

# Report

4

Report to:	<b>Performance and Review Scrutiny Forum</b>
Date of Meeting:	<b>31 May 2011</b>
Report by:	<b>Chief Executive</b>

Subject:	<b>Performance and Review Scrutiny Forum - Performance Reporting Arrangements</b>
----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ allow consideration of a revised proposal for reporting Resource performance to the Performance and Review Scrutiny Forum (PRSF)

## 2. Recommendation(s)

2.1. The Forum is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) that the proposed performance reporting arrangements outlined in paragraph 4 be endorsed.

## 3. Background

3.1. The Performance and Review Scrutiny Forum (PRSF) has the key role of overseeing the Council's strategy and approach for the implementation of best value, improvement and performance management.

3.2. Historically, performance reporting to the PRSF has been undertaken through examination of Quarter 2 and Quarter 4 Connect performance reports, however, these reports were also considered by the Executive Committee in the same format. On this basis, it is now considered appropriate to review this arrangement and take the opportunity to customise the information provided to the PRSF to enhance and further refine its scrutiny role.

## 4. Proposals

4.1. It is proposed that a composite Council wide report be produced and reported to the PRSF at Q2. The report would identify red and amber measures relating to Connect and Resource priorities and would:

- provide a progress report;
- advise of any mitigating factors; and /or
- detail any remedial action proposed

The updates would be framed against the overall progress made by each Resource in achieving their wider set of measures to ensure a proportionate approach is adopted to scrutiny.

4.2. It is not the intention to provide a further report at Q4 as this would be purely retrospective and provide no opportunity for the PRSF to influence the outcome. It

is, however, proposed that any issues of particular interest identified at Q2 by the PRSF be brought back to the forum at Q3 on a 'by exception' and Resource specific basis. This would not be automatic but would allow focussed scrutiny on a targeted basis if deemed necessary by the PRSF.

- 4.3. In the main, the information being reported should derive directly from IMPROVe (the Council's performance management and reporting system). Updates for red and amber measures should be able to be understood by a casual observer and should advise if/when the measure will be delivered and by what means.
- 4.4. To provide an indication of the projected volume of reporting, the table below has been prepared. This shows that if exception reporting is based on Connect and Resource priorities only, the reporting will only focus on an average of 50 measures from a total of approximately 800 ie 6%.

	Total Measures	Priority Measures	Red Priority	Amber Priority	Total Red and Amber Priority	Total Red and Amber Priority as % of Total Measures	Total Red and Amber Priority as % of Priority Measures
Q4 2009/10	821	496 (60%)	52	50	102	12%	20%
<b>Q2 2010/11</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>428</b> <b>(56%)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>12%</b>

- 4.5. Focussing the performance reporting on red and amber measures relating to Connect and Resource priorities will not only ensure a proportionate approach but will also give Connect priorities an increased emphasis in the Council's performance monitoring and reporting arrangements. It is also anticipated that any discussion at the PRSF would evolve around those measures where the risk associated with non delivery is highest.
- 4.6. A standard template report will be developed to report the information to the PRSF.
- 4.7. Executive Directors (and nominated senior officers) will attend the Forum as appropriate to address any questions and/or provide any other information required.

## 5. Role of the PRSF

- 5.1. In reviewing the information provided to the PRSF, it is accepted that the Resource Committees and Executive Committees have the primary role in scrutinising Resource and Council performance. However, it is also clear that the PRSF has an important role in scrutinising overall performance throughout the Council.
- 5.2. The introduction of this revised reporting arrangement will allow the PRSF to have a clear role in ensuring:

- that a consistent approach is being undertaken to report red and amber measures throughout the Council
- that adequate remedial action is being pursued on a timely basis by Resources
- that the delivery of priority Connect and Resource objectives is not compromised

## 6. Employee Implications

- 6.1. Resources to attend the PRSF as required.

## 7. Financial Implications

- 7.1. There are no financial implications.

## **8. Other Implications**

- 8.1. In terms of risk, there is a requirement to ensure the PRSF receives targeted and accurate performance information on a timely basis to allow it to adequately perform its scrutiny role.
- 8.2. There are no issues relating to sustainability associated with the content of this report.

## **9. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements**

- 9.1. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a change to an existing policy, function or strategy and therefore, no impact assessment is required.
- 9.2. Appropriate consultation has taken place with other Resources within the Council.

**Archibald Strang**  
**Chief Executive**

10 May 2011

### **Link(s) to Council Objectives/Improvement Themes/Values**

- ◆ Performance Management and Improvement

### **Previous References**

- ◆ None

### **List of Background Papers**

- ◆ None

### **Contact for Further Information**

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Heather McNeil, Head of Audit and Improvement

Ext: 5915 (Tel: 01698 455915)

E-mail: [heather.mcneil@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:heather.mcneil@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)