

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------|
| 22 January 2013 | | ITEM: 5 |
| Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee | | |
| CORPORATE SCORECARD PERFORMANCE REPORT – MONTH 6/QUARTER 2 (UP TO END OF SEPTEMBER 2012) | | |
| Report of: Cllr Phil Smith, Portfolio Holder for Central Services | | |
| Wards and communities affected: ALL | Key Decision: Non-Key | |
| Accountable Head of Service: Clare Lambert, Environment and Sustainability Manager | | |
| Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Assistant Chief Executive | | |
| This report is Public | | |
| Purpose of Report: To advise Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee of key performance issues arising from the delivery of the Corporate Scorecard 2012-13. | | |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee with a summary of performance against the Corporate Scorecard 2012-13, a basket of key performance indicators, as at Month 6/Quarter 2 ie end of September 2012. These indicators are used to monitor the performance of key priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and enables Members, Directors and other leaders to form an opinion as to the delivery of these priorities.

At the end of Month 6, 23 (50%) of these indicators are meeting their target and 54.84% have improved their performance over last year.

NB. Due to the scheduling of this committee meeting, this covering report has been updated where available with Month 7 data and commentary

1. RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- 1.1 Acknowledges and commends services where there is good delivery against priorities.**
- 1.2 Notes the performance in areas of concern and identifies, where it feels necessary, any further areas of concern on which to focus.**

1.3 Recommends the areas In Focus to be circulated to other relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairs.

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

2.1 This is the Month 6/Quarter 2 [September] performance report for the Corporate Scorecard 2012/13.

3. ISSUES, OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS:

This report is a monthly monitoring report for noting, therefore there is no options analysis. The headlines regarding corporate performance as at Month 4 are set out below.

Performance Report Headlines

The headline messages for this report are:




3.1 **Performance against target** - of the 46 indicators that are comparable, at the end of September 2012 (*NB KPIs = Key Performance Indicators*)

| | KPIs at end of September 2012 | KPIs at end of Aug 2012 | KPIs at end of Aug inc latest outturn from quarterly KPIs |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| GREEN - Met their target | 50% | 34.38% | 43.75% |
| AMBER - Within tolerance | 15.22% | 25% | 27.08% |
| RED - Did not meet target | 34.78% | 40.62% | 29.17% |

Update as at 21 December 2012

October RAG Status: GREEN 53.06%; AMBER 20.41%; RED 26.53%

3.2 **Direction of Travel (DOT)** - of the 31 indicators that are comparable, at the end of September 2012 (based on the previous year's outturn or position at the same time last year whichever is most appropriate for the indicator):

| | DOT at end of September 2012 | DOT at end of August 2012 |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|
|  IMPROVED | 54.84% | 40.9% |
|  STATIC | 6.45% | 9.1% |
|  DECLINED | 38.71% | 50% |

Update as at 21 December 2012

October DOT Status: Improved 40.73%; Static 11.11%; Declined 48.15%

KPIs 'IN FOCUS'

- 3.3 As part of the council's performance management process, the Performance Board - a council wide group of performance leads – reviews the progress of the Corporate Scorecard on a monthly basis to provide assurance to the Directors' Board and Cabinet of delivery.

Where the Performance Board identifies issues that it considers to be of concern or indeed merits the highlighting of good performance it recommends these to the Directors' Board and Cabinet for their consideration.

3.4 Housing Repairs

There are 7 indicators on the corporate scorecard which are related to the delivery of the housing repairs service. The impact of the ongoing issues surrounding the contract affects all these indicators and therefore a single overview has been provided to give an overview of progress.

| Reason for IN FOCUS | Housing Repairs performance has been a subject of concern and scrutiny for several months. | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| PI Title | Sept Actual | (Update) Oct Actual | Apr –Sept YTD | (Update) Apr-Oct YTD | Latest Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| HSG060 Housing Repairs Satisfaction (%) | 70% | 58% | n/a | n/a | 80% | 80% |
| Repairs appointments made and kept (%) | 67% | 80.9% | n/a | n/a | 85% | 85% |
| HSG050 No of complaints about Housing Repairs | 99 | 83 | 560 | 643 | 216 | 522 |
| HSG051 % of Housing repairs complaints which are upheld | 48% | 56% | 55% | n/a | 30% | 30% |
| BV212 Average Relet Times | 91 days | 87.2 days | 109.8 days | 107.9 days | 95 days | 60 days |
| LA72 Relevant Housing Repairs completed on time | 90.7% | 87.4% | 93.05% | 92.24% | 99% | 99% |
| HSG041 % First Time Fix | 67% | 73.4% | n/a | n/a | 85% | 85% |

In the first quarter of this financial year the Council introduced stronger governance arrangements for managing the service delivery provided by current contractor responsible for delivery 90% of the Council's responsive repairs. Year to date the contractor has failed adequately performance against any of its key contractual performance indicators, on timeliness, quality and resident satisfaction.

