Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



| Title of Report: | Balanced Scorecard and | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Quarter 2 Performance report | | | |
| | 2016-17 | | | |
| Report No: | PAS/FH/16/026 | | | |
| Report to and dates: | Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee | 24 November 2016 | | |
| Portfolio holder: | Steven Edwards Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01638 660518 Email: steven.edwards@forest-heath.gov.uk | | | |
| Lead officer: | Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance Tel: 01638 719245 Email: 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 2016-17 and an overview of performance against those indicators for the second quarter of 2016-17. | | | |
| Recommendation: | Members are request performance using Quarter 2, 2016-17 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 do not apply.) | No, it is | No, it is not a Key Decision - ⊠ | | | | |
| Consultation: | | This report has been prepared in | | | | |
| | | | consultation with all relevant staff and | | | |
| | | 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: | | | | | | |
| Are there any finar | icial implicat | tions? | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | |
| Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details Are there any legal and/or policy implications? 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. Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ There are no legal implications from this report. Poor performance levels may impact on the Council's | | | | |
| | | | ability to implement its policies or | | | |
| Are there any equality implications? | | | high-level strategies. 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) | | |
| | 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 | | | |
| | | 1 | | | | |

| 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 2 2016/17 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.
- 1.1.3 During the past quarter, there have been four new indicators added to the Planning and Growth scorecard, which aim to give a broader picture of the performance and the issues faced during the planning application process.

1.2 Quarter 2 Performance

- 1.2.1 In quarter 1, the performance against the "% telephone calls answered" indicators was below target levels across all areas. During quarter 2 the performance against these indicators has increased and are getting back towards the levels seen during the 2015/16 financial year despite call volumes still being higher than comparable periods last financial year.
- 1.2.2 There has been a slight drop corporately in the performance against the indicator "% of non-disputed invoices paid within 30 days" since quarter 1. The figure in June 2016 was 93.17%, whereas the September 2016 figure is 87.63%. The finance and performance team will continue to work with service areas to try and improve performance against this indicator, with monthly business intelligence reports being sent out with details of all invoices processed.
- 1.2.3 Another area where performance has dipped slightly since the first quarter of this financial year is in homelessness. An increase in homeless cases of 30% from the first quarter has led to a slightly increased time taken to make homelessness decisions and an increased use of B&B accommodation in quarter 2.