

<b>25 June 2013</b>		<b>ITEM: 5</b>
<b>Corporate Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee</b>		
<b>CORPORATE SCORECARD PERFORMANCE REPORT – Quarter 4 / MONTH 12 (UP TO END OF MARCH 2013)</b>		
Report of: Cllr Phil Smith, Portfolio Holder for Central Services		
<b>Wards and communities affected:</b> ALL	<b>Key Decision:</b> Non-Key	
<b>Accountable Head of Service:</b> Steve Cox, Assistant Chief Executive		
<b>Accountable Director:</b> Steve Cox, Assistant Chief Executive		
<b>This report is Public</b>		
<b>Purpose of Report:</b> 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 12 / Quarter 4 ie end of March 2013. 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 12, 35 (66%) of these indicators are either meeting or within an acceptable tolerance of their target.

This is the final monitoring report for this particular basket of indicators. The next monitoring report will focus on the indicators which Cabinet agreed in April 2013 as the corporate scorecard for 2013-14.

*NB. It is important to note that these outturns are currently undergoing the annual data quality assurance and audit testing and as such are subject to final verification. Final 2012-13 outturns will be presented to Cabinet and Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee in the Annual Report later in the year.*

#### **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 12 / Quarter 4 [March] 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.

**Performance Report Headlines**

The headline messages for this report are:

- 3.1 **Performance against target** - of the 53\* indicators that are comparable, at the end of March 2013 (*NB KPIs = Key Performance Indicators*)

*1 x debt KPI did not have a target set therefore does not have a RAG status for comparison ;  
1 x volunteers KPI is awaiting further information from partners which will be available in time for the final annual report later in the year*

	KPIs at end of March 2013 [53 KPIs]	KPIs at end of February 2013 [54 KPIs]
<b>GREEN</b> - Met their target	52.84%	59.26%
<b>AMBER</b> - Within tolerance	13.2%	14.81%
<b>RED</b> - Did not meet target	33.96%	25.93%

- 3.2 **Direction of Travel (DOT)** - of the 41 indicators that are comparable, at the end of March 2013 (based on the previous year's outturn):

	DOT at end of March 2013 [41 KPIs]	DOT at end of Feb 2013 [41 KPIs]
<b>↑ IMPROVED</b>	58.54%	65.85%
<b>→ STATIC</b>	9.76%	7.32%

↓ DECLINED	31.7%	26.83%
------------	-------	--------

Given the current financial position facing the Council, it is not surprising that the rate of KPI improvement is, overall, lower than desired. However, the fact that two thirds of KPIs are hitting or close to target is encouraging. The corporate scorecard has been reviewed for the new municipal year and was agreed at Cabinet in April. Keen attention has been given to ensuring that the targets for next year are sufficiently challenging to enable objectives to be successfully met, yet with due regard to the increasing financial and other resource pressures being experienced by services.

### 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 **NI117 NEETs**  
**RAG Status = GREEN**

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the percentage of young people aged 16-18 years old who are not in education, employment or training (NEET). An individual is classed as NEET if they are not one of the following: in full-time education; in work-based learning; in other education or training; in employment; currently residing in a custodial institution; have a deferred place in HR and currently taking a gap year	
<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	This indicator has been consistently on or better than target throughout the year, which bucks the national trend for youth unemployment.	
<b>March Actual</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>	
5.4%	6.1%	

The annual performance data is based on the key reporting period of November to January each year and this report was given in February. Performance has been strong across all four quarters and the team have exceeded the targets set.

The current position for 16-18 year olds is:

- NEET 5.4% compared to 6.5% in same period last year.
- Unknown 1.7% compared to 5.3% in same period last year.
- In Learning 85.2% compared to 83.6% in same period last year

The current position for 16-19 year olds is:

- NEET 6.2%, compared to 6.7% in same period last year

- Unknown 2.6%, compared to 7.4% in same period last year
- In learning 80.7%, compared to 79.1% in same period last year

*[Commentary agreed by Carmel Littleton]*

### 3.5 1C (NI130) Self Directed Support

**RAG Status = GREEN**

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the number of adults, older people and carers receiving self-directed support – either through direct payments or a personal budget – in the year to 31 <sup>st</sup> March as a percentage of clients receiving community based services and carers receiving carer's specific services aged 18 or over	
<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	This PI has improved significantly over the year and has achieved the challenging target the Council set itself	
	<b>March Actual</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>
	60%	60%

The provisional end of year outturn is 60%. This meets the target for the year of 60%, continues the three year trend of improvement and brings Thurrock above the national average for 2011-12 of 43%.