As a result of this the council has taken a range of different actions, in a bid to ensure effective management of the contractor currently responsible for responsive repairs. These actions are designed to ensure that Morrison either successfully delivers on their contractual obligations to provide an effective, responsive service to residents or the council will seek an alternative service provider in the shortest possible timeframe that the contract allows.

As quarter two performance figures show Morrison have consistently failed on all key targets. As a result of this and previous poor performance the Council has already made a decision not to use the option of contract extension, the result of this limits the maximum length of this contract to no more than five years.

In addition, in relation to the more limited contract timeframe, the Council placed a rectification notice on the contractor in September. It should be noted that this is a six month process and in this time the Council will continue to work in partnership with the contractor with the aim of improving all the performance indicators associated with this contract. However, if at the end of this period the contractor fails to sufficiently improve, then the Council will have the option to terminate the contract.

In terms of specific measures currently underway, the contractor through the rectification plan has committed to improved planning of repairs and workforce utilisation along with improvements in training of Morrison staff. Alongside delivering estate action days which are designed to tackle long outstanding repairs, improve diagnostics of larger works and discuss repairs and technical problems with residents and or their representatives. This will be delivered by a range of different technical disciplines and customer service staff all in attendance on a given estate or area.

The Housing department is committed to ensuring that our residents have a responsive repairs service that performs properly. The actions outlined above, provide a clear pathway to ensuring the Council is in a position to exercise appropriate options to ensure that responsive repairs are effectively provided to residents in Thurrock.

[Commentary provided by Kathryn Adedeji]

Update as at 21 December 2012

The Council has reached agreement with Morrison Facilities Services Ltd to the early termination of the housing repairs and maintenance contract with effect from 31st January 2013.

The contract improvement plans issued by Morrison have proved to be inadequate and undeliverable despite efforts by both parties to make it work for Thurrock residents.

Thurrock Council will now consider options for re-procurement to ensure that a new contract is let which is fit for purpose and provides residents with a more reliable repairs service that secures continuous improvements across the service. In doing so, the Council will work with residents and stakeholders to encourage their involvement in the procurement process.

Meanwhile, Mears Ltd have agreed to step in and provide an interim contract with new management and is highly committed to introducing and maintaining a robust repairs service from 1st February 2013 whilst the Council re-procures a new contract in line with its obligations under procurement and leaseholder regulations. Precise terms of the interim contract will be agreed with Mears to ensure service improvements take place and to introduce a new IT system, allowing greater access to appointments and better repairs diagnosis along with stronger control of the work bank so that repairs will be completed on time.

As part of the interim contract a new improvement plan will be also put in place to clear the backlog of repairs and this will include the transferred workforce who will be under new management and support from the local supply chain

[Commentary agreed by Barbara Brownlee]

3.5 LUO201 Fixed Term Exclusions – Primary

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Definition | This PI measures the percentage of fixed term exclusions in Primary Schools. This includes Academies but excludes the primary aspects of the Pupil Referral Unit and Special Schools. | |
| Reason for IN FOCUS | This indicator continues to be worse than target despite targeted support. | |
| April – Sept | Latest Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| 0.6% | 0.31% | 1% |

The three primary schools identified in June have all engaged with the School Improvement Service to address the school factors and the individual issues they have experienced working with specific families around exclusions. In some of these cases the rise in the use of fixed term exclusions was due in part to a particular focus with certain families and children who were experiencing specific challenges and the use of fixed term exclusions were part of a broader package of intervention to resolve these issues.

The governing bodies have also received some additional support from governor services to ensure there is a better understanding of the increase in the use of these exclusions. Work with schools has identified behaviour

management training and support for staff in two of these schools where staffing has changed significantly.

The Thurrock Improvement Consultant is targeting this area of work - 12 days of targeted support and challenge to work with the leadership, families and pupils have been allocated. It is anticipated this will improve the levels of exclusions for future reports.

[Commentary agreed by Carmel Littleton]

Update as at 21 December 2012

| April – Oct | Latest Target (Oct) | Year End Target |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 0.72% | 0.4% | 1% |

3.6 LUO202 Fixed Term Exclusions – Secondary

| Definition | This PI measures the percentage of fixed term exclusions in Secondary Schools. This includes Academies but excludes the secondary aspects of the Pupil Referral Unit and Special Schools. | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Reason for IN FOCUS | Positive turnaround of performance from first quarter of the year. First quarter of year showed this indicator as worse than target but targeted intervention has improved performance significantly. | |
| April –Sept | Latest Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| 2.8% | 3.28% | 7.7% |

This indicator is now back on target.

