

**AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET**

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

**Date of Committee** 10th June 2008

**Report Title** Full Year Directorate Report Card 2007/08 (April 2007 - March 2008)

**Summary** This report provides an analysis of the Resources Directorate's performance 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:**

Joanna Rhodes  
Head of Strategic Resources Development  
Tel: Tel. 01926 412245  
joannarhodes@warwickshire.gov.uk

David Clarke  
Strategic Director, Resources  
Tel: Tel. 01926 412003  
davidclarkeTR@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  Cllr Booth, Cllr Atkinson and Cllr Haynes
- Cabinet Member  Cllr Cockburn - for information
- Chief Executive  .....
- Legal  Sarah Duxbury
- Finance  David Clarke - reporting officer
- Other Chief Officers  .....
- 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

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the Resources Performance and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee with the end of year Directorate Report Card for Resources.

The report shows that: -

- At the end of the year, 33% of Performance Indicators have exceeded their target, 28.5% have met their target and 38.5% have missed their target (see table on page 6).
- There are 2 BVPIs reported in the Resources Report Card. These are both in the top quartile of authorities included in the PwC benchmarking group (see table on page 6).

**Performance, Resources & Development Overview &  
Scrutiny Committee - 10th June 2008.**

**Full Year Directorate Report Card 2007/08 (April 2007 -  
March 2008)**

**Report of the Strategic Director, Resources**

**Recommendation**

That the Resources Performance and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- Consider both the summary and detail of the performance indicators within the Directorate Report Card for the full year of 2007/08 (Appendix A)
- Consider and comment on areas where performance is falling short of target, and where remedial action is being taken.

**1. Background**

- 1.1 This report presents the Resources Performance and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee with the full year report on the performance of the Directorate Report Card for the Resources Directorate. This is set out in detail in Appendices 1a and 1b.
- 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 CPA, LAA or another national assessment framework.




## 2. The Report Card Framework




- 2.1 The Report Card Framework marks a significant 'step-change' from previous performance management approaches. It allows O&S Committees to focus on the issues and areas of greatest importance to the Directorate and provides high level, exception-based, monitoring of our organisational health. In addition it allows Cabinet to consider performance information on a quarterly basis, in alignment with the financial performance reporting programme.
- 2.2 The Directorate Report Card sets out the key performance measures for the Directorate under the following four headings:
- Performance Results
  - Corporate Health
  - Customer
  - People
- 2.3 The full year end performance report presents actual performance across all indicators for the financial year (April 2007 – March 2008) and therefore, performance against target is being reported as actuals and not as forecast as previously had been the case.
- 2.4 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 *eg. Sickness absence*
- 2.5 The PWC benchmarking data for 2007/08 has been used to set the full year actual 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 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.
- 2.7 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.
- 2.8 For those indicators reporting over and above target, we need to explain the higher than expected level of performance and this is set out in commentary that supports why year end actual performance is considerably higher than the target set.

### 3. Overall Summary of Performance for the Full Year 2007/08

3.1 There are 72 measures within the Directorate Report Card and at the full year point for 2007/08, performance is reported for all of these.

3.2 The full year performance for 2007/08 is summarised in the tables below against target, and where possible against the PwC Benchmark. During the year, 61% of Resources targets were achieved or exceeded. In July, a full 2007/08 PwC Benchmarking report will be presented to Cabinet and the information will be made available to all members. The end of year PwC data isn't available for this report, so the data has been compared to the PwC mid-year benchmarking data.

	Full Year Actuals (April – March 08) compared to year end target		
	Year end Actuals that exceed target	Year end Actuals that meet target	Year end Actuals that miss target
			
<b>Total no. of measures</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>39%</b>

	Full Year Actuals (April – March 08) compared to PwC best quartile 2006/07 (BVPIs and PAFs)		
	Year end Actual above 2007/08 best quartile	Year end actual meets 2007/08 best quartile	Year end actual below 2007/08 best quartile
			
<b>Total no. of measures</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

### 4. Recommendation



4.1 That the Resources Performance and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- Consider both the summary and detail of the performance indicators within the Directorate Report Card for the full year of 2007/08 (**Appendix A**).
- Consider and comment on areas where performance is falling short of target, and where remedial action is being taken.

