# **Performance Report: Quarter One 2013/14**

## **Contents**

1. Corporate performance overview	2
2.Whole council summary tables	3
•	
3. Methodology for traffic light ratings	ç
3 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

## 1. Corporate performance overview

## 1.1 Corporate performance dashboard

The methodology for calculating these health ratings is explained in section 3 of this report.

Directorate	Corporate Plan performance	Revenue budget actual variance £'000	Capital actual variance £'000	
Adults and Communities	4	144	238	
Assurance	n/a	(27)	n/a	
Children's Education and Skills	n/a	570	(6,327)	
Family Service	0.5	(205)	(1,387)	
Commissioning Group	n/a	133	4,608	
Street Scene	1	2,163	(592)	
Public Health	3	0	n/a	
HB Public Law	n/a	254	n/a	
Barnet Group	-2	243	0	
DRS	1	0	(3,228)	
NSCSO	n/a	0	(15,224)	
Central Expenses	-	(861)	n/a	
Totals <sup>1</sup>	2.5	2,384	(21,912)	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Organisational totals are based on a simple sum of overall RAG ratings for each service, where each colour is given a number e.g. green equals 1, red equals -1 as set out in section 3.

## 2. Whole council summary tables

## 2.1 Key finance indicators

	Indicator		2013/14	2012/13	Achieved
			Position as	Final	/Trend
			at 30/06/13)	Outturn	
1	Revenue Expenditure				
	(a) Balances and Reserves:				
	(i) General Fund Balance	£'m	13.45	15.83	
	(ii) HRA Balances	£'m	16.07	16.07	
	(iii) School Balances	£'m	14.76	14.76	
	,				
	(b) Performance against Budget:				
	Variations:				
	(i) Overspends	£'m	5 96	3.62	
	(ii) Underspends	£'m	3.58	4.31	
	(ii) Gilderopeilde	~	0.00		
2	Capital Expenditure				
	(i) Total Slippage	£'m	20.34	19.36	
	., ., .,				
3	Debt Management				
	(i) Total Debt Outstanding over 30				
	days	£'m	7.56	11.57	
	(i) Total Debt Outstanding over 12				
	months	£'m	1.25	1.5	
	(iiii) Council Tax - % paid	%	30.19	83.83	
4	Creditor Payment Performance				
		%	98.48	97.90	
	(i) % of Creditors paid within 30 days				

- **2.2 Revenue budget corporate overview** see monitoring report
- 2.3 Capital budget corporate overview see monitoring report

## 2.4 Corporate Plan performance - corporate overview

	Total no. of Corp		RAG	ratings		Positive/	Nogotivo	No. of indicators
Directorate	Plan indicator s	Green	Green amber	Red amber	Red	neutral DoT	Negative DoT	expected to report data
Adults and Communities	10	5	-	<u>-</u>	1	6	0	6
Children's Education and Skills	9	-	_	<u> </u>	-	-	-	0
Family Services	3	1	1	<del>-</del>	1	2	1	3
Commissioning Group	3	-	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	-	-	-	0
Street Scene	6	2	<del>-</del>	<u>-</u>	1	2	1	3
Public Health	4	3	<u>-</u>		-	3	0	3
Barnet Group	2	-	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	2	1	1	2
DRS	3	2	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	1	0	2	3
Total	40	13 (65%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	6 (30%)	14	5	20

<sup>\*</sup> A CPI has no target so has no RAG rating so has not been included in the statistics
\*\* A CPI due to be reported is still awaiting data and has not been included in the statistics

### 2.5 Council programme portfolio

The Council has three programme portfolios: One Barnet (transformation); Capital programme, including school builds and refurbishment; and Regeneration. Within the One Barnet programme (10 projects), one project was flagged as red at the end of Q1 with risks related to delivery of the project to the agreed schedule – this is NSCSO, and reflects the current position related to the Judicial Review appeal hearing. In addition, the same cause (outcome of appeal hearing) was recognised as potentially impacting the delivery of the DRS project to the revised timescale (autumn 2013). Progress has been made across a number of Wave 2 projects, including Waste, CCTV, and Sports and Physical Activity.

Across the capital programme (19 projects), all are on track to deliver on time, aside from the red-rated Depot relocation project owing to delays in completing the options appraisal to secure a site for 2015 onwards, and two school projects where some risk of delay remains.

Finally, the across the Regeneration programme (8 projects) there are no red-rated projects. The size and complexity of individual projects, and dependencies external development partners result in 'amber' ratings for the majority of the projects.