Schools and Academies have been using the Inclusion centres successfully to avoid the use of exclusion and there have been significant developments in the closer working between all secondary schools through the new Inclusion panel.

In the case of the non-Academy Secondary School identified in June, the school has been targeted through the School Improvement programme – 12 days of targeted support have been allocated. Behaviour management and learning and teaching programmes are in place. Support from the Improvement Consultant is in place to provide programmes throughout this term and it is anticipated this will further improve the levels of exclusions for future reports.

The Academy School identified in the June report sits outside the Tier support provided by the Local Authority, however additional time has been allocated to work with the Inclusion Managers and Head Teacher to identify priorities and support during the autumn term.

[Commentary agreed by Carmel Littleton]

Update as at 21 December 2012

| April –Oct | Latest Target (Oct) | Year End Target |
|------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 3.48% | 3.99% | 7.7% |

3.7 Indicators which have changed RAG status since previous month

In addition to those indicators which feature in the IN FOCUS section, the following indicator changed RAG (RED, AMBER, GREEN) status since previous month:-

3.8 From “**AMBER**” to “**RED**”

CEFCP12b Child Protection

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Definition | This PI measures the rate per 10,000 population of Children in Thurrock who are the subject of a Child Protection Plan. | | |
| | <i>This measure is not really a performance indicator in the traditional sense, more one of demand. It is in the corporate scorecard to maintain a high profile of the ever changing position regarding the needs for this service. It is most useful when looked at in conjunction with other Looked After and Child Protection statistics.</i> | | |
| | Sept Actual | YTD Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| | 55* (56) | 49* (50) | 49* (50) |

**adjusted to reflect the updated mid-year 2011 population estimates*

Quarter 2 has seen an increase in numbers on a child protection plan, during the summer period. This reflects a similar increase in the same period in 2011. This has taken the numbers over the target number of 50 per 10,000 of the population to 56 per 10,000.

The primary increase was during July and August, however due to the school holidays this tends to be a period where few review conferences are held, therefore the numbers ceasing to be subject of a plan were reduced. This creates a net increase in overall numbers.

September saw a slow down in numbers becoming subject of a plan (11) , whereas the previous two months had been 22 in July and 30 in August with relatively few children, being removed from a plan (12 in July and 1 in August).

The numbers on Child Protection plans are under constant review and early indications suggest October's figures are showing a reduction in numbers, in line with the target, and trend from 2011.

[Commentary agreed by Barbara Foster]

Update as at 21 December 2012

| Oct Actual | YTD Target (Oct) | Year End Target |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 52 | 49 | 49 |

[Please note that the rates per 10,000 have been amended to reflect the updated mid-year 2011 projections for children aged 0-17 (38,490) based on the 2011 Census].

October has seen the predicted decrease in numbers subject of a Child Protection plan. This is in line with the same period in 2011. A review of all children over the age of 12 subject of a plan has been undertaken to ensure plans are appropriate.

[Commentary agreed by Barbara Foster]

3.9 LUO300 Apprentices within the Council

| | | |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|
| Definition | This PI measures the number of young people employed in the Council as an apprentice. This includes Serco staff. One of the key aims of the apprenticeship scheme in Thurrock is that by the time they have finished their course these young people will have gained a Level 3 qualification, which will give them additional options for work and/or further education. | |
| Sept Actual | YTD Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| 32 | 46 | 55 |

There are now 32 young people employed in apprenticeship opportunities. Six of these are in childcare which the Council has fully sponsored. The 10 further opportunities by December, identified in August's update, will be in business administration.

[Commentary agreed by Carmel Littleton]

Update as at 21 December 2012

| Oct Actual | YTD Target (Oct) | Year End Target |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 47 | 48 | 55 |

There are 47 young people employed in apprenticeship opportunities created by the Local Authority. Six of these are currently placed in childcare settings across the authority. The successful Prince's Trust "Get into Local Government" offered 12 young people the opportunity to undertake work experience in a number of departments across the authority - as a result of this four young people have been offered an apprenticeship with the potential for a further four in the New Year.

