Local Government Benchmarking Framework

	Cost of indicatis:	ators where p	erformance	Satisfaction performance	indicators wh	ere	Performance	e indicators w	here
$r \in 10111a110e = 13$	Improved from previous year	Better than Scottish average	Better than Family group average	Improved from previous year	Better than Scottish average	Better than Family group average	Improved from previous year	Better than Scottish average	Better than Family group average
Children's services	20% (1/5)	40% (2/5)	40% (2/5)	100% (1/1)	100% (1/1)	100% (1/1)	73% (19/26)	35% (9/26)	46% (12/26)
Adult & Social Care Services	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)	50% (1/2)	50% (2/4)	100% (4/4)	100% (4/4)	40% (2/5)	60% (3/5)	60% (3/5)
Corporate	100% (1/1)	100% (1/1)	100% (1/1)	n/a	n/a	n/a	54% (7/13)	54% (7/13)	46% (6/13)
Culture & Leisure	50% (2/4)	50% (2/4)	75% (3/4)	100% (4/4)	100% (4/4)	100% (4/4)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Environmental	29% (2/7)	43% (3/7)	43% (3/7)	0% (0/2)	100% (2/2)	100% (2/2)	67% (4/6)	67% (4/6)	83% (5/6)
Housing services	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	40% (2/5)	20% (1/5)	20% (1/5)
Economic development	50% (1/2)	50% (1/2)	50% (1/2)	n/a	n/a	n/a	91% (10/11)	36% (4/11)	27% (3/11)
Climate change	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100% (2/2)	100% (2/2)	100% (2/2)
Finance	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	40% (2/5)	40% (2/5)	40% (2/5)
Total	33%	43%	52%	64%	100%	100%	64%	45%	47%

Children's Services

Pe	erformance Indicator (32)	How we	e perform loca	ally	How we co	mpare na	tionally	Owner
C	= Performance (26) = Cost (5) = Satisfaction (1)	Latest year status	Latest comparative value		-	Scottish average	-	
Ρ	Proportion of children being looked after in the Community		89.6%	^	15th	4	4	ELA
С	The gross cost of "children looked after" in residential based services per child per week £		£3,488	4	4th	^	^	ELA
С	The gross cost of "children looked after" in a community setting per child per week $\mbox{\pounds}$		£238	Ŷ	3rd	^	^	ELA
С	Cost per primary school pupil £	0	£7,062	4	27th	•	4	ELA
С	Cost per secondary school pupil £	0	£8,223	4	21st	•	4	ELA
С	Cost per pre-school place £	0	£12,424	4	29th	4	4	ELA
Ρ	% of pupils gaining 5 + awards at level 5	0	65%	^	25th	•	4	ELA
Ρ	% of pupils gaining 5+ awards at level 6	0	35%	Ŷ	20th	-₽	-	ELA
Ρ	% pupils in 20% most deprived areas getting 5+ awards at level 5	0	52%	^	9th	4	-	ELA
Ρ	% pupils in 20% most deprived areas getting 5+ awards at level 6	0	23%	Ŷ	9th	-	-	ELA
S	% of Adults Satisfied with local schools	0	88.1%	^	1 st	^	^	ELA
Ρ	Percentage of school leavers in positive and sustained destinations	0	95.12%	Ŷ	20th	4	4	ELA

Pe	erformance Indicator (32)	How we	e perform loca	ally	How we co	mpare na	tionally	Owner
C	= Performance (26) = Cost (5) = Satisfaction (1)	Latest year status	Latest comparative value		National position (1st-32nd)	Scottish average		
Ρ	Overall Average Total Tariff	0	899	Ŷ	25th	4	4	ELA
Ρ	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 1	0	725	Ŷ	11th	^	^	ELA
Ρ	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 2	0	982	^	5th	^	^	ELA
Ρ	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 3	0	1,015	4	14th	^	4	ELA
Ρ	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 4	\triangle	1,199	Ŷ	9th	Ŷ	^	ELA
Ρ	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 5	\triangle	1,143	\$	25th	.	^	ELA
Ρ	% of P1, P4 and P7 pupils combined achieving expected CFE Level in Literacy		71.4%	•	13th	^	^	ELA
Ρ	% of P1, P4 and P7 pupils combined achieving expected CFE Level in Numeracy		78.18%	Ŷ	15th	4	4	ELA
Ρ	Literacy Attainment Gap (P1,4,7 Combined) - percentage point gap between the least deprived and most deprived pupils		18.77%	Ŷ	3rd	4	^	ELA
Ρ	Numeracy Attainment Gap (P1,4,7 Combined) - percentage point gap between the least deprived and most deprived pupils		17.63%	•	12th	•	^	ELA
Ρ	Percentage of children who have reached all of the expected developmental milestones at the time of the child's 27-30 month child health review - Early Years Collaborative Stretch Aim	0	73.95%	4	32nd	•	•	ELA
Ρ	% of funded Early Years Provision which is graded good or better	<u> </u>	87.5%	Ŷ	21st	4	^	ELA
Ρ	School Attendance Rates (per 100 pupils)		90.4%	4	31st	4	4	ELA

