

**AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET**

**Name of Committee** Resources, Performance & Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Date of Committee** 13 November 2007

**Report Title** Mid-year Directorate Report Card 2007/08 (April – Sept 2007).

**Summary** This report provides an analysis of the Performance & Development 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:**

Billy Webster  
Improvement & Support Services Manager  
Tel. 01926 736100  
billywebster@warwickshire.gov.uk

David Carter  
Strategic Director of Performance & Development  
Tel: 01926 412045  
davidcarter@warwickshire.gov.uk

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

**Background papers** None

**CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:-**

Details to be specified

- Other Committees
- Local Member(s)  .....
- Other Elected Members  .....
- Cabinet Member  Councillor Peter Fowler
- Chief Executive
- Legal  .....
- Finance  .....
- Other Chief Officers  Strategic Director of Performance & Development
- District Councils  .....
- Health Authority  .....
- Police  .....

Other Bodies/Individuals

**FINAL DECISION YES**

**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  .....

## Resources, Performance & Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee – 13 November 2007

### Mid -year Directorate Report Card 2007/08

#### Report of the Strategic Director of Performance & Development

##### **Recommendation**

That the Resources, Performance & Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- Consider both the summary and detail of the performance indicators within the Directorate Report Card during at the mid-year point of 2007/08
- Endorse the remedial actions

## **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 This report presents the Resources Performance and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee with the mid-year update on the performance of the Directorate Report Card for Performance & Development. This is set out in detail in Appendix 1.

1.2 The report shows that: -

- There are 28 measures within the Directorate Report Card and at the mid-year point for 2007/08, performance is reported for 23 of these. Of the total number reported there are 7 BVPIs/PAFs.
- The performance of the Performance & Development Directorate shows 45% of targets being realised or exceeded. Of the rest, it is evident that these indicators show an underlying strong performance, with difficult target levels being close to realisation.

## **2.0 Background**

2.1 This report presents Resources, Performance & Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee with the mid-year update on the performance of the Directorate Report Card for the mid-year point of 2007/08. This is set out in detail in Appendices 1.

- 2.2 The Directorate Report Card is made up of indicators agreed by the Directorate Management Team in consultation with Portfolio holders and Members.
- 2.3 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.
- 2.4 The remainder of the Directorate Report Card is made up of indicators, which are considered to be of strategic importance to the Directorate.
- 2.5 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 CPA, LAA or another national assessment framework.
- 2.6 The format is based upon detailed consultation with the Overview & Scrutiny Coordinating Group (OSCG) and incorporates feedback from their consideration of presentational options.

### **3.0 The Report Card Framework**

- 3.1 The Report Card Framework marks a significant 'step-change' from previous performance management approaches:
- Cabinet will consider performance information on a quarterly basis, in alignment with the financial performance reporting programme.
  - O&S 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

This approach was launched in 2007/08 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 O&S Committees.

- 3.2 The Directorate Report Card sets out the key performance measures for the Directorate under the following four headings:
- Performance Results
  - Corporate Health
  - Customer
  - People
- 3.3 The collection frequency of the measures varies and every 6 months a forecast of the final performance for 2007/08 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.

3.4 There are two types of measure in the Directorate Report Card:

- **Type 1** – Service area or specialism, led by the Directorate
- **Type 2** – Contribution to a corporate total e.g. *Sickness absence*

3.5 The PWC benchmarking data for 2006/07 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.

3.6 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.




3.7 To facilitate exception-based reporting; when measuring performance against targets in 2007/08 a zero tolerance has been applied to all measures in the Directorate Report Card.




3.8 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.

#### 4.0 Overall Summary of Performance at the Mid-year 2007/08

4.1 There are **28** measures within the Directorate Report Card and at the mid-year point for 2007/08, performance is reported for **23** of these. Of the total number reported there are **7** BVPIs/PAFs.

