

**NOTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD
TUESDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2012**

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, D V Smith and J A Stockwood,

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr D Curtis General Manager, East Leake Leisure Centre

OFFICERS PRESENT:

C Caven-Atack	Performance and Reputation Manager
B Knowles	Leisure Contracts Manager
I Meader	Performance Officer
D Mitchell	Head of Partnerships and Performance
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer
P Randle	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
D Swaine	Head of Corporate Services

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

There were no apologies for absence

25. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

26. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 15 November 2011 were accepted as a true record following the amendments detailed below.

It was noted that a request had been made to consider the information in Members' Monthly and this had not been included in the action sheet. The Performance and Reputation Manager explained that officers were working on how this could be improved, or how the information could be provided on an extranet.

Councillor Jones asked that paragraphs three and four be amended to read:

"The Board felt that the report did not include all the partnerships Parkwood has with many sports and other clubs that used the centres, for example the heavy use by netball clubs of the courts at Rushcliffe Leisure Centre. The wide difference in cost per user with Rushcliffe Leisure Centre being the cheapest was noted. It was also felt that it would be beneficial to have more

background information to explain the differences in the cost per user per centre, such as age of building, design etc. The Head of Partnerships and Performance explained that the Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Group were reviewing the centres and had received this information. He agreed to forward this to Members of the Board.

Members were pleased to note that the holiday play schemes were improving, although Mr Palfrey stated that a lot of hard work had been undertaken over the last few years to increase the activities. However, he stated that the trend appeared to be changing to people wanting day activities from week long activities."

With regard to the action sheet Members were informed that information on the ward data in relation to complaints and the information on the user survey for Edwalton Golf Courses would be considered at future meetings. Members had been sent information regarding the Leisure Facilities Strategy and last year's meeting with Carillion. Also briefing notes had been provided regarding homesearch and fraud detection.

27. Cabinet Member Questions

There were none received.

28. East Leake Leisure Centre – Annual Report

The Leisure Contracts Manager presented a report which gave Members a brief summary of the contract conditions and an outline of the performance measures in place. He explained that the performance measures were the same for all the Council's leisure centres and that all customer comments were measured in the same way. Members were informed that the Centre was being assessed for Quest accreditation on 16 March 2012, which would be very useful for the staff and for officers at the Council as it would assist in developing a joint plan for the facility. He also explained that the Council's liability had reduced by approximately £7,500 due to the new energy efficiency measures, better monitoring and a milder winter.

Mr Curtis gave Members a presentation outlining the facilities at the Centre, how these were used and who used them. He gave examples of various clubs and community groups and which facilities they used. Members were informed that there were over 600 children on swimming programmes which was run using the ASA National Teaching Plan, at any one time. The pool was also used by a local triathlon club who trained there every week and also held two major events every year which attracted between 3-4,000 people. One major attraction for children was the Eliminator, a 15 metre inflatable that was used at weekends and for birthday parties, this had increased the numbers of casual swimmers and the number of parties booked. Although some areas were jointly used by the Centre and the school Mr Curtis informed the Board that staff ensured that the use of the facilities was maximised as much as possible.

Following on from a question Mr Curtis explained that there were no specific classes catering for disabled people, although people's individual needs were assessed and any help or assistance was given, for example there was a hoist for the pool. He also explained that one regular user was registered blind and was extremely satisfied with the assistance provided by the staff. He also outlined the number of activities available for children and young people and how the Centre was working with the 'MEND' project to tackle childhood obesity.

Mr Curtis was pleased to inform the Board that the number of users had increased over the last year by approximately 10,000 and that income had increased by £27,000. This was mainly due to the hard work of staff, the savings on utility costs and the increase in fitness users due to the refurbishment of the gym facilities.

With regard to marketing the main aim was to promote the annual membership packages. The annual marketing plan included themes such as the World Cup, the forthcoming Olympics or to promote use of the facilities in general and at times specifically to increase attendance at classes that required a boost.

