

**Overview & Scrutiny Committee**  
**12<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

**\*PART 1 – PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**AGENDA ITEM No.**

**TITLE OF REPORT: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MONITORING REPORT –  
APRIL 2011 TO MARCH 2012**

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF FINANCE, PERFORMANCE AND ASSET  
MANAGEMENT

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 To report progress against Performance Indicators (PIs), for the period April 2011 to March 2012. The full list of performance indicators reported to this Committee in 2011/12 is presented at Appendix A.

**2. FORWARD PLAN**

- 2.1 This report does not contain a recommendation on a key decision and has not been referred to in the Forward Plan.

**3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The targets for the required level of performance against the Council's indicators for 2011/12, were agreed at a member workshop held on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2011. This report, by the use of "traffic light status" enables the Committee to review performance against these targets. The definition of each of the symbols and terms used can be found on the first page of Appendix A.
- 3.2 Due to the cessation of the National Indicator set and the reduction in resources, the Committee agreed a much smaller collection of indicators (61 reduced to 23) would be monitored throughout 2011/12. This has meant a direct comparison with overall performance in 2010/11 is not practical.
- 3.3 Of the 23 performance indicators that are due to be reported for 2011/12, in-year data was available, either monthly or quarterly, for 17 indicators. The other 6 indicators are annual returns only.

- 3.4 Data is now available for some annual indicators and these have been included in Appendix A. These indicators do not form part of the regular reporting 'set' and are only reported once per annum as a result. This report therefore focuses on the year end performance of the 21 indicators where data is available. The Committee will receive details of the remaining 2 (CP LI042 and CP LI045) annual indicators when data is available later in 2012/13.
- 3.5 Throughout the year, where performance is below target, responsible officers for individual PIs have provided reasons for the under performance and details of any remedial action to be taken. These responses have been considered and noted by the Committee.

#### 4. ISSUES

##### 4.1 Performance Comparison – Traffic Light Status

Out of the 23 indicators, the Committee agreed targets for 16. The remainder that had no targets are reported as data entries only.

##### 4.2 For the data available to date for 2011/12:

- 5 indicators met or exceeded the annual target - "Green"
- 5 indicators did not achieve the annual target but performance was within the agreed tolerance level – "Amber"
- 5 indicators did not achieve the annual target and performance was outside the agreed tolerance level – "Red"
- 5 indicators are recorded as data only and have no target
- 1 indicator is no longer required to report data for 2011/12

##### 4.3 Indicators that have a changed traffic light status in the fourth quarter

The performance in the third quarter of 2011/12 was reported to the Committee on 13 March 2012. During the final quarter for 2011/12 the following indicators have had a change in traffic light status:

- 4.3.1 **BV12 Working Days lost due to sickness absence.** Sickness absence in 2011/12 fell below the agreed target of 8 days in the final quarter turning this indicator from amber to green. In November 2003, attendance and long-term absence management policies were introduced. During the life of the last People Strategy, managers were provided with a significant amount of training in managing attendance. In 2009/10, we reduced our absence rate from over 10 days to 8.68 days. In 2010/11, a step change was seen with absence dropping to a rate of 6.51 days. To put this into context, the national average rate in 2010 was 7.7 days per employee, with the public sector rate at 9.6 days per employee and absence in the private sector ranging from 6.9 days to 6.6 days per employee per year. 2011/12 was a more difficult year requiring ongoing work to reduce long-term absence cases, whilst short-term absence performed extremely well. After continued efforts to reduce long-term sick, we finally came in under target at 7.79 days. The CIPD 2011 Absence Survey showed the overall 2011 national rate for absence remained at 7.7 days with public sector at 9.1 days, local government at 9.6 days and the private sector at 7.1 days. Our rate for 2011/12 was nearer private and national sector rates than public sector and

local government rates. We lost nearly two days less per employee than the local government average rate.

4.3.2 **NI 191 Kilograms of residual waste per household.** The year-end result for this indicator is currently an estimate due to the lag time between Hertfordshire County Council confirming the final end of year waste figures and reporting them to NHDC. However, if the estimated figures are confirmed the traffic light status will have turned from green to amber in the fourth quarter. The target for 2011/12 was reduced to 450Kg from 465 Kg in 2010/11. The estimate indicates that we will miss this target by 1Kg per household. However, it should be noted that the direction of travel for this indicator shows an improvement compared with the 2010/11 year-end figure, so despite missing the target, overall performance has improved.