Portfolio	Red Status	Amber Status	Green Status	Comments
One Barnet	1	6	3	NSCSO project was flagged 'red' as at end of Quarter 1 2013/14, owing to the risks related to the appeal for a Judicial Review of the One Barnet programme. A One Barnet Highlight Report for August is to be reviewed by Budget and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee in September.
Capital Programme	1	2	16	At the end of quarter 1 the Depot relocation project reported as red. Although the project activities are well underway – including an options appraisal – there remains risk that a site will not be secured and prepared ahead of the required date.
Regeneration	-	7	1	Significant progress has been made with the Regeneration Programme. No projects are reporting as 'red'.

### 2.6 Key projects – corporate overview

Service Area	Red Status	Amber Status	Green Status	Total number of projects*
Adult and Communities	-	3	2	5
Assurance	_	1	-	1
Education and Skills	2	11	8	25**
Family Services	-	3	10	14**
Commissioning Group	-	1	-	2**
Street Scene	1	-	-	1
Public Health	_	-	-	-
HB Public Law			-	-
Barnet Group		2	8	10
DRS		1	5	6
NSCSO	-	-	-	-
Totals	3	22	33	64

Five projects managed in Delivery Units have reported as red:

- North London Waste Authority procurement: This
  is ongoing, despite the reduction to one bidder each
  for the waste services and fuel use elements of the
  procurement. NLWA Members agreed to defer the
  decision on whether to progress the procurement to
  the 26 September meeting. NLWA and borough
  officers are reviewing options including single tender
  assurance, an evaluation of the draft final tenders
  that have been submitted, and alternative options to
  the current procurement.
- Travel Assistance project: Some key milestones (procurement process for independent travel) and these will need to be reviewed in line with the project management plan.
- Develop proposals for Studio School

<sup>\*</sup>Excludes projects delivered by the Delivery Unit which are reported to One Barnet, Regeneration or Capital Programmes

<sup>\*\*</sup>Delivery Unit has change projects in management agreements which have not yet commenced.

## 2.7 Human Resource/People performance - corporate overview

Key corporate HR targets and indicators

Performance Indicator	Period covered	Target	Amber criteria	Q1 Actual (No.)	Q1 Actual % of total	Q1 (numerator/ denominator)	Target Variance	Q1 DoT	Benchmarking
				Attendance					
Average number of sickness absence days per employee (Rolling year): This indicator includes all sickness figures from June 2012 including staff who are no longer in the organisation	July 12 - June 13	6	6 - 6.5	7.6	N/A	18,029/2,364	-27%	1.4%	9 days (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2012)
Average number of absence days per employee this quarter (target is seasonally adjusted): This indicator looks at performance from April to June 2013 and includes all staff that were in post from the commencement of the new structure	April - June 13	1.34	1.35 - 1.47	1.47	N/A	3,370/2,284	-10%	20.3%	2.25 days (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2012)
% managers submitting a monthly absence return: This indicator refers to the number of managers who have completed all monthly absence returns for the quarter. Managers must also declare that no team members have been absent to complete the return	April - June 13	100%	>90%	324	78.8%	324/411	21%	12.8%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only

Performance Indicator	Period covered	Target	Amber criteria		Q1 Actual of total	% Q1 (numerato denominato		Q1 DoT	Benchmarking
				Performance	Review				
% performance reviews completed and agreed for eligible staff only: This indicator includes all staff eligible for completion of Performance Reviews started in April 2012	Apr 12 - Mar 13	100%	>90%	1515	69.5%	1,515/2,179	30%	16%	72% (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2012)
% objectives set for eligible staff only: This indicator includes all staff eligible for objectives to be set for 2013/14  Apr 13 - Mar 14 100% >90% Next reported in Quarter 2 2013/2014									
				Cost					
Variance of total paybill to budget This indicator measures the variance from the budgeted paybill for the period.	April - June 13	£19,790,279	+/-5%	£23,825,970	20.4%	19,790,279/ 23,825,970	2.2%	268.6%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only
Management Indicator	Period	d covered		Q1 Actual (No.)	Q1 Actual % of total	Q1 (numerator/ denominator)	DoT Q1 %	В	enchmarking
Percentage of top 5% earners that are female:	As at 30	) June 2013		67	52.3%	67/128	N/A	(CIPFA	en in leadership posts 44% , All Members & other ry Authorities 2012)
Number of BME employees as % of total employees:	As at 30	) June 2013		795	32.7%	795/2,431	N/A	Black and Minority Ethnic local population 35.1% (State of the Borough June 2012)	
Number of declared disabled staff as % of total employees:	As at 30	) June 2013		77	3.0%	77/2,614	N/A		4.3% , All Members & other ry Authorities 2012)
				Employee Re	lations				
High Risk - Employee Relations cases as % of total cases	As at 30	) June 2013		1	1.6%	1/64	N/A	N/A : n	neasure applicable to LBB only

# ESTABLISHED POSITIONS AS FTE:

Total number of Barnet Council Posts; these posts may be unoccupied, due to be deleted or held to be filled at a later date

