

Draft

Appendix 1 - Business Plan Draft Performance Indicators and Targets

	Ref - see key below	Indicator	Purpose/Notes	Baseline Info		Targets		
				2006/7 Year End	2007/08 Forecast	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
V a l u e f o r M o n e y / R e s o u r c e s	NI 185	CO2 emissions from Local Authority operations	This is an indicator for the LSP but also aligns closely to the Business Plan outcomes and improvement priorities.	New indicator - no historical information. Guidance states to use 2008 (Jan - Dec) as a		Baseline	tbc	tbc
	EMAS	Maintain our external EMAS accreditation	Leeds City Council operates a 'management system' to EC Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) standards No. 761/2001. This is to make sure that environmental issues are identified and addressed in a consistent and efficient manner. EMAS is a much wider measure of our environmental impact than the CO2 emissions and includes biodiversity, waste management, water usage etc. It is externally accredited every 6 months	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	New	Delivery of Medium Term Financial Plan	Overall indicator which tracks progress in achieving the MT financial plan and the resource re-allocation within this - this overall measure would also track delivery of efficiencies which have been written into the plan. The exact measure is still to be developed.	New indicator - no historical information				
	CAA	Use of Resources Score	The scope and standard for this assessment are significantly changing in 2009 to include how well we manage the business and all our resources as well as financial management and internal control. The new framework does cover a number of areas within business plan however there is a risk that under the new framework our score will go down as the bar has been raised.	3 (2006)	3 (2007)	3 (2008 - old framework)	3 (2009 new framework)	4 (2010 new framework)
		Out-turn of corporate budget	Measure of whether managers are keeping to their budget and for monitoring any over or under spends. Budget holders should get accurate financial forecast within 5 working days of month end. Reviewed by Finance Performance Group, CLT on a monthly basis and Executive Board on a quarterly basis. It can also be used to challenge budgets.			0%	0%	0%
		% income collected by authority in year through:	Overall indicator to track how much of our major sources of income we collect to ensure we are maximising our income.					
		a) Council Tax (BV 9)		96.38%	96.50%	96.65%	96.70%	96.75%
		b) Non-domestic rates (BV 10)		98.58%	98.60%	96.60%	98.65%	98.70%
		c) housing rents (BV 66a)		96.69%	96.70%			
		d) Sundry Debtors (% debts collected within 30 days of invoice issued)						
	NI 179	Value for money total net value of on-going cash releasing value for money gains that have impacted since the start of the 2008-9 financial year	Overall measure of whether we are meeting our efficiency targets. Whole public sector has been set a target of achieving at least 3% per annum value for money gains during CSR 07 period all of which should be cash releasing	New indicator - no historical information		£28,759 k (3%)	£58,476 k (6.1%)	£89,152 k (9.3%)
	CP-P51	Assess and increase % of our total budget spent through corporate framework agreements and corporate contracts	Minimise level of off contract spend to maximise our buying power and value for money gains. Within our framework contracts we can define key parameters eg quality, equality, environmental performance etc and can select suppliers which meet these standards but off-contract spend is uncontrolled. We need to know why it is happening - is it spend on things that are not covered by current contracts or is it lack of management awareness, poor service etc etc.	3.73%		3.86%	4.00%	4.17%
	New	% debt recovered (cumulative)	Overall indicator to track how much of our debt we collect to ensure we are maximising our income.					

Draft

Draft

Appendix 1 - Business Plan Performance Indicators and Targets

	Ref - see key below	Indicator	Purpose/Notes	Baseline Info		Targets		
				2006/7 Year End	2007/08 Forecast	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
C u s t o m e r s F i r s t	NI 14	Avoidable customer contact - the proportion of customer contact that is of low or no value to the customer	New national indicator which seeks to ensure that contacts between local authorities and citizens/businesses are responsive timely and efficient. Looks across all contact channels and seeks to measure those contact that are avoidable for various reasons including lack of info on website, repeat contacts chasing up service delivery etc. There are currently technical issues with measuring this indicator and further guidance is due in June 08.	New indicator - no historical information		Baseline	tbc	tbc
	Annual Survey	Overall Satisfaction levels	Gives an overall measure of effectiveness of service delivery and whether we are meeting the expectations of our customers - measured through the LCC annual survey	55% (2005)	61% (2007)	n/a		n/a
	NI 140	Fair treatment by local services	Overall measure of perception of fair access to services - via place survey	New indicator - no historical information		Baseline	n/a	tbc once baseline established
	CP-AS54	Increase the volume of total transactions delivered through customer self service	Increase the availability and uptake of self service so that customers can access these at any time and also providing services through more efficient means	317,954	475,166			
	LKI-CUS15a	Increase % complaints responded to within 15 days	Suggested to be retained to complement other customer indicators but we are currently not able to measure this due to data quality issues. Workshops planned in March to further define and develop this indicator.					
	LKI-CUS17a	% letters from the public that are responded to within 10 working days	Suggested to be retained to complement other customer indicators but we are currently not able to measure this due to data quality issues. Workshops planned in March to further define and develop this indicator.					
	LKI-CUS17b	% emails from the public that are responded to within 10 working days	Suggested to be retained to complement other customer indicators but we are currently not able to measure this due to data quality issues. Data gaps in almost all services. Workshops planned in March to further define and develop this indicator.					
		% those making a complaint who are satisfied with the handling of their complaint	This was s best value survey indicator but it is no longer measured as part of the place survey - we can define and measure through our annual survey or could do more targeted follow up work with those who have actually made complaints. To be further developed with Customer Services					
	Accessibility of council buildings	Previously measured through BV 156 but there are significant concerns over the methodology of this indicator and the robustness of the data. It is felt that we should continue to measure this but discussion are on-going with asset management and corporate landlord about how best to achieve this. Proposals under discussion include perception measures through the annual and staff surveys.						

Draft

Draft

Appendix 1 - Business Plan Draft Performance Indicators and Targets

	Ref - see key below	Indicator	Purpose/Notes	Baseline Info		Targets		
				2006/7 Year End	2007/08 Forecast	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
V a l u i n g o u r C o l l e a g e s	BV 12	Number of working days lost to the authority due to sickness absence (average per FTE)	Sickness levels are a good general indicators of health safety and well being, staff satisfaction, strength of our staff management procedures etc. We currently perform very poorly in this area as picked up during the Corporate Assessment.	12.00 days	12.44 days			
	LKI PE2	Voluntary leavers as a percentage of staff in post	A high level of turnover can indicate problems with organisational leadership culture and management and can have an impact on performance. Could be seen in another way that we are developing our staff so well that they leave to get better paid jobs elsewhere eg Finance training accountants and getting them qualified and they then go on to private sector for more money. However high turnover is costly for the organisation. The impact of job evaluation and equal pay will need to be accounted for when target setting - benchmarking might be more appropriate.	9.61%	8.69%	9%	9%	9%
	CP-ES51	Increase % staff who feel valued as an employee	Headline indicator of staff satisfaction and feeling valued – felt that this wrapped up a number of issues into one measure.	61% (from 2007 staff survey)		n/a	63%	65%
	CP – PE59	% staff who have had an appraisal	This measures the process only and not the quality of the appraisal. Currently measured through the staff survey but in the future we may be able to measure this as recorded on SAP but currently this gives a much lower result which is probably due to under-recording on SAP.	70% (from 2007 staff survey)		n/a	72%	74%
	CP-PE54	Increase % staff who feel they are involved in contribution to the direction of the organisation	Again this wraps up a number of issues into one indicator but gives an indicator of staff satisfaction and being valued and whether we are making the most of our staff.	70% (from 2007 staff survey)		n/a	74%	76%
	CP-ES 54	% of staff who feel that the council communicates well with them	Direct measure of effectiveness of internal communication	59% (from 2007 staff survey)		n/a		
	BV 17a	% local authority staff from BME communities – compared to local community	Shows whether we are recruiting and retaining a staff group which is representative of the local community	7.0%	7.5%	8.0%	8.5%	9.0%
	BV 16a	% local authority staff with disability – compared to local community	Shows whether we are recruiting and retaining a staff group which is representative of the local community	3.2%	3.5%	3.6%	3.7%	3.8%
	BV11 a-c	% of top earners who are: a) women b) From BME communities c) Disabled (excluding maintained schools)	To show that we are empowering supporting and developing all our staff and providing equal opportunities through our recruitment policies					
				36.47%	38.00%	39%	40%	41%
5.75%				6.02%	6.25%	6.5%	6.75%	
			3.60%	4.00%	4.2%	4.4%	4.6%	
IIP	Maintain our IIP accreditation across whole organisation	Shows good (best) practice across the organisation on all people management issues. Mainstreams IIP into our performance management framework – need to discuss further how well this lines up with Cultural change programme?	N/A	N/A	Level 1	N/A	Level 2	

