

**Review of Corporate Business Scrutiny Basket of Performance Indicators**

**Recommendations**

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Recommendations</b>
<b>Healthcheck report: Rolling 12 month data.</b>	Members would like to see trend charts that show 12 months of data so more information can assist them in trend analysis.	Suggestion has been tested and an example of the trend chart is included in Essential Reference Paper 'B'.	<b>The format of all scrutiny healthcheck reports are updated to show 2 years of trend data.</b> Members could see from the example report generated that it would assist in analysis and understanding seasonal trends.
<b>Healthcheck report: Performance Indicator Reference paper – layout and structure</b>	Members would like to know if the reference paper could be structured to show them being sorted by service and then by priority. Rather than the current set up which is by performance status, priority and then by service.	This can not be accommodated, as by default the system has been set to sort by status i.e. red, amber and green.	Members accepted that the healthcheck report can only be sorted by status i.e. red, amber and green. No further recommendations necessary.
<b>Healthcheck report: maximising and minimising orientation</b>	Members would like to know if the maximising and minimising orientation of performance indicators can be worded in a way so that performance indicators all follow a single orientation? I.e. are all maximising indicators.	Suggestion has been tested. See file attached above.	<b>Wording is added to all indicators in the indicator title section indicating whether it is a minimising or maximising measure.</b> Again members could see from the example report generated that this helped providing additional contextual information.

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Swims and gym usage – EHPI 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b</b></p>	<p>The usage numbers do not mean anything to members of Corporate Business Scrutiny (CBS). Members would find volume and cost more useful to them.</p> <p><i>What we need to know – Are there performance indicators that can show the cost to the council per swim/gym user?</i></p>	<p>The service has introduced a new unit cost measure for 2012/13 to provide a more meaningful tool and to better reflect the focus of the service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Net cost of the Leisure Service per user: The total users of the service divided by the net expenditure cost for the Leisure Service.</li> </ul> <p>The unit measure will be supported by the following performance indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customer Satisfaction: data captured from site based GovMetric stand alone, capturing feedback from all users of the facility (EHPI 1a)</li> </ul> <p>Total users: data captured from the till throughput, member card swipe system and site monitoring of football bookings. This figure will include: casual swimmers; gym users; group exercise users; bowls users; outdoor court users; footballers; crash course users; swimming lessons: private; school &amp; Everyone Active lessons. It will not include spectators for swimming or football.</p> <p>It is important to note that this indicator does fall into the remit of Community Scrutiny committee and would be reported to that committee for monitoring. The only exception to this is if the performance status fell into 'red' or 'amber' and would therefore be reported to CBS as an exception indicator.</p>	<p>Officer explanation was accepted <b>and the new unit cost measure for the Leisure Service be supported.</b></p>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Buildings accessible to people with a disability – EHPI 156</b></p>	<p>There has been no further progress on this indicator in the last three years. (Outturn has always been reported as 91%). As we understand it there are no future planned developments for council owned properties. Therefore is this indicator still relevant?</p> <p>Last update provided on Covalent states:</p> <p><i>“Performance shows that Public Areas in 90.90% of Buildings operated by East Herts Council are suitable for and accessible to Disabled Persons. Targets in future years 2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16 have not yet been decided as to whether any further changes will occur in these years”</i></p> <p><i>What we need to know - Are there any other issues that need to be considered before a recommendation is made to drop EHPI 156 from the CBS Healthcheck PI list?</i></p>	<p>This is an old best value indicator that measures the percentage of authority buildings open to the public in which all public areas are suitable for and accessible to disabled people.</p> <p>Officers support the proposal to drop the indicator as the assessment of whether we comply with the Equality Act in public buildings is the decision of an independent external expert. Therefore compliance is being monitored via another route.</p>	<p><b>EHPI 156 is no longer monitored as part of Corporate Business Scrutiny’s indicator basket.</b> Status will be changed to SPI, as it will continue to be monitored by the service.</p>
<p><b>Commitment compared to profile – EHPI 7.35</b></p>	<p>Members wanted to know the relevance of this indicator when budget variances are already reported in other parts of the Healthcheck report.</p> <p><i>What we need to know - Are there any other issues that need to be considered before a recommendation is made to drop EHPI 7.35 from the CBS Healthcheck PI list?</i></p>	<p>This is a local indicator and monitors the effectiveness of forecasting expenditure of the repairs and maintenance budget. Officers support the proposal to drop the indicator from the CBS basket but will continue to monitor within the service.</p>	<p><b>EHPI 7.35 is no longer monitored as part of Corporate Business Scrutiny’s indicator basket.</b> Status will be changed to SPI, as it will continue to be monitored by the service.</p>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Sickness absence - short &amp; long - EHPI 12a, 12b and 12c</b></p>	<p>Members questioned the relevancy of receiving sickness data when primarily it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A management issue</li> <li>➤ Human Resources Committee receive regular performance management reports.</li> </ul> <p>In terms of how they could influence performance members agreed this could only be achieved by ensuring effective policies were in place, which again would be led by Human Resources Committee.</p>	<p>Director of Finance and Support Services confirmed that sickness data is regularly reported to Human Resources Committee.</p>	<p><b>That sickness data is only reported to Corporate Business Scrutiny when performance is off target.</b> By applying exception reporting to this measure, it will follow the same approach that is applied to measures that fall in Community and Environment's basket of performance indicators when off target.</p> <p>This exception reporting links back to the original Performance Indicator Task and Finish Group's recommendations. Recognising that as Corporate Business Scrutiny has responsibility for overall performance management and the corporate health of the council, they would be advised when any measure from the Corporate Basket of Indicators is either 'red' or 'amber'.</p>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>Council tax - new measures</b></p>	<p>Additional measures to monitor Council Tax and NNDR collection rates to be considered.</p>	<p>The service has already been reviewing its performance measures. The proposed measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Council tax collection, % of current year liability collected</b> - this indicator will measure the % of 'in year' collectable debit, actually collected. The indicator will be measured monthly.</li> <li>➤ <b>NNDR (Business Rates) collection, % of current year liability collected</b> - this indicator will measure % of 'in year' collectable debit, actually collected. The indicator will be measured monthly.</li> </ul> <p>It is recommended that these performance indicators are piloted in 2013/14 to gather performance data so targets can be set for 2014/15 onwards.</p>	<p><b>Support the introduction of two new revenue indicators.</b></p>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>ICT - new measures</b></p>	<p>Measures to monitor effectiveness of ICT have been proposed for 2013/14.</p>	<p>A new set of performance indicators is being developed to measure ICT performance in consultation with ITSG.</p> <p>A suite of eight measures have been agreed. Performance is being captured against the following five indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ EHPI 9.1 - Percentage availability of core systems during supported hours.</li> <li>➤ EHPI 9.2 - Percentage Resolution of Incidents Within 4 Hours</li> <li>➤ EHPI 9.4 - Percentage of Calls Abandoned on ICT Service Desk</li> <li>➤ EHPI 9.5 - Percentage of Calls Resolved at First Point of Contact</li> <li>➤ EHPI 9.6 - Satisfaction with ICT Services</li> </ul> <p>ITSG have proposed that performance be measured for a further three months to establish a proper baseline for performance. Targets will then be set for the performance of the service until the year end.</p> <p>A further three measures have been proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ EHPI 9.3 - Percentage Reduction in the Number of Incidents</li> </ul>	<p><b>Support the introduction of eight new ICT indicators.</b> Baseline data currently being collected during 2013/14 and reported to Corporate Business Scrutiny as part of the Healthcheck report.</p>

