WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE COUNCIL

Report by Chief Executive

Council : 31 August 2011

Subject: Key Corporate Performance Indicators for the year 2010/11

1. Purpose

1.1 This report reviews the performance of the Key Corporate Performance Indicators for 2010/11.

2. Background

2.1 Audit Scotland published new Statutory Performance Indicator (SPI) guidance for 2009/10 and further guidance was issued for 2010/11.

2.2 The Public Performance Reporting (PPR) part of the Audit Scotland guidance requires Councils to report formally to the public on a more extensive range of indicators than the 25 SPIs. The Direction requires Councils to add their own indicators under two overarching SPIs known as SPI 1 (Corporate Management) and SPI 2 (Service Performance). The various sub-headings under these are shown below:

Corporate management

SPI 1: Each council will report a range of information, sufficient to demonstrate that it is securing Best Value in relation to:

- responsiveness to its communities
- revenues and service costs
- employees
- assets
- procurement
- sustainable development
- equalities and diversity

Service performance

SPI 2: Each council will report a range of information sufficient to demonstrate that it is securing Best Value in providing the following services (in partnership with others where appropriate):

- benefits administration
- community care
- criminal justice social work
- cultural & community services covering at least sport & leisure, museums, the arts and libraries
- planning (both environmental and development management)
- the education of children
- child protection and children's social work
- housing & homelessness
- protective services including environmental health, and trading standards

- roads and lighting
- waste management services

These classifications are unchanged between 2009/10 and 2010/11.

2.3 The SPI 1 and SPI 2 measures must include all of the 54 SPIs, so that the measures for 2010/11 now comprise:

	SPIs	WDC Indicators (local measures)
SPI 1	10	21
SPI 2	44	28
	-----	-----
Total	54	49
	===	===

All of these 103 measures are shown in Appendix 1 to this report, with

- the Statutory Performance Indicators for 2010/11 being denoted by "#", and
- the locally derived measures being denoted by "*"

2.4 It has been determined that 41 measures constitute the set of Key Corporate Performance Indicators for 2010/11. These 41 measures are denoted by "+" in Appendix 1 to this report.

2.5 It has also been determined that the full set of indicators under SPI 1 and SPI 2 be used as the basis for a 2010/11 Public Performance Report – which is due to be published by the end of September 2011.

2.6 Performance indicators, including the full set of SPI 1 and SPI 2 measures, are now monitored regularly by Departments and progress is reported to respective service committees.

2.7 The performance management framework requires that formal performance reports are submitted to service committees at least half-yearly and quarterly reports on key indicators emailed to committee members quarterly.

2.8 The framework introduces a revised methodology for assessing the 'traffic-light' status of a performance measure. This is now based on target achievement rather than ranking.

2.9 In general, to be 'Green' [ ], a measure needs to have achieved (or exceeded) its target, whereas missing the target by 15% of the target value will result in a 'Red' status [ ]. Just missing the target (0-15% below) will result in an "Amber" status [ ].

2.10 Reports on the Key Corporate Performance Indicators for quarters 1, 2 and 3 of 2010/11 have been submitted to the Audit & Performance Review Committee (references provided under "Background Papers".)

2.11 This report will also be submitted to the meeting of the Audit & Performance Review Committee on 12 October 2011.

3. Main Issues

Overall Performance

3.1 For SPI 1 and SPI 2 there are 103 measures which have been input into the 2010/11 'Scorecard' in Covalent. These are shown in Appendix 1.

3.2 The performance of the 103 measures in 2010/11 is summarised as follows:

	SPI		**Local Measure**		**Total**	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Met or exceeded target	31	57.4	33	67.3	64	62.2
Just missed target	17	31.5	12	24.5	29	28.1
Significantly missed target	6	11.1	2	4.1	8	7.8
Unable to assess (see para. 3.3)	0	0.0	2	4.1	2	1.9
	------	-------	------	------	------	-------
Total	**54**	**100.0**	**49**	**100.0**	**103**	**100.0**
	===	====	===	====	===	====

3.3 For the following two local measures it has not been possible to collect any data in respect of 2010/11:

Measure	Comments
Percentage of Type 3 (2 way interactions between citizen and council) interactions identified as appropriate for electronic service delivery that are delivered electronically	In both instances, the Improvement Service ceased capturing the required data during summer 2010. A replacement measure for 2011/12 was agreed at the Council meeting on 30 March 2011, namely: *Number of citizens using WDC website to access information and use on line* Data for this replacement measure has been collected from February 2011 and will be used to provide a local PI in 2011/12.
Percentage of Type 4 (full transaction e.g. book and pay for service online) interactions identified as appropriate for electronic service delivery that are delivered electronically	

3.4 Of the 103 indicators, 65 (63.1%) showed an improvement in performance from 2009/10 or matched that year's performance, whereas 30 (29.1%) showed a decline in performance. 8 indicators (7.8%) cannot be assessed in this way because they are new indicators where no previous year's data is available or as mentioned at paragraph 3.3 above, it has not been possible to collect the data for two measures.

