Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



Title of Report:	Balanced Scorecard and			
	Quarter 3 Performance report			
	2017-2018			
Report No:	PAS/SE/18/001			
Report to and dates:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	31 January 2018		
Portfolio holder:	Councillor 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 2017-2018 and an overview of performance against those indicators for the third quarter of 2017-2018.			
Recommendation:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee:			
	performance using Quarter 3, 2017-20 information required	sted to review the Council's Balanced Scorecards for 18 and identify any further I or make recommendations on or attention is required to s performance.		

Key Decision:		Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which			
(Chack the appropriate		definition?			
(Check the appropriate box and delete all those		Yes, it is a Key Decision - \square			
that do not apply.)	No, it is	No, it is not a Key Decision - $oximes$			
Consultation:		• This	s report has been p	repared in	
		sultation with all relevant staff and			
Lea		Lea	dership Team.		
Alternative option(s): • The		e option of doing nothing may result in			
	•		or performance, monitoring performance		
			highlight where remedial action may		
Turnitantiana		be	needed		
Implications:	aini inamiian	tion o 2	Vac D Na N		
Are there any finan	•	tions?	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,		
		<u> </u>	resources may need to be		
			reallocated to improve		
			performance in a future period.		
Are there any staffing implications?		Yes □ No ⊠			
If yes, please give details		•			
Are there any ICT implications? If		Yes □ No ⊠			
yes, please give details		• N- 57			
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. Poor performance 		
details		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) Low/Medium/	High*		Low/Medium/ High*	
Failure to achieve	High		Regular reporting of	Medium	
optimum or target			performance to Joint		
performance which may impact on			Leadership Team, Portfolio Holders and		
resources			to PASC can		
			highlight where		
			remedial action may be needed.		
Ward(s) affected:		All Ward	<u> </u>		

Background papers: (all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)	PASC May 2017 - Balanced Scorecards Targets 2017-18
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 Regulatory Balanced Scorecard
	Appendix E – Operations Balanced Scorecard

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Performance Measures

- 1.1.1 Attached at **appendices A** to **E** are the current Balanced Scorecards (based on Assistant Director area) which present Quarter 3 2017-2018 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 Red-Amber-Green (RAG) rating, details of this are highlighted in the comments box.
- 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 3 Performance**

1.2.1 Within Resources and Performance, the "% of non-disputed invoices paid within 30 days" corporate indicator across both councils shows we have achieved positive results in the third quarter, reporting 94.15% of invoices paid within 30 days. The finance and performance team will continue to work with service areas to try and improve performance against this indicator to achieve the 95% target, with monthly business intelligence reports being sent out with details of all invoices processed.