live</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
People agree adults in their communities can be trusted		X			
Anti-social behaviour [placeholder]			X		
People feel they can influence local decisions					X
People are satisfied with community / cultural facilities [placeholder]			X		
People are satisfied with their local area as a place to live		X			
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Physical visits of people into library premises per population [placeholder]			X		
Fly tipping enforcement actions per incident					X
Access to green spaces		X			

<b>Priority Outcome 12: Environment, Circular Economy and Climate Change</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Support a healthier, more resilient natural and built environment, including responding to the risks and impacts of climate change to the benefit of communities</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Deaths attributable to particulate air pollution (particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometres in diameter [PM2.5])		X			
% of total household waste sent for recycling/ compost/ reuse		X			
% of total household waste that is collected separately as food waste		X			
Biodiversity [placeholder]			X		
Flood protection [placeholder]			X		
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
None Proposed			X		
<b>Priority Outcome 13: Transport and Local Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Communities are connected with improved, healthier and greener public transport, enabled by well maintained, enhanced and delivered transport infrastructure</b>					
<b>Outcome Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Passenger journeys on buses			X		
Passenger journeys on light rail for LAs in scope			X		
Percentage of adults who walk or cycle for travel purposes at least once per week			X		
Killed or seriously injured (KSI) per billion vehicle miles			X		
% roads where maintenance should be considered (local A roads & motorway, B&C roads, and unclassified)			X		
Public transport connectivity score to key services			X		
<b>Output Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Public EV charging devices per 100,000 population		X			
Vehicle kilometres on local bus services			X		

<b>Priority Outcome 14: Economic Prosperity and Regeneration (Contextual Outcome)</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Foster local economic growth and prosperity</b>					
<b>Contextual Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Gross value added per hour worked		X			
Gross median weekly pay		X			
Employment for 16-19 year olds		X			
Employment for 16-64 year olds		X			
Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) average score			X		
Number of high growth enterprises		X			
Births of new enterprises		X			
Deaths of enterprises		X			
Business survival rate		X			
Business density		X			
Employment support [placeholder]			X		
Reducing poverty [placeholder]			X		
<b>Priority Outcome 15: Child Poverty (Contextual Outcome)</b>					
<b>Outcome Statement: Reduce and alleviate child poverty to improve children's lives and life chances</b>					
<b>Contextual Metrics</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
Children in low-income families		X			