Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



Title of Report:	Balanced Scorecard and			
	Quarter 3 Performance report			
	2016-2017			
Report No:	PAS/SE/17/	001		
Report to and dates:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	25 January 2017		
Portfolio holder:	Ian Houlder Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01284 810074 Email: ian.houlder@stedsbc.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 third quarter of 2016-17.			
Recommendation:		dit Scrutiny Committee:		
	performance using Quarter 3, 2016-17 information required	sted to review the Council's Balanced Scorecards for and identify any further or make recommendations on or attention is required to performance.		

Key Decision:		Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?			
(Check the appropriate		Yes, it is a Key Decision - □			
box and delete all those		•	ey Decision - ⊠		
that do not apply.)	110, 1010				
Consultation:	I	• This	s report has been p	repared in	
			sultation with all re		
		Lea	dership Team.		
Alternative option(s): • The		e option of doing nothing may result in			
		or performance, monitoring performance			
			highlight where remedial action may		
To a Contract		be	needed		
Implications:		tion o 2	Vac D. Na M		
Are there any financial implications?		Yes □ No ⊠			
If yes, please give details		While there are no direct financial while there are no direct financial 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	• •	
			reallocated to i	mprove	
		performance in a future period.			
Are there any staffing implications?		Yes □ No ⊠	Yes □ No ⊠		
If yes, please give d			•		
Are there any ICT implications? If		Yes □ No ⊠			
yes, please give details		•			
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give		Yes □ No ⊠			
details	piease give		There are no legal implications from this report. Been performance.		
uetans			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	vel of	Controls	Residual risk (after	
	risk (before			controls)	
	controls)	I I: a b ¥		Low/Madium/High*	
-	<u>Low/Medium/</u> High	Hign*	Regular reporting of	Low/Medium/ High* Medium	
optimum or target	9		performance to Joint	riculani	
performance which			Leadership Team,		
may impact on resources			Portfolio Holders and to PASC can		
. 555 th. 555			highlight where		
			remedial action may		
Ward(s) affected:			be needed. All Ward		
waid(5) allected.		7 iii vvai a			
Background papers:			None		
acital oalla papersi					

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 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.

1.2 **Quarter 3 Performance**

- 1.2.1 In quarter 1, the performance against the "% telephone calls answered" indicators was below target levels across all areas. During quarters 2 and 3 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 increase corporately in the performance against the indicator "% of non-disputed invoices paid within 30 days" since quarter 2. The figure in September 2016 was 87.63%, whereas the December 2016 figure is 93.1%. 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.