

Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 4 Performance Report 2016-2017	
Report No:	PAS/SE/17/008	
Report to and dates:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	25 May 2017
Portfolio holder:	Ian Houlder Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01284 810074 Email: ian.houlder@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Rachael Mann Assistant Director (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 final quarter of 2016-17.	
Recommendation:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Members are requested to review the Council's performance using Balanced Scorecards for Quarter 4, 2016-17 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 the previous service area structure) which present Quarter 4 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 Assistant Directors 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 In quarter 1 and 2, the performance against the “% telephone calls answered” indicators was below target levels across all areas. During quarters 3 and 4 the performance against these indicators has increased and exceeded target levels.

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 3. The figure in December 2016 was 93.1%, whereas the March 2017 figure is 94.19%. 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 There has also been a slight decrease corporately in the performance against the indicator “% of total debt over 90 days”. The figure in December 2016 was 61.2%, whereas the March 2017 figure is 68.72%. Although this figure has risen, the total level of debt over 90 days has in fact reduced from £631k to £487k.