

**Review of Community Scrutiny Basket of Performance Indicators**

**Recommendations**

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Housing Benefit - EHPI 181</b></p>	<p>Concern that residents could look at the performance of this indicator and conclude that it will take 8.5days (performance in May 2013) from submitting their claim to actually being paid. When in reality it is much longer, especially when documentation may need to be checked and additional information supplied.</p> <p><i>What we need to know - Can we confirm exactly what this performance indicator is measuring? Can a measure be introduced to show how quickly applicants receive payment?</i></p>	<p>EHPI 181 was previously NI 181 and is defined as 'The average time taken in calendar days to process all new claims and change events in Housing Benefit'. The <b>time taken to process is</b> - 'The time elapsed between receipt of claim or notification of change event and a decision being recorded' and the <b>Date of receipt is</b> - 'Date that notification of the claim or change event was received by the authority'.</p> <p>The indicator measures the time from the start to the end of processing, so it is all days including weekends and bank holidays. So from when the information is received to when an assessment/decision is actually processed in the system. Payment is made in accordance with the regulations. Council Tax support for example is credited to their Council tax account immediately. However payment to a landlord is made 4 weekly in arrears. We have no control</p>	<p><b>No additional monitoring to be undertaken to measure the speed of payment.</b></p> <p>Accepted officer advice and noted that payments are made in accordance with regulations and there is no facility on the software system to generate this data.</p>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
		<p>over the regulations which state the payment periods.</p> <p>Currently there is not a facility on the software system to generate data on the speed of payment and it is unlikely the software company would be interested in developing one, as it is not a national requirement.</p> <p>The important part is that we process the new claims and changes of circumstances quickly so that customers know what they are entitled to.</p> <p><i>Changes in circumstances</i> – when there is a claim already in payment, the revised award affects their next payment. For example if on Monday we process a change in circumstances which increases entitlement, and it <i>just so happens</i> that it is in the same week as their payment cycle, the adjustment payment will be done in the week. Similarly if the adjustment reduces entitlement retrospectively it will also be adjusted for in that week's payment run.</p>	

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Food Inspections - EHPI 184</b></p>	<p>Can the indicator title be changed to remove the reference to 'broadly' so it reads 'Food establishments in the area which are compliant with food hygiene law'? The members are aware that the term comes from the Food Standards Agency <i>Food Law Code of Practice</i> and that the indicator will continue to be measured in line with this guidance. However they are concerned that the term 'broadly' could be interpreted differently by a resident who is not aware of the full technical definition.</p> <p><i>What we need to know - Can we amend the title?</i></p>	<p>The service has recommended that the term 'broadly' should not be removed from the title description. The reason is that this would be very misleading to the public as many food businesses are not fully compliant, hence why everyone isn't rated at 5; even 5 ratings can have some minor issues. This is why the industry uses broadly compliant.</p>	<p><b>The term 'broadly' be retained in the title description.</b> Members accepted the advice of the officer.</p>
<p><b>Customer satisfaction with leisure facilities - EHPI 1a</b></p>	<p>Can the following be added to the indicator title 'leisure facilities'? To make it clear that this is the satisfaction level across all five sites.</p> <p><i>What we need to know - Are you happy for the title to be amended?</i></p>	<p>The service has confirmed 'leisure facilities' can be added to the title to make the indicators more understandable.</p>	<p><b>Additional wording of 'leisure facilities' be added to the title to make the indicator more understandable.</b></p>

