

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**15 JUNE 2009**

**APRIL (PERIOD 1) PERFORMANCE REPORTING**

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Cllr Roger Hollingworth
Responsible Head of Service	Hugh Bennett, Assistant Chief Executive
Non Key Decision	

**1. SUMMARY**

1.1 To report to Performance Management Board on the Council's performance at 30 April 2009 (period 1).

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That the Board notes that 52% of PIs are stable or improving.

2.2 That the Board notes that 50% of PI's that have a target are meeting their target as at the month end and 97% are projected to meet their target at the year end.

2.3 That the Board notes the performance figures for April 2009 as set out in Appendix 2.

2.4 That the Board notes the particular areas of improvement as summarised in section 3.5.

2.5 That the Board notes the PI's of particular concern as set out in section 3.6.

**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.

3.3 This is the first performance report for the 2009/10 year, using the revised corporate PI set. The set of corporately reported PI's has been revised to

ensure they reflect current priorities and also to take account of the revised assessment methodology that the Council will be judged on under CAA. There are a total of 101 PI's in the corporate set, 34 reported monthly, 27 quarterly and 40 annually. Many of the annually reported PI's are outcome measures.

3.4 The figures for PI's improving or stable and meeting monthly target (see 2.1 and 2.2 above) are somewhat lower than usual and could be viewed as cause for concern. However this is the first performance report for the year, some of the PI's are new, many of the missed targets were missed by a relatively small amount and much of the decline in performance compared to March is a relatively small amount. On that basis this is not yet cause for concern. Similarly it is difficult to make accurate outturn predictions after just one month; hence most outturns are predicted the same as target in the absence of any better information. Reports in the next few months will give an increasingly informed view of performance as these will be based on more than one month's data. Nonetheless, it is possible at this early stage to identify one area performing above expectation and one cause for potential concern.

3.5 Performance worthy of particular mention is as follows:

- The recycling rate is considerably above the monthly target for April, due mainly to more people than expected signing up for the chargeable green waste service.

3.6 Performance of potential concern is as follows:

- Sickness absence, although improved on the March figure, is still too high. A rapid and sustained reduction is required if this years target of 8.75 days is to be met (the target has been held at last years' level in light of performance, rather than being reduced to 8.5 days as was previously planned).

#### **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 Performance Summary for April 2009

Appendix 2 Detail Performance report for April 2009

Appendix 3 Detailed figures to support the performance report

15. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

**Contact officer**

Name: John Outhwaite, Senior Policy & Performance Officer

email: [j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk)

Tel: (01527) 881602