3.5 Within the 103 measures, performance for the 41 key measures is summarised as follows:

	KCPI	
	No.	**%**
Met or exceeded target	27	65.9
Just missed target	13	31.7
Significantly missed target	1	2.4
	------	-------
Total	**41**	**100.0**
	===	====

Poorly Performing Indicators

3.6 As part of the drive to improve strategic leadership by encouraging a greater level of scrutiny, it is appropriate that Elected Members undertake a further performance scrutiny role by focussing on poorly performing indicators.

3.7 The selection of appropriate indicators for further scrutiny involves applying a number of criteria.

3.8 For SPIs, the criteria used for this purpose are:

- Missed their target for 2010/11;
- Have a downward long-term trend; or
- Are included within the bottom quartile per the mostly recently available benchmarking comparison against all other 31 Scottish local authorities.

(**NB**: although SPI data for all 32 Councils is still published on the Audit Scotland website, benchmarking data is no longer produced by Audit Scotland and so the benchmarking exercise was carried out on the 2009/10 SPI data internally within WDC)

3.9 The indicators have then been sorted depending on whether they have one, two or three of these features. The 'top 2' have all three features and the next 14 have two of these. There are 19 measures with one

poorly performing feature. 19 are performing well since they have none of these three features.

3.10 Appendix 2a has details of the 'top 2' poorly performing SPIs including trend charts to aid interpretation. Appendix 2b covers the next 14 indicators.

3.11 For the locally derived measures, the criteria are:

- missed their target; or
- have a downward long-term trend

Poorly performing local measures with these criteria have been disregarded from further scrutiny if they have not been included in the suite of Key Corporate Performance Indicators for 2011/12.

The indicators are then sorted on whether they have one, or two of these features. The 'top 2' have both features, the next 9 have one feature.

3.12 Appendix 3 has details of the 'top 2' poorly performing locally derived measures, including trend charts to aid interpretation.

3.13 It is recommended that Members of the Committee request further information and explanations from the relevant departments in relation to unsatisfactory performance of specific measures.

Audit of SPIs

3.14 Work is currently being carried out by Internal Audit and External Audit on a sample of SPI measures. The deadline for this work to be finalised is 31 August 2011, by which time audited SPI data needs to be submitted to Audit Scotland via a ProForma spreadsheet document.

4. People Implications

4.1 There are no people implications.

5. Financial Implications

5.1 There are no financial implications.

6. Risk Analysis

6.1 There is a risk that performance will decline without adequate scrutiny by Senior Management and Elected Members. There is also a reputational risk if we fail to meet the new PPR Guidance.

7. Equalities Impact

7.1 No issues are identified at this stage regarding potential equality impact of this report.

8 Strategic Assessment

8.1 The strategic priorities for 2011/12 of social and economic regeneration, financial strategy, asset management and fit for purpose services were agreed by Council on 25 May 2011. In reviewing the local measures to be included in the suite of Key Corporate Performance Indicators for 2012/13, an assessment will be carried out in order to ensure that such measures, combined with the SPI's, together provide appropriate performance measurement across the four strategic priority areas.

9. Conclusions and Recommendations

9.1 The full set of indicators under SPI 1 and SPI 2 are presented for scrutiny by Elected Members.

9.2 It is recommended that Elected Members review the performance of the SPI 1 and SPI 2 measures and request further information or further reports from officers on those measures of concern to them.

9.3 It is recommended that Elected Members approve the use of the SPI 1 and SPI 2 measures as the basis for a 2010/11 Public Performance Report – which is due to be published by the end of September 2011.

.....
David McMillan
Chief Executive
Date: 18 August 2011

Person to Contact: Colin McDougall, Manager of Risk & Performance
Telephone 01389 737436
Email: colin.mcdougall@west-dunbarton.gov.uk

Appendices:
Appendix 1: SPI 1 & 2 – Full list of measures for 2010/11
Appendix 2a: Poorly performing SPIs for 2010/11: Top 2
Appendix 2b: Poorly performing SPIs for 2010/11: Next 14
Appendix 3: Poorly performing locally derived measures for 2010/11: Top 2

Background Papers:
SPI Guidance 2010/11 – Audit Scotland
Report to Council on 30 June 2010
Report to Audit & Performance Review Committee on 8 September 2010 (2010/11: Quarter 1)
Report to Audit & Performance Review Committee on 10 November 2010 (2010/11: Quarter 2)
Report to Audit & Performance Review Committee on 16 March 2011 (2010/11: Quarter 3)

Report to Audit & Performance Review Committee on 16 March 2011 (Statutory Performance Indicators – 2009/10: Benchmarking)

Wards affected: All