This indicator is the best measure of the level of choice and control offered in adult social care. The service continues to seek further improvement through extending direct payments for carers, increasing mental health recovery budgets for mental health users and exploring the feasibility of implementing additional individual service funds (ISFs are where the agency/provider holds the money and the service user can draw it down when a service is required).

*[Commentary agreed by Roger Harris]*

### 3.6 NI157b Minor Planning Applications

**RAG Status = GREEN**

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the percentage of “minor” applications that are processed by the Planning Department within 8 weeks. A minor application is typically one which involved development of less than 1,000m <sup>2</sup> or between 1-9 dwellings.	
<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	This PI has consistently been better than target throughout the year and is amongst the best in the country for processing these types of application.	
	<b>March Actual</b>	<b>Cumulative YTD</b>
	91.7%	95.4%
		<b>Year End Target</b>
		88%

The cumulative performance exceeds target. Out of 173 applications between April 2012 and March 2013, 165 were determined on time.

The planning performance national figures have been published for the year to Dec 2012 (full year comparisons not released until July) which puts our 2012-13 year end figure of 95.4% at joint 3<sup>rd</sup> nationally.

*[Commentary agreed by Andy Millard]*

**3.7 HSG060 Satisfaction with Housing Repairs**  
**RAG Status = GREEN in March, RED year to date**

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the level of satisfaction from tenants with regard to the housing repairs service they receive. This is a new methodology for 2012-13 and is collected via an external, independent survey agency.		
<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	Although looking at the whole year, this figure is below target, the result for March is above target.		
	<b>March Actual</b>	<b>Cumulative YTD</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>
	85.1%	68.44%	80%

As the portfolio holder said last month, it is good to see some repair KPIs turning green. Over the last two months, since Mears have taken over service delivery of this contract, satisfaction has improved significantly and has been above target.

However when looking at the year to date picture, this is still well below the end of year target. Whilst the new contractor continues to deal with the backlog of uncompleted works it is likely that satisfaction may fluctuate in the early part of 2013-14. This is because satisfaction is rated at the point at which the work has been completed. Therefore, as Mears is completing the backlog, earlier issues continue to impact the rating. However, once the backlog has been completely cleared satisfaction levels should consistently reach and hopefully exceed the target.

*[Commentary agreed by Kathryn Adedeji]*

**3.8 NI195 Street Cleanliness**  
**RAG Status = GREEN**

<b>Definition</b>	These PIs measure the percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having a) litter b) detritus c) graffiti d) fly-posting that fall below an acceptable level				
	A low score is best.				
<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	All four elements of this indicator have met their target and three have exceeded at a time when budgets have been expenditure levels have been amongst the lowest in the sector				
<b>Category</b>	<b>Tranche 1</b>	<b>Tranche 2</b>	<b>Tranche 3</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>
a) Litter	9	0.83	2.33	4	5
b) Detritus	10	0.33	4.33	5	14

c) Graffiti	4	0.17	2.17	2	3
d) Fly-posting	2	0	0.5	1	1

This performance indicator assesses the effectiveness of the street cleansing operations undertaken by the Environment Directorate. For the past four years levels of cleanliness have been improving steadily. The final results for this indicator for 2012-2013 demonstrate that once again the standards have improved with all areas of this measure (litter, detritus, graffiti and fly-posting) exceeding targets.

Benchmark data that has been made available by Keep Britain Tidy indicates that the standards of cleanliness achieved in Thurrock are significantly better those of other Councils. Details are:

Category	National Results (2011/2012)	Thurrock Results (2012/2013)
a) Litter	11%	4%
b) Detritus	25%	5%
c) Graffiti	4%	2%
d) Fly-posting	1%	1%

Achieving this standard is particularly note worthy in light of the cost of street cleansing per head of population, which for 2011/2012 has again been reported as amongst the lowest by the Association for Public Service Excellence. This is both in comparison to our statistical nearest neighbours and all Councils.