In respect of customer feedback there was an excellent satisfaction level, however, if any negative feedback was received this was personally followed up by the manager. This feedback formed part of the discussions with the Leisure Contracts Manager at their monthly meetings. Another topic for discussion was health and safety. Members were informed that staff were encouraged to keep the facility as clear and safe as possible and to risk assess areas on a continual basis.

Following a question Mr Curtis explained that under income the category Sales related to vending machines, swimwear, goggles, etc; membership fees were included in Fitness and Aerobics; and under expenditure Resale related to the hire of equipment, such as the sunshower, vending machines, etc.

With regard to the finance it was acknowledged that there was an adverse difference of approximately £90,000 for the year which was an improvement of the adverse difference of £140,000 in the previous year. Mr Curtis stated that he had a target to improve the situation and as the Centre was not at saturation point there were opportunities.

The Board queried the number of staff and the costs associated. Mr Curtis explained that there were 33 members of staff which equated to 14.5 full time equivalents, this had been reduced over the last few years. He stated that the staff had been consistent over the past few years and this had allowed the team to develop into a much stronger unit. The wages shown in the accounts was for the staff at the leisure centre, with all Carillion's costs contained within the management fee in the PFI agreement. The Leisure Contracts Manager agreed that there was a strong team ethos, that they were very motivated and always busy keeping the site clean and well run.

In respect of a question raised Mr Curtis explained that the Centre had not been designed with an area for people to congregate and meet, and although some chairs had been placed around the pool area this was not conducive to people sitting for a long time.

With regard to a particular out of normal hours booking Mr Curtis explained that normally this type of booking was not taken due to the security of the school site, however as there were minimal costs to Carillion and an opportunity for a lot of people to see the Centre it was agreed to take on this booking.

Following questions the Leisure Contracts Manager explained that the monthly board meetings were attended by the Deputy Chief Executive (CB), the Leisure Contracts Manager, the Head of Partnerships and Performance, Mr Curtis, Mr Burwell, the contracts manager, and the school site manager. It was also noted that, although the Centre had exceeded the usage figure the Council could not increase it until the contract was renegotiated after the four year period. However, Mr Curtis explained that he was committed to increasing the number of people who visited the Centre.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Board, thanked Mr Curtis for providing Members with excellent information in a very clear and understandable format and for answering Members' questions. He stated that many compliments had been received about the Centre and the professionalism of the staff.

29. **Performance Monitoring – Quarter 3 – 2011/12**

The Performance and Reputation Manager presented the performance indicators for the third quarter of 2011/12. She informed the Board that there were five highlights and six exceptions, that sickness levels were below last year's figures and that two of the strategic tasks were on target with the remaining two needing some corrective action.

With regard to the strategic tasks Members were informed that the Local Development Framework had been delayed due to national changes and the need for further consultation. The introduction of a hub and spoke method of customer access had been delayed due to the Police's decision to close some of its stations. However Members were assured that officers were considering alternatives. In relation to climate change 59% of the Action Plan had been delivered, although the remaining actions were more intricate these would be contained within the original timescale. Finally Members were informed that the last play area redevelopment had just started and that this would complete the Rushcliffe Play Strategy.

One highlight this quarter was the speed of processing new claims, which had been identified as an exception in Quarter 1. With regard to the other exceptions Members were informed that the number of missed bins was now improving after the difficulties in Quarter 1 and would hopefully be on target in Quarter 4. Major planning applications were below target as these could be

more complex and require further investigations, also due to the small numbers the percentage could fluctuate. Members were informed that the Business Rates collected was due to the fact that if there were changes during the year the cost could be spread over the twelve months rather than the original ten, which the target was based upon.

In respect of invoices paid this was due to the new computer system but performance was improving. Following a question the Board was informed that the Council aimed to pay small businesses within ten days. The Performance and Reputation Manager explained that the number of robberies had increased and that this was due to the number of thefts of mobile phones from young people, she stated the Community Safety Team were targeting youth groups and schools to make young people more aware. The final exception was the length of stay in hostel accommodation which was due to scrutinised by the Community Development Group as part of its consideration of Choice Based Lettings. Members were assured that this would be considered on an annual basis and that their concerns would be passed on.

