

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

INFORMATION

Agenda Item No 8

meeting date: 4 SEPTEMBER 2013  
title: 2012/2013 YEAR-END PERFORMANCE INFORMATION  
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES  
principal author: PRINCIPAL POLICY AND PERFORMANCE OFFICER

## 1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 This is the year-end report of 2012/2013 that details performance against our local performance indicators.
- 1.2 Regular performance monitoring is essential to ensure that the Council is delivering effectively against its agreed priorities, both in terms of the national agenda and local needs.
- 1.3 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
  - Community objectives - Monitoring our performance ensures that we are both providing excellent services for our community as well as
  - Corporate priorities - meeting corporate priorities.
  - Other considerations -

## 2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Performance Indicators are an important driver of improvement and allow authorities, their auditors, inspectors, elected members and service users to judge how well services are performing.
- 2.2 A rationale has been sought for maintaining each indicator – with it either being used to monitor service performance or to monitor the delivery of a local priority.
- 2.3 The report attached at Appendix 1 comprises the following information:
  - The outturn figures for all local performance indicators relevant to this committee, reported by exception for each of the quarters of 2012/13. Some notes have been provided to explain significant variances either between the outturn and the target or between 2012/2013 data and 2011/2012 data. A significant variance is greater than 15% (or 10% for cost PIs).
  - Performance information is also provided for previous years for comparison purposes (where available) and the trend in performance is shown.
  - Targets for service performance for the year 2012/2013 are provided and a 'traffic light' system is used to show variances of actual performance against the target as follows: Red: Service performance significantly below target (i.e. less than 75% of target performance), Amber: Performance slightly below target (i.e. between 75% and 99% of target), Green: Target met/exceeded.
  - Targets have been provided for members to scrutinise for the following three years. A target setting rationale was sought from each Head of Service.
- 2.4 These tables are provided to allow members to ascertain how well services are being delivered against our local priorities and objectives, as listed in the Corporate Strategy.

2.5 Analysis shows that of the 18 indicators that can be compared to target:

- 72.2% (13) of PIs met target (green)
- 27.8% (5) of PIs close to target (amber)
- 0% of PIs missed target (red)

2.6 Analysis shows that of the 30 indicators where performance trend can be compared over the years:

- 46.7% (14) of PIs improved
- 33.3% (10) of PIs stayed the same
- 20% (6) of PIs worsened

2.7 Where possible audited and checked data has been included in the report. However, some data may be corrected following work of Internal Audit and before the final publication of the indicators on the Council's website. In addition, some of the outturn performance information has not been collected/not yet available before this report was produced.

2.8 Indicators can be categorised as 'data only' if they are not suitable for monitoring against targets – these are marked as so in the report.

### 3 GENERAL COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE AND TARGETS

3.1 In respect of PIs for Human Resources, Michelle Smith, Head of Human Resources, has provided the following information regarding performance and targets:

- **PI HR12 - Equality Standard for Local Government** - We continue to ensure that fairness and equality underpins all the Council's processes and are still working towards progressing through the Equality Standard.
- **PI HR1 - HR11 – Number of staff at each pay grade** - Staff numbers remain fairly static as the grading structure was set as a permanent framework following Job Evaluation. Any difference, increase/decrease, in number of staff in each band is just a reflection of staff turnover or career progression
- **PI HR16 – Top 5% of Earners with a disability** - Our top 5% covers the Chief Executive, Directors and Heads of Service. Staff turnover in this grouping is fairly static so the opportunity for improvement in the % is only likely to arise as and when a new staff member is recruited to the group. Our overarching recruitment policy is to recruit the best person to the post and as such we do not adopt a 'positive action' approach to any minority groups. We do however ascribe to the Job Centre's 'two ticks' scheme where we guarantee an interview to any candidate who declares that they have a disability and meets the essential criteria for the post.
- **PI HR17 – Working days lost to sickness** - Our final outturn figure for 2012/13 was slightly above target, this was mainly due to an increase in long term absence in the last quarter. We have previously reported on the disproportionate impact that long term absence can have on our sickness figures. Members will already be aware that we monitor absence very closely and have robust Absence Management policies and procedures in place, so we actively strive to achieve and improve on targets. Recent monitoring of the first quarter for 2013/14 has shown an increase in the absence figure to 1.84%, as we have had a number of people whose health has been affected by the exceptionally hot weather and we currently have six members of staff who have long term absence. Early indications are that our absence figure will remain above target for quarter 2 so members may wish to consider adjusting our outturn target for 2013/14.

#### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources - it is important to monitor our performance closely and take any appropriate action as necessary, in order to ensure the most effective and efficient use of our resources
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – None
- Political - None
- Reputation – It is important that correct information is available to facilitate decision-making.
- Equality & Diversity – None

#### 5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Consider the 2012/2013 performance information provided relating to this committee.