Pe	erformance Indicator (32)	How we	e perform loca	ally	How we co	mpare na	tionally	Owner
C	-Cost(5)		comparative value		position	Scottish average		
Ρ	School Attendance Rates for Looked After Children (per 100 Looked After Children)		88.2%	Ŷ	17 th	^	^	ELA
Ρ	School Exclusion Rates (per 1000 pupils)		17.9	Ŷ	27 th	4	\$	ELA
	School Exclusion Rates for Looked After Children (per 1000 looked after children)		66.9	Ŷ	10 th	â	â	ELA
Ρ	Participation Rate for 16-19 year olds (per 100)	0	90.1%	4	31 st	4	4	ELA
Ρ	% Child Protection Re-Registrations within 18 months		2.99%	^	9 th	^	^	ELA
	% Looked After Children with more than one placement within the last year		11.7%	Ŷ	7 th	^	^	ELA
Ρ	% of children living in poverty (after housing costs)	0	23.4%	Ŷ	28 th	4	4	H&E

02 Corporate Services

P= Performance (13)	How we perform locally			How we cor	Owner		
P= Performance (13) C= Cost (1)	2	comparative value	Performance against previous year value	position	Scottish average	-	
P Sickness absence days per teacher		2.51	•	8 th	1	^	P&T

	erformance Indicator (14)	How we	e perform loca	ally	How we co	mpare na	tionally	Owner
	= Performance (13) = Cost (1)	Latest year status	comparative		National position (1st-32nd)	Scottish average	-	
Ρ	Sickness absence days per employee (local government)		4.36	₽	23 rd	4	4	P&T
Ρ	Support services as a % of total gross expenditure	0	3.42%	4	7th	^	Ŷ	RES
Ρ	The percentage of the highest paid 5% employees who are women	0	62%	Ŷ	6th	^	^	P&T
Ρ	Gender pay gap	\bigcirc	1.78%	Ŷ	11th	î	^	P&T
Ρ	Percentage of income due from council tax received by the end of the year	0	94.5%	Ŷ	27th	4	4	RES
Ρ	% of invoices sampled that were paid within 30 calendar days	\triangle	90.7%	Ŷ	21st	4	4	RES
Ρ	% of operational buildings that are suitable for their current use	0	93.3%	-	6th	Ŷ	^	RES
Ρ	% of internal floor area of operational buildings in satisfactory condition %	0	91%	-	18th	٦	^	RES
Ρ	Proportion of SWF Crisis Grants decisions within 1 day		94%	^	21st	^	4	CCF
Ρ	Proportion of SWF Community Care Grants decisions within 15 days		77.7%	Ŷ	25th	•	4	CCF
Ρ	Proportion of SWF budget spent		100.8%	₽	26th	4	~	RES
Ρ	Proportion of DHP funding spent		96.7%	Ŷ	11th	^	Ŷ	RES
С	Cost of collecting council tax per dwelling £	0	£5.84	Ŷ	12th	Ŷ	^	RES

03 Adult & Social Services

	erformance Indicator (11)	How w	e perform loca	ally	How we co	mpare na	tionally	Owner
C	= Performance (5) = Cost (2) = Satisfaction (4)	Latest year status	Latest comparative value		National position (1st-32nd)	Scottish average	-	
Ρ	Self-directed support spend for people aged over 18 as a % of total social work spend on adults		2.2%	Ŷ	32nd	•	-	HSCP
С	Home care costs for people aged 65 or over per hour \pounds	~	£31.91	\$	21st	•	^	HSCP
S	% of adults supported at home who agree that they are supported to live as independently as possible (Core Integration Indicator)	0	83.2%	Ŷ	6th	^	1	HSCP
S	% of adults supported at home who agree that they had a say in how their help, care or support was provided		75.1%	4	6th	^	^	HSCP
S	% of carers who feel supported to continue in their caring role (Core Integration Indicator)		31.7%	•	9th	^	^	HSCP
Ρ	Rate of readmission to hospital within 28 days per 1,000 discharges (Core Integration Indicator)		95.9	Ŷ	10th	Ŷ	^	HSCP
Ρ	% Proportion of care services graded "good" or better in Care Inspectorate inspections (Core Integration Indicator)		87.7%	4	4th	^	^	HSCP

