

Measure Service	Description	Owner	Result 2018/19	Result 2019/20	Result 2020/21	2021/22 Target	Q1 21/22 Target	Jun-21	Jul 21 target	Jul 21 actual	Commentary	Questions from Scrutiny	Response
CS003	CS003: Customers calls answered on the council's main telephone service lines without hanging up	Helen Bishop	95%	94.45%	94.69%	95	95	89.75%	95.00%	89.57%	An action plan was drawn up to address the performance levels . The following actions have been taken: Reduce 1-1 times for officers to 30 mins, Team Meetings now cross over the time we are closed on a Thursday to minimize the impact, on-line messages have been added promoting on-line services, recruitment has taken place for 3 new CSOs who start on 16th Aug, training has taken place for 4 CSOs to increase our ability to pick up Repairs and council tax calls, internal and external comms are being drawn up promoting our on-line services and we have reduced the support we are providing to the hubs. Throughout July, August and September we go through peak holiday period and with additional sickness and 3 CSOs leaving this has put additional strain on our available resource, There are also still some issues with QL that need to be resolved which creates additional disruption for CSOs and additional call volume.		
CS002	CS002: Time to process changes in circumstances	Tanya Bandekar	12.08	10.77	6.58	15	15	5.95 days	15	6	Some 3,450 "Change Events" were processed in July in an average 7.2 days. Our year to date result is a commendable 6.2 days, almost 9 days within the 21/22 target of 15 days.	Why is the target here 15, given from 2018 onwards the actual performance has been well below this, and indeed has improved year on year? Surely a more stringent target is appropriate?	NB This is a response to questions for CS002 and CS005: We have taken a view for this year to leave the target as is, but reduce the new claims target from 18 days to 15 days. Whilst performance is good, there were several reasons for leaving this as it was. 1. Test and Trace support- Councils were required to administer these grants with inadequate funding. This meant we had to move staff from processing, checking and recovery within the team to administer these payments. We had a large number of applicants, many that were ineligible, but we still had to process these. So far we have managed to keep largely on top of the work by introducing more automated processes, but we also see a rise in days to process whilst staff take summer holiday leave. We do try to manage this but inevitably there will also be levels of sickness as well as leave. 2. We are implementing a new Revenues and Benefits system which will require a 3-4 week close down period whilst we go through the conversion period in September. During this time we will be unable to process claims and changes, which will inevitably mean delays in processing, and we expect performance to take a hit. Once we are live we have arranged for extra support to clear this as quickly as possible. 3. Covid-19 is still with us. We are awaiting the impact of the cessation of the furlough scheme, Self Employed Income Support Scheme (SEISS) , and the cessation of Business Grants. All these may lead to businesses ceasing to trade and an increase in claims. For these reasons we have left the indicator as is, as whilst we absolutely accept stretching targets should be set, we must balance that with staff morale, and as you will be aware staff have been working flat out to keep services running
												Why is the target 15, exactly the same as for CS005, when this achieved 6.58 the previous year?	

Measure Service	Description	Owner	Result 2018/19	Result 2019/20	Result 2020/21	2021/22 Target	Q1 21/22 Target	Jun-21	Jul 21 target	Jul 21 actual	Commentary	Questions from Scrutiny	Response
CS005	CS005: Time to process new benefits claims	Tanya Bandekar	14.01	13.54	13.26	15		14.92 days		14.36	The July result of 12.2 days was our best monthly result of the year to date. This made our year to date result 14.4 days that is comfortably within the 15 day target set for 21/22.	As with CS002, the target is above results achieved in 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21, and there have been year on year improvements. Should this not also be more stringent?	we are ever hopeful that as we move back to some form of normality we will be able to reduce this target from April next year
HP011	Households in temporary accommodation	Stephen Clarke	NA	NA	New KPI 2021/22	110	110	96			This is updated quarterly		
BI038	BI038: Percentage of staff turnover for the whole organisation	Helen Bishop / Samantha Lees			7.92%			7.32%		7.97%			
CH001	CH001: Days lost to sickness	Helen Bishop / Samantha Lees	6.5	7.68	5.59	6.50		5.34		5.71		I would be keen to hear more on the rationale behind this target, and what measures are sitting underneath it. Obviously there can be positive interventions here – for example stress prevention, mental health support etc., but on the other hand seeking to meet this target through less positive measures would be unhelpful – eg. a culture where staff are discouraged from taking sick leave when needed.	Awaiting response
												Can we split this between long term and short term?	Awaiting response
BI001a	BI001a: The % of Council spend with local business (excluding ODS and OCHL)	Annette Osborne	54%	65.88	71%	45		77%		64%		This target is more than 20 percentage points lower than what has been delivered in 2019/20 and 2020/21 – what's the explanation/rationale behind this?	While actual performance to date shows performance closer to previous years there is a risk that local spend can vary significantly from month to month due to one contract alone - hence the reason for an annual target of 45%. The council could pay the parent company, but local supply could be utilised. Our systems do not currently have the ability to register indirect local spend.