*[Commentary agreed by Daren Spring]*

### 3.9 CUL400a Vounteering – within the Council RAG Status = **GREEN**

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the total number of volunteer opportunities that are created by the Council to enable local people to work in council departments.	
<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	This PI has exceeded expectations and the target	
<b>March Actual</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>	
240	174	

At the end of March, Thurrock Council had 240 volunteers. This is a huge achievement given the initial target for 2012/13 was 174. A number of factors are thought to have contributed to this:

- An increase in the appeal of volunteering within Thurrock
- Making all volunteer placements available on the website - people are more likely to volunteer if they can consider a placement in full

- Dedicated resource within HR to support the recording of volunteer numbers and dedicated resource in Community Development to support volunteer development

Volunteers make a huge difference to the way in which services are delivered. The volunteer support provided to Thurrock Council by residents adds value to skills

*[Commentary agreed by Natalie Warren]*

### 3.10 BV08 Invoices Paid on time

**RAG Status = AMBER** in month; **RED** year to date

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the percentage of invoices for goods and services that were paid by the Council to its suppliers within 30 days of being received by the Council.	
<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	Although still fractionally under target, performance has improved significantly over the latter part of this year.	
<b>March Actual</b>	<b>April – March YTD</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>
<b>96.38%</b>	<b>88.76%</b>	<b>97%</b>

Performance has improved over the last 3 months and although under target for the year to date, the percentage in March is only marginally under the 97% target at 96.38, which puts the Council in a good position moving forward into 2013-14.

Detailed reports are now being distributed monthly on service performance against this indicator. Purchase Order data is now also being compiled as this is a major factor in the process and areas of poorer performance targeted to streamline processes.

*[Commentary agreed by Sean Clark]*

### 3.11 OD13 Stress related absence

**RAG Status = RED**

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the percentage of sickness absence data attributed to stress/stress related illness	
<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	This indicator has maintained a worse than target outturn for the majority of the year.	
<b>March Actual</b>	<b>April – March YTD</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>
<b>27.6%</b>	<b>20.94%</b> (subject to end of year verification)	<b>15%</b>

Stress and stress-related absences made up 27.6% of all sickness during March - the highest monthly figure all year. Over the whole year stress/ stress related absence accounted for 21% of all sickness – in total 2885 days. This is significantly worse than the target of 15%. Approximately 48% of this was specifically reported as being “work-related”. In March this figure related to 356 days from 23 individuals, 12 of who explicitly identified themselves as having "work related stress". In March last year stress/stress related illness accounted for 19.76% of absence made up of 246 days.

Nationally, the socio-economic climate is impacting across all sectors. Indeed, according to an independent survey\* conducted in 2012, two-fifths of UK organisations (all sectors) reported an increase in stress-related absence since the previous year, rising to half of all public sector organisations. The top causes of stress at work were recorded as being workloads, management styles and relationships (both at and outside work). [\*CIPD/Simply Health Annual Absence Survey 2012].

A report was presented to Directors Board in February. This identified that, organisationally, we have all necessary mechanisms in place. Further actions aimed at improving attendance and well-being were agreed and will be implemented.

Any absence reported as being stress/stress-related triggers an automatic trigger in DHS to managers to refer to Occupational Health. For 2012-13 targeted stress risk assessments were integrated into the role of the Occupational Health nurse. Where there is a service identified as having higher than average stress/ stress-related absence, further in depth analysis is being undertaken as part of the review and revision of the stress action plan.

This indicator is remaining in the corporate scorecard into 2013-14 and the Council has decided to maintain the target for 2013-14 of 15%.

Key actions during 2012-13:

- 1) Stress risk assessment workshops were held for managers
- 2) Ongoing analysis of stress risk assessments undertaken specifically in relation to work related stress.
- 3) HR Advisors are working with HOS/managers to actively manage cases

*[Commentary agreed by Jackie Hinchliffe]*

### 3.12 Housing Repairs

<b>Reason for IN FOCUS</b>	The problems surrounding housing repairs have been well documented during the year. The same issues have impacted on all of the below indicators.			
	<b>March Actual</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>	<b>RAG YTD</b>
HSG050 No of Housing Complaints	8	1087	522	<b>RED</b>
HGS051 % of Housing Complaints upheld	50%	n/a	30%	<b>RED</b>



HSG041 One visit repairs	73.9%	73.6%	85%	RED
BV212 Average relet times	76.1 days	109.5 days	60 days	RED
LA72 Emergency repairs on time	62.3%	86.52%	99%	RED
HSG060 % Repairs Satisfaction	85.1%	68.44%	80%	RED
% repairs appointments made and kept	86.5%	82.1%	90%	AMBER

There has been continued overall improvement when compared to the performance of the previous service provider. However, one of the key factors that continues to impact performance under Mears, is the volume of uncompleted work. As this was so high, Mears continue to work through it and because satisfaction is rated at the point at which the work has been completed, earlier issues continue to impact the rating.

