

NOTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD
TUESDAY 14 JUNE 2011

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford

PRESENT:

Councillors D G Wheeler (Chairman), Mrs S P Bailey, B Buschman, B G Dale, R M Jones, A MacInnes, S J Robinson, P Smith (substitute for Councillor J A Stockwood)

OFFICERS PRESENT:

S Griffiths	Deputy Chief Executive (SG)
D Mitchell	Head of Partnerships and Performance
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer

APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE:

Councillor J A Stockwood

1. **Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

2. **Chairman's Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed the new Members to the Board, especially the new Vice Chairman. He wished his predecessor a long and happy retirement.

3. **Notes of the Previous Meeting**

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 26 April 2011 were accepted as a true record.

4. **Cabinet Member Questions**

There were none received.

5. **Role and Remit**

The Head of Partnerships and Performance gave a presentation outlining the role of scrutiny and in particular the role of the Performance Management Board. He explained that scrutiny had been created by the Local Government Act 2000 and that it had been introduced in Rushcliffe in 1999. Scrutiny's role was the method for the 'non executive' members to influence policy development and service delivery. It was also an opportunity to examine the Cabinet's decisions via the Call In process. Members were informed that previously the Performance Management Board had heard all the Call Ins, however, as part of the Constitution review it had been determined that future Call Ins would be heard by the most appropriate scrutiny group.

In particular the Board's key role was to examine and evaluate the Council's performance and its work to sustain and enhance its 'excellent' status. In order that this is done effectively the Board has a rolling 2 year work programme which Members monitor at each meeting and changes can be made to reflect changing priorities.

6. Nottinghamshire Local Area Agreement

The Board was informed that the LAA had been formed in 2008 and that the County Council and the district councils had formed a Nottinghamshire Partnership to contribute to the ten priorities, monitored by 36 national and 3 local indicators, as agreed by central Government. These indicators had been a mixture of those chosen by central Government and others which were agreed locally. As part of the agreement Rushcliffe contributed towards performance in eleven areas. It had been anticipated that a final report outlining all the Partnership's performance would have been presented at this meeting, however this was now unlikely as the Partnership had been dissolved. As part of the Agreement Rushcliffe had received a Reward Grant of £349,000 in 2009/10. With regard to the grant for 2010/11 the Government had announced in October 2010 that no further grants would be paid.

In relation to the eleven areas that Rushcliffe contributed the only indicators that had not performed well were in relation to fuel poverty. This was due to the steep rise in energy costs which had meant that more properties had moved into the fuel inefficient category.

Following a question regarding whether the councils had placed the money in their own budgets, Members were informed that the money awarded to Rushcliffe was being overseen by the Local Strategic Partnership, who ensured that any project was sustainable and met certain criteria. Many of the projects focussed on areas of deprivation, such as welfare rights whereas others were for apprenticeships or rural playgrounds. Officers were confident that the money was being used to assist performance in the relevant indicators.

With regards to the number of organisations that had been supported through the Local Area Agreement officers agreed to provide further information.

It was AGREED that the Performance Management Board recognise the excellent contribution Rushcliffe has made to the county-wide Local Area Agreement.

7. Performance Management Framework – 2011/12

The Head of Partnerships and Performance explained that the present performance management framework had been written in 2003. Following a major national change in the collection of data it was proposed to amend the Council's basket of performance indicators in order to focus on customers/outcomes and processes/activity levels.

Following a question regarding the cost of waste collection per household Members were informed that the updated figure should read £57.93 and not £62.77.

With regard to LIPPS06a - the total number of searches received – it was felt that the time taken to process the searches was important.

Members discussed the issue of air quality. It was recognised that the Council could not greatly influence the outcome, however, Members felt that it should be monitored and the Board's findings presented to the County Council.

Members considered that there should be a performance measure covering the level of carbon reduction achieved in accordance with agreed plans.

