

Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Key Performance Indicators and Quarter 2 Performance report 2014-15	
Report No:	PAS/SE/14/002	
Decisions plan reference:	Not applicable.	
Report to and dates:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	26 November 2014
Portfolio holder:	Dave Ray Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01359 250912 Email: david.ray@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 Key Performance Indicators being used to measure the Council's performance for 2014-15 and an overview of performance against those indicators for the second quarter of 2014-15.	

Recommendation:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Members are requested to Review the Council's performance against the Key Performance Indicators for Quarter 2, 2014-15 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: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		None	
Documents attached:		Appendix A – Forest Heath, St Edmundsbury and West Suffolk Key Performance Indicators 2014-15 – Quarter 2 Results	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)





1.1 Key Issues

1.1.1 The report at **Appendix A** presents performance against Quarter 2 2014-15 for both Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury, together with a combined performance for West Suffolk where this is relevant.

1.1.2 Forest Heath KPIs are denoted with a FH/ prefix, St Edmundsbury KPIs are denoted with a SE/ prefix and those for West Suffolk with a WS/ prefix.

1.1.3 The information included in the report has been provided by Heads of Service and service management. 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.

1.1.4 The following table shows the status of the current performance for all indicators:

Quarter 2 2014-15	PI on or exceeded target 	PI below target within tolerance 	PI significantly below target 	Data only Indicators 
Forest Heath KPIs	8	3	5	8
St Edmundsbury KPIs	9	3	4	8
West Suffolk KPIs	7	3	4	7

1.1.5 Where performance is below target the data is supported by notes and explanations from services.

1.2 Planning Performance

1.2.1 Generally performance in dealing with the various planning applications is steadily improving. It has to be said that the performance improvement for Major projects is really encouraging. The team are now getting to grips with the inherent back log and we should be seeing sustained improvements across all categories of applications during the next two quarters