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ EHPI 9.7 - Delivery of Key ICT Projects</li> <li>➤ EHPI 9.8 - Delivery of Key Milestones in the ICT Strategy</li> </ul> <p>The reduction in the number of incidents measure will be reported once a 6 month baseline for performance has been established. The delivery of Key ICT Projects indicator will be reported upon from quarter 3 onwards, once the ICT programme has been reviewed and agreed by ITSG. The key milestones indicator will be reported once the ICT Strategy has been agreed.</p>	

Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
<p><b>LG Inform - new measures</b></p>	<p>Having considered the measures that are available on LG Inform, the review team recommend the following are adopted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Council tax average band D tax bill - amount paid to local services (excl parishes). Members feel that this would provide a useful tool to enable comparison of council tax levels across local authorities and be an indicator of whether East Herts is providing value for money.</li> </ul>	<p>Although this measure will provide a comparison of council tax levels across local authorities. Initial analysis could be misleading. Contextual information in terms of understanding the position would be needed to triangulate the data. For example satisfaction levels may need to be considered to see if there is a correlation between lower council tax levels and higher satisfaction ratings. Therefore officers advise that if introduced some caution will need to be given when analysing the data.</p>	<p><b>To test the usefulness of this measure in the first part of 2014/15 following completion of the council's Residents Survey, before making a final decision.</b> The analysis to be reported in the Healthcheck report.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Local Government Ombudsman - Complaints to the local government ombudsman, total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints).</li> <li>➤ Local Government Ombudsman - Total Decisions. Members felt it would be useful to see how many complaints are being received in total and to then be able to generate comparison data where possible. It could be seen as a way of assessing the effectiveness of our own complaints system.</li> </ul>	<p>These measures are already monitored and reported to Corporate Business Scrutiny:</p> <p>The LG Inform measure - Local Government Ombudsman - Complaints to the local government ombudsman, total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints) - is exactly the same as EHPI 5.4 - % of complaints to the Local Government Ombudsmen (LGO) that are upheld. East Herts local indicator is measured annually the same frequency as the LG Inform measure. The added advantage with the LG Inform measure is that you can compare:</p>	<p>Members accepted the recommendation of officers. No further recommendations necessary.</p>



Performance Indicator	Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion	Officer Response	Scrutiny Review - Recommendations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ performance with other authorities. However the Local Government Ombudsman does provide detail in their annual review letter regarding an authority's performance in comparison to others. To date Council has had no determinations against it for over 4 years.</li> <li>➤ The LG Inform measure - <i>Local Government Ombudsman - Total Decisions</i>. This information is collated by the service and also reported as part of the annual review letter. Performance is reported annually to Corporate Business Scrutiny as part of the Comments, Compliments and Complaints (3Cs) annual report. The numbers of complaints received by the LGO are very small. This is therefore not a particularly effective measure in terms of performance monitoring. It is helpful context and that is why it is reported to scrutiny in connection with our own complaints figures.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore officers recommend that the LG Inform measures are not implemented because they duplicate measures that are already in place and would not add any further value.</p>	

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review - Recommendations</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Payroll - employee costs as a percentage of revenue costs, overall. Is this a duplication of EHPI Net cost of Human Resources service to the Council's 2012/13 net cost of services budget.</li> </ul>	<p>Payroll - employee costs as a percentage of revenue costs, overall is not the same as EHPI Net cost of Human Resources service to the Council's 2012/13 net cost of services budget.</p> <p>Officers advise that this measure would be subject to volatility as the indicator is expressed as a percentage of revenue costs. Each year revenue spending is subject to many changes such as changes in capital charges, funding, CEC charges (i.e. internal recharges) and building costs. Therefore it is questionable how useful this measure is and what could be gained from it.</p>	<p>Members accepted the advice of officers. No further recommendations necessary.</p>