

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No. 9

meeting date: 17 AUGUST 2016  
 title: 2015/2016 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 2015/2016 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 2015/16. Some notes have been provided to explain significant variances either between the outturn and the target or between 2015/2016 data and 2014/2015 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 2015/2016 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:
  - 57.14% (4) of PIs met target (green)
  - 42.86% (3) 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:
- 14.28% (1) of PIs improved
  - 42.86% (3) of PIs stayed the same
  - 42.86% (3) of PIs worsened
- 2.7 Whilst three PIs are flagged as having worsened above, this relates to only a very minor fall in results between the 2014/15 and 2015/16 financial year performance and is not an area for concern.

### 3 GENERAL COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE AND TARGETS

- 3.1 In respect of the three amber flagged performance indicators, the Head of Financial Services has stated that these are not areas for concern as performance has been only marginally below the target that was set at the beginning of the year.

### 4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 Consider the 2015/2016 performance information provided relating to this committee.

PRINCIPAL POLICY AND  
PERFORMANCE OFFICER

DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

AA22-16/MH/AC  
29 July 2016

For further information please ask for Michelle Haworth, extension 4421

# APPENDIX 1

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

## Accounts and Audit Performance Information 2015/2016

PI Code	Short Name	2014/15		2015/16		2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Current Performance	Trend year on year	Target setting rationale
		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	86%	90%	92%	90%	90%	90%	90%			Maintain performance
PI FS11	Percentage of audit recommendations made to date now implemented or accepted	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%			
PI FS12	Audit time as a percentage of total time available	71.25%	70%	69.13%	70%	70%	70%	70%			Past performance
PI FS13	Percentage of audits completed within budgeted days	78.25%	80%	78.25%	80%	80%	80%	80%			
PI FS14	Percentage of customers providing feedback	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			Past performance
PI FS15	Average satisfaction score	4.35	4	4.25	4	4	4	4			Past performance and achievability