DAVID CLARKE  
Strategic Director, Resources

Shire Hall,  
Warwick

## Performance Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)	2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
RC 26	% BVPIs in the top quartile	High/ Quarterly	-	100.00	100.00		Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
	% catering in special & primary school sites retained	High/ Quarterly	99.90	98.00	95.00				
	% catering in secondary school sites retained	High/ Quarterly	100.00	94.00	95.00				
	1st Time pass rate for Quality Inspections	High/ Quarterly	99.10	99.46	97.50				
	% sites retained - cleaning (total of all services)	High/ Quarterly	95.00	94.00	95.00				
	Building opening not on time	Low/ Quarterly	0.00	1.00	0.00				
	% of repaired items returned to customer in 10 days	High/ Quarterly	88.00	88.00	89.00				
	Budget & balanced capital prog. approved	To Plan/ Annually	Approved	Approved	Approved				
	Debt outstanding over 42 days as a % of total annual invoiced income	Low/ Quarterly	4.40	4.64	4.00				

## Performance Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance			2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)			
BV 008	Invoices paid within 30 days	High/ Quarterly	94.30	96.00	96.71	▲	7 out of 20	93.46	★
	% Payments made by BACS	High/ Quarterly	86.70	91.00	87.00	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
	% invoiced income posted within 24 hours (WCC wide)	High/ Quarterly	97.00	97.00	99.00	▲			
	Accounts for previous year approved by members	To Plan/ Annually	Approved	Approved	Approved	●			
	External audit opinion on accounts	To Plan/ Annually	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	●			
	% Pay days met	High/ Quarterly	100.00	100.00	100.00	●			
	% Pensions paid on time	High/ Quarterly	100.00	100.00	100.00	●			
	Return on Council investments	High/ Quarterly	4.74	5.81	5.58	★			
	Borrowing rate for long term funds	Low/ Quarterly	4.29	4.55	4.59	★			









## Performance Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)	2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
	Return on LGPS investments	High/ Quarterly	6.30	1.89	1.00	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
	% of support calls resolved at the point of contact	High/ Quarterly	47.06	57.58	55.00	★			
	% of support calls resolved with 4 Hours	High/ Quarterly	66.12	72.54	68.00	★			
	% of support calls resolved with 8 Hours	High/ Quarterly	74.90	80.46	77.00	★			
	WAN availability	High/ Quarterly	99.98	99.12	98.00	★			
	Server downtime	High/ Quarterly	0.16	0.36	1.00	★			
	Project Performance for NWoW & ICT Strategy Programme	High/ Quarterly	80.00	85.00	85.00	●			
	Business alignment of ICT Development Projects	High/ Quarterly	75.00	100.00	80.00	★			
	Schools - Condition Surveys (m sq)	High/ Quarterly	269,000	156,000	130,000	★			

Performance Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)	2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
	Water Hygiene Survey (m sq)	High/Quarterly	370,000	417,000	417,000	●	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
	Asbestos Resurvey Programme - No. of properties	High/Quarterly	106.00	359.00	359.00	●			
	Number of school based unmanaged late projects	Low/Annually	1.00	0.00	0.00	●			
	Capital Monitoring - Quarterly reviews completed by target date	High/Quarterly	1.00	1.00	1.00	●			
	Benchmarking of consultants – KPI indicators prepared for consultants on individual projects (Property).	High/Quarterly	0.00	0.00	25.00	▲			
	% of development projects within initial cost estimate and budget framework	High/Quarterly	40.00	20.00	40.00	▲			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols	
	Year end actual to exceed target		Year end actual above 2007/08 best quartile
	Year end actual to meet target		Year end actual meets 2007/08 best quartile
	Year end actual to miss target (See remedial action section)		Year end actual below 2007/08 best quartile (See remedial action section)

1	Year End Actual for 2007/08 (A) (based on period April – March 08) <b>NB</b> . In all cases this will be an actual figure.	4	WCC's 2007/08 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (B)	5	The County Council best quartile for 2007/08 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	<b>Alert</b> - Year End actual (A) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (B)	6	<b>Alert</b> - Year End actual (A) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile) for 2007/08 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (C)

