| 20 September 2016 | ITEM: 7 |
|---|---|
| **Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee** | |
| **Quarter 1 Corporate Performance Report 2016/17** | |

| Wards and communities affected: | Key Decision: |
|---|---|
| All | Non-key |

**Report of:** Councillor Deborah Stewart, Portfolio Holder for Performance & Communities

**Accountable Head of Service:** Karen Wheeler, Head of Strategy, Communications & Customer Services

**Accountable Director:** Jackie Hinchliffe, Director of HR, OD & Transformation

**This report is** public

**Executive Summary**

The Corporate Plan 2016/17 outlines the focus areas for service delivery during this year. This is currently based on the existing vision and corporate priorities which will be refreshed during the year. The plan is supported by the Corporate KPI (Key Performance Indicator) Framework which details the statistical evidence the council will use to monitor the progress and performance against those priority activities.

This report provides a progress update in relation to the performance of those KPIs.

This report also provides Corporate Overview and Scrutiny members with a briefing on how services use benchmarking information as requested at the meeting of the committee in June 2016.

1.      **Recommendation(s)**

1.1    **To note and comment upon the performance of the key corporate performance indicators in particular those areas which are IN FOCUS**

1.2    **To identify any areas which require additional consideration**

## 2.     Introduction and Background

2.1     The key corporate plan activities for the year ahead mapped against the priorities were agreed by Cabinet in July 2016. The performance of those priority activities will be monitored through the Corporate KPI (Key Performance Indicator) framework. This report provides a progress update in relation to the performance of those KPIs. The data is included in Appendix 1 and the areas for focusing upon this quarter are detailed in section 3.3.

2.2     There will be a full and thorough review of existing KPIs and other performance tools in 2016 keeping in line with recommendations made by Corporate Overview and Scrutiny in 2015/16.

2.3     This review will also take into account feedback and intelligence the council receives from residents. During the Autumn, a resident survey will take place to ensure our communities are given the opportunity to express their views about what is important to them and their feelings about services and the borough.

2.4     As part of the review the council will also be looking at the trends in other forms of feedback received including complaints and customer service requests.

2.5     There is a great deal of analysis done on the volume and issues relating to complaints received by the council. In 2015/16 the top five expressions of dissatisfaction related to housing repairs, missed bins, estate management, council tax and housing solutions. The Corporate Complaints team work with services to establish the root cause for concerns/ complaints received, reasons for complaint escalation and reasons why complaints are upheld and work hard to learn from those complaints.

2.6     Similar to complaints, the Customer Services team do extensive monitoring of the calls that come into the council to see which areas are receiving the highest volumes. Not only is monitoring done on a monthly basis, but daily reports are run and there is also real-time monitoring to ensure demand can be met and issues can be picked up at the earliest opportunity.  The service also operates trackers, records comments and monitors customer satisfaction. As an example, in June 2016 alone the Contact Centre received over 36,000 calls. The top five areas (not including switchboard) were queries about council tax, benefits, rents, housing registrations and environment services.

**3.1    Issues, Options and Analysis of Options**

3.1.1   The Corporate KPI Framework for 2016/17 combines the corporate KPI scorecard with other key service demand indicators. This provides a mixture of strategic and operational indicators.

3.1.2   However, in 2016/17, with the demand for council services increasing and being ever more complicated, a more holistic approach to monitoring data and intelligence will be utilised. This will include scrutiny of the workflow and demand in front line services at the highest level. There will also be increased analysis of internal processes at service level by Directors.

3.1.3   Although overall the volume of draft KPIs has increased from previous years, not all of these indicators will be reported to members each time. The main focus of the monitoring reports will continue to be those indicators which directly monitor the delivery of the corporate priorities, with other indicators being escalated to members on an exception basis. This approach will ensure the mixture of data being monitored is most useful and provides proper intelligence for business decision making.

3.1.4   From 2016/17 the reports no longer categorise KPI performance as Red, Amber or Green (RAG status). Instead there is a simplified Achieved or Failed i.e. performance which is worse than target, regardless of the margin, will have "failed".