4.2 The mid-year performance for 2007/08 is summarised in the tables below against target, and where possible against the PwC Benchmark:

	Qrt 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
			
<b>Total no. of measures</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>57%</b>

	Qrt 2 Forecast (April – Sept) Forecast compared to 2006/07 PwC best quartile (BVPIs and PAFs)		
	Year end forecast above 2006/07 best quartile	Year end forecast meets 2006/07 best quartile	Year end forecast below 2006/07 best quartile
			
<b>Total no. of measures</b>	<b>Not Applicable (N/A)</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	

- 4.3 The performance of the Performance & Development Directorate shows 45% of targets being realised or exceeded. Of the rest, it is evident that these indicators show an underlying strong performance, with difficult target levels being close to realisation.
- 4.4 The Performance Results area shows strong performance with indicators currently exceeding end of year targets.
- 4.5 In the Customer Results area the majority of these targets are new and the targets were challenging, however the results to date are close to meeting these targets, and a concerted effort is being taken to assess and understand current performance, rationalise data collection and focusing on improving these results over the rest of the year.
- 4.6 It is currently unrealistic to meet our target of 100% of emails responded to within WCC standards, which is a direct result of the ever increasing demands placed on staff by email use.
- 4.7 It is also unlikely for the target of 97% of calls answered within WCC standards to be met due to technical data collection. For example, the data collection software will not register a call as answered if it goes to voicemail or if it is rerouted to a colleague, therefore registering some calls that are answered within set standards as unanswered. This is currently being reviewed by the corporate Customer Care Standards Group.
- 4.8 The Corporate Health Results show performance to be good with our Direction of Travel (CPA Score) being on target, as is our use of budget. More positive is our Compliance with our Corporate Governance Action Plan, which is well ahead of target.
- 4.9 In People Results, the results are close to meeting the targets, and although the results from the staff survey are an improvement on last year, they are behind a high of two years ago. The results have provide areas for improvement and a positive check on the areas where we need to focus.

## 5.0 Recommendations

That the Resources, Performance & Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- Consider both the summary and detail of the performance indicators within the Directorate Report Card during at the mid-year point of 2007/08 (Appendix 1)

**David Carter**  
Strategic Director of  
Performance & Development

Shire Hall,  
Warwick.

## Performance Results

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 <sup>1</sup> (A)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast <sup>2</sup> (B)	End of Year Target <sup>3</sup> (C)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against end of year target (B) v (C) <sup>4</sup>	2006/07 Ranking <sup>5</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>6</sup> (D)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against County Council Top Quartile <sup>7</sup> (B) v (D)
RC 26	% BVPIs in the top quartile	High/Quarterly	N/A	37%	35%	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		

### 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) <b>NB.</b> 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 <sup>th</sup> percentile Where the aim is low, this is the 25 <sup>th</sup> 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)		
				4	<b>Alert</b> - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	<b>Alert</b> - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup> (A)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast <sup>2</sup> (B)	End of Year Target <sup>3</sup> (C)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against end of year target <sup>4</sup> (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking <sup>5</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>6</sup> (D)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against County Council Top Quartile <sup>7</sup> (B) v (D)
BV 2 RC 48	Equalities Standard level	High/ Annual	2	2	2		12 <sup>th</sup> /34	> 3	
BV 3 RC 28	% Residents satisfied with the way the Council runs things	High/ Annual	55.4%	Data available in Quarter 4	60%		Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
BV 4 RC 49	Satisfaction with complaints handling	High/ Annual	36%	Data available in Quarter 4	36%				
RC 36	% Calls answered within WCC Standards	High/ Quarterly	N/A	85%	97%				
RC 37	% Letters responded to within WCC Standards	High/ Quarterly	N/A	100%	75%				
RC 38	% E-mails responded to within WCC Standards	High/ Quarterly	N/A	76%	100%				







