

Report to: Finance and Performance Management Scrutiny Panel

Date of Meeting: 10 June 2010



Portfolio: Performance Management (Councillor R. Bassett)

Subject: Key Performance Indicators 2009/10 - Outturn

Officer contact for further information: S. Tautz (Ext 4180)

Democratic Services Officer: A. Hendry (Ext 4246)

Recommendations/Decisions Required:

That the Scrutiny Panel consider the Council's outturn performance for 2009/10, in relation to the Key Performance Indicators adopted for the year.

Executive Summary:

1. Key Performance Indicators (KPI) relevant to the Council's core activities and corporate priorities and objectives are adopted each year. Performance against the KPIs is a regular inspection theme in external judgements on the overall performance of the Council.

Reasons for Proposed Decision:

2. It is important that relevant performance management processes are in place to review and monitor performance against the Council's key priorities, objectives, and indicators, in order to identify proposals for appropriate corrective action in areas of under performance.

Other Options for Action:

3. No other options are available in this respect. Failure to monitor and review performance against key priorities, objectives, and indicators and to take corrective action where necessary, could have negative implications for judgements made about the Council in corporate assessment processes, and might mean that opportunities for improvement were lost. The Council has previously agreed arrangements for monitoring progress against the achievement of targets set for the KPIs and other performance indicators.

Report:

Background

4. (Deputy Chief Executive) As the Scrutiny Panel will be aware, a range of fifty-eight KPIs was adopted for 2009/10. Details of the KPIs for the year are attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

5. The KPIs are important to the Council's activities, and reflect its corporate priorities and objectives, comprising a mix of statutory National Indicators (NIs), Local Performance Indicators (LPIs) (a number of which are former statutory Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs)), and other locally determined indicators that the Council has 'had regard to' in the current Local Area Agreement (LAA) for Essex. The aim of the KPIs is to focus improvement on key areas and to achieve comparable performance with that of the top performing local authorities (where appropriate), and to then maintain or improve further on that level of performance.

6. Targets for the KPIs have traditionally been based on the most recently available national performance information published by the Audit Commission. The new NI set replaced all existing BVPIs from April 2008 and, as baseline information was not necessarily available for these indicators, targets were either determined locally or drawn from the LAA where relevant. In adopting the KPIs for 2009/10, a target was set for at least 80% to achieve target performance by the end of the year.

7. Improvement plans are produced for the KPIs each year, which also contain details of service costs, and feed into the Council's annual business planning process and cost and performance benchmarking analysis. Progress in achieving target performance in respect of the KPIs is reported to the Scrutiny Panel and the relevant Portfolio Holder at the conclusion of each quarter (where appropriate) and at year-end.

8. Individual outturn performance reports for each of the KPIs for 2009/10 are attached as Appendix 2 to this report.

9. It should be noted however that final performance against a number of indicators cannot currently be reported. The following indicators comprise measures for which finalised outturn data for 2009/10 is due to be reported by other organisations and which has not yet been published, where (in the case of NI 14) targets were not required to be set, or where (NI 160) the indicator was subject of a bi-ennial survey measure that was not required to be undertaken in 2009/10. Additionally, data for LPI 23 (Capital Projects) was not reported during the year as a result of uncertainty around the purpose and scope of the indicator, and a revised version has therefore been introduced for 2010/11:

- NI 14 - Avoidable Contact.
- NI 160 - Tenant Satisfaction
- NI 184 - Food Establishments
- NI 185 - CO² Reduction (Local Authority)
- NI 186 - CO² Reduction (Per Capita)
- NI 194 - Air Quality
- LPI 23 - Capital Projects

10. Having regard to the issues raised above, the year-end position with regard to the achievement of target performance for the KPIs for 2009/10, is as follows:

- (a) 31 (53.4%) achieved the performance target for 2009/10;
- (b) 20 (34.5%) did not achieve the performance target for 2009/10;
- (c) 8 (40%) of those (20) that did not achieve the performance target for 2009/10 were within 5% of the target for the year;
- (d) 4 (6.9%) cannot currently be reported;
- (e) 1 (1.7%) was not required to be measured in 2009/10;
- (f) 1 (1.7%) was not required to subject to a performance target; and
- (g) 1 (1.7%) was not reported during 2009/10.

11. The removal of the seven indicators in categories (d) to (g) above bring the current reportable level of KPI target achievement for 2009/10 to 60.8%. This outturn position could obviously increase once performance for the outstanding four indicators (NI 184, 185, 186

and 194) is known.

12. The Scrutiny Panel is requested to note the Council's performance in relation to its KPIs for 2009/10. Relevant service directors will be in attendance at the meeting to respond to members' questions in respect of performance against specific indicators and targets, and this report will also be considered by the Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee at its meeting on 14 June 2010.

Consultation Undertaken:

The performance information set out in this report has been submitted by each appropriate Service Director, and has been reviewed and considered by the Corporate Executive Forum and will also be considered by the Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee at its meeting on 14 June 2010. Submitted performance information has been tested by the Performance Improvement Unit in accordance with the Council's Data Quality Strategy.

Resource Implications:

The respective Service Director will identify the resource requirements for any proposals for corrective action in respect of areas of KPI under-performance during 2010/11.

Legal and Governance Implications:

There are no legal implications or Human Rights Act issues arising from the recommendations in this report, which ensure that the Council monitors progress against its corporate KPI improvement target for 2010/11, and that proposals for corrective action are considered in respect of areas of current under-performance.

Safer, Cleaner and Greener Implications:

The respective Service Director will identify any implications arising from proposals for corrective action in respect of areas of KPI under-performance during 2010/11, in respect of the Council's commitment to the Nottingham Declaration for climate change, the corporate Safer, Cleaner and Greener initiative, or any Crime and Disorder issues within the district.

Background Papers:

Fourth quarter and annual KPI calculations and submissions held by the Performance Improvement Unit.

Impact Assessments:

Risk Management

The respective service director will identify any risk management issues arising from proposals for corrective action in respect of areas of KPI under-performance during 2010/11.

Equality and Diversity:

Did the initial assessment of the proposals contained in this report for relevance to the Council's general equality duties, reveal any potentially adverse equality implications?

No. However, the respective Service Director will identify any equality issues arising from proposals for corrective action in respect of areas of KPI under-performance during 2010/11.

Where equality implications were identified through the initial assessment process, has a formal Equality Impact Assessment been undertaken? N/A

What equality implications were identified through the Equality Impact Assessment process?
N/A

How have the equality implications identified through the Equality Impact Assessment been addressed in this report in order to avoid discrimination against any particular group? N/A