**3.2    Summary of Corporate KPI Performance**

| Performance against target | | Direction of Travel compared to 2015/16 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Quarter 1** | | ↑   BETTER | 45.84% |
| Achieved | **50.00%** | →   In Line | 6.25% |
| Failed | **27.08%** | ↓   WORSE | 31.25% |
| Not available for comparison | **22.92%** | Not available for comparison | 16.68% |

### 3.3 Focus Areas for Quarter 1

Each quarter, this report will focus on a few key performance highlights and challenges. This quarter there are three focus areas requiring improvement and one area – planning – where performance has excelled.

| Focus 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| KPI | a) % of Major planning applications processed within target<br>b) % of Minor planning applications processed within target | | | |
| Portfolio | Regeneration | | | |
| Directorate | Environment & Place | Service | Planning & Growth | |
| Performance | a) **100%**<br>b) **100%** | Quarter 1 Target: | a) 75%<br>b) 88% | **ACHIEVED** |

The performance of this team is highlighted as it has achieved 100% performance for both of these indicators consistently throughout the year so far.

This performance is instrumental in driving growth and investment in Thurrock, with timely decision making being a key concern for developers and investors. In 2016, the council has seen a significant 25% increase in planning applications (much higher than in the rest of South Essex), which signals strong development interest in Thurrock and real confidence in the planning service. This also has a positive effect on income generation. In addition, the team's performance provides credibility and gives confidence to other authorities who are looking for assistance in delivering their own services and has led to profitable trading opportunities.

(Commentary agreed by Steve Cox)

| Focus 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| KPI | % of refuse bins emptied on correct day (No of missed bins per 100,000) | | | |
| Portfolio | Environment | | | |
| Directorate | Environment & Place | Service | Environment | |
| Performance | **97.2%** (Average 2,792 missed bins per 100,000 per month) | Quarter 1 Target: | 98.5% | **FAILED** |

These figures are high this quarter due to May collection rates only being at 95%. With both of the Bank Holidays in May many residents had not seen the notification that waste collection crews would be working on the Bank Holiday Mondays and so did not present their bins for collection. Consequently, the following week, crews were faced with side waste to clear, resulting in rounds taking longer than usual. In many instances crews were not able to clear waste from all roads in their rounds. This had a knock on effect and was compounded by increases in the volumes of garden waste. The team will continue to review how best to ensure that notifications are seen.

From September, the service is running an additional crew three times a week to ensure that all kitchen and garden waste collections are completed as scheduled.

Some issues causing the missed collections are due to unbalanced rounds. There is a

longer term project ongoing within the team to review and re-balance the rounds and ways of working. It is intended that new rounds will be issued early next year.

The round structure is linked to the re-procurement of the disposal contracts and the procurement of new waste vehicles. Issues have also arisen over the past few months due to vehicle unreliability – the collection vehicles are close to end of life and a procurement strategy is in place. There can be a significant lead time for the delivery of refuse trucks.

As part of wider council programmes, a full review of the service and service delivery is being undertaken and will be completed in the next six weeks. The output will be a time-scaled action plan.

(Commentary agreed by Steve Cox)

| Focus 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| KPI | % of older people still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital | | | |
| Portfolio | Adult Social Care | | | |
| Directorate | Adults, Housing and Health | Service | Adult Social Care | |
| Performance | **83.2%** | Quarter 1 Target: | **90.9%** | **FAILED** |

In Quarter 1 there were a total of 131 older people (65+) discharged from hospital into reablement/ rehabilitation.  Of these, 109 were still at home 91 days later which equates to 83.2%.  This is below our target of 90.9% for 2016/17 and also falls short of our 2015/16 outturn of 90.85%.

Due to the local domiciliary care crisis additional pressure has been put upon the Joint Re-ablement Team (JRT) within the last year.  This pressure has resulted in over 1,800 hours per week being brought back in house and an internal team, Thurrock Care at Home, being created.  As JRT is the council's provider of last resort, the team respond to emergency referrals following hospital discharges and preventing premature admissions to hospital or residential care.

Staffing issues within the re-ablement team have affected care delivery and the ability to perform true re-ablement. The team has been unable to recruit care staff, therapists and medical professionals not only for substantive posts, but also through the council's matrix system.  In addition the population is ageing and becoming more frail, the level of support that is being delivered within the community is becoming more complex. This increase in demand and complexity and decrease in staffing levels may have contributed to the underperformance of this indicator, while the team are prioritising high risk clients.

Furthermore, Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspected the JRT in May and has issued the service with a warning notice following a "requires improvement" rating.   A current action plan is in place to address the issues highlighted to improve the quality of the service.

(Commentary agreed by Roger Harris)

| Focus 4 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| KPI | Number of new apprenticeships within the council | | |
| Portfolio | Education | | |
| Directorate | Children's Services | Service | Learning & Skills |
| Performance | 4 | Quarter 1 Target: | 15 FAILED |

As of end June, there were 45 apprentices in post from a diverse range of teams, which included four new apprentices who have started since April 2016.

