

## ANGUS COUNCIL

## SCRUTINY &amp; AUDIT SUB-COMMITTEE – 15 FEBRUARY 2011

## STATUTORY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2009/10

## REPORT BY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**ABSTRACT**

This report provides an analysis of council performance against the statutory performance indicators for 2009/10.

**1 RECOMMENDATION**

The sub-committee consider the performance of the council in financial year 2009/10 in terms of the statutory performance indicators.

**2 BACKGROUND**

In accordance with the council's performance management arrangements each year this sub-committee analyses council performance within the previous financial year against the statutory performance indicators which are specified by Audit Scotland.

This report considers council performance against the statutory performance indicators for 2009/10 following publication of the all Scotland data by Audit Scotland in December 2010.

There are 25 statutory performance indicators on which all councils are required to report to Audit Scotland. Many of the indicators incorporate more than one measure and accordingly this report analyses performance against the 54 measures which make up the 25 indicators.

**3 PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW 2009/10**

The 25 statutory performance indicators and 54 performance measures on which the council reported in 2009/10, are listed in [Appendix 1](#).

A comparison of performance between 2008/09 and 2009/10 for each of the measures shows that:

- 38 (70%) showed an improvement in performance
- 4 (7%) maintained performance
- 12 (22%) showed a deterioration in performance

Based on the rankings produced by Audit Scotland for all 32 councils the following table compares performance to the rest of Scotland with each measure put into a quartile – the first quartile representing the top eight performing councils and the fourth quartile representing the bottom eight performing councils.

Quartile	Measures	Percentage
First	20	37% (33%)
Second	9	17% (23%)
Third	15	28% (21%)
Fourth	10	18% (22%)

From this table it can be seen that for 54% of the measures our performance is amongst the top half performing councils in Scotland. Furthermore and as can be seen from the percentages shown in brackets and which relate to 2008/09 performance, in overall terms in 2009/10 there

was an increase in the number of measures in the first quartile and a decrease in the number in the bottom quartile.

[Appendix 2](#) places all of the measures in the appropriate quartile with our ranking position.

#### **4 DETAILED PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS 2009/10**

In order to explore performance in more detail it is necessary to examine each of the individual performance measures.

Appendix 3 gives details on each individual measure reported for 2009/10. It provides the direction of travel for each measure year on year from 2006/07 where data is available, shown in both tabular and graph format. It also shows performance relative to the average for all Scottish councils from 2006/07 where data is available.

For those measures where performance has deteriorated by greater than 10% a commentary from the director responsible for that measure is also incorporated, highlighting, where appropriate, any actions to improve future performance.

Analysis of the measures done on the same basis as that traditionally done by Audit Scotland shows that:

- 12 measures showed an improvement in performance of 15%+
- 4 measures showed an improvement in performance of 10 - 14%
- 7 measures showed an improvement in performance of 5 - 9%
- 0 measures showed a deterioration in performance of 5 - 9%
- 1 measures showed a deterioration in performance of 10 - 14%
- 3 measures showed a deterioration in performance of 15%+

Appendix 4 lists those measures where performance improved in 2009/10, sub-divided into improvement by less than 5%, 5-9%, 10-14% and 15%+.

Appendix 5 lists those measures where performance in 2009/10 was maintained compared to 2008/09.

Appendix 6 lists those measures where performance deteriorated in 2009/10 again sub-divided into less than 5%, 5-9%, 10-14% and 15%+.

The breakdown provided in Appendix 7 places all of the measures into three distinct categories:

Category 1 - those measures where our performance was better than the Scottish average figure in 2009/10.

Category 2 - those measures where our performance was the same as the Scottish average figure in 2009/10.

Category 3 - those measures where our performance was not as good as the Scottish average figure in 2009/10.

Each of the three categories in the appendix has then been further sub-divided to show the performance trends year on year as follows:

- a) those measures where our performance has improved between financial year 2008/09 and financial year 2009/10.
- b) those measures where our performance has not changed between 2008/09 and 2009/10.
- c) those measures where our performance deteriorated between financial year 2008/09 and financial year 2009/10.

Grouping the measures in this way allows our performance in 2009/10 to be assessed against the Scottish average and also demonstrates whether our general trend of direction of travel is one of improving or deteriorating performance.

The following table summarises our position for 2009/10 within an all Scottish context:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Relative performance against Scottish Average</b>	<b>Trend Year on Year (2008/09 and 2009/10)</b>	<b>Number of Indicators</b>
1a	Better	Improving	21
1b	Better	Unchanged	3
1c	Better	Declining	7
2a	Same as	Improving	2
2b	Same as	Unchanged	0
2c	Same as	Declining	0
3a	Not as good	Improving	15
3b	Not as good	Unchanged	1
3c	Not as good	Declining	5

This table shows that:

- Of the 31 measures in which our performance is better than the Scottish average, in 21 of them our performance in 2009/10 improved on 2008/09 - indeed of the 20 measures in which the council is in the top eight performing councils performance in 2009/10 improved in 15.
- Of the 21 measures in which our performance is not as good as the Scottish average, in 15 of them our performance in 2009/10 improved on 2008/09 – indeed of the 10 measures in which the council is in the bottom eight performing councils performance in 2009/10 improved in 7.

## **5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications associated with the terms of this report.

## **6 HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

There are no human rights implications associated with this report.

## **7 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

The issues contained in this report fall within an approved category that has been confirmed as exempt from an equalities perspective.

## **8 CONSULTATION**

The Director of Corporate Services, Head of Law and Administration and Head of Finance have been consulted on the terms of this report.

**DAVID SAWERS  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

## **HMR**

**NOTE** No background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, (other than any containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to any material extent in preparing the above Report.