CABINET 30 JUNE 2010

MAY (PERIOD 2) 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 Cabinet on the Council's performance at 31 May 2010 (period 2).

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That Cabinet notes that 61% of PIs are stable or improving.
- 2.2 That Cabinet notes that that 45% of PI's that have a target are meeting their target as at the month end and 85% are projected to meet their target at the year end.
- 2.3 That Cabinet notes the performance figures for May 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.

CABINET 30 JUNE 2010

4. KEY ISSUES

- 4.1 The proportion of PI's that have met their monthly target is lower than usual at 45%.
- 4.2 There is no performance worthy of particular mention this month.
- 4.3 There are no particular individual indicators of specific concern. However the overall picture with the majority of indicators not meeting their target in May is concerning, particularly when coupled with the fact that only 61% of indicators are stable or improving and 39% are declining. The overall position has worsened slightly since April. On the other hand, this is only the second month of the year and therefore there is time for performance to be improved and brought up to target.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 None
- 6. <u>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</u>
- 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

CABINET 30 JUNE 2010

- 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.
- 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 Not applicable

CABINET 30 JUNE 2010

19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

19.1 None

20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	No
Chief Executive	No
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	No
Executive Director – Leisure, Cultural, Environmental and Community Services	No
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services	No
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships	Yes
Head of Service	No
Head of Resources	No
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	No
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

CABINET 30 JUNE 2010

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: <u>j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk</u>

Tel: (01527) 881602