Although the number of new apprentices is not currently meeting the in-year target there are a number in the recruitment process, including a further 30 young people who are in initial discussions with various teams around the council. It is likely that the current activity will not increase numbers sufficiently to meet the mid-year target, however, the service do anticipate that the cohort will be on track by the end of Quarter 3 (December).

The Employability & Skills team provide support to the apprentice/manager to enable successful completion and, in some cases, progression to a Level 3 qualification.

Work has also begun on identifying the support required and impact of the Apprenticeship Levy, including officers from a number of services across the council. Officers are also looking at the possibility of establishing our own dedicated apprenticeship training centre which would enable the council to have more control over the way the Apprenticeship Levy is spent. This is all part of a wider review taking place on our support to apprentices.

(Commentary agreed by Rory Patterson)

3.4    The full summary of Corporate Scorecard KPI performance is set out below:

| Corporate Priority | No. of KPIs | Performance against Target | | | Direction of Travel since 2015/16 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. of KPIs unavailable for comparison (n/a) | ACHIEVED | FAILED | No. of KPIs unavailable for comparison (n/a) | Better ⬆ | In line ➡ | Worse ⬇ |
| Create a great place for learning and opportunity | 11 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Build pride, responsibility and respect | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Improve health and well-being | 11 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 4 |
| Promote and protect our clean and green environment | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Well-run organisation | 10 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 |
| **TOTAL** | **48** | **11** | **24** | **13** | **8** | **22** | **3** | **15** |
| | | % unavailable for comparison **22.92%** | % achieved target **50.00%** | % failed to meet target **27.08%** | % unavailable for DOT comparison **16.68%** | % better than 2015/16 **45.84%** | % same as 2015/16 **6.25%** | % worse than 2015/16 **31.25%** |

**3.5   Benchmarking**

At the meeting of the Committee on 21 June 2016, a number of members asked for clarification on how the organisation compares itself with others.

3.5.1   Ever since the National Indicator Dataset was revoked in 2010 benchmarking has become more difficult. Whilst many authorities retained some useful KPIs, (eg sickness absence, invoice payment, planning turnaround), often the definitions were altered locally which prevents "like-for-like" comparison. Similarly, the localisation agenda means councils have different local priorities - performance in Authority A where that function is a top priority compared to Authority B where the service is not a priority and therefore budget efficiencies have impacted service delivery.

3.5.2   However, despite the above limitations, comparing performance with others is still a useful piece of intelligence when setting targets, alongside trend data from previous years Wherever appropriate, services aim to continually improve on the previous year's performance, however, this is also influenced by any changes to the financial situation and local priorities of the service.

3.5.3   There are some "free" benchmarking tools available, such as LG Inform, however the data in this is often several months or years out of date and is restricted by the number of indicators included. Some organisations and professional associations offer benchmarking groups by subscription, but budgets for these are often surrendered as efficiency savings. Therefore the field from which to benchmark changes and reduces each year.

3.5.4   In response to this, Performance Board agreed that services should use their own networks to benchmark in whatever way was most appropriate and effective for them. The current position is summarised below in 3.5.6.

3.5.5   The most common groupings of authorities which services use to compare and benchmark against are all England authorities, unitaries, the eastern region and CIPFA nearest neighbour. The CIPFA nearest neighbour model is a statistical model, which takes into account a number of characteristics of an authority area including social, economic, geographical size, population, type of authority etc. The latest model shows Thurrock to be nearest statistical neighbours with the following authorities:

| Milton Keynes | Trafford | Bedford |
|---------------|----------|---------|
| Swindon | Telford & Wrekin | Derby |
| Peterborough | Medway | Coventry |
| Reading | Bolton | Rochdale |
| Warrington | Stockton-on-Tees | Calderdale |

### 3.6 Service level benchmarking arrangements

### 3.6.1 Planning
The Planning team benchmark using the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Planning Quality Framework. This allows a choice of which authorities to compare with but is dependent on who else is in that benchmarking club. Wherever possible, planning will benchmark against other unitary authorities, however the number of authorities subscribed to the benchmarking group is dwindling and there is the possibility that the group will cease in the future as PAS has seen its funding cut.

Planning are able to compare planning performance on some key indicators via the statistics published nationally by DCLG.