### 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) <b>NB.</b> 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	<b>Alert</b> - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (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 <sup>th</sup> percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 <sup>th</sup> percentile
				7	<b>Alert</b> - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup> (A)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast <sup>2</sup> (B)	End of Year Target <sup>3</sup> (C)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against end of year target <sup>4</sup> (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking <sup>5</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>6</sup> (D)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against County Council Top Quartile <sup>7</sup> (B) v (D)
RC39	% Satisfaction with visits – Mystery Shopping	High / Half Yearly	N/A	*82%	85%	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 40	% Satisfaction with calls - Mystery Shopping	High/ Half Yearly	N/A	*74%	78%	▲			
RC 41	% Satisfaction with letters - Mystery Shopping	High/ Half Yearly	N/A	*47%	60%	▲			
RC 42	% Satisfaction with e-mails - Mystery Shopping	High/ Half Yearly	N/A	*61%	65%	▲			
RC 43	Public satisfaction with ability to influence decisions affecting the local area	High/ Annual	31%	Data available in Quarter 4	32.5%				
RC 50	Number of adverse Ombudsman complaints	Low/ Quarterly	0	0	0	●			
RC 84	% Public enquiries satisfied at first point of contact	High/ Quarterly	70%	78%	80%	▲			

### 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) <b>NB.</b> 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 <sup>th</sup> percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 <sup>th</sup> 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)		
				4	<b>Alert</b> - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	<b>Alert</b> - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup> (A)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast <sup>2</sup> (B)	End of Year Target <sup>3</sup> (C)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against end of year target <sup>4</sup> (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking <sup>5</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>6</sup> (D)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against County Council Top Quartile <sup>7</sup> (B) v (D)
RC 59	Direction of Travel CPA Score	High/Annual	2	3	3		Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 85	% LAA measures on target to be achieved	High/Quarterly		Subject to submission of all LAA indicators	100%				
RC 60	% End year variance from budget	Target/Quarterly		0	0				
RC 66	% Compliance with the Corporate Governance action plan	High/Annual	N/A	90%	80%				

### 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) <b>NB.</b> 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 <sup>th</sup> percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 <sup>th</sup> percentile
3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	<b>Alert</b> - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	<b>Alert</b> - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup> (A)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast <sup>2</sup> (B)	End of Year Target <sup>3</sup> (C)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against end of year target <sup>4</sup> (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking <sup>5</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>6</sup> (D)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against County Council Top Quartile <sup>7</sup> (B) v (D)
RC 68	% Staff Satisfied overall with WCC as a place to work	High / Annual	78%	*80%	83%	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 69	% Staff clear about what they are expected to achieve in their job	High/ Annual	86%	*86%	89%	▲			
RC 70	% Staff satisfied with the recognition they get for doing a good job	High/ Annual	61%	*59%	66%	▲			
RC 71	% Staff satisfied with the training & development they receive for their present job	High/ Annual	70%	*66%	75%	▲			
RC 72	Communication between Directorates is good	High/ Annual	15%	*23%	35%	▲			

### 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) <b>NB.</b> 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 <sup>th</sup> percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 <sup>th</sup> 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	<b>Alert</b> - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)		<b>Alert</b> - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

## People Results

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 <sup>1</sup> (A)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast <sup>2</sup> (B)	End of Year Target <sup>3</sup> (C)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against end of year target <sup>4</sup> (B) v (C)	2006/07 Ranking <sup>5</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>6</sup> (D)	Qtr 2 YE Forecast against County Council Top Quartile <sup>7</sup> (B) v (D)
BV 12 Local RC 73	No. Working days/ shifts lost due to sickness absence per FTE	Low/ Quarterly		8	9	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
BV 16a Local RC 74	% Employees who are disabled	High / Quarterly	2%	0.26%	2%	▲			
BV 17a Local RC 75	% Employees from BME communities	High / Quarterly	7.1%	14%	7.5%	★			
BV 11a Local RC 76	Top 5% of earners that are women	High / Quarterly		58%	45%	★			

### 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)

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) <b>NB.</b> 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 <sup>th</sup> percentile. Where the aim is low, this is the 25 <sup>th</sup> percentile
3	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (C)		
4	<b>Alert</b> - Quarter 2 year end forecast (B) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (C)	7	<b>Alert</b> - Qtr 2 Year End forecast (B) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile) for 2006/07 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (D)