Draft

Draft

Appendix 1 - Business Plan Draft Performance Indicators and Targets

	Ref - see key below	Indicator	Purpose/Notes	Baseline Info		Targets		
				2006/7 Year End	2007/08 Forecast	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Business Improvement / Excellence	BV2a CP-E050	Equality standard level	Continue to measure achievement against the equality standard framework. We do need to develop an additional measure of overall achievement against our own equality strategy - this will be developed as part of the work to develop this document.	Level 3	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 5
	CP-LE50	Voter turn out in local elections	This is an overall indicator on public engagement levels in the political process	37.52%				
	Annual Survey	% people who are satisfied that they think LCC allows residents a say in what it does	Overall perception measure of our engagement work	36% (2005)	43% (2007)			
	Annual Survey	% people who think the council keeps them well informed about services and benefits it supplies	Overall perception measure of our communications work	48% (2005)	51% (2007)			
	New	% of major projects assured by the Project Assurance Unit which are being delivered: a) on time b) on budget c) realised benefits	Ideally we would measure all major change projects but currently this is not possible. In the interim we can measure this indicator as the Project Assurance Unit are involved in providing independent assurance on a number of projects across the council although their coverage is patchy. Effectively a & b - shows efficiency of project management and delivery of projects and c measure the return on the original investment.					
	CAA	Direction of Travel Score	External assessment of the rate of our improvement and implementation of the Leeds Strategic Plan and Council Business Plan. Forms part of CAA	Improving Adequately (2006)	Improving Well (2007)	Improving Well (2008)	Improving Well (2009)	Improving Strongly (2010)
	New	Delivery of IO programme through % project milestones achieved vs those planned	Provides an overall monitor of the delivery of the Intelligent Organisation programme					
	New	% staff who feel they have access to the information and systems to do their job efficiently	General perception measure around the impact of the IKM agenda and it delivering benefits to staff and making it easier and more efficient to do their job - measured through staff survey. Next survey would set baseline	New indicator - no historical information		n/a	Baseline	tbc
	New	Data Quality measured by: a) number of key systems using a corporately agreed monitoring framework and defined metrics to measure data quality	Measure whether we are using reliable and good quality data to make key decisions. This is a key element of our information, knowledge management agenda.					
		b) % strategic indicator set (LSP, CBP & NI) where we have "no concerns" on data quality	This requires us to ensure that we have embedded data quality into our performance systems and processes - starting with those indicators we use to measure our strategic outcomes. Effectively this is a self assessment - might we have problems proving its robustness? To develop further.	New indicator - no historical information		n/a	Baseline	tbc
New	% of eligible decisions available for call in	As many decisions as possible should be open for call in to that elected members can fulfil their democratic role effectively. Shows we have effective corporate governance in place.	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	
New	% key decisions which did not appear in the forward plan	Decisions not in forward plan cannot be give full consideration and elected members do not have the opportunity to gather views. Shows we have effective corporate governance in place	n/a	1%	1%	1%	1%	

Reference Key	
NI	Part of new National Indicator set
CAA	Assessment which forms part of the new Comprehensive Area Assessment process
CP	Indicator already measured as part of our current Corporate Plan 2005-8
New	New indicator
LKI	Indicator already in use locally
BV	Best value performance indicator

Draft