**Customer Results**

Customer Results									
Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance			2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)			
RC 36	% Calls answered within WCC Standards	High/ Quarterly	97.70	97.00	80.00	★	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 37	% Letters responded to within WCC Standards	High/ Quarterly	64.00	60.00	70.00	▲			
RC 38	% E-mails responded to within WCC Standards	High/ Quarterly	78.00	88.00	80.00	★			
RC 51	% Satisfaction with Value for Money	High/ Annual	36.00	39.60	36.90	★			
	Complaints	Low/ Quarterly	26.00	51.00	24.00	▲			
	Overall score from Members - meeting their needs	High/ Annual	93.30	78.60	95.00	▲			
	Overall score from WCC staff for Resources services	High/ Annual	-	60.1	No target set – new survey	-			
	Overall score from WCC managers for Resources services	High/ Annual	-	59.5	No target set – new survey	-			

**Key Target Symbols**

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

**Benchmarking Symbols**

★	Year end actual above 2007/08 best quartile
●	Year end actual meets 2007/08 best quartile
▲	Year end actual below 2007/08 best quartile (See remedial action section)

1	Year End Actual for 2007/08 (A) (based on period April – March 08) <b>NB</b> . In all cases this will be an actual figure.	4	WCC's 2007/08 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (B)	5	The County Council best quartile for 2007/08 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	<b>Alert</b> - Year End actual (A) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (B)	6	<b>Alert</b> - Year End actual (A) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile) for 2007/08 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (C)

Corporate Health Results									
Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)	2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
RC 58	Use of Resources Overall CPA Score	High/Annual	3	4	4	●	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 60 (a)	% End year variance from budget (Corporate)	To Plan/Quarterly	-1.90	-0.5	+/-1.00	●			
RC 60 (b)	Variation to budget (Directorate)	To Plan/Quarterly	-0.67	-1.1	+/-1.00	▲			
RC 62	% Degree of achieving efficiency plan	To Plan/Annual	100.00	100.00	100.00	●			
RC 66	% Compliance with the Corporate Governance action plan	High/Annual	N/A	100.00	8.00	●			
RC 77	VFM CPA Score	High/Annual	3	3	3	●			
	Overall availability - average basket of 6 app. & Network	High/Quarterly	99.80	99.64	98.00	★			
BV156	% LA public buildings - disabled	High/Quarterly	82.00	90.00	92.00	▲	8 out of 23	84.07	★
	Condition - % Gross internal floor space in condition category D (poor)	Low/Quarterly	1.00	2.00	<1.00	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
	% of portfolio (m2) for which a Suitability Survey has been undertaken in last 5 years.	High/Quarterly	86.00	89.00	90.00	▲			
	% of portfolio (m2) with Good Suitability	High/Quarterly	16.00	20.00	20.00	●	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		

## Corporate Health Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance			2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)			
	% of maintenance backlog professionally recommended for completion within 2 years	Low/ Quarterly	63.50	63.00	64.00	★			
	Environmental – CO2 emissions in tonnes per sq. m	Low/ Quarterly	0.04	0.04	0.04	●			

## Key

## Target Symbols

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

## Benchmarking Symbols

★	Year end actual above 2007/08 best quartile
●	Year end actual meets 2007/08 best quartile
▲	Year end actual below 2007/08 best quartile (See remedial action section)







1	Year End Actual for 2007/08 (A) (based on period April – March 08) <b>NB</b> . In all cases this will be an actual figure.	4	WCC's 2007/08 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (B)	5	The County Council best quartile for 2007/08 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	<b>Alert</b> - Year End actual (A) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (B)	6	<b>Alert</b> - Year End actual (A) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile) for 2007/08 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (C)

People Results									
Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance					
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)	2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
RC 68	% Staff Satisfied overall with WCC as a place to work	High / Annual	84.70	85.60	87.00	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
RC 69	% Staff clear about what they are expected to achieve in their job	High/ Annual	92.70	95.00	95.00	●			
RC 70	% Staff satisfied with the recognition they get for doing a good job	High/ Annual	64.90	70.00	70.00	●			
RC 71	% Staff satisfied with the training & development they receive for their present job	High/ Annual	80.10	78.00	85.00	▲			
RC 72	Communication between Directorates is good	High/ Annual	31.20	50.00	40.00	★			
	Staff Morale	High/ Annual	68.00	71.00	73.00	▲			
	Staff satisfaction that the appraisal adds value	High/ Annual	50.90	65.00	60.00	★			
	Staff satisfaction with communication with directorate	High/ Annual	55.80	71.00	65.00	★			
	Average number of staff training days (office-based)	High/ Quarterly	5.00	6.18	7.00	▲			
BV 12 Local RC 73	No. Working days/ shifts lost due to sickness absence per FTE	Low/ Quarterly	8.42	8.59	7.50	▲			
	Average spells of sickness per year	Low/ Quarterly	1.44	1.38	1.25	▲			
	Number of reported accidents	Low/ Quarterly	61.00	58.00	55.00	▲			