4.3.3 **BV9 Percent of Council Tax Collected.** The total percentage of Council Tax collected in the year was 98.4% compared to the annual target of 99%. This has resulted in the indicator changing from green to amber in the fourth quarter. The results are slightly less than was achieved for 2010/11 (98.63%) but this is still a good level in the current economic climate.

4.3.4 **BV 213 Number of households where homelessness was prevented per 1,000 households.** The 2011/12 result has narrowly missed the target and the indicator has turned from green to red in the last quarter. Early indications are that difficulties accessing private rented sector accommodation and more people approaching the Council for help after they have become homeless have influenced the end of year position. There were 285 cases of homelessness prevention in total for the year. This is slightly less than the 298 cases in 2010/11 but overall there was no change to the direction of travel, as returns are rounded to whole numbers.

#### 4.4 **Direction of Travel**

It is possible to measure the Direction of Travel 16 of the indicators where data is available and comparable. As at 31 March 2012 the data shows:

- 7 indicators had an improved level of performance
- 7 indicators showed a decline in performance
- 2 indicators showed no change in performance (BV213 see 4.4.3)
- 5 indicators did not have comparable data or a direction of travel was not applicable.
- Data is still to be provided for 2 indicators where it will be possible to measure the direction of travel.

#### 4.5 **Indicators that had a “Positive” Direction of Travel**

The 7 indicators that are showing an improved direction of travel compared to 2010/11 are summarised in Table 1.

**Table 1 – Indicators that are showing an improved level of performance in 2011/12 compared to the 2010/11 year end position**

PI No.	Title	2010/11 Value	2011/12 Value
BV 8	% of invoices paid on time	99.54	99.69
BV 175	Racial incidents resulting in further action	75%	100%

PI No.	Title	2010/11 Value	2011/12 Value
CPLI037	% of vacant units in Royston	10.5	9
LI 026	% of H&PPS programmed inspections completed on time (cumulative performance)	58.2	68.6
MILI 015	Number of swims and other visits	1,210,404	1,213,625
NI157c	% of other planning applications determined within 8 weeks	88.3	89.25
NI 191	Kg of residual waste	453	451 (est)

#### 4.6 Indicators that had a “Negative” direction of travel

The 7 indicators that are showing a downturn in the direction of travel compared to 2010/11 are summarised in Table 2.

**Table 2 – indicators that are showing a downturn in performance compared to 2010/11**

PI No.	Title	2010/11 Value	2011/12 Value
BV 9	% of council tax collected	98.63	98.4
BV 10	% of NNDR collected	98.12	98.0
BV12	Working days lost due to sickness absence	6.51	7.79
NI 157a	% of major planning applications determined within 13 weeks	73.77	55.56
NI 157 b	% of minor planning applications determined within 8 weeks	69.31	67.16
NI 192	% of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	50.07	49.51 (est)
NI 193	% of municipal waste sent to landfill	52.11	52.28 (est)

- 4.6.1 **BV9 Percent of council tax collected.** As mentioned in paragraph 4.3.3, this indicator narrowly missed its target in the fourth quarter and the total percent recovered was slightly less than in 2010/11. The Council continues to robustly pursue recovery of Council Tax.
- 4.6.2 **BV10 Percent of NNDR collected.** This indicator exceeded its target of 97%, and has therefore retained a green traffic light status. The total percentage collected has however seen a slight decrease when compared to 2010/11.
- 4.6.3 **BV12 Working Days lost due to sickness absence.** As mentioned in paragraph 4.3.1, despite the downturn in performance compared to 2010/11, this indicator did have a green traffic light status. Sickness absence will continue to be tightly managed throughout 2012/13. The April 2012 figure of 0.64 days shows an improvement on April 2011 (0.89 days).
- 4.6.4 **NI 157a % of major planning applications determined within 13 weeks.** Performance against this indicator is largely determined by the general economic climate. The number of decisions made within 2011/12 was 41% down on the previous year 2010/11 and as such, the impact of any delay in deciding an application was greater. Principally delays were as a result of lengthy negotiations around Section 106 agreements, negotiations to improve the quality of the scheme and referrals to committee. However, the April 2012

figure is 100%, as three out of three major applications were determined within 13 weeks (in April 2011 the figure was 20%).

