|  |
| --- |
| **LOCAL AUTHORITY SUGGESTED CORE PERFORMANCE MONITORING FRAMEWORK FOR THE HOMELESSNESS REDUCTION ACT** |
|  |
| **Indicator measured**  | **Number/%** |
| Decisions made in the month on homeless applications  |  |
|  |  |
| ***Breakdown of decisions made that month*** |  |
|  |  |
| Number found to be not eligible  |  |
| Number found to be not homeless or threatened with homelessness within 56 days |  |
| Number owed a prevention duty |  |
| Number owed a relief duty  |  |
|  |  |
| ***Prevention Duty Outcomes*** |  |
|  |  |
| Number of prevention duty outcomes in the month |  |
|  |  |
| ***Breakdown of the above figure by outcome, number for that outcome and % for that outcome as a % of the total number of outcomes*** |  |
|  |  |
| 1. Prevented – The threat of homelessness is resolved through action to help them stay in their home or to find other accommodation before they have to leave their home (with a reasonable prospect of 6 months)
 |  |
| 1. 56 days or more from the date of the prevention duty has passed and Council decided to end the prevention duty
 |  |
| 1. The applicant refused suitable accommodation,
 |  |
| 1. The applicant became homeless during the prevention duty
 |  |
| 1. The applicant lost their eligibility status
 |  |
| 1. The applicant has withdrawn their application, or lost contact with the Council
 |  |
| 1. The applicant deliberately failed to co-operate in taking the actions required of them in their PHP
 |  |
| 1. The applicant has become homeless intentionally from any accommodation that has been made available to the applicant as a result of the authority’s exercise of their functions under the prevention duty
 |  |
|  |  |
| % Of successful outcomes (use prevention outcome figure 1 above) set against the total number of prevention outcomes for the month (the figure for 1-8 combined) |  |
| % Of successful outcomes as a % set against the number of unsuccessful outcomes only (the figure for the prevention duty ending due to the applicant becoming homeless) *Use the figures for Prevention outcomes 1 and 2 above to obtain this % and disregard the other outcomes where it can be strongly argued you are unable to influence the outcome. This will then give you a second more accurate picture of prevention performance by removing unsuccessful outcomes that the local authority cannot control e.g. lost contact/application withdrawn/non cooperation/refusal of an offer that would have provided a prevention solution, etc.*  |  |
|   |  |
| ***Breakdown by number and % of all successful prevention outcomes broken down by keeping the applicant in the accommodation presented from versus helping them to secure alternative accommodation before they become homeless through arranging to offer accommodation that was accepted or helped to find accommodation***  |  |
| 1) Number and % of successful outcomes where applicant is assisted to remain in their accommodation | Number = % = |
| 2) Number and % of successful outcomes where applicant is assisted to secure other accommodation  | Number = |
|  | % = |
| ***For 2) above the breakdown of what the accommodation was that the applicant was offered/helped to find*** | **Number and %** |
| 1. Number and % secured into the social sector
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured into the private rented sector
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured into supported accommodation,
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured with family, friends
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured into other accommodation
 |  |
|  |  |
| ***Relief Duty Outcomes*** |  |
|  |  |
| ***Number of Relief duty outcomes in the month***  |  |
|  |  |
| ***Breakdown of the above figure by outcome, number for that outcome and % for that outcome as a % of the total number of outcomes***  |  |
|  |  |
| 1. Homelessness Relieved - homelessness is resolved through action to help them to find accommodation or helped to return home (with a reasonable prospect of 6 months)
 |  |
| 1. 56 days or more from the date of the Relief duty has passed and Council decided to end the Relief duty (or is required to end it as enquiries are completed and the applicant would be owed a main duty)
 |  |
| 1. The applicant refused suitable accommodation,
 |  |
| 1. The applicant lost their eligibility status
 |  |
| 1. The applicant has withdrawn their application, or lost contact with the Council
 |  |
| 1. The applicant deliberately failed to co-operate in taking the actions required of them in their PHP
 |  |
| 1. The applicant has become homeless intentionally from any accommodation that has been made available to the applicant as a result of the authority’s exercise of their functions under the relief duty
 |  |
| 1. The applicant had been owed a relief duty but this has come to an end because the authority has informed them that they are referring their case to another local authority on the grounds of local connection
 |  |
|  |  |
| % Of successful outcomes (use relief outcome figure 1 above) set against the total number of relief outcomes for the month (the figure for 1-8 combined) |  |
| % Of successful outcomes as a % set against the number of unsuccessful outcomes only (the figure for 2 above which is the figure for the relief duty having come to an end after 56 days without a successful relief of homelessness outcome) *Use the figures for Relief outcomes 1 and 2 above to obtain this % and disregard the other outcomes where it can be strongly argued you are unable to influence the outcome. This will then give you a second more accurate picture of Relief casework performance by removing unsuccessful outcomes that the local authority cannot control e.g. lost contact/application withdrawn/non cooperation/refusal of an offer that would have provided a Relief solution, etc.* |  |
|   |  |
| ***Where Relief has been successful what was the outcome***  | **Number and %** |
|  |  |
| 1. Number and % assisted to return to the home that they originally presented from
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured into the social sector
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured into the private rented sector
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured into supported accommodation,
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured with family, friends
 |  |
| 1. Number and % secured into other accommodation
 |  |
|  |  |
| ***Other key performance measures*** |  |
|  |  |
| Number of applicants in the month found to be owed a main 193 duty at the end of the relief duty.  |  |
| Number of applicants in the month found to be intentionally homeless |  |
| Number of applicants in the month found to be not in priority need |  |
| Intentional homeless decisions as a % of all decisions made on homeless applications (running total)*Could be an indicator of culture change. Low IH decisions as a percentage of applications could be seen as a move away from applying the traditional pre HRA tests approach* |  |
| Average number of working days this month to make a decision on new homeless applications (i.e. the initial decision on the homeless application – not eligible, not homeless, prevention duty owed, relief duty owed) |  |
| Number of placements into temporary accommodation in the month (exclude 1 night out of hours cases) |  |
| Number of households that have left temporary accommodation in the month (exclude 1 night out of hours cases)  |  |
|  |  |
| ***Breakdown of numbers in TA by:*** |  |
| Relief duty or other interim TA duty v 193 duty  |  |
| Numbers in B and B type accommodation (singles and families and for families the number over 6 weeks |  |
| Number in each other form of TA by type of TA and total in TA |  |