

## BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

# CABINET

1 JUNE 2011

### MARCH (PERIOD 12) PERFORMANCE REPORTING

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Mark Bullivant
Relevant Head of Service	Hugh Bennett, Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships
Non-Key Decision	

#### 1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS





- 1.1 To report to Cabinet on the Council's performance at the year ending 31 March 2011 (period 12).

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Cabinet notes that 55% of PIs are stable or improving.
- 2.2 That Cabinet notes that that 59% met their target at the year end.
- 2.3 That Cabinet notes the performance figures for March 2011 as set out in Appendix 2. Detailed figures are shown in Appendix 3.
- 2.4 That Cabinet notes the comparisons to previous years as summarised in section 4.1.
- 2.5 That Cabinet approves the proposed revised reporting format for 2011/12 onwards, as set out in section 4.2 and section 4.3.

#### 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The full list of performance indicators due to be reported monthly is set out in **Appendix 2** where:-

	<b>On Target</b>
	<b>Less than 10% from target</b>
	<b>More than 10% from target</b>
	<b>No target set</b>

<b>I</b>	<b>Performance is Improving</b>
<b>S</b>	<b>Performance is Stable</b>
<b>W</b>	<b>Performance is Worsening</b>
<b>N/a</b>	<b>No target set</b>

- 3.2 Comparisons of overall performance improvements this month to last month are shown on Appendix 1.

#### 4. KEY ISSUES

## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **CABINET**

**1 JUNE 2011**

---

- 4.1 59% of PI's met their target in 2010/11, compared to 69% in 2009/10 and 78% in 2008/09. Although this is lower than previous years it should be noted that a further 14% of PI's missed their target by less than 10%, some of these by a very small margin.
- 4.2 As part of the implementation of the shared service for Policy, Performance and Partnerships team the resource available across Bromsgrove and Redditch Councils has decreased. One of the proposed actions to mitigate this is to move to a standard reporting system for both Councils. Examination of the two systems currently in use shows that the Redditch 'EDC' system is the better of the two systems and it is proposed to use this system to record and report performance for both Councils from 2011 onwards. An additional benefit of this system is that it will save some effort in all departments when they are recording their performance. The format of the performance report will change slightly; an illustrative layout is shown at appendix 4.
- 4.3 As it has already been determined that specific targets will not be applied to performance measures the concept of 'traffic lighting' performance no longer applies, hence, as can be seen in the example report shown at appendix 4, there are no traffic lights shown for each performance indicator. Performance will be identified as either Improving or Worsening.

### **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 None

### **6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 None

### **7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 None

### **8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

- 8.1 Performance reporting & management links to the Improvement objective

### **9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS**

9.1 The main risks associated with the details included in this report are:

- Data quality problems
- Poor performance

9.2 These risks are being managed as follows:

- Implementation of the Data Quality Strategy
- Robust follow up on performance issues, including performance clinics

9.3 There are no Health & Safety considerations.

**10. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 Performance Improvement is a Council Objective.

**11. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 None.

**12. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET MANAGEMENT**

12.1 None.

**13. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON IMPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY**

13.1 None.

**14. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 None.

**15. GOVERNANCE/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

15.1 Sound performance management and data quality are key to achieving improved scores in the Use of resources judgement. This performance report supports that aim.

**16. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING SECTION 17 OF CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998**

16.1 None.

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

1 JUNE 2011

---

**17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

17.1 None.

**18. LESSONS LEARNT**

18.1 Not applicable.

**19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

19.1 None

**20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT**

Portfolio Holder	No
Chief Executive	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director – Leisure, Cultural, Environmental and Community Services	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services	Yes (at CMT)
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships	Yes
Head of Service	Yes (at CMT)
Head of Resources	Yes (at CMT)
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes (at CMT)
Corporate Procurement Team	No

**21. WARDS AFFECTED**

All

**22. APPENDICES**

- Appendix 1 Performance Summary for the period.
- Appendix 2 Detail Performance report for the period.
- Appendix 3 Detailed figures to support the performance report.
- Appendix 4 Sample of revised format performance report

**23. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

**24. KEY**

- PI - Performance Indicator
- NI - National Indicator ( a PI defined by government and used by all Councils)
- LPI - Local Performance Indicator – (a PI defined by Bromsgrove, District Council to measure performance on local priorities)
- CAA - Corporate Area Assessment – the methodology used by the Audit Commission to judge the performance of Councils and partners

**AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: John Outhwaite, Senior Policy & Performance Officer  
email: [j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk)  
Tel: (01527) 881602