Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



Title of Report:	Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 2 Performance report 2015-16		
Report No:	PAS/FH/15/030		
Report to and dates:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	25 November 2015	
Portfolio holder:	Steven Edwards Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01638 660518 Email: steven.edwards@forest-heath.gov.uk		
Lead officer:	Joanne Howlett Acting Head of Resources and Performance Tel: 01284 757264 Email: joanne.howlett@westsuffolk.gov.uk		
Purpose of report:	This report sets out the West Suffolk Balanced Scorecards being used to measure the Council's performance for 2015-16 and an overview of performance against those indicators for the second quarter of 2015-16.		
Recommendation:	Members are request performance using Quarter 2, 2015-16 information required	dit Scrutiny Committee: sted to review the Council's Balanced Scorecards for and identify any further or make recommendations on or attention is required to s performance.	

Key Decision:		Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which			
(Check the appropriate		definition?			
box and delete all those		Yes, it is a Key Decision - □			
that <u>do not</u> apply.)	NO, It is	No, it is not a Key Decision - ⊠			
Consultation:	ultation: • This		report has been prepared in		
			nsultation with all relevant staff and		
			Leadership Team.		
Alternative option	ı(s):		e option of doing nothing may result in		
can		or performance, monitoring performance highlight where remedial action may needed			
Implications:					
Are there any financial implications?			Yes □ No ⊠		
If yes, please give details			While there are no direct financial or budget implications arising from this report, it is possible that any recommendations of the Committee may have some resource implications. For example, resources may need to be reallocated to improve		
Are there any staffing implications?		performance in a future period. Yes \square No \boxtimes			
Are there any staffing implications?		TES LINU A			
If yes, please give details Are there any ICT implications? If) TF	Yes □ No ⊠		
Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details		• NO 🗵			
		Yes □ No ⊠			
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details		 There are no legal implications from this report. Poor performance levels may impact on the Council's ability to implement its policies or high-level strategies. 			
Are there any equality implications?		Yes □ No ⊠			
If yes, please give details		•			
Risk/opportunity assessment:		(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)			
Risk area	Inherent le risk (before controls)		Controls	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to achieve	Low/Medium/	High*	Dogular reporting of	Low/Medium/ High*	
Failure to achieve optimum or target performance which may impact on resources	High		Regular reporting of performance to Joint Leadership Team, Portfolio Holders and to PASC can highlight where remedial action may be needed.	Medium	
Ward(s) affected:		All Ward			
Background papers:			None		
(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)					

Documents attached:	Appendix A – Resources & Performance Balanced Scorecard
	Appendix B – Families & Communities Balanced Scorecard
	Appendix C – Human Resources, Legal & Democratic Balanced Scorecard
	Appendix D – Planning & Growth Balanced Scorecard
	Appendix E – Operations Balanced Scorecard
	Appendix F – Housing Balanced Scorecard

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Performance Measures

- 1.1.1 Attached at **appendices A to F** are the current Balanced Scorecards (based on Head of Service area) which present Quarter 2 2015/16 performance. Unless otherwise stated, all performance figures on the scorecards are from a West Suffolk perspective. Where the performance for either individual Council is significantly different from the West Suffolk figure that it would have a different RAG rating, details of this are highlighted in the comments box.
- 1.1.2 The information included in the report has been provided by Heads of Service and service managers. Most indicators report performance against an agreed target using a traffic light system with additional commentary provided for performance indicators below optimum performance. Other KPIs report a data value only (e.g. no target performance) in order to track performance over time.

1.2 **Quarter 2 Performance**

- 1.2.1 Across all service balanced scorecards, there are indicators measuring the performance of the transactional finance functions. These are "% of non-disputed invoices paid within 30 days" and "% of debt over 90 days old". In the first quarter of the year, against these indicators, all services areas had failed to meet the targets of more than 95% of non-disputed invoices paid with 30 days and less that 10% of debt over 90 days old.
- 1.2.2 The finance and performance team have been working with service areas to try and improve performance against both of these measures. Monthly business intelligence reports are sent out to service areas with details of all invoices processed, and detailed aged debt lists. Debt control workshops have also taken place to help improve debt collection performance.
- 1.2.3 As a result of this, performance against both of these indicators has improved across the council. Invoices paid within 30 days has risen from 78.50% in June to 87.96% in September. Debt over 90 days has dropped from 62.53% in June to 47.25% in September. Although these figures are still not within the target range, it shows improvements are being made.

1.3 **Risk Management**

1.3.1 As reported in the first quarter performance report, the quarterly Strategic Risk Register has been incorporated into the Balanced Scorecard for the second quarter. Each of the individual Balanced Scorecards have details of the relevant strategic risks, and the full detailed Strategic Risk Register can be found in Report number PAS/FH/15/031.