BI001b	BI001b: The % of ODS spend with local business	Nicky Atkin	48%	46.58%	55.15%	60%		89%		56%	The target is in line with an increase of the spend for 20/21 and is expected to increase during the year	Why is this target 0?	Annual target of 0 was error - now corrected to 60%
BI001c	BI001c: The % of OCHL spend with local business	Annette Osborne	5.90%	7.03%	26.5%	25%		8%		6%		Is this target too high given it's only been exceeded once in the past three years?	This should be a yearly target based on the fact that one contract alone can impact this figure. Construction contracts are more likely to use large organisations who indirectly use local supply which we cannot easily track.
BV008	BV008: Percentage of invoices paid on	Anna Winship	89.34%	89.82%	88.86%	95%	95%	93.43%	95.00%	95.59%			
CS025	CS025: Percentage of Business Rates Collected	Tanya Bandekar	98.14%	97.39%	95.71%	95.5	28	27.84	37	28.56	2021/22 is proving a difficult year for rates collection. In 20/21 due to the pandemic retail premises received 100% discount. That relief finished on 30/06/21, with the relief being capped at 66%. This means that the debit to collect this year is some £34m (65%) higher. By 31/07 we had collected almost £25m that equals 28.6% of the £87.5m due for 21/22	Can we be given just the Q1 targets for comparison	Q1 and July targets now provided. Please note that this is a cumulative figure, so collection increases throughout the year. More Ratepayers now choose to pay over 12 months, so we have to monitor this target very closely throughout the year. We have reissued bills showing the 66% Expanded Retail Reduction, so the debit to collect has increased from July. We will look at the August outturn figure as we may need to reprofile the monthly targets. We haven't done that yet as there was always the option for Government to extend the 100% discount further, which didn't happen.

Measure Service	Description	Owner	Result 2018/19	Result 2019/20	Result 2020/21	2021/22 Target	Q1 21/22 Target	Jun-21	Jul 21 target	Jul 21 actual	Commentary	Questions from Scrutiny	Response
FN034	FN034: Trading Income	Scott Warner	£418,397	£360,918	£268,523	175000	43,749	Not available	58,332	£19,983		What's the rationale for this target being significantly below what has been delivered in previous years?	Some of our larger long-term contracts have concluded and with the pandemic, new business development was affected and a large percentage of resource was diverted to the administration of Covid Business grants. BD activity has started to slowly pick up again and it is hoped new contracts will fill the income gap.
FN036	FN036: Fraud Losses Prevented	Scott Warner	£2,524,987	£3,292,143	£8,735,225	£2,000,000	500,000	£261,151	£666,667	£497,151	As business grants investigations and interventions are concluded and collated, this target will likely be exceeded by the end of Q2.		
FN052	FN052a: % of Council spend with SME's (excluding ODS and OCHL)	Annette Osborne	71.57%	63.44%	81.11%	60%	60%	89%	60%	82%		This target is nearly 30 percentage points below the lowest point in the last three years. What's the rationale for this?	This was an error in the report and target has now been corrected to 60% (with the intervention being 33%)
LG006	% of missed Data Subject Action	Liz Godin			New KPI 2021/22	2%	2%	0%	2%	0%			
RS005	RS005: Number of cases in the private rented sector, where	Ian Wright	131	166	171	NA	NA	41	NA	10		Why is this target 0?	As there is no target attached to this indicator it has been revised to show N/A. This is work undertaken reactively through tenants and agencies contacting the TRO.
												This is interesting, but if there is no target, it's not clear why it is here.	This is work undertaken reactively through tenants and agencies contacting the TRO.
