Quarterly Performance and Complaints Monitoring Report – 1st Quarter 2014/15

Executive Portfolio Holder: Ric Pallister, Strategy and Policy
Strategic Director: Rina Singh, Place and Performance
Lead Officer: Andrew Gillespie/Charlotte Jones, Performance Managers
Contact Details: Andrew.gillespie@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462364
Charlotte.jones@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462565

1. Purpose of the Report
To present the corporate performance monitoring report covering the period from 1st April – 30th June 2014 (Q1).

2. Forward Plan
This report appeared on the District Executive Forward Plan with an expected date of September 2014.

3. Public Interest
The Council is accountable for its performance to the local community and we publish performance data to enable us to demonstrate achievements against targets.

4. Recommendations
The District Executive is asked to:

1) Note and comment on the corporate performance monitoring report;
2) Note the additional information concerning the 2013/14 Annual Corporate Performance Report.

5. Background
The 20 performance indicators used in this report were selected and approved by members on 3rd May 2012.

6. Performance
A summary of performance from 1st April – 30th June 2014 (Q1) is shown below with full details provided at Appendix A.

Where appropriate, this information is colour coded, using red, amber, or green to indicate performance against target.
7. Performance Exceptions:

Indicators with performance below target are classed as exceptions. In these cases Appendix A also includes a comment from the Service Manager, detailing reasons why the indicator is an exception, together with any corrective action being taken.

The exception for quarter 1 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Q1 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI003 – % of planning appeal decisions allowed against the authority's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision to refuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Complaints

During the period 1st April – 30th June 2014, SSDC received 31 complaints, which is a 9% decrease on the quarter 1 2013/14 figure of 34.

The chart and table below provide a summary of complaints received, with a detailed breakdown by service at Appendix B.

9. 2013/14 Annual Performance Report

The 2013/14 Annual Performance report was presented to full Council in July 2014.

A number of specific queries were raised that required further investigation.

*PI 032 – Working days lost due to sickness absence per full time employee.*

HR manager comments indicated that there may be a correlation between teams undergoing major change and relatively high absence rates and the matter was under investigation as part of action to reduce absence levels.
Members were concerned that the management of change may be the cause of high levels of absence.

Further investigation has shown that there is no strong correlation. Where applicable, dealing with major change is found to be only one of a number of influential factors rather than the sole or main cause.

PI 034 - % of complaints resolved at Stage 1 of the complaints procedure.

The 2012/13 headline outturn figure was not compatible with the accompanying table. Investigation confirmed that the table was correct and therefore the headline figure of 94.5% was incorrect. It should have read 92.18%. When compared to the 2013/14 figure of 94.12%, the trend was marginally better, not marginally worse as the report indicated.

PI 037(a) - Number of FTE's employed by SSDC Annual Snapshot

This figure fell from 440 to 424 and the trend was described as “improved”, but there was no explanatory commentary in the report to justify this.

Although there is no target figure for a reduction of staffing levels, and in the absence of contra indicators such as a failure to recruit staff to key positions, a lower number of FTEs is regarded as an indicator of lower costs and/or improved efficiency.

Suitable commentary will be included in future reports.

10. Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications related to this report other than any compensation that has been paid out. However, financial implications may need to be considered for possible actions necessary to address performance in failing areas.

11. Risk Matrix

This matrix only identifies the risk associated with taking the decision as set out in the report as the recommendation(s). Should there be any proposal to amend the recommendation(s) by either members or officers at the meeting then the impact on the matrix and the risks it identifies must be considered prior to the vote on the recommendation(s) taking place.
Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Colours (for further detail please refer to Risk management strategy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CpP</td>
<td>Corporate Plan Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Community Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>High impact and high probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Major impact and major probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Moderate impact and moderate probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Minor impact and minor probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Insignificant impact and insignificant probability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Council Plan Implications

The Corporate Performance Management contributes towards the delivery of the SSDC Council Plan through effective monitoring and smart target setting that help to deliver a continuous improvement.

13. Carbon Emissions and Climate Change Implications

None

14. Equality and Diversity Implications

None

15. Privacy Impact Assessment

No issues.

16. Background Papers

Refreshed Council Plan 2012-15  
SSDC Complaints Procedure  
(http://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/contact-us/making-a-complaint-(1)/)
DX report- refresh of corporate Indicators – DX May 2012
Annual Performance Report 2013/14 – DX July 2014