

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Committee 29 January 2008

Report Title Mid-year Directorate Report Card 2007/8 (April–September 2007)

Summary This report provides an analysis of the Environment and Economy Directorate’s performance at the mid-year point for 2007/08. It reports on performance against the key performance indicators as set out in the Directorate Report Card

For further information please contact

Andy McDarmaid, Environmental Management and Performance Manager. Tel. 01926 418646 andymcdarmaid@warwickshire.gov.uk	Ron Tennant, Performance Management Officer. Tel. 01926 412796 rontennant@warwickshire.gov.uk
---	---

Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework? Yes/No

Background Papers None.

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:- *Details to be specified*

Other Committees

Local Member(s)
(With brief comments, if appropriate)

Other Elected Members Councillor P Barnes }
Councillor M Jones } for information
Councillor P Morris-Jones }

Cabinet Member Councillor C Saint – for information
(Reports to The Cabinet, to be cleared with appropriate Cabinet Member)

Chief Executive

Legal I Marriott – agreed.

- Finance
- Other Chief Officers
- District Councils
- Health Authority
- Police
- Other Bodies/Individuals

FINAL DECISION

YES/NO (If 'No' complete Suggested Next Steps)

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS :

Details to be specified

- Further consideration by this Committee
- To Council
- To Cabinet
- To an O & S Committee
- To an Area Committee
- Further Consultation

Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

29 January 2008

Mid-year Directorate Report Card 2007/8 (April–September 2007)

Report of the Interim Strategic Director for Environment and Economy

Recommendation

That the Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers both the summary and detail of the performance indicators within the Directorate Report Card at the mid-year point of 2007/8.

1. Background

- 1.1 This report presents Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee with the mid-year update on the performance of the Directorate Report Card for 2007/8.
- 1.2 The Directorate Report Card is made up of indicators agreed by the Directorate Management Team in consultation with Portfolio Holders and Members.
- 1.3 As a starting point, it includes any indicators which are in the Corporate Report Card and are the responsibility of this Directorate either on the basis of our specific service areas or as contributions to a corporate total. These indicators will also be reported to Cabinet as part of the Corporate Report Card.
- 1.4 The remainder of the Directorate Report Card is made up of indicators, which are considered to be of strategic importance to the Directorate.
- 1.5 However it is not a complete set of all the Performance Indicators and the selection of indicators has been made with reference to a number of factors including; areas of corporate priority; low performance; public interest and if the indicator is part of Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA), Local Area Agreement (LAA) or another national assessment framework.

- 1.6 The format is based upon detailed consultation with the Overview and Scrutiny Coordinating Group (OSCG) and incorporates feedback from their consideration of presentational options.

2. The Report Card Framework




- 2.1 The Report Card Framework marks a significant 'step-change' from previous performance management approaches:-
- (i) Cabinet will consider performance information on a quarterly basis, in alignment with the financial performance reporting programme.
 - (ii) Overview and Scrutiny Committees will focus on the issues and areas of greatest importance to the Directorate this year, and will receive high level, exception-based, monitoring of our organisational health.
- 2.2 This approach was launched in 2007/8 and although this Quarter will be the second time that Cabinet will consider the Corporate Report Card, it is the first time Directorate Report Cards have been presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committees.
- 2.3 The Directorate Report Card sets out the key performance measures for the Directorate under the following four headings:
- (i) Performance Results
 - (ii) Corporate Health
 - (iii) Customer
 - (iv) People
- 2.4 The collection frequency of the measures varies and every six months a forecast of the final performance for 2007/8 will be presented. In the case of annual figures, where an actual result (rather than a forecast) is presented this will be made clear within the report.
- 2.5 There are two types of measure in the Directorate Report Card:
- (i) Type 1 – Service area or specialism, led by the Directorate.
 - (ii) Type 2 – Contribution to a corporate total eg. Sickness absence.
- 2.5 The PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC) benchmarking data for 2006/7 has been used to set the forecasted performance in the context of the performance of other County Councils for all the Best Value Performance Indicators within the Directorate Report Card.
- 2.6 The full series of comparative data and graphs for all the Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) and Performance Assessment Framework




indicators (PAFs) have been presented to Cabinet as a separate report and are available on the Intranet.