FSC019a	Total income collection as % of plan (Council Tax) [NB BV009 removed as a duplicate KPI]	Nigel Kennedy			New KPI 2021/22	96.5	29.5	30.87%	38.50%	39.66%	Collection of the current year's Council Tax continues to be very good. By 31/07 we had collected almost £38.6m that equates to 39.66% of the collectable debit for the year. We had collected over £1.1m in excess of the month end profiled target of 38.5%. We had collected 38.57% at this time last year.	Can we be given just the Q1 targets for comparison	Q1 and July targets now provided. Collection is holding up well, however we still take a cautious approach to recovery, and work with taxpayers to ensure that if they are in need of support we can signpost them. We had expected to see a drop in collection once the new Breathing Space legislation came into force in May, however to date we have only received 18 applications. This means we have to pause recovery action for 60 days or longer if there are mental health issues. We have not seen this impact on the target. Again we expect the ending of furlough and SEISS to impact on collection from October onwards.
FN008	FN008: Investment return above base rate	Bill Lewis			0.72%	0.20%		0.27%		0.49%	[NB month time lag in this result being available] At the end of June, we had a total of £88.065m invested including 5.055m in Money Market Funds and 10m in Equity Funds.		
REC002	Number of Oxford Living Wage employers	Carolyn Ploszynski			New KPI 2021/22	50		36			Updates available quarterly	The description refers to "employers" and "employees" but the target only has one number. Which is the target referring to?	The description should refer to employers only and has been updated accordingly.
												This is difficult to understand. Does it relate to numbers of employees? If so, it would be very low. If it's number of employers, it would be good to have an idea how many employees it covers.	See above
PSC007	Planned council housing with planning permission	Adrian Arnold			New KPI 2021/22	1701		No change			Updates available quarterly		

Measure Service	Description	Owner	Result 2018/19	Result 2019/20	Result 2020/21	2021/22 Target	Q1 21/22 Target	Jun-21	Jul 21 target	Jul 21 actual	Commentary	Questions from Scrutiny	Response
CSC008	% of people who share protected characteristics that have confidence in the Councils equality, diversity and inclusion programme	Ian Brooke, Nadeem Murtuja			New KPI 2021/22	Baseline year		Not available			Updates available quarterly		
CSC012	Physically active adults	Ian Brooke	72%	74%	76.00%	75%	74%	76.4		73	November 2019-2020 Active Lives Survey shows 73.2% of adult population are meeting the CMO's physical activity guidelines in Oxford city.	How are these data collected? What does physical active adults mean, especially during a period of lockdown?	This is the Active Lives data which is collected via a national survey with a minimum sample size per local authority of 500 people and 'physically active' is 'active for at least 150 minutes per week'(this is moderate intensity and includes most types of sport and physical activity except gardening.) More information can be found here: https://www.sportengland.org/know-your-audience/data/active-lives
HSC011	The number of people in Oxford estimated to be sleeping rough	Stephen Clarke	94	62	26	17	17	24			Updates available quarterly		
HSC014	Percentage of council owned stock that has an EPC below C	Stephen Clarke			New KPI 2021/22 - Baseline 54%	46		annual measure			Updates available quarterly	[Q1] answer is much too long and detailed for this purpose.	Noted
BIC018	% of BAME staff	Helen Bishop			New KPI 2021/22	13.50%		13.08%		13.08%			
BIC022	% of transactions carried out online relative to total transaction numbers	Helen Bishop			New KPI 2021/22	50%		52.16%		52.72%	The month has seen a 6% increase year on year, from 46.70% to 52.72%. This is due to both a reduction in calls to the contact centre and an increase in online transactions. This increase has been primarily from more web forms submissions including a large number of test and trace payment applications. Other online transactions remained similar to previous months with a reduction in online payments this month. Cumulatively, this trend follows, with 49.48% transactions carried out online last financial year and 52.17% this.		
CPC017	Oxford residents' satisfaction with City Council services	Mish Tullar	Not recorded	Not recorded	Not recorded	Baseline year		Not available			Updates available quarterly		
FSC020	Discretionary funding won by the Council	Anna Winship			New KPI 2021/22			Not available		£2.3m	£1.9m Meanwhile Oxfordshire - to revitalise vacant retail units and transform them into independent shops, cultural venues, creative studios & co-working space. £400k for Rough sleeping initiative	Does this discretionary funding require co-financing from the council? Is this in the budget?	The funding received to date does not require any match funding from the Council.