

Corporate Performance Standards
Performance Select Committee, item 5

Committee: Performance Select Committee
Date: 19 April 2006
Title: Corporate Performance Standards
Author: Tracy Turner, Executive Manager
(Strategy & Performance), 01799 510402

Agenda Item
5
Item for
decision

Summary

The document sets out 38 corporate performance indicators for adoption alongside statutory Best Value Performance Indicators.

Recommendations

The Committee agree to adopt the indicators.

Background Papers

Local Government Reputation, IDeA & LGA, 2005

Impact

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Communication/Consultation | Consultation with Members is contained within the committee process |
| Community Safety | There are no explicit community safety implications |
| Equalities | There are no explicit equalities implications |
| Finance | The indicators are non statutory and have no reward element attached to them, therefore there are no explicit financial implications |
| Human Rights | There are no explicit human rights implications |
| Legal implications | With the exception of any statutory best value performance indicators there are no legal implications arising from the corporate indicators selected |
| Ward-specific impacts | All |
| Workforce/Workplace | Collection, measurement, monitoring and management of the performance indicators are contained within existing staffing requirements |

Corporate Performance Standards

Performance Select Committee, item 5

Situation

- 1 The Committee considered at its meeting in March (minute PS10, 9 March 2006) that a broad range of more customer focused and outward facing performance indicators should be used to manage corporate performance.
- 2 Subsequently a suite of 38 indicators have been developed as part of the Corporate Plan process. The indicators have been developed to align with the priorities and areas of corporate focus set out in the plan, themed against the Uttlesford Excellence model.
- 3 Drawing on discussion at the Committee's March meeting the suite of indicators also pick up issues set out in the LGA's Reputation project on public satisfaction with local authorities.
- 4 Outturn data for 2005/06 and targets for 2006/07 are still being sourced and input and the Committee will receive a verbal update on progress.
- 5 The Committee are asked to agree the indicators and to monitor on a quarterly basis alongside progress with corporate plan projects.
- 6 Former 'local' performance indicators will be reviewed/retained as management indicators.

Risk Analysis

| Risk | Likelihood | Impact | Mitigating actions |
|--|---------------|-------------|---|
| Indicators selected not an appropriate measure of progress against priority projects and areas of corporate focus | Medium | High | Progress towards establishing a balanced scorecard may throw up the need for alternative measures. This learning will need to be fed into indicators for the following year, or any 'running' amendments. Appropriate mechanisms will need to be put in place for monitoring public satisfaction measures on a regular basis. Systems also need to be set up for corporate complaints and letter monitoring. |