- 2.7 To facilitate exception-based reporting, when measuring performance against targets in 2007/8 a zero tolerance has been applied to all measures in the Directorate Report Card.
- 2.8 Where indicators showing a negative trend or low comparative position are reported they will be subject to exception reporting in a similar manner to the Financial Reporting model. In these cases we need to explain the performance and set out the remedial action.

3. Overall Summary of Performance at the Mid-Year 2007/8

- 3.1 There are 26 measures within the Directorate Report Card and at the mid-year point for 2007/8, performance is reported for 22 of these. Of the total number reported there are no BVPIs for which PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PwC) benchmarking data is available.
- 3.2 The mid-year performance for 2007/8 is summarised in the tables below against target and where possible against the PwC Benchmark:

	Quarter 2 Forecast (April – Sept) compared to year end target		
	Year end forecast to exceed target	Year end forecast to meet target	Year end forecast to miss target
			
Total no. of measures	9	7	6
Percentage	40.9%	31.8%	27.3%

	Quarter 2 Forecast (April – Sept) Forecast compared to 2006/7 PwC best quartile (BVPIs and PAFs)		
	Year end forecast above 2006/7 best quartile	Year end forecast meets 2006/7 best quartile	Year end forecast below 2006/7 best quartile
			
Total no. of measures	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percentage	n/a	n/a	n/a

- 3.3 For the measures reported on, the mid-year forecast is that 72.7% of these will either meet or exceed the original year-end objective. Of those forecast to miss the year-end target, the assumption has, in some cases, been based upon actual results available at the end of Quarter 2 and as such these assumptions may be overly pessimistic.
- 3.4 The indicators most likely to remain “Red” are the following:-

- (i) RC19 - earnings relative to regional average (100) – Quarter 2 year end forecast is revised to 108.5 compared to the original year end forecast of 114.
 - (ii) RC60 - % end year variance to budget - where we are currently anticipating a 3% overspend.
 - (iii) BV17 - % employees from Black and Minority Ethnic communities - currently the Environment and Economy Directorate (EED) stands at 3.83% against a corporate objective of 4.50%.
 - (iv) BV11 - Top 5% of earners who are women - at present 19.44% of the directorate's top earners are women compared to the corporate objective of 55%. Adoption of the corporate objective for BV11 may in this instance be inappropriate as the current female - male balance within the directorate is 46% - 54%.
- 3.5 Further explanation for all “Green” and “Red” indicators is given at the end of this report.
- 3.6 In terms of customer care, the directorate is performing well with a result of 98.5% of all telephone calls answered within the corporate guidelines of 15 seconds (five rings) against the corporate objective of 80%. Letter and e-mail responses within five working days scored 72.7% and 79.4% respectively against corporate targets of 70% and 80%.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That the Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers both the summary and detail of the Performance Indicators within the Directorate Report Card during at the mid-year point of 2007/8.

Performance Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual ¹ (A)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast ² (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking ⁵	County Council Best Quartile ⁶ (D)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
RC 19	Number earnings relative to regional average (based on 2006 actual, index - 100I)	High/ Annual	108	108.5	114	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 20	% Unemployment rate relative to regional average (based on January 2007 actual, index – 100)	High/ Quarterly	-1.6%	-1.4% Actual	-0.6%	★			
RC 26	% Best Value Performance indicators (BVPs) in the top quartile	High/ Quarterly	36%	8%	8%	●			
RC 83	No. Directorates certified -ISO14001	High/ Quarterly	3	4	4	●			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols			
★	Year end forecast to exceed target	★	Year end forecast above 2006/07 best quartile	1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)
●	Year end forecast to meet target	●	Year end forecast meets 2006/07 best quartile	2	Quarter 2 year end forecast for 2007/08 (B) (based on period April – September) NB. In some cases this will be an actual figure
▲	Year end forecast to miss target (See remedial action section)	▲	Year end forecast below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)	3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)
				4	Alert - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)
				5	Warwickshire County Council's (WCC) 2006/07 position against the total number of comparator county councils
				6	The County Council best quartile for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool. Where the aim is high, this is the 75 th percentile Where the aim is low, this is the 25 th percentile
				7	Alert - Quarter 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 th or 75 th percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

