

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee Overview & Scrutiny Coordinating Group

Date of Committee 12th September 2007

Report Title Performance Reporting to O&S Committees

Summary This reports sets out the proposed reporting format for Directorate Performance Reports in 2007/08

For further information please contact:

Tricia Morrison Corporate Planning & Performance Manager Tel: 01926 736319 triciamorrison@warwickshire.gov.uk	Gereint Stoneman Corporate Planning Manager Tel: 01926 412378 gereintstoneman@warwickshire.gov.uk
---	---

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

Background papers Reporting Performance to Overview & Scrutiny Committees – 25/04/07

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:- Details to be specified

- Other Committees
- Local Member(s)
- Other Elected Members Cllr Browne
- Cabinet Member
- Chief Executive
- Legal Sarah Duxbury
- Finance
- Other Chief Officers David Carter
- District Councils
- Health Authority
- Police
- Other Bodies/Individuals .Jane Pollard.....

FINAL DECISION NO

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

Agenda No 2

Overview & Scrutiny Coordinating Group - 12th September 2007.

Performance Reporting to O&S Committees

Report of the Strategic Director of Performance & Development

Recommendation

OSCG is recommended to:

- Consider and comment on the proposed reporting format for Directorate Report Cards in 2007/08.

1. Background

- 1.1 On 25th April 2007 the Overview & Scrutiny Coordinating Group (OSCG) received a demonstration of the Corporate Performance Management system (Performance Plus) and considered a supporting paper outlining proposals for future arrangements for performance reporting the Overview & Scrutiny Committees.
- 1.2 The proposed approach is based upon the adoption of Report Cards at Corporate and Directorate level from 1st April 2007.
- 1.3 Following a detailed discussion it was agreed that it would be beneficial to consider an example of a Performance report in the new Report Card style at a subsequent meeting. The views and suggestions of the Group were used to help shape the quarterly Corporate Report Card template adopted for Cabinet.
- 1.4 This report therefore presents the proposed reporting template for O&S Committees format at **Appendix 1** for consideration using 2006/7 year- end data.

2. The Report Card Framework

2.1 Background

The move to a Report Card system represents a 'step-change' from previous performance management approaches at both the Corporate and Directorate level. Report Cards at both levels will focus on the key organisational and Directorate issues and performance areas at a given point in time and provide high level, exception-based, organisational health monitors at the respective levels. This is presented in Paragraph 2.2 – 2.5 below as agreed by Cabinet on the 26th June.

2.2 Report Card Roles

Leader/Deputy Leader & Chief Executive

To hold Portfolio Holders and Strategic Directors to account

Overview & Scrutiny Committees

To hold services to account via regular 6 monthly performance reporting of Directorate Report Cards to Committee.

Portfolio Holders and Strategic Directors

To maintain efficient and effective service delivery and supply the required performance information; and to remedy poor performance where it occurs.

Portfolio Holder and Strategic Director for Performance & Development

To ensure the Report Card system and processes are in place to drive the overall approach and ensure it operates as efficiently and effectively as possible.

2.3 Report Card Features

SMART Target setting

Directorates are responsible for setting realistic and challenging targets for each of their respective indicators within the Corporate and Directorate Report Cards.

Zero tolerance

To facilitate exception-based reporting; when measuring performance against targets in 2007/08 a zero tolerance will be applied to all measures in the Corporate and Directorate Report Cards.

Exception reporting

Where indicators are reported as showing a negative trend, poor comparative performance or a missing target this will be subject to exception reporting in a similar manner to the Financial Reporting model. This will require the source Directorates to explain performance and set out the requisite remedial action.

2.4 Report Card Content

Local Area Agreement measures

The Local Area Agreement brings together contributions from a variety of partner agencies across the County. The Public Service Board on a quarterly basis will review these contributions. Where these measures are considered to be of particular importance for the County Council they have been included in the Corporate Business Plan and in some cases the Corporate Report Card. The Corporate Report Card also measures the percentage of LAA targets overall on target to be achieved.

Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs)

To retain the strategic focus of the Corporate and Directorate Report Cards, some but not all of the Council's BVPIs will appear in the Report Card. However all BVPIs will continue to be monitored and reported on as part of the annual Best Value Performance Report (a statutory requirement) and elevated into the Corporate Report Card where indicators meet the criteria for inclusion i.e. poor performance or we have a statutory requirement. The Corporate Report Card also measures the percentage of BVPIs in the top and bottom quartile when compared to all Counties in the previous year.

Local Measures

Both the Corporate and Directorate Report Cards include indicators, which are of local service need and priority but in themselves are not statutory requirements.

PWC Benchmarking data

The PWC benchmarking Club allows us to compare our performance on the Best Value Performance Indicators with the other Shire Counties on a quarterly basis. This information will be included in the Corporate and Directorate Report Cards for the relevant indicators. The full series of comparative data and graphs will be made available on the intranet to inform service improvement and the wider context.

2.5 The wider Performance Management Framework

Corporate Business Plan

The Corporate Business Plan encapsulates the strategic direction of the Organisation over the medium term. It sets out the Council's Vision and shows how the top priorities will be delivered through headline activity. The progress and impact of this activity is in turn measured through a selection of indicators taken from the Corporate Report Card and Local Area Agreement.

New Ways of Working Programme

The New Ways of Working Programme is the major change Programme for the Council and provides strategic focus and wider ownership of a range of improvement projects and programmes across the Organisation.

Comprehensive Performance Assessment

Every aspect of the Performance Management Framework is focused upon the delivery of excellent services. The attainment of this goal is externally validated through the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) Framework and the Corporate Report Card contains overall scores for each of the service and corporate components of CPA.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 Consider and comment on the proposed reporting format for Directorate Report Cards in 2007/8.

DAVID CARTER
Strategic Director of Performance
& Development
Shire Hall, Warwick.

Performance Results

Performance Results									
Indicators			Trend Data	Current Performance 2006/07			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
Ref	Description	Aim & Frequency	2005/06 Actual ¹ (A)	2006/07 Actual (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Actual Performance against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	Ranking ⁵	County Council Top Quartile ⁶ (D)	Actual Performance against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
BV50	Educational qualifications of children looked after by reference to the % of young people leaving care aged 16+ with at least 1 GCSE at grades A*- G or GNVQ	High/ Annual	68.89%	58%	75%	▲	16 th /34	> 61	▲
BV 53 RC 17	No. Households receiving intensive home care per 1000 of people aged 65+	High/ Quarterly	7.95	10	9.5	★	14 th /34	> 11	●
BV 54 RC 15	No. Older people helped to live at home per 1000 of people aged 65+	High/ Quarterly	57.44	61.8	74	▲	27 th /34	> 81.9	▲
BV84b.05	% Change in no. Kg of household waste collected per head of population.	Low/ Quarterly	-1.44%	-0.22%	0	★	13 th /34	< -0.83%	★
BV 143ii RC 79	No. Accidental fire injuries per 100,000 population	Low/ Quarterly	5.32	4.87	3.43	▲	5 th /13	< 4.13	▲
BV 201 RC 18	No. Adults receiving direct payments at 31/03/07, per 100,000 of people aged 18+	High/ Quarterly	60.42	92	121	▲	19 th /34	> 108	▲
BV162	Child protection cases which were reviewed regularly as a % of those cases that should have been reviewed during the year.	High/ Annual	98.1%	95.5%	100%	▲	33 rd /34	> 99.5%	▲







Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols			
★	Exceeded performance	★	2006/07 actual performance above 2006/07 best quartile	1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)
●	Met performance	●	2006/07 actual performance meets 2006/07 best quartile	2	Actual performance for 2006/07 (B) NB. In some cases this will be an actual figure
▲	Missed performance (See remedial action section)	▲	2006/07 actual performance below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)	3	End of year target for 2006/07 as set by respective Directorates (C)
				5	WCC's 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 – actual performance (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			Trend Data	Current Performance 2006/07			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
Ref	Description	Aim & Frequency	2005/06 Actual ¹ (A)	2006/07 Actual (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Actual Performance against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	Ranking ⁵	County Council Top Quartile ⁶ (D)	Actual Performance against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
BV 206 RC 10	No. Deliberate fires per 10,000 population	Low/Quarterly	37.57	36.71	34.99	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
CH15 RC 04	% Positive destinations for 16+ school leavers	High/Annual	93.6%	93.5%	93.9%	▲			
CH26 RC 16	No. Admissions of supported residents aged 65 or over to residential/ nursing care per 10,000 population	Low/Quarterly	73	59	71	★			
CH28	No. Delayed transfers of care per 100,000 people aged 65 or over	Low/Quarterly	23	29	32.60	★			
CH30	% Looked after children adopted during the year	High/Annual	5.59%	8.5%	8%	★			
CH39	No. Pupils permanently excluded during the year per 1000 pupils at all maintained schools	Low/Annual	1.90	0.95	0.95	●			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols	
	Exceeded performance		2006/07 actual performance above 2006/07 best quartile
	Met performance		2006/07 actual performance meets 2006/07 best quartile
	Missed performance (See remedial action section)		2006/07 actual performance 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	Actual performance for 2006/07 (B) 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 2006/07 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	Alert – Actual performance (B) compared to end of year target for 2006/07 (C)	7	Alert – actual performance (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			Trend Data	Current Performance 2006/07			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
Ref	Description	Aim & Frequency	2005/06 Actual ¹ (A)	2006/07 Actual (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Actual Performance against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	Ranking ⁵	County Council Top Quartile ⁶ (D)	Actual Performance against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
CH51 RC 08	Average point score per student entered for exam	High/Annual	303.2	706.7	310.2	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
CH55	% 11 year olds (KS2) achieving level 4+ in English	High/Annual	82%	82%	82%	●			
CH56	% 11 year olds (KS2) achieving level 4+ in Maths	High/Annual	78%	78%	83%	▲			
CH83	Reduce total crime in Warwickshire (by 15% by 2008)	Low/Quarterly	43459	45254	40570	▲			
CH84	% Reduction in Youth Offenders Re-Offending	Low/Annual	42.8%	43%	37%	▲			
CH88	% Reduction Household Waste sent to Landfill	High/Annual	N/a	8%	5%	★			
CH90	% Reduction for all Killed/Seriously injured people compared to average 2001-2004 base	High/Annual	27%	29%	10%	★			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols			
★	Exceeded performance	★	2006/07 actual performance above 2006/07 best quartile	1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)
●	Met performance	●	2006/07 actual performance meets 2006/07 best quartile	2	Actual performance for 2006/07 (B) NB. In some cases this will be an actual figure
▲	Missed performance (See remedial action section)	▲	2006/07 actual performance below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)	3	End of year target for 2006/07 as set by respective Directorates (C)
				4	Alert – Actual performance (B) compared to end of year target for 2006/07 (C)
				5	WCC's 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 – actual performance (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			Trend Data	Current Performance 2006/07			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
Ref	Description	Aim & Frequency	2005/06 Actual ¹ (A)	2006/07 Actual (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Actual Performance against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	Ranking ⁵	County Council Top Quartile ⁶ (D)	Actual Performance against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
Local	% of all schools providing access to the five core offer services for Extended Schools by September 2010	High/Annual	N/a	15%	15%		Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
Local	Number of Children's Centres	High/Annual	N/a	13	10				
Local	Reduce the number of fixed term exclusions to 50% of the current rate in 3 years	Low/Annual	3207	3229	2632				
Local	Reduce the number of permanent exclusions to 50% of the current rate in 3 years	Low/Annual	146	119	100				







Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols					
	Exceeded performance		2006/07 actual performance 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
	Met performance		2006/07 actual performance meets 2006/07 best quartile	2	Actual performance for 2006/07 (B) 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
	Missed performance (See remedial action section)		2006/07 actual performance below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)	3	End of year target for 2006/07 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
				4	Alert – Actual performance (B) compared to end of year target for 2006/07 (C)	7	Alert – actual performance (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			Trend Data	Current Performance 2006/07			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
Ref	Description	Aim & Frequency	2005/06 Actual ¹ (A)	2006/07 Actual (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Actual Performance against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	Ranking ⁵	County Council Top Quartile ⁶ (D)	Actual Performance against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
Local	% Care Leavers in Suitable Accommodation	High/Annual	95.2%	94.4%	100%	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
Local	Reduce % re-registrations on the child protection register	10-15% is best/Annual	17%	11.8%	12%	▲			
Local	% Reduction duration on the child protection register	Low/Annual	8.5%	6.6%	8.5%	★			
Local	% Improvement educational qualification of care leavers (5 A*-C)	High/Annual	11.1%	16.3%	12%	★			
Local	% Key Actions Achieved in the Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy	High/Quarterly	N/a	75%	100%	▲			
Local	% Members Individual Learning Plans by March 2007	High/Annual	N/a	0	70%	▲			
Local	Advertising spend equivalent to £3m worth of positive prominent coverage achieved in the local press	Target/Annual	N/a	£3m equivalent	£3m equivalent	●			







Key






Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols	
	Exceeded performance		2006/07 actual performance above 2006/07 best quartile
	Met performance		2006/07 actual performance meets 2006/07 best quartile
	Missed performance (See remedial action section)		2006/07 actual performance 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	Actual performance for 2006/07 (B) 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 2006/07 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	Alert – Actual performance (B) compared to end of year target for 2006/07 (C)	7	Alert – actual performance (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)







Customer Results									
Indicators			Trend Data	Current Performance 2006/07			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
Ref	Description	Aim & Frequency	2005/06 Actual ¹ (A)	2006/07 Actual (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Actual Performance against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	Ranking ⁵	County Council Top Quartile ⁶ (D)	Actual Performance against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
BV03 RC 28	% Residents satisfied with the way the Council runs things	High/ Annual	57.6%	55.4%	58%	▲	5 th or 6 th /34	> 35%	★
CH23 RC 52	% users satisfied with the Home Care Service	High/ Annual	62%	66%	63%	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
CH92 RC 89	% Reduction in residents worried about crime	High/ Annual	54%	50%	52%	★			
Local RC 84	% Public Enquiries Satisfied at First Point of Contact	High/ Quarterly	N/a	70%	80%	▲			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols					
	Exceeded performance		2006/07 actual performance 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
	Met performance		2006/07 actual performance meets 2006/07 best quartile	2	Actual performance for 2006/07 (B) 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
	Missed performance (See remedial action section)		2006/07 actual performance below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)	3	End of year target for 2006/07 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
				4	Alert – Actual performance (B) compared to end of year target for 2006/07 (C)	7	Alert – actual performance (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			Trend Data	Current Performance 2006/07			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
Ref	Description	Aim & Frequency	2005/06 Actual ¹ (A)	2006/07 Actual (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Actual Performance against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	Ranking ⁵	County Council Top Quartile ⁶ (D)	Actual Performance against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
CH04	CPA rating	High/Annual	3	3	3		Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
CH07 RC 60	% Year end budget variance from budget	Target/Annual	-1.05%	-1%	-1%				
Local	% visits meeting the CPA standard for visits to high risk premises	High/Annual	81.3%	100%	100%				
Local	Rating for delivery report and LTP (Local Transport Plan)	N/a	Fair/promising	Very good	Good				
Local	% 2005/06 Recommendations of the corporate governance audit and action plan implemented	High/Annual	N/a	76%	75%				