With regard to the finance information Members were informed that there was a predicted underspend of £1,000,000, which was due to extra income from green waste, efficiencies and careful management of budgets.

30. Corporate Basket of Indicators

The Performance and Reputation Manager gave a presentation explaining that 18 months ago the need for reporting on national indicators had been removed and the Board had looked at the corporate scorecard. It was now time to consider if these indicators were providing the information needed to identify if the Council was performing well. Officers had considered all the data that was being collected for both officers and Members and had identified indicators that were important to judge how the Council was delivering its key responsibilities and those that would be of concern to residents. She highlighted some indicators that could be removed, kept and added into the basket.

She reminded Members that the proposed Corporate Strategy had three themes, each of which had three tasks and asked how the performance indicators could measure the success of the Strategy. The Head of Corporate Services stated that the new Strategy had been rationalised and consequently the proposed indicators had been divided into three categories:

- Service delivery and quality
- Customer satisfaction, and
- Strategic outcomes

The Board discussed the need to be able to benchmark with other authorities and the fact that the definition of the information collected needed to be of a similar nature. The Performance and Reputation Manager explained that the Council was part of the East Midlands Benchmarking Group and that everyone was signed up to benchmarking, although this could be at a lower

management level. She stated that many of the old best value indicators had been kept for managers to ensure that services were being delivered well. She also informed Members that the Council now had a duty to publicise information to residents in a clear and understandable way.

Members also felt that much of the information they needed to help residents should be available, such as the length of time taken to process planning applications. The Performance and Reputation Manager stated that officers had access to LG Inform which collated a large amount of performance data and that this could be shared with Members. It was also pointed out that ward councillors could contact heads of service for performance information to help them in their roles as community leaders.

Members suggested that it would be useful for officers to collect the data and provide all the information on an annual basis and only report on a quarterly basis those indicators that were varying from the target by +/- 10%. Also indicators should include information on value for money. Officers agreed that there was a need to look at how the information was provided especially as presently some of the present indicators that were an exception in Quarter 1 would then fail for the remainder of the year. There was also a need to agree the indicators as officers would need to collect information to form a baseline. Members were concerned that for the first year they would not be able to identify any trends as the baseline had not been established for some indicators.

Members discussed the need to ensure that the right indicators were collected as sometimes it was when managers did not realise that service delivery was awry was when scrutiny could assist. The Performance and Reputation Manager agreed that much of the performance data was useful and like some of the Environmental Health statistics it could be presented in a different format, such as an extranet or in Members' Monthly. Councillors queried the review of Members' Monthly and how Members would be involved in this. The Performance and Reputation Manager explained that she and the Democratic Services Manager were reviewing how the information was presented and how this could be done differently ie via an extranet.

Following a query officers agreed that many of the Council's strategies were living documents and that there could be better links through the extranet for Members to monitor how these were being delivered and how they interacted with other strategies.

With regard to the new Corporate Strategy it was noted that each task could have several performance indicators. Members queried the Council Tax Support Scheme and the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) explained that this was a new Government scheme and this would be complex to implement, however, there would be indicators used to monitor the implementation and then indicators to ensure it was being delivered correctly. Members felt that there would need to be flexibility and an annual review of the basket.

Members also felt that the data collected should be shown in a transparent way ie present numbers as well as percentages as this could put indicators into context. The Head of Corporate Services accepted that the reports needed to contain more dialogue about the indicators as well as just the data. It was a challenge for officers to present the information in a clear, transparent and understandable method.

Members felt that it was difficult to gauge whether the information proposed was correct and that this should be discussed again when the first report was produced.

The Board agreed in principle to the 35 indicators as proposed subject to there being sufficient flexibility built into the performance management framework to allow Members to review them annually. It was also agreed that there should be a review of the information contained within Members Monthly alongside the development of an extranet to display the information.

31. Rolling Work Programme

The Board considered its work programme for 2011/12 and 2012/13 and made no alterations.

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm.

Action Sheet PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD - TUESDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2012

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
30. Corporate Basket of Indicators	Officers review the information contained in Members Monthly and further the development of an extranet	Performance and Reputation Manager and Democratic Services Manager