## People Results

Indicators			2006/07	2007/08			PwC County Council Benchmark Year End 2007/08 To be completed by CP&P end May 08 – see Section 1 point 3 explanatory notes		
			Trend Data	Current Performance			2007/08 Ranking <sup>4</sup>	County Council Best Quartile <sup>5</sup> (C)	Year End Actual against County Council Top Quartile <sup>6</sup> (A) v (C)
Ref	Description	Aim and Frequency	Actual	Year End Actual <sup>1</sup> (A)	End of Year Target <sup>2</sup> (B)	Year End Actual against end of year target <sup>3</sup> (A) v (B)			
	% of staff agreeing that their manager does a good job	High/ Annual	78.90	82.10	83.00	▲	Not part of the PwC Benchmarking data		
	% staff receiving an appraisal	High/ Quarterly	69.32	91.00	100.00	▲			
	% of total new staff receiving training/development (site-based)	High/ Quarterly	n/a	100.00	100.00	●			
	% of total existing staff receiving training/development (site-based)	High/ Quarterly	n/a	39.00	25.00	★			
	Number of formal grievances raised	Low/ Quarterly	2.00	1.00	0.00	▲			
BV 16a Local RC 74	% Employees who are disabled	High/ Quarterly	1.09	1.68	2.50	▲			
BV 17a Local RC 75	% Employees from BME communities	High/ Quarterly	-	5.00	4.50	★			
BV 11a Local RC 76	Women in management	High/ Quarterly	-	20.37	55.00	▲			

Key

Target Symbols		Benchmarking Symbols	
	Year end actual to exceed target		Year end actual above 2007/08 best quartile
	Year end actual to meet target		Year end actual meets 2007/08 best quartile
	Year end actual to miss target (See remedial action section)		Year end actual below 2007/08 best quartile (See remedial action section)

1	Year End Actual for 2007/08 (A) (based on period April – March 08) <b>NB</b> . In all cases this will be an actual figure.	4	WCC's 2007/08 position against the total number of comparator county councils
2	End of year target for 2007/08 as set by respective Directorates (B)	5	The County Council best quartile for 2007/08 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	<b>Alert</b> - Year End actual (A) compared to end of year target for 2007/08 (B)	6	<b>Alert</b> - Year End actual (A) compared against the County Council best quartile (25 <sup>th</sup> or 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile) for 2007/08 as taken from the PwC Benchmarking Tool (C)



**Remedial action taken/proposed for all 'Red' Indicators and Milestones & Supporting commentary for "Over Performing" indicators**

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	% catering in special & primary school sites retained				✓	3 schools chosen to make alternative arrangements - from 184 in 2007/8. (100% special schools buy-in)	
	% catering in secondary school sites retained	✓	✓			One school has given notice of withdrawal by CC from July 2008.	Remedial action not needed as this was choice by Service to make reduction in deficit
	1st Time pass rate for Quality Inspections				✓	1 <sup>st</sup> time pass rates have exceeded target due to improved cleaning standards as a result of action taken to "close the quality loop" by the introduction of remedial work action plans. Further improvements including applying a weighting system to raise the bar on percentage pass rates has been implemented.	
	% sites retained - cleaning (total of all services)	✓				Sites not retained due to some site closures and also schools opting out of the service after using our service to set them up with staffing and equipment etc. A number of sites have left the service following difficulties in time taken to secure employees.	Detailed work with one school who has provided notice will take place to reach a fuller understanding of the issues of schools. Action planning to increase retention will follow that process.