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols			
	Exceeded performance		2006/07 actual performance above 2006/07 best quartile	1	Actual performance for 2006/07 (A)
	Met performance		2006/07 actual performance meets 2006/07 best quartile	2	Actual performance for 2006/07 (B) NB. In some cases this will be an actual figure
	Missed performance (See remedial action section)		2006/07 actual performance below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)	3	End of year target for 2006/07 as set by respective Directorates (C)
				4	Alert – Actual performance (B) compared to end of year target for 2006/07 (C)
				5	WCC's 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 – actual performance (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			Trend Data	Current Performance 2006/07			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2006/07		
Ref	Description	Aim & Frequency	2005/06 Actual ¹ (A)	2006/07 Actual (B)	End of Year Target ³ (C)	Actual Performance against end of year target ⁴ (B) v (C)	Ranking ⁵	County Council Top Quartile ⁶ (D)	Actual Performance against County Council Top Quartile ⁷ (B) v (D)
CH05 RC 68	% of staff satisfied overall with WCC as a place to work	High/ Annual	80%	79%	70%	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols					
★	Exceeded performance	★	2006/07 actual performance 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
●	Met performance	●	2006/07 actual performance meets 2006/07 best quartile	2	Actual performance for 2006/07 (B) 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
▲	Missed performance (See remedial action section)	▲	2006/07 actual performance below 2006/07 best quartile (See remedial action section)	3	End of year target for 2006/07 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
				4	Alert – Actual performance (B) compared to end of year target for 2006/07 (C)	7	Alert – actual performance (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)

Remedial action identified for all 'Red' indicators

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action		Explanation/ Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Negative Benchmark	
BV50	Educational qualifications of children looked after by reference to the % of young people leaving care aged 16+ with at least 1 GCSE at grades A*- G or GNVQ	✓	✓	Performance has fallen under this indicator this year. However, we still compare favourably against other local authorities. The ambitious 75% target is set based on national targets, although performance depends on specific cohorts included in the indicator. We have a high proportion of looked after children who have statements of special educational need, so this is always likely to present a challenge. However, we have reported improvements this year in the proportion of children leaving care with 5 GCSEs at grades A*-C, thus demonstrating improved attainment at a higher level.
BV 54 RC 15	No. Older people helped to live at home per 1000 of people aged 65+	✓	✓	The take up of the newly established low level support service was lower than expected meaning the target was missed. An additional 375 older people were helped to live at home in 2006/07
BV 143ii RC 79	No. Accidental fire injuries per 100,000 population	✓	✓	There were 26 injuries in accidental dwelling fires during last year. Area Risk Teams are continuing the programme of community fire safety education targeted at "at risk" groups. This programme includes Home Fire Safety Checks for vulnerable groups.
BV 201 RC 18	No. Adults receiving direct payments at 31/03/07, per 100,000 of people aged 18+	✓	✓	Outturn is significantly greater than 2005/06 but still below target. The number of older people (aged 65 or over) receiving direct payments increased from 45 in 2005/06 to 122 in 2006/07.
BV162	Child protection cases which were reviewed regularly as a % of those cases that should have been reviewed during the year.	✓		We set a 100% target for achieving child protection review on time, but this is not always possible due to unforeseen circumstances on the part of professionals or the family. This year only 3 meetings were held out of timescales, but this affected 9 children. Rigorous systems are well established to ensure reviews are always held within timescales unless absolutely unavoidable.
BV 206 RC 10	No. Deliberate fires per 10,000 population	✓		There has been a slight reduction in the number of deliberate fires, however the target has not been met. An Arson Reduction Officer has been appointed who will review the work being undertaken by the Area Risk Teams and the local Crime and Disorder Partnerships.