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Recommendations</b>
<b>Customer satisfaction with leisure facilities - EHPI 1a - 1f</b>	<p>Do the schools as 'customers' complete the survey information.</p> <p><i>What we need to know</i> - Does it capture feedback from school users?</p>	<p>Survey information is captured from the GovMetric stand alone units that facility users complete as an anonymous exit survey. Customers/users are not directly asked to complete the comments or survey.</p>	<p>Members found officer explanation useful in understanding how the surveys are conducted and appreciated that there are additional feedback mechanisms also available from user groups e.g. football and gym.</p>
<b>Usage (swims) - EHPI 3a</b>	<p><i>What we need to know</i> - Does this data include school numbers?</p>	<p>No, this data is compiled from casual pay as you go users and members that are swiped in at reception.</p>	<p>Members accepted that no additional data collection method is necessary.</p>
<b>Usage - EHPI 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b (swims and gyms)</b>	<p>Can usage data be broken down further by site? For example Members raised concern about access to the pool for 60+, in particular the difficulty some older people have getting in and out the pool. It was felt that by having the next layer of data they could see if there was a difference between sites.</p> <p><i>What we need to know</i> - Can this level of data be accessed? Could this information be provided as additional context when the overall usage figure is reported?</p>	<p>Data is collected as male &amp; female then totalled per site and reported as a total in age group.</p> <p>Reporting of a further breakdown of type of user would involve a great amount of officer time in collating the information and it is unclear how this detail could be effectively utilised.</p>	<p>Members recognised that no further breakdown of type of user will be necessary, but would like to know if all/any of the sites have the option available to be adapted for better accessibility to the swimming pool. <b>The issue of accessibility to be raised with SLM when they attend Community Scrutiny to present the Annual Report.</b></p>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Usage - EHPI 4a and 4b (gyms)</b></p>	<p>Members commented that gym usage is much higher than swims for 16 - 60 year olds.</p> <p><i>What we need to know</i> - Could officers clarify if a customer uses the gym and then afterwards uses the pool, is this usage counted twice (use of gym and use of pool) or once for both.</p>	<p>If users use the gym then swim they are counted as one visit.</p>	<p>Officer explanation was accepted.</p>
<p><b>Net additional homes provided - EHPI 154</b></p>	<p>Can the data be broken down further to show who provided the additional homes? For example private developer, housing association etc</p> <p><i>What we need to know</i> - Can this level of data be accessed? Could this information be provided as additional context when the overall figure is reported?</p>	<p>Yes the data can be broken down to show who provided the additional homes. For example in 2011/12 383 net additional homes were provided. All of which were provided by housing associations. The outturn for 2012/13 is still being analysed and is due shortly.</p>	<p><b>Service continues to provide contextual information when performance data is reported annually.</b></p>
<p><b>Response to ASB complaints - EHPI 129</b></p>	<p>Aware that this indicator measures the speed of response 'Number of ASB complaints made or referred to EHC ASB Officer that of the ASB.</p> <p><i>What we need to know</i> - Can a new measure be introduced to record performance regarding the 'resolution' of the ASB? We</p>	<p>The service has expressed that a new measure cannot be introduced to measure the 'resolution' as no two cases are the same.</p> <p>When taking the initial call the complainant will always be advised of when they can expect an update; whether that be a call back from the</p>	<p><b>No additional monitoring in respect to anti social behaviour to be undertaken.</b></p> <p>Officer explanation was accepted.</p>

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Recommendations</b>
	<p>appreciate that this may be difficult as the type of ASB will differ significantly. But are you able to categorise them in any way e.g. noisy neighbour.</p>	<p>service or another partner that week, or a letter with a diary etc. in order to manage their expectations at the earliest stage. They are also advised that the resolution will inevitably require liaison with another agency within the partnership.</p> <p>The nature of the complaint will determine the course of action. For example if a complaint is in regards to a park and open space and there is a need for some foliage to be lifted this may be something that could be remedied quite quickly following a site visit and approval for works. However if the complaint is in regards to some on-going problems with a neighbour which is a housing association property, the resolution of the problem could be significantly longer whilst evidence is gathered and processes followed by the housing association.</p>	

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Recommendations</b>
<p><b>Unit cost EHPI 8.34a - Net cost of Licensing per LA2003 Premises Licences and 8.34b - Net cost of Licensing per all Premises Licenses (LA2003, GA2005 and Misc)</b></p>	<p><i>What we need to know</i> - Can the indicator be made clearer by defining what is meant by LA2003 Premises License, GA2005 Premises License and Miscellaneous</p>	<p>The code LA2003 means Licensing act 2003 and this covers the selling of alcohol in pubs.</p> <p>The code GA2005 means gambling act 2005 which covers for the use of gambling machines i.e. one arm bandits.</p> <p>(It should be noted that EHPI 8.34b calculates the use of not only GA2005 but is also combination of the above LA2003 and misc)</p>	<p>Officer explanation was accepted.</p>
<p><b>Unit cost EHPI 8.40 - Net cost of the Homelessness Service per presentation</b></p>	<p><i>What we need to know</i> - Can the financial information used in the calculation be detailed?</p>	<p>The financial information used to calculate the unit cost is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ employee costs e.g. salaries</li> <li>➤ transport related expenses</li> <li>➤ supplies and services e.g. stationery, postage, photocopying, printing etc</li> </ul>	<p>Members found officer explanation useful in understanding the financial information used to calculate this unit cost.</p>

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Recommendations</b>
<p><b>Benefits - new measures</b></p>	<p>Additional benefit measures in particular to monitor Council Tax Support should be considered.</p>	<p>The service has already been reviewing its performance measures in light of the recent government changes to benefits and council tax support. The proposed measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Housing Benefit caseload</b> - this indicator will measure the total number of recipients of housing benefit with live claims on a particular date. The indicator will be measured monthly.</li> <li>➤ <b>Council Tax Support caseload</b> - this indicator will measure the total number of recipients of council tax support with live claims on a particular date. The indicator will be measured monthly.</li> <li>➤ <b>A further indicator will be introduced to measure the processing of council tax support.</b> Currently waiting feedback from the software supplier regarding the measure that could be developed.</li> </ul> <p>It is recommended that all performance indicators are piloted over 2013/14 to gather performance data so targets can be set for 2014/15 onwards.</p>	<p><b>Support the introduction of the new benefits indicators.</b></p> <p>The service is still waiting feedback from the software supplier regarding a performance measure on the processing of council tax support (CTS) and in the interim are using EHPI 181 to be indicative of the performance on CTS, they are assessed simultaneously in the vast majority of cases.</p>



Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Markets - new measures</b></p>	<p>An indicator (s) so the Committee can monitor the effectiveness of the local markets in the district in supporting the economic vibrancy of the towns. For example measuring the usage of pitches used / the total number of pitches available. We have assumed that there must be a planning limit on the number of pitches each market can have.</p> <p><i>What we need to know</i> - Could a measure as described above be introduced? Can we show this by market to see if there is a difference by area?</p>	<p>The service has proposed the following market indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Rental income from Traders</b> - This will be a useful indicator because it's the best way of showing evidence of the revenue value of markets to the Council. When the markets are performing well our rental increases – the opposite applies when they perform badly. It is fairly easy to measure as the income can be counted on a weekly basis. The markets that will be included are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Hertford Saturday</li> <li>➤ Bishops Stortford Saturday</li> <li>➤ Bishops Stortford Thursday</li> <li>➤ Ware Tuesday</li> <li>➤ Plus individual pitch hires in Hertford and Ware during the week.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ <b>Number of Producers at Hertford Farmers Market</b> - a number of measures have</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreed the new performance measures for Markets.</b></p>

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Recommendations</b>
		<p>been undertaken over the last couple of years to improve the performance of the market. As a result the number of stalls have increased from approximately 14 to 20 plus on a regular basis. The stall numbers are a good indicator of the viability of the market but also of our own contribution to the performance. High performing markets also contribute to town centre vibrancy as well as the individual businesses trading at the market.</p> <p>These new performance indicators will be measured on a quarterly basis. No targets have currently been set as they will need to be piloted first to establish a benchmark base.</p>	

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Hertford Theatre - new measures</b></p>	<p>Keen to see more regular performance data on Hertford theatre, not just as part of the annual report. For example could more regular data be made available on the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Percentage of theatre time allocated - purpose - to get an understanding of capacity and usage. Allocation could be determined as 'in use by shows, cinema showings, private hirers etc'. Allocation could be broken down by room - main auditorium; river room and studio.</li> <li>➤ Ticket sales - % of non ticket sales out of total number available. - purpose - to get an understanding of capacity and usage</li> </ul> <p>It was acknowledged that ticket sale information is provided in the annual report e.g.:</p> <p><i>There were 65 distinct shows (excluding Panto) in 2011/12 against an original business plan target of 30. 12,936 tickets were sold with an average attendance of</i></p>	<p>Additional information can be reported in the Annual Report presented to scrutiny. Head of Service to attend meeting to discuss further.</p>	<p><b>Agreed that no new performance indicators will be required. Supported the inclusion of more management data in the Annual Report, showing the occupancy levels of all shows; room hire rate for the main hall, the studio and the river room.</b></p> <p>Members also accepted that work is currently under way to help improve the attractiveness of Hertford Theatre for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better offering of bar food and ways to improve the café.</li> <li>• Better use of terraces.</li> <li>• Improved seating.</li> </ul>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
	<p><i>199 per event.</i></p> <p>But what it does not show is whether the total tickets are good or bad in terms of the total number of tickets available across the 65 shows.</p> <p><i>What we need to know</i> - Could a measure(s) as described above be introduced? Appreciate you may have sub parts to ticket sale measures e.g. by show, cinema screening, pantomime?</p>		
<p><b>New measure - Small Businesses and employment growth</b></p>	<p>The member looked at the measures available on LG Inform and were interested in:</p> <p><b>Percentage of small businesses in an area showing employment growth</b></p> <p>This is the percentage of small registered businesses showing year-on-year employment growth. It includes those businesses registered for VAT and/or PAYE with fewer than 50 employees (around 98% of all VAT registered enterprises). It measures the proportion of those businesses</p>	<p>The service does not have access to any other data and would suggest we use the data available on LG Inform.</p> <p>By using the existing data and comparing performance over time we would see whether employment was growing or declining.</p> <p>The data is collected annually on LG Inform from DCLG and the last update relates to 2008. So it is not the most up to date data.</p>	<p>After consideration members felt that this measure would be too out of date to be helpful. No further recommendations were made.</p>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
	<p>showing year on year employment growth, where employment is measured as the number of employees (full and part-time) plus the number of self-employed people that run the business. This was previously reported as NI 172.</p> <p>This data is currently collected by DCLG. However the members wondered if data is available on the following and whether we could access the data to report on it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Percentage of small businesses in an area showing declining employment growth</li> </ul> <p>If we are able to monitor decline as well as growth, they may be able to help influence performance via support to small businesses.</p>		
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<p>Suggested that the Healthcheck report could benefit from an additional reference paper, providing PI descriptions. As not all the information can be contained in the indicator title. Useful reference point for all members.</p>	<p>Performance team to action and introduce for the next Healthcheck report, so wider feedback can be sought. Suggestion to be shared with the other chairs and vice chairs of scrutiny at their meeting in September 2013.</p>	<p><b>Recommend additional information be provided as a reference paper.</b></p>