# As at 30 June 2013

**Total** Establishe Occupie d d (FTE) **Positions** (FTE) Adults and 362.75 277.79 Communities Assurance 39.60 34.08 **Barnet Group** N/A N/A Children's-410.21 317.17 **Education Family Services** 565.23 663.79 Commissioning 52.47 68.89 Group DRS 272.22 234.74 **NSCSO** 404.93 590.85 **Public Health** N/A N/A Street Scene 478.42 404.93 **Not Yet Assigned to** 179.53 48.51 **New Structure** 3,066.26 2,339.85 Total

#### EMPLOYEES COVERING ESTABLISHED POSITIONS AS FTE:

Total Number of employees, permanent, temporary and fixed working for Barnet and occupying an established post

Permanen t	Fixed Term, Temporar y, Seasonal	TOTAL
246.00	22.34	268.34
29.47	4.60	34.07
N/A	N/A	N/A
295.98	19.37	315.35
429.79	137.22	567.01
38.89	11.58	50.47
214.48	19.77	234.25
358.46	36.48	394.94
N/A	N/A	N/A
379.02	31.83	410.85
12.00	3.01	15.01
2,004.09	286.20	2,290.2 9

### MSP RESOURCE AS HEADCOUN

Total number of agency staff, interims or consultants provided by our Managed Service Provider (non Council

employees)

TOTA	ıL
82	
3	
N/A	
92	
20	
41	
177	
N/A	
160	
0	
575	

# NON MSP RESOURCE AS Headcount:

Total number of agency staff, interims or consultants provided through agencies outside or Managed Service Provider(non Council employees)

TOTA L	Consultant s paid in the quarter	Resourc e paid in the quarter
2	2	0
0	0	0
N/A	N/A	N/A
46	0	46
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
N/A	N/A	N/A
0	0	0
0	0	0
48	2	46

#### AVAILABL E CASUAL RESOURC E AS FTE:

Number of workers who undertake work on an ad hoc basis (Council employees)

Total
13.00
0.00
N/A
24.00
158.00
1.00
23.00
6.00
N/A
53.00
4.00
282.00

### 3. Methodology for traffic light ratings

### 3.1 Thresholds for awarding directorate-level health rating traffic lights

	Green	Green Amber	Red Amber	Red
	Good performance	Good, with some concerns	Some concerns	Serious concerns
Revenue & capital budget mgt - variance % (above and below)	0%	< 0.5%	0.5 - 1%	More than 1%
Corporate Plan & HR performance scores	l lviore than ∠	0.5 to 2	-1 to 0.	Less than -1

### 3.2 Method for producing the Corporate Plan, HR/People and Project health ratings

Each individual performance indicator is traffic lighted according to the same four point traffic light scale: Green, Green Amber, Red Amber and Red. Points for each are awarded, as shown in the table below, and then added together to produce the overall health rating score for each directorate.

	Points for each indicator
Green	1
Green Amber	0.5
Red Amber	-0.5
Red	-1

For example, if there were four indicators in a particular directorate and each achieved one of the four traffic lights, the net result would be a score of 0 and this would produce a Red Amber overall health rating, based on the table above.

### 3.3 Method for producing individual performance indicator traffic light ratings

Any target that is met achieves a Green traffic light. Targets that have not been met, but where 80% or more of the targeted improvement has been achieved, will be given a Green Amber traffic light.

Traffic Light	% of targeted improvement achieved	Description
Green	100% or more	Meeting or exceeding target
Green Amber	>80% <100%	Near target with some concerns
Red Amber	>65% <80%	Problematic
Red	<65%	Serious concerns

If the targeted improvement is below 80% but above 65% the indicator will get a Red Amber rating.

For example, if the baseline is 80 people and the target is 100 people, the targeted improvement is 20. 80% of 20 is 16, so the outturn would need to be at least 96 people to achieve Green Amber and at least 93 people to achieve a Red Amber.

Whilst initial traffic lights will be based on this objective criterion, they may subsequently be changed through discussion between Directorates and the Performance team, based on the individual circumstances and prospects for each target. Where this has occurred it will be clearly stated in the report with the reasons given.

The criteria for red and amber traffic lights for HR/People measures differ for each indicator; the amber criterion for each is shown alongside the indicator in the individual data tables.

In addition to the above criteria, Any performance indicator that is less than 10% off target and has a positive direction of travel will automatically qualify to be amber rated. <u>Both</u> of the following criteria need to be met if a service is to have a red-rated performance indicator amended to either a greenamber or a red-amber.

#### For an indicator to be rated as Green amber:

- 1. No more than 5% off target, and;
- 2. A positive direction of travel

#### For an indicator to be rated as Red amber:

- 1. Between >5% and no more than 10% off target, and;
- 2. Positive direction of travel or negative direction of travel not in excess of 2.5% (if the service has a clear story and improvement activity in place)