1 PURPOSE

1.1 This is the year-end report of 2017/2018 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 meeting corporate priorities.
   - 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 for 2017/18. Notes are provided where necessary to explain significant variances either between the outturn and the target or between 2017/2018 data and 2016/2017 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 2017/2018 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 also been provided for 2018/2019.

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

- 42.86% (3) of PIs improved
- 42.86% (3) of PIs stayed the same
- 14.28% (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.

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 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 2017/2018 performance information provided relating to this committee.
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PRINCIPAL POLICY AND PERFORMANCE OFFICER

Jane Pearson
DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
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## Accounts and Audit Performance Information 2017/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI Code</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>Current Performance</th>
<th>Trend year on year</th>
<th>Corporate Objective</th>
<th>Latest Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI FS1</td>
<td>% of draft audit reports issued in less than 10 days from completion of audit (sign-off meeting by auditee)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Trend]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI FS3</td>
<td>Percentage of Audit Plan covered</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>93.67%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Trend]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI FS11</td>
<td>Percentage of audit recommendations made to date now implemented or accepted</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Trend]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI FS12</td>
<td>Audit time as a percentage of total time available</td>
<td>72.63%</td>
<td>70.88%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Trend]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI FS13</td>
<td>Percentage of audits completed within budgeted days</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>93.44%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Trend]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI FS14</td>
<td>Percentage of customers providing feedback</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI FS15</td>
<td>Average satisfaction score</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Trend]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>