**4.6.5 NI 157 b % of minor planning applications determined within 8 weeks.**

2011/12 has seen an increase in decisions made of 43%. Lengthy legal negotiations were again a cause of delays within this indicator. The Planning Team is continuing to monitor performance in this area and improve processes wherever possible. In 2012/13, the Committee will receive additional information from the two new indicators that were introduced in order that the whole of the workload of the service can be considered and monitored. Again, within this indicator there has been an improvement in April 2012 (71.43%) compared with April 2011 (59.09%).

**4.6.6 NI 192 % of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting.**

A communications plan is in place that aims to maintain, and if possible increase, the level of landfill diversion through public engagement. Any substantial gains in diversion can only be met by service changes such as increased food waste diversion, removal of card from the organic waste bin, kerbside collection of textiles etc. Communications relating to the potential service changes are included within the annual communications plan.

**4.6.7 NI 193 % of municipal waste sent to landfill** The materials sent to landfill under NI 193 are different to those under NI 191 (Kilograms of residual waste per household) in that NI 193 includes all other kinds of waste, such as street cleansing tonnages, bulky wastes etc. These additional cleansing activities, such as high speed road cleansing, have affected the end of year figure due to the amount of additional waste of this type that was collected.

**4.7 Improved performance**

There are two indicators that have achieved the agreed target (have a green traffic light status) for 2011/12 and have shown an improved direction of travel.

**4.7.1 BV8 Invoices paid on time** The Council is keen to ensure that invoices it receives are paid promptly so that we do not adversely impact the cash flow and hence economic position of our suppliers.

**4.7.2 MI LI015 Number of swims and other visits** Some of our neighbouring authorities have recently shown a decline in the use of leisure facilities. The fact there has been an increase, albeit small, in the use of NHDC facilities demonstrates how the Council can contribute towards improvements in the general health of residents by the provision and encouragement of the use of these facilities.

**5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this monitoring report.

**6 FINANCIAL AND RISK IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 Failure to perform against those indicators which pose significant financial or reputation risk to the Council, such as increasing recycling rates versus the

higher cost implications of sending waste to landfill, are further managed through the Council's risk management framework. The risks are recorded on Covalent and linked to the relevant performance indicator.

## **7. HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no additional Human Resource implications.

## **8. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 The Equality Act 2010 came into force on the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010, a major piece of legislation. The Act also created a new Public Sector Equality Duty, which came into force on the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011. There is a General duty, described in 8.2, that public bodies must meet, underpinned by more specific duties which are designed to help meet them.

8.2 In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty, public bodies must, in the exercise of its functions, give **due regard** to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

8.3 Performance reporting provides a means to monitor whether the Council is meeting the stated outcomes of the district priorities, its targets or delivering accessible and appropriate services to the community to meet different people's needs. Although data is collected for BVPI 174/175 (racial incidents and resulting actions), this is only one aspect of ensuring that NHDC is offering equality of opportunity in its service provision.

## **9. CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND WARD MEMBERS**

9.1 Not applicable.

## **10. RECOMMENDATIONS**

10.1 That the Overview & Scrutiny Committee notes and comments as necessary on the out turn of the performance indicators, for the period from April 2011 to March 2012.

## **11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

11.1 To enable the Committee to fulfil its Terms of Reference to review the performance of the Council in relation to its performance targets.

## **12. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

12.1 None applicable.

## **13. APPENDICES**

13.1 **Appendix A** – Performance Indicators Management Report from April 2011 to March 2012.

## **14. CONTACT OFFICERS**

- 14.1 Fiona Timms  
Performance & Risk Manager  
Tel: 01462 474251  
[fiona.timms@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:fiona.timms@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 14.2 Andrew Cavanagh  
Head of Finance, Performance & Asset Management  
Tel: 01462 474243  
[andrew.cavanagh@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.cavanagh@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 14.3 Katie White  
Corporate Legal Manager  
Tel: 01462 474315  
[katie.white@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:katie.white@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 14.4 Kerry Shorrocks  
Corporate Human Resources Manager  
Tel: 01462 474224  
[kerry.shorrocks@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:kerry.shorrocks@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 14.5 Ian Fullstone  
Head of Development & Building Control  
Tel: 01462 474480  
[ian.fullstone@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:ian.fullstone@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 14.6 Vaughan Watson  
Head of Leisure & Environmental Services  
Tel: 01462 474641  
[Vaughan.watson@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:Vaughan.watson@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 14.7 Howard Crompton  
Head of Revenues, Benefits and IT

## **15. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- . Information recorded on Covalent the Council's performance and risk management software.