

Notes of the meeting of the Performance Monitoring Scrutiny Panel held on Tuesday 23rd February 2010 for presentation to the City Executive Board on 3rd March 2010:-

Present: Councillors Goddard, Morton and Simmons: Danny Woodhouse, Simon Howick and William Reed.

1. The Panel had before it the report entitled "Third Quarter Performance Report 2009/10" that was going to the City Executive Board on 3rd March 2010.
2. The Panel wished to draw the following to the Board's attention:-
 - (a) Paragraph 2.2 of the report (What we do with performance management information) – it was entirely the right approach to manage performance and not merely to monitor it. Monitoring on its own without management represented an incomplete exercise. Danny Woodhouse confirmed that there was a clear shift (i.e. towards positive management) in the way in which Service Areas addressed performance information.
 - (b) Paragraph 2.4 (NI 155- Number of affordable homes delivered) – in addition to the information required by NI 155, information should henceforth be gathered in quarterly monitoring reports of the net number of affordable homes delivered (i.e. those delivered after disposals in the same period had been subtracted).
 - (c) Paragraph 2.12 (BV 202 – Number of rough sleepers (snapshot)) – to ask Nerys Parry to provide a note listing the A10 states, what their nationals were and were not entitled to, when they would be entitled to more and what was being achieved to assist this category of rough sleepers.
 - (d) Paragraph 2.13 (BV 012 – Days lost to sickness (average) excluding unpaid) – the more relevant information was that relating to days lost to sickness with no exclusions (e.g. swine flu illness should not be excluded). There appeared to be no good reason to take out this or any other particular cause of sickness absence.
 - (e) Paragraph 2.14 (BV 212 – Days to re-let Council houses (average days)) – the range of time as well as the average number of days should be provided in future monitoring reports. In this way it might be possible specifically to address issues relating to the longer times taken to re-let (i.e. hard to let properties).

- (f) Paragraph 2.18 (BV 008 – Invoices paid within 30 days) – the Panel noted that reports to Service Areas were being made on an individual level as a means to drive up the percentage of invoices paid on target.
- (g) BV 079(a) (Cases where calculation of benefit correct) – the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee noted advice from Helen Bishop that performance was predicted to improve in Quarter 4 (January performance was 100% correct); that just one or two incorrect cases would reduce performance below target; and that training and consequent performance improvements were underway.

The Committee thanked Helen Bishop for her efforts to drive up the performance of the Benefits Service generally.

- (h) Paragraph 2.20 (NI 014 – Available contact with customers per customer request) – to express concern that this target was at ‘intervene’ level. However, it also noted advice from Danny Woodhouse that the NI was not easy of interpretation and involved some degree of subjectivity.
- (i) Paragraph 3.10 (NI 195a – level of litter) – to note that Danny Woodhouse had asked for a report on the local results (*report now received*). To record that the persons independent of the City Council should carry out the cleanliness inspections.
- (j) Paragraph 3.15 (Work of City Centre Manager) – to ask for the following from the City Centre Manager (or his Service Head):-
 - A fuller description of what the City Centre Manager did (i.e. his job description)
 - What his priorities were for the first six months
 - A report back after six months upon what he considered he had achieved.
- (k) Paragraph 3.20 (CP 16.9 – Increase staff attendance) – to note that this target was at ‘monitor’ level and to ask for an explanation of the indicator and what was being done to achieve it to the next Panel meeting in conjunction with the quarterly performance information.
- (l) Paragraph 3.23 (NI 192 – Household waste recycled and composted) – the percentage had stuck at below target for too long.
- (m) Paragraph 3.24 (CP 11.8 – Survey of users of community centres) – to ask Graham Stratford to report by the end of the

Council Year upon timescales for the broader survey (into community group satisfaction overall) that it understood that was now proposed, how it would be conducted and what it would cover.

- (n) Paragraph 3.25 (CP 13.10 – Create and adopt area action plans) – to ask Graham Stratford to report by the end of the Council Year upon what was now proposed, when it would happen and how he envisaged the regeneration strategy and area action plans in-linking.
- (o) Paragraph 1.4 and Appendix B (Data quality) – the Panel noted that the internal audit outcome had shown “moderate” level assurance. However, the Panel felt that the outcome showed that supporting documentation/an audit trail for performance information was not fully embedded, but that it should be. It noted that Service Heads were systematically spot checking performance results.