## Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 4 Performance report 2015-16		
Report No:	PAS/SE/16/007		
Report to and date:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	25 May 2016	
Portfolio holder:	Ian Houlder Outgoing Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance <b>Tel:</b> 01284 810074 <b>Email</b> : <u>ian.houlder@stedsbc.gov.uk</u>		
Lead officer:	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance <b>Tel:</b> 01638 719245 <b>Email:</b> rachael.mann@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 fourth quarter of 2015-16.		
Recommendation:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Members are requested to review the Council's performance using Balanced Scorecards for Quarter 4, 2015-16 and identify any further information required or make recommendations where remedial action or attention is required to address the Council's performance.		

Kan Daalalaan	Ta this a	Kan Da	sision and if as an	den webiek	
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	s report has been p	repared in	
			sultation with all re		
		Lea	Leadership Team.		
Alternative option(s):		• The option of doing nothing may result in poor performance, monitoring performance can highlight where remedial action may be needed			
Implications:			Γ		
Are there any <b>finar</b>		tions?	Yes 🗆 No 🖂		
If yes, please give o	details			no direct financial	
			<b>.</b> .	cations arising from	
			this report, it is possible that any		
				recommendations of the Committee may have some	
				ations. For example,	
			resources may need to be		
			reallocated to improve		
			performance in a future period.		
Are there any staff	<b>ing</b> implicati	ions?	Yes 🗆 No 🖂		
If yes, please give o			•		
Are there any <b>ICT</b> i	•	' If	Yes 🗆 No 🖂		
yes, please give details			•		
Are there any <b>lega</b>		-	Yes 🗆 No 🖂		
<i>implications? If yes, please give details</i>			<ul> <li>There are no legal implications from this report. Poor performance</li> </ul>		
			levels may impact on the Council's		
			ability to implement its policies or		
			high-level strategies.		
Are there any <b>equality</b> 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	vel of	Controls	<b>Residual risk</b> (after	
	risk (before			controls)	
	controls)	L L'arla V		Less (Medison / Litels *	
Failure to achieve	Low/Medium/ High	HIgh≁	Regular reporting of	Low/Medium/ High* Medium	
optimum or target			performance to Joint		
performance which			Leadership Team,		
may impact on resources			Portfolio Holders and to PASC can		
			highlight where		
			remedial action may		
Ward(s) affected:		be needed. All Ward			
Background pape			None		
(all background papers are to b					
published on the website and a lir					
included)					

Documents attached:	Appendix A – Resources and Performance Balanced Scorecard	
	<b>Appendix B</b> – Families and Communities Balanced Scorecard	
	<b>Appendix C</b> – Human Resources, Legal and Democratic Balanced Scorecard	
	<b>Appendix D</b> – Planning and Growth Balanced Scorecard	
	<b>Appendix E</b> – Operations Balanced Scorecard	
	<b>Appendix F</b> – 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 4 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 4 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 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, four service areas are now achieving over 90% performance on invoices paid within 30 days.