	erformance Indicator (11)	How we	e perform loca	ally	How we compare nationally			
C=	= Performance (5) = Cost (2) = Satisfaction (4)	year	comparative value	Performance against previous year value	National position (1st-32nd)	Scottish average	5	
Ρ	Number of days people spend in hospital when they are ready to be discharged, per 1,000 population (75+) (Core Integration Indicator)		1,441	•	28th	•	-	HSCP
Ρ	% of people aged 65 and over with long-term care needs who receiving personal care at home		72.9%	-	2nd	^	•	HSCP
S	% of adults supported at home who agree that their services and support had an impact in improving or maintaining their quality of life (Core Integration Indicator)		85.7%	^	2nd	â	•	HSCP
С	Net Residential Costs Per Capita per Week for Older Adults (65+)		£736	4	26th	4	-	HSCP

04 Culture & Leisure Services	
-------------------------------	--

	erformance Indicator (8)	How we	e perform loca	ally	How we co	Owner		
	= Cost (4) = Satisfaction (4)	Latest year status	comparative value	Performance against previous year value	-	Scottish average	-	
С	Cost per attendance at sports facilities £		£5.50	^	14th	^	^	WDLT
С	Cost per visit to libraries	0	£5.18	4	20th	4	^	CCF
С	Cost per museum visit £	0	£0.31	^	3rd	<u></u>	^	CCF
С	Cost of parks & open spaces per 1,000 population £	0	£48,064	4	32nd	4	4	R&N
S	% of adults satisfied with libraries	<u> </u>	86.7%	Ŷ	3rd	^	^	CCF
S	% of adults satisfied with parks and open spaces	0	87.5%	Ŷ	14th	^	^	R&N
S	% of adults satisfied with museums and galleries	<u> </u>	74.6%	Ŷ	6th	Ŷ	^	CCF
S	% of adults satisfied with leisure facilities	0	75.1%	Ŷ	12th	^	^	WDLT

05 Environmental Services

Pe	erformance Indicator (15)	How w	e perform loca	ally	How we co	mpare na	tionally	Owner
C	= Performance (6) = Cost (7) = Satisfaction (2)	Latest year status	comparative value		National position (1st-32nd)	Scottish average	-	
С	Net waste collection cost per premises	0	£52.84	^	6th	^	1	R&N
С	Net waste disposal cost per premises	0	£132.12	4	28th	4	4	R&N
С	Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population £	\bigtriangleup	£22,991	Ŷ	32nd	4	4	R&N
Ρ	Street Cleanliness Index - % Clean	0	86.9	•	6th	4	^	R&N
С	Road maintenance cost per kilometre £	0	£27,441	•	30th	4	4	R&N
Ρ	% of Class A roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	0	17.6%	Ŷ	6th	Ŷ	^	R&N
Ρ	% of Class B roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	0	17%	Ŷ	1st	â	^	R&N
Ρ	% of Class C roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	0	21.8%	Ŷ	5th	Ŷ	^	R&N
Ρ	Percentage of unclassified roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	0	31.2%	Ŷ	10th	Ŷ	Ŷ	R&N
С	Cost of trading standards and environmental health per 1,000 population \pounds		£19,326	Ŷ	12th	^	^	R&R
С	Cost of trading standards per 1,000 population £		£6,385	4	17th	-₽	-₽	R&R

Pe	erformance Indicator (15)	How we	How we perform locally			How we compare nationally			
C	= Performance (6) = Cost (7) = Satisfaction (2)	year	comparative value			Scottish average	-		
С	Cost of environmental health per 1,000 population £	0	£12,941	•	12th	1	^	R&R	
Ρ	% of total household waste that is recycled		35.6%	•	27th	4	-₽	R&N	
S	% of adults satisfied with refuse collection	\bigtriangleup	81.6%	•	13th	^	^	R&N	
S	% of adults satisfied with street cleaning		68.9%		7th	^	^	R&N	

