Performance Report: Quarter One 2012-13

<u>**Contents**</u>

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	0	448	3.5	-4.5	2
Children's Service	2.5	(228)	(10,830)	2.5	-5.5	26
Environment, Planning & Regeneration	2.5	1085	(2,930)	0.5	-3.5	0
Commercial Services	2	714	690	0.5	-1	-2.5
Deputy Chief Executive's Service	-1.5	(3)	0	2.5	-1	4.5
Chief Executive's Service (incl. Customer Services & Libraries)	-2	344	(1,200)	-2.5	-5	n/a
Corporate Governance	1	155	0	4	-3.5	n/a
Central Expenses	n/a	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
Totals[2]	2.5	2,067	(7,962)	4	-6	1

---

[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 30/09/12)	2011/12 (Position at 31/06/12)	Achieved /Trend
1	**Revenue Expenditure**				
	(a) Balances and Reserves:				
	(i) General Fund Balance	£'m	13.71	13.04	
	(ii) HRA Balances	£'m	7.81	7.81	🟩
	(iii) School Balances	£'m	15.09	15.09	
	(b) Performance against Budget: Variations:				
	(i) Overspends	£'m	5.56	4.76	🟥
	(ii) Underspends	£'m	3.49	2.02	🟩
2	**Capital Expenditure**				
	(i) Total Slippage	£'m	12.58	1.97	🟥
3	**Debt Management**				
	(i) Total Debt Outstanding over 30 days	£'m	5.1	7.5	
	(i) Total Debt Outstanding over 12 months	£'m	1.29	1.51	🟩
	(iiii) Council Tax - % paid	%	56.74	30.14	
4	**Creditor Payment Performance**				
	(i) % of Creditors paid within 30 days	%	97.98	97.93	🟩

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 Q4
		Green	Green amber	Red amber	Red			
Adult Social Care and Health	7	6			1	3	3	7
Children's Services	11	6		1	3	6	3	10*
Environment , Planning & Regeneration	10	5	1		3	7	2	10
Commercial Service	4	3			1	4		4
Deputy Chief Executive	10	2	2	1	4	6	3	9
Chief Executive's Service	7	1		2	2	3	2	6
Corporate Governance	1	1				1		1
Total	**50**	**24 (51.1%)**	**3 (6.4%)**	**4 (8.5%)**	**14 (29.8%)**	**30**	**13**	**47**

*A CPI due to be reported is still awaiting data
nb. Where the direction of travel is N/A or black this has not been included in the statistics

2.5 Human Resource/People performance - corporate overview

Key corporate HR targets and indicators

Performance Indicator	Period covered	Target	Amber criteria	Q2 Actual (No.)	Q2 Actual % of total	Q2 (numerator/ denominator)	Target Variance	Q2 DoT	Benchmarking
Attendance									
Average number of sickness absence days per employee (Rolling year)	Oct 11 - Sept 12	6	6 - 6.5	**7.7**	**N/A**	19430.19/2535.98	-27.7%	▼ 2.8%	10.1 days (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)
Average number of absence days per employee this quarter (target is seasonally adjusted)	July 12 - Sept 12	1.44	1.45 - 1.57	**1.9**	**N/A**	4655.53/2426.7	-33.3%	▼ 28%	2.25 days (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)
% managers submitting a monthly absence return	July 12 - Sept 12	100%	>90%	**384**	**91.7%**	384/419	8.4%	▲ 2.9%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only
Performance Review									
% performance reviews completed and agreed for eligible staff only	April 11 - Mar 12	100%	>90%	**2063**	**84.6%**	2063/2438	15.4%	▲ 2.3%	86% (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)
% objectives set for eligible staff only	April 12 - Mar 13	100%	>90%	**2108**	**91.1%**	2108/2313	8.9%	▲ 22.2%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only
Cost									
Variance of total paybill to budget	July 12 - Sept 12	£28,473,024	+/-5%	**25,178,838**	**-11.6%**	25178838/28473024	-11.6%	▼ 38.1%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only

Management Indicator	Period covered		Q2 Actual (No.)	Q2 Actual % of total	Q2 (numerator/ denominator)	DoT Q2 %	Benchmarking
Diversity Data							
Percentage of top 5% earners that are female	As at 30 Sept 2012		**70**	**49.0%**	70/143	— 0.0%	Women in leadership posts 49.9% (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)

Number of BME employees as % of total employees	As at 30 Sept 2012	**819**	**31.9%**	819/2568	▼ 0.7%	Black and Minority Ethnic local population 33.1% (State of the Borough June 2011)
Number of declared disabled staff as % of total employees	As at 30 Sept 2012	**76**	**2.8%**	76/2686	— 0.0%	2.33% (CIPFA, All Members & other Unitary Authorities 2011)

Employee Relations

High Risk - Employee Relations cases as % of total cases	As at 30 Sept 2012	**8**	**9.1%**	8/88	▼ 21%	N/A : measure applicable to LBB only

2.6 Staff numbers by service

As at 30 Sept 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	410.99	331.37	300.32	29.66	329.98	72	0	6	**6**	4.00
Adult Social Services	370.00	278.25	248.76	20.40	269.16	68	2	16	18	12.00
Children's Service	976.86	839.58	659.51	153.70	813.21	73	17	14	**31**	274.66
Corporate Governance	53.36	42.06	35.47	7.00	42.47	2	2	0	**2**	1.00
Deputy Chief Executive Service	202.71	170.64	132.89	31.75	164.64	33	6	8	**14**	5.00
Commercial Services	169.08	130.66	104.65	23.00	127.65	16	9	4	**13**	0.00
Environment, Planning & Regen.	875.75	655.48	617.14	44.88	662.02	169	0	31	**31**	87.00
Total	**3,097.12**	**2,448.04**	**2,098.74**	**310.39**	**2,409.13**	**433**	**36**	**79**	**115**	**384.66**

2.7 Key projects – corporate overview

Service Area	Red Status	Amber Status	Green Status	Nil Return/Not enough information provided
Adult Social Services			2	
Chief Executive's Office				
Children's Services	2	2	29	
Commercial Services	2	1		
Deputy Chief Executive including One Barnet		5	7	
Environment, Planning & Regeneration	2	4	7	1
Totals	6	12	45	2

A total of 66 projects have been monitored over quarter 2, of these projects six have been given a Red RAG rating due to milestone or general project slippage, these projects are listed below:

Grahame Park Regeneration Programme(EPR)

Brent Cross and Cricklewood Regeneration Programme (EPR)

Depot Relocation (Commercial)

SOC Eye Maps Replacement (Commercial

Oakleigh School Expansion Project (Children's Service)

Summerside Primary Expansion Project (Children's Service)

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.

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)