

ANGUS COUNCIL

SCRUTINY & AUDIT SUB-COMMITTEE – 10 JANUARY 2012

STATUTORY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2010/11

REPORT BY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

ABSTRACT

This report provides an analysis of council performance against the statutory performance indicators for 2010/11.

1 RECOMMENDATION

The sub-committee consider the performance of the council in financial year 2010/11 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 2010/11 following publication of the all Scotland data by Audit Scotland in November 2011.

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 53 measures which make up the 25 indicators (note – there are actually 54 measures but the council does not report data for one measure as it does not provide the particular service covered by that measure).

3 PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW 2010/11

The 25 statutory performance indicators and 53 performance measures on which the council reported in 2010/11, are listed in [Appendix 1](#).

A comparison of performance between 2009/10 and 2010/11 for each of the measures shows that:

- 29 (55%) showed an improvement in performance
- 2 (4%) maintained performance
- 22 (41%) 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	17	32% (37%)
Second	11	21% (17%)
Third	11	21% (28%)
Fourth	14	26% (18%)

From this table it can be seen that for 53% of the measures our performance was amongst the top half performing councils in Scotland. Furthermore and as can be seen from the percentages

shown in brackets and which relate to 2009/10 performance, in overall terms in 2010/11 there was little change from the previous year.

Appendix 2 places all of the measures in the appropriate quartile.

4 DETAILED PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS 2010/11

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 2010/11. It provides the direction of travel for each measure year on year from 2007/08 where data is available, shown in both tabular and graph format. It also shows performance relative to the average for all Scottish councils from 2007/08 where data is available.

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

Members will note that in 2010/11 for the first time departments set a performance target against measures. Analysis shows that performance in 20 indicators was better than target with performance in 27 below target.

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

- 8 measures showed an improvement in performance of 15%+
- 2 measures showed an improvement in performance of 10 - 14%
- 4 measures showed an improvement in performance of 5 - 9%
- 4 measures showed a deterioration in performance of 5 - 9%
- 1 measure showed a deterioration in performance of 10 - 14%
- 8 measures showed a deterioration in performance of 15%+ (7 of which were below targeted performance)

Appendix 4 lists those measures where performance improved in 2010/11, sub-divided into improvement by less than 5%, 5-9%, 10-14% and 15%+.

Appendix 5 lists those measures where performance in 2010/11 was maintained compared to 2009/10.

Appendix 6 lists those measures where performance deteriorated in 2010/11 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 two distinct categories:

Category 1 - those measures where our performance was better than the Scottish average figure in 2010/11.

Category 2 - those measures where our performance was not as good as the Scottish average figure in 2010/11.

Members may recall that in last year's report there was a third category – those measures where our performance was the same as the Scottish average figure. This has been excluded this year as no 2010/11 measures fall within this category.

Each of the two 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 2009/10 and financial year 2010/11.
- b) those measures where our performance has not changed between 2009/10 and 2010/11.
- c) those measures where our performance deteriorated between financial year 2009/10 and financial year 2010/11.

Grouping the measures in this way allows our performance in 2010/11 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 2010/11 within an all Scottish context:

Category	Relative performance against Scottish Average	Trend Year on Year (2009/10 and 2010/11)	Number of Indicators
1a	Better	Improving	16
1b	Better	Unchanged	2
1c	Better	Declining	10
2a	Not as good	Improving	13
2b	Not as good	Unchanged	0
2c	Not as good	Declining	12

This table shows that:

- Of the 28 measures in which our performance was better than the Scottish average, in 16 of them our performance in 2010/11 improved on 2009/10 - indeed of the 20 measures in which the council is in the top eight performing councils performance in 2010/11 improved in 10.
- Of the 25 measures in which our performance was not as good as the Scottish average, in 13 of them our performance in 2010/11 improved on 2009/10 – indeed of the 14 measures in which the council is in the bottom eight performing councils performance in 2010/11 improved in 7.

Although not evident from the above table members may wish to note that of the 12 measures in which our performance was not as good as the Scottish average and in which our performance deteriorated from 2009/10 the Council was in the bottom eight performing councils in 7 of those measures. Furthermore, of these 12 measures performance in 10 was below target.

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.

**RICHARD STIFF
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.