06 Housing Services

Pe	erformance Indicator (5)	eator (5) How we perform locally		ally	How we compare nationally			
P=	Performance (5)	-	comparative value		position	Scottish average	-	
Ρ	Gross rent arrears (all tenants) as at 31 March each year as a percentage of rent due for the reporting year	<u> </u>	9.2%	Ŷ	14th	4	.₽	RES
Ρ	% of council rent that was lost due to houses remaining empty	0	1.3%	•	12th	^	^	H&E

Pe	erformance Indicator (5)	How we	How we perform locally			How we compare nationally			
P=	= Performance (5)	year	comparative value		position	Scottish average	-		
Ρ	% of council dwellings that meet the Scottish Housing Quality Standard	0	18.2%	4	24th	•	•	H&E	
Ρ	Average time taken (in days) to complete non-emergency repairs	0	10.2	¢	17th	•	•	H&E	
Ρ	% of council houses that are energy efficient		83.7%	4	16th	•	-	H&E	

07 Economic Development

Pe	erformance Indicator (13)	How we perform locally		How we co	Owner			
	= Performance (11) = Cost (2)		comparative value		position	Scottish average	5	
Ρ	% Unemployed People Assisted into work from Council operated / funded Employability Programmes	0	48%	Ŷ	2nd	^	•	H&E
С	Cost per planning application	0	£7,250	4	30th	4	.	R&R
Ρ	Average time taken to deliver a commercial planning application decision	0	13.1	^	21st	4	•	R&R

Pe	Performance Indicator (13)		How we perform locally			How we compare nationally			
	= Performance (11) = Cost (2)	Latest year status	Latest comparative value		National position (1st-32nd)	Scottish average			
Ρ	% of procurement spent on local enterprises (assessed by LGBF)	0	12.7%	Ŷ	31st	4	•	R&R	
Ρ	No of business gateway start-ups per 10,000 population (2022/23)	0	23.35	Ŷ	9th	4	1	R&R	
С	Investment in Economic Development & Tourism per 1,000 population		£152,091	4	7th	4	1	R&R	
Ρ	Proportion of people earning less than the living wage	0	14.6%	Ŷ	10th	4	-	H&E	
Ρ	Proportion of properties receiving superfast broadband		98.9%	Ŷ	2nd	^	Ŷ	R&R	
Ρ	Town Vacancy Rates		14.4%	Ŷ	24th	4	4	R&R	
Ρ	Immediately available employment land as a % of total land allocated for employment purposes	<u> </u>	38.9%	4	13th	^	4	R&R	
Ρ	Gross Value Added (GVA) per capita	2	£19,273	Ŷ	24th	-₽-	4	R&R	
Ρ	Claimant Count as a % of Working Age Population (2022-23)	2	4.6%	Ŷ	30th	•	4	H&E	
Ρ	Claimant Count as a % of 16-24 Population (2022-23)		5.7%	Ŷ	32nd	4	-	H&E	

08 Tackling Climate Change

P	erformance Indicator (2)	How we perform locally			How we co	Owner		
P		-	comparative	Performance against previous year value	position	Scottish average	-	
Ρ	CO2 emissions area wide per capita		3.59	^	10th	1	4	R&R
Ρ	CO2 emissions area wide: emissions within scope of LA per capita		3.61	^	7th	^	^	R&R

09 Finance

			How we perform locally			How we compare nationally			
		Latest year status	comparative value			Scottish average	-		
Ρ	Total useable reserves as a % of council annual budgeted revenue		5.3%	4	32nd	4	4	RES	
Ρ	Uncommitted General Fund Balance as a % of council annual budgeted net revenue		1.4%	-	30th	•	•	RES	
Ρ	Ratio of Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream - General Fund		3.3%	Ŷ	5th	^	1	RES	

			How we perform locally			How we compare nationally			
P	= Performance (5)		comparative value			Scottish average	-		
Ρ	Ratio of Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream - Housing Revenue Account		23.6%	1	16th	4	*	RES	
Ρ	Actual outturn as a percentage of budgeted expenditure	0	100.4%	4	2nd	^	^	RES	

* LGBF data is continually reviewed and updated throughout the year by the Improvement Service and therefore subject to change, data reported is accurate at time of reporting. In addition any modification to any data within the full benchmarking suite may impact our comparative performance.

PI Status			Trends	Trends		
۲	Target significantly missed	Ŷ	Improving from previous performance	1	Higher performance than the national	
\triangle	Target narrowly missed	No change			average	
0	Target met or exceeded		Getting worse from previous		Neither higher nor lower	
	Data only PI		performance		Lower performance than the national average	