Performance Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual ¹ (A)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast ² (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking ⁵	County Council Best Quartile ⁶ (D)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
RC 81	Maintenance and expansion of the Council's business portfolio, including managed workspace facilities, to meet the needs of the local economy	Target/ Quarterly	N/a	On target	On target	●	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 82	Successful implementation of the major regeneration schemes in Nuneaton and Bedworth and Stratford	Target/ Quarterly	N/a	On target	On target	●			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols	
★	Year end forecast to exceed target	★	Year end forecast above 2006/07 best quartile
●	Year end forecast to meet target	●	Year end forecast meets 2006/07 best quartile
▲	Year end forecast to miss target (See remedial action section)	▲	Year end forecast below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)

1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)	5	WCC's 2006/07 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	Quarter 2 year end forecast for 2007/08 (B) (based on period April – September) NB. In some cases this will be an actual figure	6	The County Council best quartile for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool. Where the aim is high, this is the 75 th percentile Where the aim is low, this is the 25 th percentile
3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	Alert - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	Alert - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 th or 75 th percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

Customers Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual ¹ (A)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast ² (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking ⁵	County Council Best Quartile ⁶ (D)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
RC 36	% Calls answered within WCC Standards	High/Quarterly	95%	98.5% Actual Year to Date (YTD)	80% *	★			
RC 37	% Letters responded to within WCC Standards	High/Quarterly	68.8%	72.7% Actual YTD	70% *	★			
RC 38	% E-mails responded to within WCC Standards	High/Quarterly	77%	79.4% Actual	80% *	▲			

Key

Target Symbols

★	Year end forecast to exceed target
●	Year end forecast to meet target
▲	Year end forecast to miss target (See remedial action section)

Benchmarking Symbols

★	Year end forecast above 2006/07 best quartile
●	Year end forecast meets 2006/07 best quartile
▲	Year end forecast below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)

* WCC Corporate Target

1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)	5	WCC's 2006/07 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	Quarter 2 year end forecast for 2007/08 (B) (based on period April – September) NB . In some cases this will be an actual figure	6	The County Council best quartile for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool. Where the aim is high, this is the 75 th percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 th percentile
3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	Alert - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	Alert - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 th or 75 th percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

Customers Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual ¹ (A)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast ² (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking ⁵	County Council Best Quartile ⁶ (D)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
RC39	% Satisfaction with visits – Mystery Shopping	High/Half Yearly	79%	67% Mini-wave result	85% *	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 40	% Satisfaction with calls - Mystery Shopping	High/Half Yearly	77%	Not available	89% *	n/a			
RC 41	% Satisfaction with letters - Mystery Shopping	High/Half Yearly	89%	Not available	65% *	n/a			
RC 42	% Satisfaction with e-mails - Mystery Shopping	High/Half Yearly	70%	72% Mini-wave result	70% *	★			

Key

Target Symbols

★	Year end forecast to exceed target
●	Year end forecast to meet target
▲	Year end forecast to miss target (See remedial action section)



Benchmarking Symbols

★	Year end forecast above 2006/07 best quartile
●	Year end forecast meets 2006/07 best quartile
▲	Year end forecast below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)







* WCC Corporate Target

1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)	5	WCC's 2006/07 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	Quarter 2 year end forecast for 2007/08 (B) (based on period April – September) NB. In some cases this will be an actual figure	6	The County Council best quartile for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool. Where the aim is high, this is the 75 th percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 th percentile
3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	Alert - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	Alert - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 th or 75 th percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

