

Response to PMB questions raised regarding June Performance report

At PMB in August members asked for an explanation of the apparently large drop in the percentage of PI's that were improving or stable in June (67%) compared to 80% in May. This paper provides further detail.

Members will recall that in April the Council moved to reporting on a smaller number of Performance Indicators in order to focus on priority areas. It was also decided that some PI's would be reported monthly and some quarterly.

In May 35 PI's were reported on, of which 28 were Stable or Improving, which gives a percentage figure of 80%

In June, as this was a quarter end, more PI's were reported – a total of 43, of which 29 were Stable or Improving, which gives a percentage figure of 67%.

As can be seen from the figures above a similar number of actual PI's were stable or improving in both months.

The following table shows the PI's that were improving or stable in both May and June (where performance was stable or improved over the previous month it is highlighted in green). It also shows those PI's where performance has worsened from May to June in red.

Therefore members concerns about a possible drop off in performance centre around 5 indicators, three of which did not meet their targets in June, these being violent crime, missed household waste collections and response to excess charge appeals.

Whether PI's are improving, stable or falling is one means of assessing overall performance, but it also needs to be considered in conjunction with the proportion of PI's on target at this point in the year and also the projected proportion of PI's expected to meet their target at the year end. Just because performance has worsened it is not necessarily a cause for concern, for instance, using a couple of examples in the table overleaf:

- BV78b performance was not as good in June as it was in May, but, at 7.86 days it was still more than 2 days better than the target of 10 days.
- % of helpdesk calls closed within timescales fell from 95.45% in May to 89.95% in June, but that is still better than the target of 86%.

Conversely just because performance has improved it does not necessarily mean there is no need to look closely at the PI. For instance it can be seen that BV78a performance improved from May to June, however even though it had improved it was flagged in the list of PIs of potential cause for concern in the June report because of other underlying issues.

The introduction of variable reporting frequency has led to a different number of PI's being reported at quarter end compared to other months, thus comparisons of

percentages between a quarter end month and a non-quarter end month might not give as clear a picture as used to be the case when PI's were reported monthly. Further consideration will be given to how best to report movements from one period to the next.