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action		Explanation/ Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Negative Benchmark	
CH15 RC 04	% Positive destinations for 16+ school leavers	✓		With regards to our young people aged 16+, a total of 93.5% entered 'positive destinations' (including employment, training and further education), a slight fall on 2005/06 but overall a positive trend over the last five years. Key Partners (i.e. Connexions and LSC) alongside Warwickshire County Council are working to address the fall across the region as a priority.
CH56	% 11 year olds (KS2) achieving level 4+ in Maths	✓		2007/08 Target is the statutory DfES Target (moderated by the Local Authority). 2009 & 2010 are estimates based on current targets. The actual attained figure is likely to be lower than this estimate as Type D requires all pupils to be performing in the Top 20% of pupils nationally.
CH83	% Reduction in Total Crime (15% by 2008)	✓		Current progress indicates that not all targets for 2008 are likely to be reached. Partners are currently identifying initiatives and activities to enable the target to be achieved
CH84	%Reduction in Youth Offenders Re-Offending	✓		Improved sharing of information between YOS, police and other community agencies has helped to increase detection rates, which in turn affect re-offending rates. Although the overall rate has increased this is mainly due to an increase in the release from custody rates, relating to the behaviour of one young person. The main area in which re-offending has reduced is in "community penalties" where YOS has a large influence, through the management of court orders.
Local	% Key Actions Achieved in the Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy	✓		Resourcing issues throughout the year. The work has now been completed with support from Business Consultancy
Local	% Members Individual Learning Plans by March 2007	✓		There have been delays in completing the interviews with Members. 42 members were interviewed and plans were completed for them by the end of April
BV03 RC 28	% Residents satisfied with the way the Council runs things	✓		Satisfaction with the way the Authority runs things (55.4%) has slightly increased since 2003, which was the last statutory year (53.5%) but decreased since last year. Benchmarking results from 15 County Councils show WCC in 2 nd position behind Shropshire (56%).

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action		Explanation/ Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Negative Benchmark	
Local RC 84	% Public Enquiries Satisfied at First Point of Contact	✓		Specific processes have been identified as issues. The most significant is PC bookings for libraries. Agreement has now been reached that the Centre will process these, with implementation for may 2007
Local	Reduce the number of fixed term exclusions to 50% of the current rate in 3 years	✓		Internal processes have been examined (for example implemented quarterly reporting of this area) and changed to improve performance. Expecting to see an improvement in this area next year. Continue to work in close partnership with schools to address this area of work.
Local	Reduce the number of permanent exclusions to 50% of the current rate in 3 years	✓		Internal processes have been examined (for example implemented quarterly reporting of this area) and changed to improve performance. Expecting to see an improvement in this area next year. Continue to work in close partnership with schools to address this area of work.
Local	% Care Leavers in Suitable Accommodation	✓		We are currently pursuing the development of a supportive residential accommodation project for care leavers in the North/Nuneaton&Bedworth/Rugby districts. Care leavers have been identified as a priority for supported accommodation.

Comments for all 'Green' indicators

NB. Please note that Commentary on 'Green' indicators was not collected in 2006/07, but the table is presented as an example of how this could be addressed in future reports to O&S Committees.

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Greens		Comments
		Green Performance Against Target	Green Benchmark	
BV84b.05	% Change in no. Kg of household waste collected per head of population.	✓	✓	
CH26 RC 16	No. Admissions of supported residents aged 65 or over to residential/ nursing care per 10,000 population	✓		
CH28	No. Delayed transfers of care per 100,000 people aged 65 or over	✓		
CH30	% Looked after children adopted during the year	✓		
CH51 RC 08	Average point score per student entered for exam	✓		
CH88	% Reduction Household Waste sent to Landfill	✓		
CH90	% Reduction for all Killed/Seriously injured people compared to average 2001-2004 base	✓		
Local	Number of Children's Centres	✓		

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Greens		Comments
		Green Performance Against Target	Green Benchmark	
Local	% Reduction duration on the child protection register	✓		
Local	% Improvement educational qualification of care leavers (5 A*-C)	✓		
BV03 RC 28	% Residents satisfied with the way the Council runs things		✓	
CH23 RC 52	% users satisfied with the Home Care Service	✓		
CH92 RC 89	% Reduction in residents worried about crime	✓		
Local	Rating for delivery report and LTP (Local Transport Plan)	✓		
Local	% 2005/06 Recommendations of the corporate governance audit and action plan implemented	✓		
CH05 RC 68	% of staff satisfied overall with WCC as a place to work	✓		