[Commentary agreed by Carmel Littleton]

3.10 % of Housing Repairs Appointments made and kept

See 3.4 above

3.11 From “RED” to “AMBER”

CEFLAC09b Looked After Children

| | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------------|
| Definition | This PI measures the rate per 10,000 population of looked after children in Thurrock who are aged 19 and under. Ideally children should not remain “in care” or “looked after” for a long period of time. | |
| | <i>This measure is not really a performance indicator in the traditional sense, more one of demand. It is in the corporate scorecard to maintain a high profile of the ever changing position regarding the needs for this service. It is most useful when looked at in conjunction with other Looked After and Child Protection statistics.</i> | |
| Sept Actual | YTD Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| 66* (68) | 61* (63) | 61* (63) |

**adjusted to reflect the updated mid-year 2011 population estimates*

Despite an apparent slight reduction in overall numbers we believe this has been created by data lag, and the numbers in reality have remained relatively constant for the last quarter. Although there were seven children or young people recorded as having left care in September (four of these because of Special Guardianship Orders to family members) this was more than offset by ten new entrants (nine of whom belonged to two sibling groups).

Recent national figures released in September suggest that our increase over the last year and a half is partly informed by an upward trend nationally. However we have identified that Thurrock's increase may be at a faster rate than others, and Service Managers are scheduled to meet shortly to examine whether there are specific local factors which have contributed to this differential.

[Commentary agreed by Barbara Foster]

Update as at 21 December 2012

| Oct Actual | YTD Target (Oct) | Year End Target |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 66 | 61 | 61 |

[Please note that the rates per 10,000 have been amended to reflect the updated mid-year 2011 projections for children aged 0-17 (38,500) based on the 2011 Census.]

The service has undertaken a review of the factors influencing the current rise in the looked after children population. It has concluded that there is no single causal explanation.

The Department has just received its comparative data from the DFE, which it is in the process of analysing. This will be further expanded on next month.

[Commentary agreed by Jo Olsson]

3.12 HSG060 Housing Repairs Satisfaction

See 3.4 above

3.13 From “**AMBER**” to “**GREEN**”

NI157a Major Planning Applications

| Definition | This PI measures the percentage of “major” planning applications which are responded to within the 12 week deadline. | | |
|--------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Sept Actual | April –Sept YTD | YTD Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| 100% | 80% | 75% | 75% |

Performance now exceeds target.

The Development Management team have determined 8 in time out of 8 determined. The Major Projects Team have determined 8 in time out of 12 determined. The nature of some of these applications is that they require complex negotiations to resolve issues raised by third parties as well as legal agreements to secure planning obligations.

[Commentary agreed by Nigel Hebden]

Update as at 21 December 2012

| Oct Actual | April –Oct YTD | YTD Target (Oct) | Year End Target |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 83.33% | 80.77% | 75% | 75% |

In October Development Management determined 10 in time out of 10 determined. Major Projects determined 11 in time out of 16 determined.

3.14 FIN004 Capital Programme

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Definition | This PI measures the percentage of the Council's Capital Programme that has been spent at any quarterly monitoring period in the year. | | |
| | April –Sept YTD | YTD Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| | 30% | 30% | 90% |

Work during the second quarter of the year has tightened up on the profiling of capital expenditure and as such it is now within the predicted target profile. There continues to be work required with services managers, especially in terms of profiling and procurement issues linked to programme approvals and this will continue for the rest of this year and into 2013-14.

Further detailed analysis of the capital programme can be found in the Capital Monitoring Report on the Cabinet agenda for December.

[Commentary agreed by Sean Clark]

Update as at 21 December 2012

No further update as this is a quarterly indicator.

3.15 From “**GREEN**” to “**RED**”

OD13 Stress related absence

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Definition | This KPI measures the number of days absence attributed to stress/stress-related illness as a percentage of all sickness absence days | | |
| | Sept Actual | YTD Target (Sept) | Year End Target |
| | 19.5% | 16.5% | 15% |

Stress and stress-related absences made up 19.5% of all sickness during September. This is now worse than the target of 16.5%. In September this figure related to 220 days from 22 individuals, 6 of whom were explicitly identified as having "work related stress". This compares to August / July where there were 185 / 139 days relating to 20 / 15 individuals, 6 / 5 of whom were work-related respectively. Any absence reported as being stress/stress-related triggers an automatic referral to Occupational Health, regardless of the length of that absence.

Data monitoring during 2011-12 highlighted a high level of stress related absence. A review of stress related absence took place and an action plan was approved by DB. For 2012-13 targeted stress risk assessments have been integrated into the role of the new Occupational Health nurse. One of the staff focus groups which came out of the Staff Survey in 2011, specifically looked at the issue of stress and staff wellbeing. Feedback from this group is being fed into the wider action plan.

