

Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 3 Performance report 2015-16	
Report No:	PAS/SE/16/001	
Report to and dates:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	28 January 2016
Portfolio holder:	Ian Houlder Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01284 810074 Email: ian.houlder@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Jo 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 third quarter of 2015-16.	
Recommendation:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Members are requested to review the Council's performance using Balanced Scorecards for Quarter 3, 2015-16 and identify any further information required or make recommendations where remedial action or attention is required to address the Council's performance.	

Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>		<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Consultation:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This report has been prepared in consultation with all relevant staff and Leadership Team. 	
Alternative option(s):		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option of doing nothing may result in poor performance, monitoring performance can highlight where remedial action may be needed 	
Implications:			
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		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	

Documents attached:

Appendix A – Resources and Performance Balanced Scorecard

Appendix B – Families and Communities Balanced Scorecard

Appendix C – Human Resources, Legal and Democratic Balanced Scorecard

Appendix D – Planning and 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 3 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 3 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 and second quarters of the year, against these indicators, almost all service areas had failed to meet the targets of more than 95% of non-disputed invoices paid with 30 days and less than 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, three service areas are now achieving over 90% performance on invoices paid within 30 days, with one of these areas achieving over 98%.