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	Building opening not on time	✓	✓			Only missed target on one occasion this year. This was in October and was due to the early caretaker being taken to hospital and another caretaker being called in to replace him.	No remedial action required.
	% of repaired items returned to customer in 10 days	✓				Process delays have been experienced in work scheduling and in spare parts sourcing.	Increased admin staffing hours, appointment of technical sourcing technician, and improvements in I.T. systems have facilitated better monitoring of jobs through the workshop.
	Debt outstanding over 42 days as a % of total annual invoiced income	✓	✓			Target missed largely due to PCT debts.	AHCS Overview and Scrutiny committee have been asked by Cabinet to review how the PCT debts have accrued and recommend any action to prevent similar situations occurring in the future.
BV 008	Invoices paid within 30 days	✓				Significant improvement on previous year.	
	% Payments made by BACS				✓	Excludes cheques raised for equal pay claims	
	% invoiced income posted within 24 hours (WCC wide)	✓				Data-punching now done by Exchequer staff and difficulty obtaining info from debtors/directorates	No remedial action required.
	Return on Council investments				✓	Out-performed by 23 basis points	
	Borrowing rate for long term funds				✓	Out-performed by 4 basis points	

Appendix A

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	Return on LGPS investments				✓	No annual figures yet. Data for quarter ended 31 Dec 2007. Out-performed by 89 basis points	
RC 60 (b)	Variation to budget (Directorate)	✓	✓				Remedial action taken throughout the year.
	% of support calls resolved at the point of contact				✓	This is part of a 2 year change where actions were developed to improve performance following disappointing benchmarking results. Actions included: increased integration of Service Desk staff; improved staff training and a focus on common problems. We moved to permanent staff rather than contractors. Revised targets for future years based on SOCITM benchmarking data.	
	% of support calls resolved with 4 Hours				✓		
	% of support calls resolved with 8 Hours				✓		
	WAN availability				✓		Increased resilience and tighter change control
	Server downtime				✓	Increased resilience and tighter change control	
	Schools - Condition Surveys (m sq)				✓	Target exceeded by 20% for schools. Also in addition 78 Non Schools surveyed - (44700m2) Large properties surveyed hence reasoning for exceeding target based on m2, and additional Easter shutdown in financial year allowing further access	

Appendix A

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	Business alignment of ICT Development Projects				✓	Programme was accepted as proposed.	
	Benchmarking of consultants – KPI indicators prepared for consultants on individual projects (Property).	✓				The absence of a P&M manager for most of 2007/08 has meant the implementation of performance management has been delayed.	A Cost Manager is due to be recruited early in 2008/9.
	% of development projects within initial cost estimate and budget framework	✓	✓			The absence of a P&M Manager & Quantity Surveyor for most of 2007/08 has meant that cost estimate activity has been undertaken externally.	A Cost Manager is due to be recruited early in 2008/9.
RC 36	% Calls answered within WCC Standards				✓	Corporate figure of 84%. Best performing directorate along with EED.	
RC 37	% Letters responded to within WCC Standards	✓	✓			Corporate performance of 82%. Joint worst performing directorate along with CYP&F.	Currently the sample only includes letters to SRD and Property. We will look at how to collect a representative sample of the whole directorate in 2008/09.
RC 38	% E-mails responded to within WCC Standards				✓	Corporate performance of 78%. Best performing directorate along with P&D	
RC 51	% Satisfaction with Value for Money				✓	This is a positive result for the authority.	
	Overall score from Members - meeting their needs	✓	✓			Decrease in satisfaction since last year, although no Members responded negatively to the statement. Only 15 survey responses were received.	Action taken on some areas identified in the survey.

Appendix A

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	Complaints	✓	✓			Although the number of complaints has risen this year, this can be seen as a positive affect of asking for customer feedback. A more true reflection of good customer service is the level of justified complaints. We have introduced this as a new PI for 2008/09 and will aim to reduce the number of justified complaints by 10% each year.	
	Overall availability - average basket of 6 app. & Network				✓	Increased resilience and tighter change control.	
BV156	% LA public buildings - disabled	✓	✓				To be revisited in 2008/9 to establish specific compliance levels and programmes of work in future years.
	Condition - % Gross internal floor space in condition category D (poor)	✓	✓			The % of those properties where the overall condition is poor is starting to increase. Properties would require increased investment to maintain them at a satisfactory or good level as per recent bids for funding have highlighted.	Increased funding required to maintain overall condition of property portfolio at a satisfactory or good level.
	% of maintenance backlog professionally recommended for completion within 2 years				✓	The % of those properties where the overall condition is poor is starting to increase. Properties would require increased investment to maintain them at a satisfactory or good level as per recent bids for funding have highlighted.	