In general terms there remain some key positives, such as the number of complaints received about service delivery which has reduced by 70% in the last two months of the year.

Ten months of this outturn data was exclusively related to the Morrison contract – the issues for which have been well documented and scrutinised. The two months attributable to Mears continue to be impacted by this earlier poor service delivery due to the backlog. The Council continues to work closely with our contractors and partners to ensure that the service returns to the high levels expected by our tenants as soon in 2013-14 as possible.

*[Commentary agreed by Kathryn Adedeji]*

### 3.13 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:-

#### 3.14 From “**AMBER**” to “**RED**”

##### 2A Permanent Admissions

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the rate of permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes per 100,000. This measure gives an indication of effectiveness of our local interventions in reducing/delaying this level of care.	
	<b>March Actual</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>
	153	145

This indicator measures the rate of new permanent admissions into residential care as a proportion of the population aged 18+. It provides an indication of the overall success of adult social care and partners in keeping vulnerable people out of more costly care placements as a result of increased use of earlier intervention and preventative support.

The service set a challenging year-end target for this indicator and the rate of new permanent admissions to residential care had been maintained through the first three quarters of 2012/13 within target. However, since December 2012, the rate of new admissions has increased; primarily among those aged 65+. The provisional year-end outturn is 153 admissions per 100,000 population. This exceeds the performance ceiling/target set at 145.

A number of extreme factors have combined to contribute to this in recent months. These include the continued capacity pressures faced by Basildon and Thurrock University Hospital (BTUH), which remains on a state of black alert; subsequent pressures on preventative services such as reablement and reduced capacity within homecare providers as a consequence of the transitional period ahead of new contractual award and failing of a provider.

*[Commentary agreed by Roger Harris]*

### 3.15 From “RED” to “GREEN”

#### Housing Repairs Satisfaction

See commentary at 3.12 and 3.7 above

### 3.16 From “RED” to “AMBER”

#### CEDU011 Low Carbon Business Programme

<b>Definition</b>	This PI measures the number of businesses who have received at least 12 hours of support from the council to help them improve their energy efficiency. It forms part of the council’s objective to improve sustainability, reduce CO2 emissions and adapt to climate change. This programme operates across South Essex and is funded through a European Regional Development fund (ERDF) grant.	
	<b>March Actual</b>	<b>Year End Target</b>
	382	397

Performance in March was considerably stronger with 72 businesses supported. This was mainly due to completed paperwork received from businesses who have received support from the programme over the past 3 months. Substantial effort is being put into ensuring the outstanding forms signed and completed so that these results can be counted.

At the end of the financial year, the outturn is 382 businesses supported leaving only 15 to be achieved by the end of September 2013 - in order to meet the end of programme target.

A request to extend the programme to 2014 was granted conditional approval on 10<sup>th</sup> May. Work is underway to meet the conditions set and official approval is expected in June.

*[Commentary agreed by Clare Lambert]*

**3.17 From “GREEN” to “AMBER”**

**Repairs Appointments made and kept**

See commentary at 3.12 above

3.18 The full summary of 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	1	14	3	2	6	11	0	3
Customer	21	0	9	1	11	6	5	3	7
Business Process	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2
People	6	0	2	2	2	0	5	0	1
Finance	4	0	2	0	2	1	2	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>
		<b>PIs available = 53</b>	<b>52.84%</b>	<b>13.2%</b>	<b>33.96%</b>	<b>PIs available = 41</b>	<b>58.54%</b>	<b>9.76%</b>	<b>31.7%</b>

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 These monitoring reports are 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](mailto: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**  
[davidlawson@bdtlegal.org.uk](mailto:davidlawson@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](mailto: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 12 / Quarter 4

**Report Author Contact Details:**

**Name:** Sarah Welton  
**Telephone:** 01375 652019  
**E-mail:** [swelton@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:swelton@thurrock.gov.uk)