## PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD

14 JUNE 2010

### **APRIL (PERIOD 1) PERFORMANCE REPORTING**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr Roger Hollingworth
Relevant Head of Service	Hugh Bennett, Director of Policy,
	Performance and Partnerships
Non-Key Decision	

### 1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

1.1 To report to Performance Management Board on the Council's performance at 30 April 2010 (period 1).

### 2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That The Board 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 The Board notes that 56% of Pl's where information is available have met or their monthly target in April.
- 2.3 That The Board notes the performance figures for March 2010 as set out in Appendix 2.
- **2.4** That The Board notes the particular areas of improvement as summarised in section 4.2.
- **2.5** That The Board 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.

## PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD

14 JUNE 2010

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. <u>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</u>
- 6.1 None
- 7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS
- 7.1 None
- 8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

## PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD

14 JUNE 2010

8.1 Performance reporting & management links to the Improvement objective

## 9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1The 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. <u>VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET MANAGEMENT</u>
- 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.

## PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD

14 JUNE 2010

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

16.1 None

### 17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

17.1 None

## 18. <u>LESSONS LEARNT</u>

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)

## PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD

14 JUNE 2010

Corporate Procurement Team	No

### 21. WARDS AFFECTED

ΑII

### 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