

LOCAL GOVERNMENT NATIONAL INDICATOR SET TECHNICAL HANDBOOK - RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

Name and address of responding organisation:

**Devon County Council
County Hall
Topsham Road
Exeter
EX2 4QR**

Is this your organisation's official response to the consultation? Y/N

Name and phone number of key contact in case of follow-up queries:

Louise Taylor - 01392 383478

National Indicator Number:

NI103

Please complete a separate form for each indicator on which you wish to respond

Indicator Issue	
1. Is the Technical Definition of this indicator clear?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
If NO a. What aspects of the technical definition of the indicator are unclear? Please specify clearly - is it in relation to the measurement method, or - on reporting b. Please suggest how the template can be clarified/improved.	
2. Does the Technical Definition for this indicator have any unintended consequences?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
If YES a. What are the unintended consequences on this national indicator? b. Can the unintended consequence be avoided? If so, how?	This is a modification of BVPI 43a that will provide additional weeks to issue SEN statements. The top quartile performance for BV43a achieving the same in 18 weeks is 100% and the bottom quartile

	<p>threshold not far behind. Goodness know how anyone considers this move a sensible way to measure prompt completion of statements. It most certainly is not an outcome measure. An extremely retrograde step that will reduce the present level of service being provided to those with SEN.</p> <p>The principle of measuring achievement against a standard in itself does not promote good practice. If a case does not meet the standard it has already adversely affected the performance as measured by the indicator and there is no futher incentive to complete the statement at all as measured by this approach!</p> <p>Since it is intended to collect this, a better service will be encouraged to customers by keeping the 18 week standard.</p> <p>It would be better still to replace it with a measure that encouraged continuous improvement and recognised early completion of the statements and move away from one that encourages LAs to leave it to the final day within the standard before completion.</p>
<p>3. Will the Technical Definitions for this indicator work in practice?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>If NO a. Why would this technical definition not work in practice?</p>	
<p>4. Is this indicator defined at the right spatial level?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a) If not, what level should it be defined at? (including whether information is already gathered and/or reported at that level and if so where, if not, estimated cost of collecting and reporting it)</p>	
<p>5. Should data for this indicator be provided for any or all of the different equalities strands (please tick the relevant box)?</p>	<p>Ethnicity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Gender <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Religion <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Age <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Sexual orientation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Disability <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/> (Please specify)</p>
<p>a) For any boxes ticked at 5, is this information already gathered and/or reported and, if so, where? If not, what would be the estimated additional burden of collecting and reporting it?</p>	
<p>6. Further comments on the questions above and /or any other comments that are not covered above questions.</p>	
<p>Completed versions can be sent to niconsultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk. Hard copy responses should be returned to Local Government Quality and Performance Division, Zone J2, 4th Floor, Eland House, Bressenden Place, LONDON, SW1E 5DU.</p>	