

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD

16TH DECEMBER 2008

SIX MONTHLY REVIEW OF ESTIMATED OUTTURN

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Cllr Mike Webb, Portfolio Holder for Customer Care & Service
Responsible Head of Service	Hugh Bennett, Assistant Chief Executive
Non Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 To report to The Board on the Council's performance at the mid year point (end September) on all performance measures published in the 2008/09 business plans.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That The Board notes that 82% of corporately reported PIs are projected to meet or exceed their target (as previously reported in the Quarter 2 integrated performance report) and that 77% of all targets set in business plans are expected to be met.
- 2.2 That The Board notes the overall positions for each department on all their performance targets as set out at para 3.3.
- 2.3 That The Board notes the recommendations made to Leaders' Group about those performance indicators which are included in business plans but not regularly reported as part of the corporate PI set (see section 3.4) and make recommendations if deemed appropriate.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Each year Heads of Service include a number of performance measures and targets in the departmental business plans. A subset of these targets, those which most closely support the corporate priorities of the Council, are included in the Council Plan. This set is referred to 'corporately reported' PIs and it is these that are reported on each month and quarter in the Monthly Performance reports and Quarterly Integrated Finance & Performance reports which are submitted to members. The other PIs which are included in the departmental business plans are monitored within each Department and are discussed and managed at Departmental Management Team meetings (DMTs).
- 3.2 This report provides a mid year view of our progress against all of the performance measures and targets that were published in the business plans. The summary position analysis is shown by department in section 3.3

below. Appendix 1 contains the detailed list of targets, the mid year position and estimated outturn with a commentary where appropriate.

- 3.3 The departmental analysis is shown in the table below, as can be seen from the table performance against all targets in business plans, compares favourably with performance against targets for the corporately reported subset of indicators. 77% of all targets set in business plans are expected to be met, compared to 82% of targets declared in the Council Plan.

Department	Number / % of PI's expected to meet target (green)	Number/ % of PI's expected to miss target but by less than 10% (amber)	Number/ % of PI's expected to miss target by more than 10% (red)
Streetscene and Community	31 (94%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)
Planning and Environment	8 (100%)	0	0
Chief Executives department	8 (54%)	2 (13%)	5 (33%)
Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services	10 (77%)	3 (23%)	0
Human Resources & Organisational Development	3 (37.5%)	0	5 (62.5%)
Financial Services	14 (67%)	4 (19%)	3 (14%)
E Government and Customer Services	12 (100%)	0	0
Overall Council	86 (77%)	11 (10%)	14 (13%)

- 3.4 Preparation of this report has highlighted that the quality of the management of those performance measures that are managed at DMT's is variable and not, in some cases, as robust as the processes and procedures that have been in place for the corporately reported PI set. Issues and recommendations to address these are as follows:

- The Corporate system, based on Excel spreadsheets, for capturing performance information for corporately reported Performance

indicators was changed last year so that it could also be used by Departments to record performance information on those other performance measures and targets in their business plans that are managed within the department and at DMTs. The idea being that this would enable departments to have a repository of all performance information pertaining to the department in a single place. Not all departments have taken up this option. In some cases where performance information was not kept on the Excel spreadsheet it took some time to be delivered for use in this report, thus suggesting that it might not be stored appropriately. It is therefore RECOMMENDED that it becomes mandatory to use the corporate system to record all performance information, both for corporately reported PIs and those reported only at DMT.

- In other cases it became clear that there is scope for differing interpretation of those local performance measures and targets which are not corporately. At the moment those PI's which are corporately reported are supported by a PI procedure note which sets out, amongst other things, the definition of the PI and the method of calculation. It is RECOMMENDED that from 2009/10 onwards all performance measures that are included in Business Plans have a PI procedure note, whether they are corporately reported PI's or not.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no financial implications

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no legal implications.

6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

- 6.1 Performance reporting & management links to the Improvement objective

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

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

- Data quality problems
- Poor performance

- 7.2 These risks are being managed as follows:

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

8 CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 Performance Improvement is a Council Objective

9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no implications for the Council's Equalities and Diversity Policies.

10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 ■ There are no VFM implications

11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Procurement Issues None
Personnel Issues None
Governance/Performance Management – Production of the performance report supports the aim of improving performance & performance management
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime & Disorder Act 1988 None
Policy None
Environmental None

12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Please include the following table and indicate 'Yes' or 'No' as appropriate. Delete the words in italics.

Portfolio Holder	Yes(At Leader's Group)
Chief Executive	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director (Partnerships & Projects)	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director (Services)	Yes (at CMT)
Assistant Chief Executive	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	Yes (at CMT)
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes (at CMT)
Head of Organisational Development & HR	Yes (at CMT)
Corporate Procurement Team	Yes (at CMT)

13. WARDS AFFECTED

All Wards'.

14. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 detailed estimated outturn information by Department

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

Contact officer

Name: John Outhwaite, Senior Policy & Performance Officer

email: j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk

Tel: (01527) 881602