### 3.6.2 Environment
The Environment team use APSE Performance Networks who generate a "family group". A family group is similar to the CIPFA Nearest Statistical Neighbours classification whereby authorities with similar characteristics in relation to the specific service being benchmarked are grouped together. This means that the family group for waste will be different to that for fleet services for instance. Environment also use Keep Britain Tidy who provide a benchmark figure for the street cleanliness performance indicator, compared to a national score.

For waste indicators, the DEFRA Waste Data Flow database enables the team to compare against data from a range of groups (all England, Eastern Region, Unitaries etc.)

### 3.6.3 Housing
Housing no longer uses a benchmarking service having ceased membership in 2013 as a cost saving measure. Therefore comparing delivery and data is done as required as part of service reviews, via other networks, with varying response success.

### 3.6.4 Adult Social Care
Most of our comparative data for Adult Social Care is done via the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework. ASCOF is a national data return and therefore the service are able to compare against a number of different groups including All England, regional or indeed any individual authority/group of authorities.

### 3.6.5 Public Health
The majority of comparative Public Health data can be benchmarked via the Public Health Outcomes Framework, which enables comparison against a number of different groups. Often the benchmarking is performed against the national average or the CIPFA nearest neighbours; however certain indicators have other preferred comparators – drug and alcohol treatment indicators are often benchmarked against their DAT Families group, whilst healthcare indicators available at CCG level often compare to their "Similar 10" group of most demographically similar CCGs.

3.6.6 **Children's Services**
Children's Social Care are a member of various Eastern Region performance and quality assurance benchmarking groups to monitor general social care performance in the region. They are also a member of the CIPFA Children Looked After Benchmarking Club used to compare the spend on looked after children.

Children's Education and Social Care use comparative data from statistical releases and performance tables provided by the Department for Education. Comparisons are at England authority, statistical neighbour and local neighbour levels.

3.6.7 **Central Services**
Several of the finance related services use the CIPFA Nearest Neighbour model to benchmark. HR OD use data from Xperthr and EELGA for general policy benchmarking and policy queries and the CIPD Simply Health annual report for sickness absence comparison.

3.6.8 **Highways and Transportation**
The service uses HMEP (Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme) for benchmarking and performance comparisons.

## 4. Reasons for Recommendation

4.1 The Corporate Plan and associated performance framework are fundamental to articulating what the council is aiming to achieve and how. It is best practice to report on the performance of the council. It shows effective levels of governance and transparency and showcases strong performance as well as an acknowledgement of where we need to improve.

## 5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

5.1 The original vision and corporate priorities were extensively consulted upon with residents, community and voluntary sectors and other partners.

5.2 Performance 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.

5.3 Corporate Overview and Scrutiny on 21 June were invited to comment on the draft Corporate Plan and KPIs for 2016/17 ahead of consideration by Cabinet and a full review in 2016. The committee felt that the Corporate Plan was robust and welcomed the change to monitoring progress against KPI targets with the introduction of Achieved and Failed making it clearer.

**6.    Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact**

6.1    The Corporate Plan and associated performance framework are fundamental to articulating what the council is aiming to achieve and how. The vision and priorities cascade into every bit of the council and further to our partners, through key strategies, service plans, team plans and individual objectives.

6.2    This 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:    **Laura Last**
**Senior Finance Officer – Management Accounts**

The report provides an update on performance against corporate priorities. There are financial KPIs within the corporate scorecard, the performance of which are included in the appendix to the report.

The council continues to operate in a challenging financial environment, therefore, where there are issues of underperformance, any recovery planning commissioned by the council may entail future financial implications, and will need to be considered as appropriate.

7.2    **Legal**

Implications verified by:    **David Lawson**

**Monitoring Officer & Deputy Head of Law & Governance**

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report. However, where there are issues of underperformance, any recovery planning commissioned by the council or associated individual priority projects may have legal implications, and as such will need to be addressed separately as decisions relating to those specific activities are considered.

7.3    **Diversity and Equality**

Implications verified by:    **Rebecca Price**
**Community Development Officer**

The Corporate Plan and KPI Framework for 2016/17 contain measures that help determine the level of progress with meeting wider diversity and equality ambitions, including  youth employment and attainment,

independent living, vulnerable adults, volunteering etc. Individual commentary will be given throughout the year within the regular monitoring reports regarding progress and actions.

7.4     **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

The Corporate Plan includes areas which affect a wide variety of issues, including those noted above. Where applicable these are covered in the appendix.

8.      **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright): N/A

9.      **Appendices to the report**

*   Appendix 1 – Quarter 1 Corporate Performance Report 2016/17

**Report Author:** Sarah Welton, Strategy & Performance Officer