Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 2 Performance report 2015-16		
Report No:	PAS/SE/15/030		
Report to and dates:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	25 November 2015	
Portfolio holder:	Ian Houlder Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01284 810074 Email : <u>ian.houlder@stedsbc.gov.uk</u>		
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:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Members are requested to review the Council's performance using Balanced Scorecards for Quarter 2, 2015-16 and identify any further information required or make recommendations where remedial action or attention is required to address the Council's performance.		

Kay Decision	To this a	Karr	vision and if as un	douwhich	
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 - □ No, it is not a Key Decision - ⊠			
that <u>do not</u> apply.)					
Consultation:	This report has been prepared in				
			nsultation with all relevant staff and		
			eadership Team.		
			ne option of doing nothing may result in		
poc		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			
			performance in a future period.		
Are there any staffi		ions?	Yes D No 🛛		
If yes, please give details		•			
Are there any ICT implications? If		Yes 🗆 No 🖂			
yes, please give details		•			
Are there any legal		-	Yes 🗆 No 🛛		
implications? If yes, please give		There are no legal implications			
details		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 D No 🛛			
, .	<i>If yes, please give details</i>				
Risk/opportunity assessment:		(potential hazards or opportunities affecting			
Risk area	Inherent le	velof	corporate, service or p	Residual risk (after	
	risk (before	veror	Controis	controls)	
	controls)				
	Low/Medium/	High*		Low/Medium/ High*	
Failure to achieve optimum or target	High		Regular reporting of performance to Joint	Medium	
performance which			Leadership Team,		
may impact on			Portfolio Holders and		
resources			to PASC can highlight where		
			remedial action may		
			be needed.		
Ward(s) affected:		All Ward			
Background papers:		None			

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 **Explanation of Balanced Scorecard**

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/SE/15/031.

PAS/SE/15/030