### 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 36	% Calls answered within WCC Standards	✓			A target of 97% has not been reached, with performance currently at 85%	<p>Performance in these areas is not as it should be, and work is being done to increase the awareness of these 'standards' that exist, and that all staff must deliver. In addition, the current measures and targets for these elements are being reviewed as it is difficult to accurately measure the response rates. For examples, manual processes are used for letter correspondence, whilst current technology does not adequately support the breakdown or assessment of answering calls, with voicemail or 'third party' pick-up not being recorded.</p> <p>Another issue has been the sharp rise in email communications, which was not so prominent when targets were initially set, therefore requiring a review in standards in line with customer expectations (i.e. recent customer consultation shows that customers are willing to wait longer for emailed correspondence given it's prevalence in modern society)</p> <p>Although some targets will not be achievable (emails), the raising of awareness, combined with highlighting sound, and minimum, standards of working practice will inevitably support these performance measures and drive up performance in these areas to bridge the gap highlighted at this half year point.</p>
RC 38	% E-mails responded to within WCC Standards	✓			An exceptionally high target of 100% has not been reached, and performance sits at 76%	
RC39	% Satisfaction with visits – Mystery Shopping	✓			A target of 85% has not been reached, with performance currently at 82%	
RC 40	% Satisfaction with calls - Mystery Shopping	✓			A target of 78% has not been reached, with performance currently at 74%	
RC 41	% Satisfaction with letters - Mystery Shopping	✓			A target of 60% has not been reached, with performance currently at 47%	
RC 42	% Satisfaction with e-mails - Mystery Shopping	✓			A target of 65% has not been reached, with performance currently at 61%	

RC 84	% Public enquiries satisfied at first point of contact	✓			At the start of the year we were performing at around 70% and have driven up the figures as a consequence of PC bookings for libraries.	We will continue to work with services to support higher levels of resolution where possible and all new business transferring into the centre is analysed for POC achievement prior to migration.
RC 68	% Staff Satisfied overall with WCC as a place to work	✓			A target of 83% has not been reached, with performance currently at 80%	Performance has improved on the previous year but not to the target levels set at the beginning of the year. The staff survey has shown how staff perception has increase/improved and the approach to be used to further develop this improvement is being agreed at a corporate level, and supported through Directorate specific approaches which provide focus on Directorate issues, whilst enhancing the benefit of the corporate actions.
RC 69	% Staff clear about what they are expected to achieve in their job	✓			A target of 89% has not been reached, with performance currently at 86%	
RC 70	% Staff satisfied with the recognition they get for doing a good job	✓			A target of 66% has not been reached, with performance currently at 59%	
RC 71	% Staff satisfied with the training & development they receive for their present job	✓			A target of 75% has not been reached, with performance currently at 66%	
RC 72	Communication between Directorates is good	✓			A target of 35% has not been reached, with performance currently at 23%	
BV 16a Local RC 74	% Employees who are disabled	✓			A target of 2% has not been reached, with performance currently at 0.26%	

### Commentary on activity related to all 'Green' indicators

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Greens		Commentary
		Green Performance Against Target	Green Benchmark	
RC 26	% BVPIs in the top quartile	+5%		This is due to effective management of performance.
RC 37	% Letters responded to within WCC Standards	+25%		Performance has been managed due to the limited, and important, nature of the postal correspondence of the Directorate.
RC 66	% Compliance with the Corporate Governance action plan	+10%		This is due to effective management of performance.
BV 12 Local RC 73	No. Working days/ shifts lost due to sickness absence per FTE	-1day		Proactive management of sickness absence and use of Occupational Health.
BV 17a Local RC 75	% Employees from BME communities	+6.5%		This is due to recruitment to the Directorate, including the Centralisation of transactional HR Services in the form of the HR Service Centre and development of the Customer Service Centres and One Stop Shops.
BV 11a Local RC 76	Top 5% of earners that are women	+13%		