Latest actions:

- Quarterly report to CHRECC highlighting increased cases and making recommendations
- Automatic referral to OH for all stress related sickness, regardless of length of absence
- Ongoing OH and HR support for individual cases of stress - for both employee and manager
Additional capacity created short term by recruiting Occupational Health Nurse on a year contract to ensure as timely and efficient appointments and case management as possible
- Review against the Stress Management Action Plan to be undertaken before Christmas to identify progress and feedback to be given to CHRECC.

[Commentary agreed by Jackie Hinchliffe]

Update as at 21 December 2012

| Oct Actual | YTD Target (Oct) | Year End Target |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 19.76% | 16.5% | 15% |
| Nov Actual | YTD Target (Nov) | Year End Target |
| 23.94% | 16% | 15% |

In October, stress related absences were worse than the target of 16.5%, and the second month in a row where the figure has exceeded 19%. In October this figure related to 317 days from 25 individuals, 9 of whom were explicitly identified as having "work related stress". This time last year stress/stress related illness accounted for 17.5% of absence (205 days).

November data has also been confirmed as 317 days which accounts for 23.94% of all sickness that month.

Additional actions to those outlined above:

- *Additional stress risk assessment workshops are being held in the New Year*
- *Report being presented to Directors Board in January to propose further actions to improve attendance and well-being.*

[Commentary agreed by Jackie Hinchliffe]

3.16 The full summary of September (Month 6) performance is set out below:

| Scorecard Segment | No. of PIs (not inc. Annual KPIs) | Performance against Target | | | | Direction of Travel | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | No. of KPIs unavailable for comparison (n/a) * | No. of KPIs at Green ✓ | No. of KPIs at Amber ⇄ | No. of KPIs at Red ✗ | No. of KPIs unavailable for comparison (n/a) * | No. Improved since 2010-11 ↑ | No. Unchanged since 2010-11 → | No. Decreased since 2010-11 ↓ |
| Community Leadership | 20 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 4 |
| Customer | 21 | (4) | 6 | 4 | 7 | 7 (+4) | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| Business Process | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| People | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Finance | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 55 | 5 (+4) | 23 | 7 | 16 | 20 (+4) | 17 | 2 | 12 |
| | | PIs available = 46 | 50% | 15.22% | 34.78% | PIs available = 31 | 54.84% | 6.45% | 38.71% |

* [brackets denote number not yet due (eg. Thrice yearly indicators)]

Please note it is possible to have a different number of indicators comparable against “Direction of Travel” than “Against Target” because

- 1) For some indicators we only have one year’s worth of data and therefore cannot compare Direction of Travel
- 2) Some indicators have not had targets set, but are still being monitored as have strategic importance to the Council.

4. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

- 4.1 This monthly monitoring report is for noting, with a further recommendation to circulate any specific areas to relevant Overview and Scrutiny for further consideration.

5. CONSULTATION (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 This monitoring report is considered on a quarterly basis by Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee and where there are specific issues relevant to other committees these are further circulated as appropriate.

6. IMPACT ON CORPORATE POLICIES, PRIORITIES, PERFORMANCE AND COMMUNITY IMPACT

- 6.1 This monitoring report will help decision makers and other interested parties, form a view of the success of the Council's actions in meeting its political and community priority ambitions.

7. IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: Mike Jones
 Telephone and email: **01375 652772**
mxjones@thurrock.gov.uk

This is a monitoring report and there are no direct financial implications arising. Within the corporate scorecard there are some specific financial performance indicators, for which commentary is given within the report. With regard to other service performance areas, any recovery planning commissioned by the Council may well entail future financial implications, which will be considered as appropriate.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: David Lawson
 Telephone and email: **01375 652087**
David.Lawson@bdtlegal.org.uk

This is a monitoring report and there are no direct legal implications arising.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: Billy Masters
 Telephone and email: **01375 652472**
bmasters@thurrock.gov.uk

This is a monitoring report and there are direct diversity implications arising. The Corporate Scorecard contains measures that help determine the level of progress with meeting wider diversity and equality ambitions, including sickness, youth employment and attainment, independent living, vulnerable adults, volunteering, access to services etc. Individual commentary is given within the report regarding progress and actions.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Section 17, Risk Assessment, Health Impact Assessment, Sustainability, IT, Environmental

There are no other relevant implications.

BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT (include their location and identify whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- Not applicable

APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT:

- Appendix 1 – Corporate Performance Report 2012-13 Month 6/Quarter 2

Report Author Contact Details:

Name: Sarah Welton
Telephone: 01375 652019
E-mail: swelton@thurrock.gov.uk