THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1 JULY 2013

PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FINAL
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LOCAL AND NATIONAL PERFORMANCE
INDICATORS AND THEIR VALUE TO THE COUNCIL INFORMAL SCRUTINY
GROUP

REPORT OF CORPORATE BUSINESS MANAGER

Contact Officer: Simon Howson 01962 848 104
Email: showson@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

OS44 – Local and National Performance Indicators and their value to the Council
Informal Scrutiny Group, 18 June 2012.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Cabinet at its meeting on 4 July 2012 considered the final recommendations of the
Informal Scrutiny Group (ISG) which reviewed the Local and National Performance
Indicators and their value to the City Council after earlier review by The Overview
and Scrutiny Committee.

A set of recommendations were agreed following consideration.

This Report summarises progress against the actions that were agreed within the
final action plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee notes the progress made to date in implementing the
recommendations following the ISG that looked at the value to the Council of local
and national performance indicators.

THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1 JULY 2013

PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FINAL
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LOCAL AND NATIONAL PERFORMANCE
INDICATORS AND THEIR VALUE TO THE COUNCIL INFORMAL SCRUTINY
GROUP

REPORT OF CORPORATE BUSINESS MANAGER

1.   Introduction

1.1   Cabinet on 4 July 2012 considered the final recommendations of the ISG
       which reviewed the Local and National Performance Indicators and their
       value to the Council, following an earlier review by The Overview and
       Scrutiny Committee on 18 June 2012 (Report OS44 refers).

1.2   At that meeting, Cabinet agreed a set of recommendations that would
       support and assist the Council in moving forward with the managing and
       monitoring of its performance.

1.3   Furthermore, Cabinet also approved a set of key performance indicators that
       would be used corporately to monitor performance and a performance
       monitoring cycle for the reporting of progress against Change Plans.

1.4   This report summarises in Appendix 1 the progress made so far against the
       actions that were agreed within the final action plan.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

2.   SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CHANGE PLANS
      (RELEVANCE TO):

2.1   The effective use of performance indicators allows the Council to monitor,
       manage and improve the services that it provides to the residents of the
       District.

3.   RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

3.1   For the most part, the recommendations arising from the ISG have required
       officer time in implementing revised arrangements. However, there is one
       recommendation, which was to investigate the possibility of integrating data
       from third party sources, such as the Orchard Housing system and Idox
       Planning system into Covalent. Procuring the Covalent integration software
       or middleware would cost between £7,000 and £8,000. As there are no
       specific budgets allocated to the implementation of any of the
       recommendations from the ISG, no progress has been made with the
       integration of data

4. <u>RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES</u>

4.1 There are no risks directly associated with the recommendations included in the final report of the ISG. However, ineffective performance management could lead to the failure to identify and rectify service performance which leads to service decline which could result in the Council providing poor value for money, poor customer service and damage the Council's reputation. This risk is included in the Corporate Risk Schedule for 2013/14.

<u>BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS</u>:

Files held in the Policy Team and information held on Covalent.

<u>APPENDICES</u>:

Appendix 1 – Summary of progress in implementing Local and National performance indicators and their value to the Council ISG recommendations

No.	Original ISG recommendation	Progress/Current status
1	That the Council adopts the identified qualities of a good performance indicator set out in the report at paragraph 7.2 of Appendix 1 to the report.	The qualities of a good performance indicator, which are also included in the Council's Data Quality Policy, have been adopted.
2	That the Council endorses Winchester City Council's Performance Management Guide.	Cabinet endorsed the Performance Management Guide which was then circulated to all senior managers and staff who monitor performance for reference and guidance. To ensure that the Guide remains current it is now being considered for a refresh.
3	That the Performance Indicator Check List be adopted as part of the WCC Performance Management Guide for Heads of Teams to deploy to test the usefulness and quality of each PI to establish its status in the Council's PI data set.	The Performance Indicator checklist has been adopted by the Council and referred to when new indicators are being proposed.
4	That the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader determines through the adoption of recommendations 1, 2 & 3 in the report, a set of draft key performance indicators to show the degree to which services are performing using: output, efficiency and value for money (VFM) indicators; customer satisfaction with services; as well as relevant qualitative and quantitative (including 'sense of community') and outcome indicators alongside each other.	At this Committee's meeting on 18 March 2013, as part of the wider discussion on providing performance monitoring information online, Members asked that consideration be given to the inclusion of additional performance information to the set of key performance indicators. Collection of the data has begun from 1 April 2013 for these additional indicators and will be available to view online alongside the existing suite of indicators. Officers acknowledge the requirement for more qualitative and outcome measures and have started to develop these so that they can be included in the next refresh of the Change Plans due later this year.
5	That officers investigate the feasibility of automating the integration of data from third party software systems used by the Council to the Covalent performance management system; starting with an inventory of data bases and systems used by the Council to record PI information, identifying those that can directly interface with Covalent and those that cannot.	There is a cost to providing data integration in both the procurement of the Covalent integration software/middleware and officer time developing the reports to extract the data. The likely cost of the integration software is between £7,000 and £8,000. Based on the relatively small number of indicators it is not considered to be cost effective. Furthermore, it has not been possible to identify a budget to cover the additional cost.

No.	Original ISG recommendation	Progress/Current status
6	That the Chief Executive in consultation with the Head of Policy and Head of Customer Services consider the different methods of obtaining qualitative performance data from the residents of the District and the users of Council services (for example through the residents' e-panel) so that it may monitor customer satisfaction levels.	The Council continues to monitor levels of customer satisfaction on a quarterly basis for example by contacting 100 customers who have contacted the Customer Service Centre and inviting them to answer questions about the service they received during that contact. The summary results of these quarterly surveys are reported online. The residents' ePanel has been launched and has been used to assess qualitative measures such as what is important to residents where they live and what do they think most needs improving. Whilst the number of residents signed up to the ePanel is not sufficient for the surveys to be representative, the results are indicative and can give the Council a general idea of residents' satisfaction.
7	That the proposed Performance Monitoring Cycle is implemented.	The performance monitoring cycle continues to be followed with a mid-year update on the progress against Change Plans reported to this Committee in November 2012 and an 'outturn' report elsewhere on this Committee's agenda (Report OS78 refers). A further update on the progress against Change Plans in 2013/14 will be reported in November. Performance Management Team continues to monitor progress against Change Plans and the dashboard of key performance indicators on a monthly basis.
8	That consideration is given to the following designated Members having access to Covalent: Cabinet, The Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Personnel Committee and the residual members of this ISG.	Cabinet members were given access and training on how to use Covalent in April of this year. A limited number of Covalent licences are currently available and there would be a cost to the Council if it were to increase this number to accommodate further Members. However, Covalent users are continually reviewed so that users who no longer require access take up a licence.