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	% of portfolio (m2) for which a Suitability Survey has been undertaken in last 5 years.	✓					There will be an ongoing programme of Suitability surveys, to coincide with the Property Review programme.
RC 68	% Staff Satisfied overall with WCC as a place to work	✓				Although the target was missed by 1%, the satisfaction level has increased by 1.3% since 2006/07. Resources was the <b>highest</b> scoring directorate for this question. The WCC average was 78%.	Directorate set challenging target above the corporate target. No remedial action required. Corporate Staff Survey to be carried out in June/July.
RC 71	% Staff satisfied with the training & development they receive for their present job	✓				Satisfaction with training and development declined by 2% from last year and the 07/08 target was missed. Resources was the <b>highest</b> scoring directorate for this staff survey question. The WCC average score was 71%.	Development was the key priority identified for directorate-wide improvement by the Staff Panel.
RC 72	Communication between Directorates is good				✓	Large increase in performance since 2006/07. Resources was the <b>highest</b> scoring directorate for this staff survey question. The WCC average score was 38%.	
	Staff satisfaction that the appraisal adds value				✓	Large increase in performance since 06/07. Resources was the <b>highest</b> scoring directorate for this staff survey question. The WCC average score was 56%.	

## Appendix A

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	Staff Morale	✓				Although the target was missed by 2%, the staff moral score has increased by 3% since 06/07. Resources was the <b>highest</b> scoring directorate for this staff survey question. The WCC average score was 51% compared to the Resources score of 71%.	No remedial action required. Corporate Staff Survey to be carried out in June/July.
	% of staff agreeing that their manager does a good job	✓				Increase in score since last year. Just below target for this year.	Team & Management Development programme to continue. Upward Appraisal to be carried out November 08.
	Staff satisfaction with communication within the directorate				✓	Large increase in performance since 2006/07. Resources was the <b>highest</b> scoring directorate for this staff survey question. The WCC average score was 57%. There have been a number of initiatives aimed at improving communications in the directorate (e.g. REveal, Staff Seminars etc).	
	% staff receiving an appraisal	✓				Data relates to the % of office-based staff receiving an appraisal between 1 April 2007 - 31 March 2008. This total includes paper-based appraisals. This is a massive improvement on the percentage recorded for 2006/07.	All staff are using the same appraisal system, so it will be easier for HR to monitor compliance in 2008.

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	% of total existing staff receiving training/development (site-based)				✓	Training given to Catering staff to respond to changing market sector and new legislative requirements. C & CSS have improved the use of training school which enables provision of group training instead of one to one training at individual sites with a resultant more effective use of the training time and facilities	
	Average number of staff training days (office-based)	✓				Slightly below target but a more positive performance than initial estimates (YE Estimate was 2.7 in Qtr 2). All Managers were asked to check their training data for the whole year and this has increased the number of training days.	More accurate training data needs to be provided by managers in future in order to predict performance throughout the year.
BV 12 Local RC 73	No. Working days/ shifts lost due to sickness absence per FTE	✓				This is a forecast end of year figure as the actual figure will not be available until mid-May. The figure at the end of Quarter 3 is 6.1. Figures in line with corporate reporting.	Audit of sickness absence management to ensure triggers are being actioned by managers.
	Average spells of sickness per year	✓				See above. The figure at the end of Quarter 3 is 0.95. Figures in line with corporate reporting.	



Appendix A

Ref	Indicator	Reason for Remedial Action			Over Performing	Explanation	Remedial action
		Negative Performance Against Target	Not Improving	Negative Benchmark			
	Number of reported accidents	✓				H&S Annual Report contains a breakdown of accidents in the directorate. There were also actually 61 accidents in 06/07 (not 54 previously reported). This was due to problems with IT system, which have now been corrected. Therefore the target for 2007/08 was very ambitious.	On-going Health & Safety awareness raising and positive response/action to any information arising out of accident investigations
	Number of formal grievances raised	✓				Currently pending due to long term sickness absence. Only 1 grievance raised.	No remedial action required. Staff should feel able to raise a grievance if required.
BV 16a Local RC 74	% Employees who are disabled	✓				HR know that this figure is understated – i.e. staff haven't declared that they are disabled.	HRMS Self Service will allow staff to self declare. This will make the data more representative.
BV 17a Local RC 75	% Employees from BME communities				✓	HRMS shows that 4% of Resources staff are still showing as unknown or not stated. This is a very low % in comparison with the other larger directorates, but we will aim to reduce that further during 2008/9	
BV 11a Local RC 76	Women in management	✓					Corporate equality targets need to be revisited.