In relation to the number of penalty charge notices issued it was felt that this should be removed as it was not a figure that had to be achieved or surpassed. The effectiveness of the Civil Parking Enforcement Contract was scrutinised on an annual basis.

With regard to the Council's website it was recognised that the reduction in people visiting the site was a concern and differed from the national trend. Officers stated that the present website's functionality was dated and that the new site that was being developed would be more interactive. Also due to the changes in the leisure management customers now used Parkwood's, Glendale's and Carillion's websites rather than the Council's.

In relation to the percentage of adults participating in sport Members were informed that this was a national survey and that a sample of residents from each district were contacted. This allowed for national comparisons to be made and Rushcliffe had come third.

Following a question Members were informed that Choice Based Lettings was a new system for the allocation of social housing which involved all the Registered Social Landlords and the Council. As it was a new system it was being scrutinised by the Community Development Group, who had been reassured that there would be support for the more vulnerable members of society.

Officers agreed to provide Members with further information on

- NI154 - a clearer definition if the indicator
- Burglary – if empty properties were included in the data
- NI116 – definition of national child poverty target, and the wards affected

Members were concerned that the targets for NI195a and NI195b were high compared to the Council's outcomes which were quite low. Officers explained that the targets had been set nationally and that the Borough Council had always exceeded these.

With regard to the Green Bin collection service officers gave an update of the current position in relation to the roll out. 21,300 of the 40,000 properties had signed up to the scheme, with approximately 40% of the income already received.

Members felt that it would be more beneficial to have all indicators listed by service area rather than having two lists. Also actual numbers should be recorded as well as percentages as these on their own could be misleading.

It was AGREED that the indicator set detailed should be monitored, including measures for air quality and carbon reduction.

8. Performance Monitoring – Outturn – 2010/11

The Board considered the final outturn figures for 2010/11. Members were informed that the current Corporate Strategy, which was due to be refreshed, had contained 13 Strategic Tasks; of these tasks only 4 had not been fully completed and would be carried forward into the new year, these were:

- 02 - Approve the Local Development Framework
- 03 - Deliver Climate Change Strategy and associated Action Plan
- 06 - Introduce a 'hub and spoke' approach to customer access across the borough
- 13 - Deliver the Rushcliffe Play Strategy

Of the 53 indicators monitored there were 13 identified as highlights and 9 as exceptions. Sickness levels had improved from the previous year although it was slightly above target.

Members discussed Strategic Task 12 and it was recognised that the work undertaken as part of the Sport England funding had been completed.

With regard to the exceptions Members queried if there had been any particular complaints. The Head of Partnerships and Performance explained that the Council had introduced a procedure which had four levels and that all complaints/compliments would be considered at the Board's next meeting to see if there were any trends.

It was AGREED that the Performance Management Board had considered the identified exceptions.

9. Rolling 2 Year Work Programme

The Board considered its work programme. Officers explained that there were several regular items throughout the year especially regarding the review of contracts. The Deputy Chief Executive (SG) explained that it had been found to be beneficial to only invite one external partner to a meeting as this gave Members a better opportunity to scrutinise the partner's work and performance. Members were informed that if there were any areas of concern these could be raised and the work programme altered accordingly. However, the work programmes of all four scrutiny groups were considered by the Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen's meetings and were refreshed to ensure that the most appropriate group scrutinised an issue. Councillor Wheeler endorsed these comments and stated that there was a frank exchange of views at these meetings.

It was AGREED that the proposed rolling work programme for 2011/12 and 2012/13 be supported.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.

Action Sheet

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD - TUESDAY 14 JUNE 2011

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
7. Performance Management Framework – 2011/12	Officers agreed to provide Members with further information on <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NI154 - a clearer definition if the indicator• Burglary – if empty properties were included in the data• NI116 – definition of national child poverty target, and the wards affected• Consider performance measure for carbon reduction	Head of Partnerships and Performance