RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT TO COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 1st SEPTEMBER 2015
title: 2014/2015 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 2014/2015 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 2014/15. Some notes have been provided to explain significant variances either between the outturn and the target or between 2014/2015 data and 2013/2014 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 2014/2015 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 5 indicators that can be compared to target:

- 0% (0) of PIs met target (green)

- 100% (5) of PIs close to target (amber)
- 0% (0) of PIs missed target (red)

2.6 Analysis shows that of the 5 indicators where performance trend can be compared over the years:

- 20% (1) of PIs improved
- 0% (0) of PIs stayed the same
- 80% (4) 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 Culture, Recreation and Leisure Services, - since Mark Beveridge took over as Head of Service he has been reviewing the performance information collected for monitoring the various services.

3.2 In respect of PIs for Engineering Services, Adrian Harper, Head of Engineering Services, has provided the following information regarding performance and targets:

- **PI ES1 - Number of reported missed collections per 100,000 population** - The difficulty is not predicting the bins, but rather the paper. We assume every house will present a bin for collection, but we don't know who will present paper for collection. This skews the result.

- **PI ES2 - Percentage of missed collections put right in 24 hrs -** There were 2 particularly bad months for returns (being May and June 2014). These were due to staff resources not being available due to sickness.

- **PI ES5 - Percentage of households receiving a three-stream collection service** - Target virtually met.

- **PI ES6 (NI185)** - **CO2 reduction from local authority operations** – Data not yet available.

- **PI ES9 (NI191) - Residual household waste per household** - Target was not achievable.

- **PI ES10 (NI192) - Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting** - Target was too optimistic.

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 2014/2015 performance information provided relating to this committee.

Michelle Haworth   **Jane Pearson**
PRINCIPAL POLICY AND   DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
PERFORMANCE OFFICER

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

REF: MH/Community Committee/01.09.15

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		

Engineering Services Performance Information 2014/2015

PI Code	Short Name	2013/14		2014/15		2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Current Performance	Trend year on year	Target setting rationale	Link to Corporate Strategy Objective	Explanations for Variances to Target
		Value	Target	Value	Target	Target	Target	Target					
PI ES1	Number of reported missed collections per 100,000 population	17	20	20	19	18	17	17			Target revised with introduction of consistency in methods of reporting and monitoring. Increase monitoring and allocation of responsibility to refuse collection staff. Improved communications of accountability. Work required to establish which claims are genuine and remove false claims from numbers.	To increase the recycling of waste material	The difficulty is not predicting the bins but rather the paper. We assume every house will present a bin for collection but we don't know who will present paper for collection. This skews the result.
PI ES2	Percentage of missed collections put right in 24 hrs	94%	96%	92%	98%	99%	99%	99%			Target set to reach a 'plateau' of optimum service delivery and to remove false claims	To increase the recycling of waste material	There were 2 particularly bad months for returns being May and June. These were due to resources not being available due to sickness.
PI ES5	Percentage of households receiving a three-stream collection service	97%	97%	96.49%	96.5%	96.6%	96.7%	96.8%			All new developments/new builds will be provided with 3 stream waste collection services which will increase the percentage of the borough covered.	To increase the recycling of waste material	Target virtually met

PI Code	Short Name	2013/14		2014/15		2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Current Performance	Trend year on year	Target setting rationale	Link to Corporate Strategy Objective	Explanations for Variances to Target
		Value	Target	Value	Target	Target	Target	Target					
PI ES6 (NI185)	CO2 reduction from local authority operations	21.6%	1.0%	N/A					?	?	Previous 5% target reductions are unrealistic - 1.2% for 1/3 savings on energy in building. May action 4% next year and then little else. It will get harder as years go on.		Not yet available
PI ES9 (NI191)	Residual household waste per household	540	515	539	525	525	520	515	⚠	⬇	Due to the newly built properties being designed for co-mingled recycling and further education of existing property owners there will be a natural trend of reduction of residual waste per household. A reduction of 10kg per household per annum results in a reduction of 269 tonnes of the total residual waste per annum. With this in mind and the fact that the target was not achieved 14/15 the targets have been revised accordingly.	To increase the recycling of waste material	Target was not achievable
PI ES10 (NI192)	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	37.46%	40.00%	38.65%	42.00%	40.00%	41.00%	45.00%	⚠	⬆	As education increases and residual waste decreases per household there should be an increase. This will however, need to be tempered by the amount of paper recycled decreasing due to 'e' technology.	To increase the recycling of waste material	Target was too optimistic