

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

2 JUNE 2010

APRIL (PERIOD 1) PERFORMANCE REPORTING

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

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS





- 1.1 To report to Cabinet on the Council's performance at 30 April 2010 (period 1).

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Cabinet notes the changes to the corporately reported PI set and the changes to the structure of the report as described in section 3.3.
- 2.2 That Cabinet notes that 56% of PI's where information is available have met or their monthly target in April.
- 2.3 That Cabinet notes the performance figures for March 2010 as set out in Appendix 2.
- 2.4 That Cabinet notes the particular areas of improvement as summarised in section 4.2.
- 2.5 That Cabinet notes the PI's of particular concern as set out in 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:-

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
|  | On Target |
|  | Less than 10% from target |
|  | More than 10% from target |
|  | No target set |

| | |
|------------|---------------------------------|
| I | Performance is Improving |
| S | Performance is Stable |
| W | Performance is Worsening |
| N/a | No target set |

- 3.2 Comparisons of overall performance improvements this month to last month are shown on Appendix 1. As this is the first month of the new financial year summary figures for this month only are shown in this Appendix this time.

3.3 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. The revised set of PI's was proposed in the Council Plan. The format of the report remains the same but the order in which performance indicators are reported has changed. Indicators are grouped under the new Shared Services departments that are responsible for each PI. As this is the first report of the new financial year and because of the changes to the PI set then for this month the usual reporting as to whether performance is Improving, Stable or Worsening (the I,S,W analysis) is not reported. This will resume in the May performance report when it will be possible to compare performance in May to that in April.

4. KEY ISSUES

4.1 The proportion of PI's that have met their monthly target is low, at 56%, 26% of indicators have missed their monthly target by more than 10%.

4.2 There is no performance worthy of particular mention this month.

4.3 As this is the first month of the year it is too early to raise concerns about whether specific indicators might not meet their annual target. However, in general terms, the proportion of PI's that have not met their April target (44%) is not a good start to the new financial year. Whether this is a temporary 'blip' or is cause for concern will begin to become clearer when figures for May are available.

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

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

2 JUNE 2010

16.1 None

17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

17.1 None

18. LESSONS LEARNT

18.1

19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

19.1 None

20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Portfolio Holder | No |
| Chief Executive | No (annual leave) |
| 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 (at CMT) |
| 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

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

Tel: (01527) 881602