Corporate Health Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual ¹ (A)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast ² (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking ⁵	County Council Best Quartile ⁶ (D)	Qtr 2 Year End Forecast against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
RC 55	Environment Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) Score	High/ Annual	4	4	4		Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 85	% Local Area Agreement (LAA) measures on target to be achieved	High/ Quarterly	N. Gower-Johnson to supply information						
RC 60	% End year variance from budget	Target/ Quarterly	-0.29%	+3.0%	0%				
RC 66	% Compliance with the Corporate Governance action plan	High/ Annual	N/A	n/a	80%	n/a			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols					
	Year end forecast to exceed target		Year end forecast above 2006/07 best quartile	1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)	5	WCC's 2006/07 position against the total number of comparator county councils
	Year end forecast to meet target		Year end forecast meets 2006/07 best quartile	2	Quarter 2 year end forecast for 2007/08 (B) (based on period April – September) NB. In some cases this will be an actual figure	6	The County Council best quartile for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool. Where the aim is high, this is the 75 th percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 th percentile
	Year end forecast to miss target (See remedial action section)		Year end forecast below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)	3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)	7	
				4	Alert - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)		Alert - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 th or 75 th percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

People Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual ¹ (A)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast ² (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking ⁵	County Council Best Quartile ⁶ (D)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
RC 68	% Staff Satisfied overall with WCC as a place to work	High/Annual	83%	85% Actual	80% *	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 69	% Staff clear about what they are expected to achieve in their job	High/Annual	89%	90% Actual	90% *	●			
RC 70	% Staff satisfied with the recognition they get for doing a good job	High/Annual	59%	62% Actual	60% *	★			
RC 71	% Staff satisfied with the training and development they receive for their present job	High/Annual	74%	77% Actual	72% *	★			
RC 72	Communication between Directorates is good	High/Annual	21%	35% Actual	35% *	●			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols	
★	Year end forecast to exceed target	★	Year end forecast above 2006/07 best quartile
●	Year end forecast to meet target	●	Year end forecast meets 2006/07 best quartile
▲	Year end forecast to miss target (See remedial action section)	▲	Year end forecast below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)

* WCC Corporate Target

1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)	5	WCC's 2006/07 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	Quarter 2 year end forecast for 2007/08 (B) (based on period April – September) NB . In some cases this will be an actual figure	6	The County Council best quartile for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool. Where the aim is high, this is the 75 th percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 th percentile
3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	Alert - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	Alert - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 th or 75 th percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

People Results									
Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual ¹ (A)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast ² (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking ⁵	County Council Best Quartile ⁶ (D)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
BV 12 Local RC 73	No. Working days/shifts lost due to sickness absence per Fully Time Equivalent (FTE)	Low/ Quarterly	7.53	6.6	8 *	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
BV 16a Local RC 74	% Employees who are disabled	High/ Quarterly	2.06%	2.06%	1.50% *	★			
BV 17a Local RC 75	% Employees from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities	High/ Quarterly	3.83%	3.83%	4.50% *	▲			
BV 11a Local RC 76	Top 5% of earners that are women	High/ Quarterly	19.44%	19.44%	55% *	▲			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols	
★	Year end forecast to exceed target	★	Year end forecast above 2006/07 best quartile
●	Year end forecast to meet target	●	Year end forecast meets 2006/07 best quartile
▲	Year end forecast to miss target (See remedial action section)	▲	Year end forecast below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)

* WCC Corporate Target

1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)	5	WCC's 2006/07 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	Quarter 2 year end forecast for 2007/08 (B) (based on period April – September) NB. In some cases this will be an actual figure	6	The County Council best quartile for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool. Where the aim is high, this is the 75 th percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 th percentile
3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	Alert - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	Alert - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 th or 75 th percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

