RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT TO ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 26TH JULY 2017
title: 2016/2017 YEAR-END PERFORMANCE INFORMATION
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
principal author: MICHELLE HAWORTH – PRINCIPAL POLICY AND PERFORMANCE OFFICER

1 PURPOSE

1.1 This is the year-end report of 2016/2017 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 –
- Corporate Priorities –
- Other Considerations -

Monitoring our performance ensures that we are both providing excellent services for our community as well as meeting corporate priorities.

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 for 2016/17. Some notes have been provided to explain significant variances either between the outturn and the target or between 2016/2017 data and 2015/2016 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 2016/2017 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 7 indicators that can be compared to target:

- 100% (7) of PIs met target (green)
- 0% (0) of PIs close to target (amber)

- 0% (0) of PIs missed target (red)

2.6 Analysis shows that of the 7 indicators where performance trend can be compared over the years:

- 57.14% (4) of PIs improved
- 28.57% (2) of PIs stayed the same
- 14.29% (1) of PIs worsened

2.7 Where possible audited and checked data has been included in the report. However, some data may be corrected following the work of Internal Audit and before the final publication of the indicators on the Council's website. 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 Financial Services, no additional information or explanations were required to explain variances or why targets have not been met.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources - None
- 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 2016/2017 performance information provided relating to this committee.

Michelle Haworth
PRINCIPAL POLICY AND
PERFORMANCE OFFICER

Jane Pearson
DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

REF: MH/A&A/

For further information please ask for Michelle Haworth, extension 4421

PI Status		Long Term Trends	
🔴	Alert	⬆	Improving
⚠	Warning	▬	No Change
✅	OK	⬇	Getting Worse
❓	Unknown		
📈	Data Only		

Accounts and Audit Performance Information 2016/2017

PI Code	Short Name	2015/16		2016/17		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Current Performance	Trend year on year	Target setting rationale	Objective	Latest Notes
		Value	Target	Value	Target	Target	Target	Target					
PI FS1	% of draft audit reports issued in less than 10 days from completion of audit (sign-off meeting by auditee)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	✅	▬	Maintain performance.		
PI FS3	Percentage of Audit Plan covered	92%	90%	91.5%	90%	90%	90%	90%	✅	⬇	Maintain performance whilst recognising staffing issues in 2012/13		
PI FS11	Percentage of audit recommendations made to date now implemented or accepted	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	✅	⬆			
PI FS12	Audit time as a percentage of total time available	69.13%	70%	72.63%	70%	70%	70%	70%	✅	⬆	Past performance		
PI FS13	Percentage of audits completed within budgeted days	78.25%	80%	86.1%	80%	85%	85%	85%	✅	⬆	Stretch current performance, as staff now embedded.		
PI FS14	Percentage of customers providing feedback	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	✅	▬	Past performance		
PI FS15	Average satisfaction score	4.25	4	4.28	4	4.25	4.25	4.25	✅	⬆	Past performance and achievability		