PRINCIPAL POLICY AND  
PERFORMANCE OFFICER









DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

P1-13/MH/AC  
13 August 2013

















BACKGROUND PAPERS:  
MH/personnel committee/04.09.13

For further information please ask for Michelle Haworth, extension 4421

## Human Resources (and Corporate) Performance Information – 2012-2013

PI Status		Long Term Trends	
	Alert		Improving
	Warning		No Change
	OK		Getting Worse
	Unknown		
	Data Only		

## Annual Indicators







PI Code	Short Name	Type	2010/2011	2012/13		Annual 2013/14	Annual 2014/15	Annual 2015/16	Current Performance	Year on year trend
			Value	Value	Target					
PI PS1 (BV3)	Overall satisfaction with the authority	Percentage	69%	76.2%	70%		76%			
PI PS25	Overall, how well informed feel about local public services	Percentage	57.5%	69.6%	60%		70%			
PI PS28	How well informed about how to get involved in local decision making	Percentage	48.9%	53%	50%		55%			
PI PS29	How well informed about what standard of service to expect from local public services	Percentage	53%	61%	55%		65%			
PI PS30	How well informed about how well local public services are performing	Percentage	49.5%	60%	50%		65%			
PI PS36 (NI 4)	% of adults surveyed who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area	Percentage	36.2%	38.2%	40%		40%			
PI PS37 (NI 5)	Overall/general satisfaction with local area	Percentage	97.3%	95.4%	97%		96%			
PI PS48	Overall satisfaction with experience of contacting the Council	Percentage	68.1%	74.5%	70%		75%			

PI Code	Short Name	Type	2011/12	2012/13		Annual 2013/14	Annual 2014/15	Annual 2015/16	Current Performance	Year on year trend
			Value	Value	Target					
PI HR12 (BV2a)	Equality Standard for Local Government	Number	1	1	2	2	2	2		
PI HR20 (BV16a)	Percentage of Employees with a Disability	Percentage	5.03%	7.15%	5.51%	7.65%	8.15%	8.65%		
PI HR22 (BV17a)	Ethnic Minority representation in the workforce - employees	Percentage	.50%	1.02%	.98%	1.46%	1.94%	2.46%		

Quarterly Indicators

PI Code	Short Name	Type	2011/12	Q1 2012/13		Q2 2012/13		Q3 2012/13		Q4 2012/13		2012/13		Annual 2013/14	Annual 2014/15	Annual 2015/16	Current Performance	Year on year trend
			Value	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target					
PI HR1	Number of staff at: craft grade	Number	2	2		2		2		2		2						
PI HR3	Number of staff at: Local Agreement grade	Number	1	1		1		1		1		1						
PI HR4	Number of staff at: Scale 1-3	Number	92	94		97		96		98		98						
PI HR5	Number of staff at: Scale 4-6	Number	76	78		74		74		70		70						
PI HR6	Number of staff at: Scale SO 1-2	Number	24	24		24		22		24		24						
PI HR7	Number of staff at: Scale PO 1-5	Number	15	15		14		15		16		16						

PI Code	Short Name	Type	2011/12	Q1 2012/13		Q2 2012/13		Q3 2012/13		Q4 2012/13		2012/13		Annual 2013/14	Annual 2014/15	Annual 2015/16	Current Performance	Year on year trend
			Value	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target					
PI HR8	Number of staff at: Scale PO 6-10	Number	8	8		8		7		7		7						
PI HR9	Number of staff at: Scale PO 11-15	Number	1	1		1		1		1		1						
PI HR10a	Number of staff at: Scale PO 16-22	Number	6	6		6		6		6		6						
PI HR10b	Number of staff at: Scale PO 23-26	Number	3	3		3		3		3		3						
PI HR11	Number of staff at: Scale CEX/Director	Number	3	3		3		3		3		3						
PI HR14 (BV11a)	Top 5% of Earners: Women	Percentage	30.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%		
PI HR15 (BV11b)	Top 5% of Earners: Ethnic Minorities	Percentage	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%		
PI HR16 (BV11c)	Top 5% of Earners: with a disability	Percentage	10.00%	8.30%	10.00%	8.30%	10.00%	8.30%	10.00%	8.30%	10.00%	8.30%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%		
PI HR17 (BV12)	Working Days Lost Due to Sickness Absence	Number	6.01	1.56	1.49	1.66	1.49	1.43	1.49	2.43	1.49	6.88	5.95	6.50	6.25	6.50		

PI Code	Short Name	Type	2011/12	Q1 2012/13		Q2 2012/13		Q3 2012/13		Q4 2012/13		2012/13		Annual 2013/14	Annual 2014/15	Annual 2015/16	Current Performance	Year on year trend
			Value	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target					
<b>PI HR18 (BV14)</b>	Percentage of Early Retirements	Percentage	1.44%	.00%	1.00%	.00%	1.00%	.00%	1.00%	.00%	1.00%	.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.50%		
<b>PI HR19 (BV15)</b>	Percentage of Ill-health Retirements	Percentage	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	0.5%	.00%	.00%		
<b>PI HR23</b>	Staff turnover	Percentage	11.2%	1.35%	2.68%	1.79%	2.68%	3.14%	2.68%	1.79%	2.68%	8.07%	10.72%	10.72%	10.24%	10.24%		
<b>PI HR24</b>	Number of training days provided	Number	188	74		48.5		60		54		236.5					