Commentary on Activity Related to all 'Green' Indicators

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Greens		Commentary
		Green Performance Against Target	Green Benchmark	
RC 20	% Unemployment rate relative to regional average (based on January 2007 actual, index – 100)	√		Quarter 2 year-end forecast (-1.4%) is expected to exceed our original year-end objective of -0.6% and approach the recorded levels of 2006-07.
RC 36	% Calls answered within WCC Standards	√		EED half-year results compare very favourably with corporate objectives 98.5% vs 80%. Response rates are monitored on a monthly, rather than quarterly, basis within the directorate.
RC 37	% Letters responded to within WCC Standards	√		Actual letter response rate of 72.7% is slightly ahead of the 70% corporate objective. Further improvements are anticipated due to amendments made to EED letter template.
RC 42	% Satisfaction with e-mails - Mystery Shopping	√		Results of the original wave equalled the corporate objective of 70%. The following mini-wave returned an improved result of 72%.
RC 68	% Staff Satisfied overall with WCC as a place to work	√		EED result of 85% compared well with both corporate result of 78% and benchmark of 70%

Commentary on Activity related to all 'Green' Indicators

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Greens		Commentary
		Green Performance Against Target	Green Benchmark	
RC 70	% Staff satisfied with the recognition they get for doing a good job	√		EED result of 62% compared well with both corporate result of 59% and benchmark of 52%
RC 71	% Staff satisfied with the training & development they receive for their present job	√		EED result of 77% compared well with both corporate result of 71% and benchmark of 61%
BV 12 Local RC 73	No. Working days/ shifts lost due to sickness absence per FTE	√		Based on half year performance, year-end forecast is 6.6 days of FTE absence comparing favourably with corporate objective of 8 days and 2006-07 actual result of 7.53 days.
BV 16a Local RC 74	% Employees who are disabled	√		EED are ahead of the corporate objective of 1.5% of employees who are disabled with an actual half year result of 2.06%.

Remedial action taken/proposed for all 'Red' Indicators and Milestones

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark		
RC 19	No. Earnings relative to regional average (based on 2006 actual, index - 100)	√			The declaration of 114 as an end of year target was on reflection "over ambitious". The absolute maximum that we could hope to achieve is in the order of 110, but 108.5 is now declared as a realistic Qtr2 year end forecast.	
RC 38	% E-mails responded to within WCC Standards	√			The corporate target for e-mails is that 80% of those received should be responded to within the prescribed timescale. E-mail response rates are automatically captured for all directorates - the 2006-07 actual result for EED was 77%, the Qtr2 result is 79.4%. Based on this Qtr2 result, we have no reason to believe that the year end target will not be achieved. However, certain issues with the current data capture mechanism, which could influence the results, are being investigated by P&D and the ICT department.	
RC39	% Satisfaction with visits – Mystery Shopping	√	√		A deterioration was evident between the main wave and subsequent mini wave. This was due to the fact that the mini wave concentrated on the area shown to be worst performing in the original wave, which was Montague Road (Countryside Recreation). Two visits to Montague Road were rated as "Okay" in the original wave, but of the 3 visits made in the mini wave, 1 was rated as "Good" and 2 were rated as "Poor".	

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark		
RC 60	% End year variance from budget	√	√		The forecast overspend is the result of efficiency savings which still need to be identified and various net overspends across services. Leadership Team is continuing to identify management actions to bring net expenditure back in line with budgets.	
BV 17a Local RC 75	% Employees from BME communities	√			Actual at half year equal to 3.83% compared to corporate objective of 4.50%. Of the 65 new appointments made year-to-date, 8% of the successful candidates were from an ethnic minority background.	
BV 11a Local RC 76	Top 5% of earners that are women	√			The current position is accepted as not being particularly good, but it is something that we are aware of and are looking to address.	

DAVID PYWELL
Interim Strategic Director for Environment and Economy
Shire Hall
Warwick

3 January 2008