

Performance Report: Quarter One 2012-13

Contents

1. Corporate performance overview	1
2. Whole council summary tables	3
3. Methodology for traffic light ratings.....	9

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	MTB	HR/People	Key project rating
Adult Social Care and Health	5.5	1	37	4.5	-3	1
Children's Service	1.5	2	1,337	0.5	-4	22
Environment, Planning & Regeneration	1.5	1,680	(1,846)	-3	-4	6.5
Commercial Services	3.5	698	(75)	-0.5	0	-2.5
Deputy Chief Executive's Service	-2	-	-	3.5	0	3.5
Chief Executive's Service (incl. Customer Services & Libraries)	-1	350	-	-3.5	-4.5	1
Corporate Governance	-1	7	-	4	0	n/a
Central Expenses	n/a	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
Totals²	1	2,738	(547)	1	-5.5	3

² 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		2012/13 (Position at 31/06/12)	2011/12 (Position at 31/03/12)	Achieved /Trend
1 Revenue Expenditure				
(a) Balances and Reserves:				
(i) General Fund Balance	£'m	12.89	15.78	
(ii) HRA Balances	£'m	7.81	7.81	
(iii) School Balances	£'m	15.09	15.09	
(b) Performance against Budget: Variations:				
(i) Overspends	£'m	4.91	9.39	
(ii) Underspends	£'m	2.02	10.03	
2 Capital Expenditure				
(i) Total Slippage	£'m	1.97	72.59	
3 Debt Management				
(i) Total Debt Outstanding over 30 days	£'m	7.5	4.97	
(i) Total Debt Outstanding over 12 months	£'m	1.51	1.54	
(iii) Council Tax - % paid	%	30.14	96	
4 Creditor Payment Performance				
(i) % of Creditors paid within 30 days	%	97.9	98.5	

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

Directorate	Total no. of Corp Plan indicators	RAG ratings				Positive/neutral DoT	Negative DoT	No. of indicators expected to report data in Q1
		Green	Green amber	Red amber	Red			
Adult Social Care and Health	7	5	1	0	0	6	0	6
Children’s Services	11	1	3	0	1	4	1	5
Environment , Planning & Regeneration	10	5	0	1	3	3	6	9
Commercial Service	4	3	1	0	0	2	0	4*
Deputy Chief Executive	10	2	2	0	4	3	1	8
Chief Executive’s Service	7	2	0	2	1	2	1	5**
Corporate Governance	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Total	50	18 (47.4%)	7 (18.4%)	3 (5.4%)	10 (26.3%)	21	9	38

2.5 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 absence days per employee (Rolling year)	July 11 - June 12	6	6 - 6.5	7.5	N/A	19811.88/2657.29	-24.3%	▲ 3.2%	10.1 days (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)
Average number of absence days per employee this quarter (target is seasonally adjusted)	April 12 - June 12	1.34	1.35 - 1.47	1.5	N/A	3771.83/2492.26	-12.9%	▲ 20.4%	2.25 days (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)
% managers submitting a monthly absence return	April 12 - June 12	100%	>90%	377	89.1%	377/423	10.9%	▼ 3.0%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only
Performance Review									
% performance reviews completed and agreed for eligible staff only	April 11 - March 12	100%	>90%	1972	82.8%	1972/2383	17.2%	▲ 30.1%	86% (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)
% objectives set for eligible staff only	April 12 - March 13	100%	>90%	1688	74.6%	1688/2263	25.4%	▼ 7.7%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only
Cost									
Variance of total paybill to budget	April 12 - June 12	29,349,454	+/-5%	29,222,544	-0.4%	29222544/29349454	-0.4%	▼ 233.1%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only
Management Indicator	Period covered			Q1 Actual (No.)	Q1 Actual % of total	Q1 (numerator/denominator)	DoT Q1 %	Benchmarking	
Diversity Data									
Percentage of top 5% earners that are female	As at 30 June 2012			73	49.0%	73/143	4.6%	▼	Women in leadership posts 49.9% (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)
Number of BME employees as % of total employees	As at 30 June 2012			842	32.1%	842/2623	1.8%	▼	Black and Minority Ethnic local population 33.1% (State of the Borough June 2011)

Appendix A

Number of declared disabled staff as % of total employees	As at 30 June 2012	78	2.8%	78/2748	▲ 5.2%	2.33% (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)
Employee Relations						
High Risk - Employee Relations cases as % of total cases	As at 30 June 2012	10	11.5%	10/87	▲ 66.6%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only

2.6 Staff numbers by service

As at 30 June 2012	ESTABLISHED POSITIONS AS FTE		EMPLOYEES COVERING ESTABLISHED POSITIONS AS FTE			MSP RESOURCE AS HEADCOUNT	NON MSP RESOURCE AS Headcount			AVAILABLE CASUAL RESOURCE AS FTE
	Total Established Positions (FTE)*	Occupied (FTE)	Permanent	Fixed Term, Temporary, Seasonal	TOTAL	TOTAL	Resource paid in the quarter	Consultants paid in the quarter	TOTAL	Total
Chief Executive	403.74	334.89	300.83	32.66	333.49	45	1	0	1	4.00
Adult Social Services	405.87	290.78	261.80	19.54	281.34	64	2	8	10	11.00
Children's Service	965.53	843.52	665.43	148.01	813.44	73	24	5	29	282.66
Corporate Governance	88.69	71.94	62.96	10.00	72.96	6	3	1	4	1.00
Deputy Chief Executive Service	221.20	171.28	128.00	39.24	167.24	37	5	4	9	7.00
Commercial Services	166.08	137.49	111.49	22.00	133.49	29	6	1	7	0.00
Environment, Planning & Regen.	949.05	665.88	619.22	50.86	670.07	160	1	16	17	82.00
Total	3,200.16	2,515.78	2,149.71	322.31	2,472.02	414	42	35	77	387.66

2.7 Key projects – corporate overview

Service Area	Red Status	Amber Status	Green Status	Nil Return/Not enough information provided
Adult Social Services	0	0	1	0
Chief Executive's Office	0	0	1	0
Children's Services	2	2	25	0
Commercial Services	2	1	0	0
Deputy Chief Executive including One Barnet	0	5	6	0
Environment, Planning & Regeneration	1	1	8	1
Totals	5	9	41	1

For Quarter, 1 projects will be reported against the service area responsible for delivery; previously they have been reported against the service of the Project Manager. The exception to this will be One Barnet Projects, which will all be reported against DCE.

This quarter there are a total of 56 projects, five of which are reporting as red and in the case of one, no information has been submitted to Corporate Project Assurance. The projects rated as red are listed below:-

1. Depot Relocation – Commercial Service
2. SOC Eye Maps Replacement – Commercial Service (IS)
3. Blesses Dominic Temporary Accommodation – Children's Service
4. Summerside Primary FSU Refurbishment – Children's Service

The project where no information has been provided is the Highways Master Plan/Flood Risk Alleviation Project in EPR.

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	More than 2	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.

Appendix A

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. Both of the following criteria need to be met if a service is to have a red-rated performance indicator amended to either a green-amber 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)