

**Appendix 1: Response to specific performance summaries cited as examples of weakness of monitoring procedures in Q2 Scrutiny report**

<b><i>Performance indicator</i></b>	<b><i>Scrutiny comment</i></b>	<b><i>Response</i></b>
BI002a – The number of training places and jobs created as a result of Council investment and leadership	Why are the targets listed as zero? Is this an error? Is the methodology for calculating results consistent with the results in 2015/16?	This performance target was not showing a 2016/17 year-end target, this was an error. The 2016/17 year-end target has been set at 470 which is an increase on the 15/16 result of 466. We are confident that we should reach this target by year end. We will also be looking at a clearer method for more accurate recording during the performance setting process for 2017/18.
BI002b – The number of Council apprenticeships created through Council investment for those who live in Oxford	Why are the targets listed as zero? Is this an error? Is the methodology for calculating results consistent with the results in 2015/16?	<p>This performance measure was not showing a 2016/17 year-end target, this was an error. The 2016/17 year-end target has been set at 15. This refers to our internal apprenticeship programme which was funded through a specific investment from CEB in 2011. The target in 2012 was for 15 in each cohort (every two years), and was set in 2015/16 for a target of 15 by the end of 2017. There was a peak in 2015/16 year to 22; however this was due to some extra funding for apprentices.</p> <p>From October 2017, the Government Enterprise Bill puts in place public sector apprenticeship targets where employees will be expected to work towards achieving a new start apprenticeships target of 2.3% of their total headcount per annum. This roughly equates to 28-30 new apprenticeship starts per annum for OCC. This will be taken into account with the target setting process for 2017/2018.</p>

<p>CS001 – The % of customers satisfied at their first point of contact</p>	<p>This relates to contact with customers, but the presentation of the results makes interpretation difficult. What is the meaning of “Positive ratings (310) were received for the following on-line services - Pest Control (wasps) (9%), St Giles’ Fair (7%), Pay to Stay (6%)”? Is 9% for wasps good?</p>	<p>Positive ratings of web pages are decided by customers clicking smiley faces for satisfaction. Web pages can be rated as good, average or poor. At the end of September, there were 310 positive or good comments reported for September about the following on-line services – Pest Control (wasps) 9%, St Giles’ Fair 7%, Pay to Stay 6%. There were also 277 negative or poor ratings reported in September for the following – Contact us 10%, Capita Connect outage 5% and Parking fines payments outage 3% (this was on 14th September only with no downtime since)</p> <p>The Digital team has a programme of redesigning webpages to improve usability. They are looking at other authorities for best practice and will be implementing changes in the next quarter.</p>
<p>CS003 – Customers getting through first time on Councils Main Service lines</p>	<p>This is easier to understand than CS001, but it would be good to break down the information down into smaller sections would make it more useful, e.g., phone, email, face to face. As they stand, the comments were difficult to understand. More important, the targets seemed contrary to the aim of encouraging customers to self-serve. Again, greater clarity and, if necessary more text, is desirable.</p>	<p>The title of CS003 will be changed to “ Customers getting through first time on the Councils Main Telephony line ” to make it clear that this PI just relates to the telephony channel.</p> <p>There are opportunities within the telephony system to encourage customers to self-serve with options available including payments, reporting missed bins and reminders about the web services available.</p> <p>We have recorded a year on year reduction in call volumes which indicates a move to self service.</p>

<p>LG002 – Achieve the electoral registration household registration rate</p>	<p>No results were presented but some initial reporting is already available from the new register on 1st December. We don't need to wait till March.</p>	<p>The percentage result is available and reported in January each year, not March as previously stated.</p> <p>The return is an annual reporting of the household return rate to the annual canvass, which starts in September and finishes on 1st December. So there is no formal reporting until it is complete on the 1<sup>st</sup> December and the report is produced each January. Any "in canvass" reporting would be the cumulative results as the canvass progressed and therefore not deemed useful.</p> <p>The household registration rate for the 2016 canvass was 96.2%. This measure will be set as an annual target in CorVu rather than quarterly, which was an error.</p>
<p>CE002 – Commercial property income received against target for the year</p>	<p>The target would be more useful if it took better account of the timing of the payments for commercial property income.</p>	<p>Following comments from the Scrutiny committee, it was noted that the target for each month does need updating / re-profiling as although it does take into account timing of payments due to the Council, it does not include the Westgate income.</p> <p>The target and profile will be updated to reflect this for the next financial year in the service planning process.</p>

∞

<p>NI157b – Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for minor application types</p>	<p>The target is too blunt, combining backlog cases as well as current ones. It would be better to have separate targets and measures of progress for current cases and for clearing up the backlog.</p>	<p>We have been doing a clear out/clean-up of many old planning cases as part of the service improvement process and this potentially has an adverse impact upon the reported performance where these have been determined, rather than being withdrawn.</p> <p>The quarter 3 performances, October – December shows the improvement being achieved.</p> <p>During the performance setting process, we can look at splitting the target and having a separate measure to report current cases and another measure to report clearing up the backlog.</p>
<p>NI157c – Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for other application types</p>	<p>The target is too blunt, combining backlog cases as well as current ones. It would be better to have separate targets and measures of progress for current cases and for clearing up the backlog.</p>	<p>We have been doing a clear out/clean-up of many old planning cases as part of the service improvement process and this potentially has an adverse impact upon the reported performance where these have been determined, rather than being withdrawn.</p> <p>The quarter 3 performances, October – December shows the improvement being achieved.</p> <p>During the performance setting process, we can look at splitting the target, having a separate measure to report current cases and another measure to report clearing up the backlog.</p>

<p>PC027 – Increase the number of people engaging with the Council’s social media accounts</p>	<p>The result figure is in the thousands but the target for the year is only 400! Is this an error in the figures? In any case, it is difficult to understand what is being measured.</p>	<p>The year-end target was set as 420, which was an error. A social media strategy is being developed which will propose a new target for increasing social media engagements as well as a reduction in the total number of social media accounts.</p> <p>This target monitors and reports on the number of people following our various social media accounts. Until September this year, we included people following Fusion or other partners as Oxford City Council accounts. Work has since been put in place to reduce the amount of social media accounts down from 57 to a more manageable number.</p>
<p>BI001 – The % of Council spend with local businesses</p>	<p>The target is zero but the result is 40% is this an error in the figures?</p>	<p>The 2016/17 year-end target for this performance measure is set at 52% and was stated in the report.</p>
<p>WR002 – Customers supported to improve financial capability</p>	<p>Can we separate the impact of the benefit cap from other factors?</p>	<p>We can separate this performance measure to report on the impact of the benefit cap and another measure to report on other factors for 2017/18 if this is more useful.</p>
<p>ED002 – Implementation of measures to reduce the City Council’s carbon footprint by 5% each year</p>	<p>Are the carbon footprint reduction targets realistic in the light of the comments made there? In other respects the performance of Cleaner, Greener Oxford is to be commended.</p>	<p>The result for September was reported as 36 tonnes against a year-end target of 248 tonnes. There are several measures planned for the remainder of the year and the team are confident that the target will be met by March 2017.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank