

<b>DECISION-MAKER:</b>	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE		
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	COUNCIL STRATEGY PERFORMANCE – QUARTER 4, 2015-16		
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	14 JULY 2016		
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	LEADER OF THE COUNCIL		
<b><u>CONTACT DETAILS</u></b>			
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Saqib Yasin</b>	<b>Tel: 023 8083 2017</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Saqib.yasin@southampton.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Director</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Emma Lewis</b>	<b>Tel: 023 8091 7984</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Emma.lewis@southampton.gov.uk</b>	
<b>STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY</b>			
None			
<b>BRIEF SUMMARY</b>			
<p>This report provides information about quarter 4 and final year annual performance for 2015/16 against the key success measures included in the Southampton City Council Strategy 2014-17. A revised 4 year Council Strategy is being developed for consideration by Council in September 2016. As part of this, a new set of success measures will be agreed; this is therefore the last time the Council will report against the current set of performance measures.</p>			
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>			
	(i)	To note the report	
	(ii)	To provide feedback on the current set of Council Strategy performance measures, to be taken into account as part of the review and development of a revised Council Strategy.	
<b>REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS</b>			
1.	<p>Quarterly performance reports are produced and reported to the Overview and Scrutiny management Committee (OSMC), as well as published on the Council's website, in accordance with Southampton City Council's commitment to open and transparent governance. These reports are based on the measures included in the Council Strategy; in revising the Strategy, there is therefore an opportunity to review the measures and ensure they are aligned to priorities, relevant, and timely.</p>		
<b>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED</b>			
2.	Not applicable.		
<b>DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)</b>			
3.	<p>The Council monitors its performance quarterly against the key success measures included in the Council Strategy 2014-17. The quarter 4 scorecard for 2015/16 is attached in Appendix 1.</p>		
4.	<p>The attached scorecard provides an update on all quarterly measures included in the Council Strategy 2014-17. The scorecard also provides figures for annual measures where these are available.</p>		

**Quarter Four Performance 2015/16**

5.	The Council Strategy measures have remained consistent since 2014/15, although in some cases targets have been updated (where this applies, it is detailed in the scorecard). Therefore it is possible to compare performance against that achieved last year.																		
6.	<p>There have been refinements to the Prospective Adoptive Families (rate per 10,000 0-17 year olds) measure. This old measure is no longer reported nationally and the underlying data descriptions have been redeveloped with nationally comparable information. Two new measures are therefore agreed with the service. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.3 (a) The number of approved adoptive families</li> <li>• 3.3 (b) The average number of days between registration and approval for new approvals</li> </ul> <p>These changes were made effective for quarter 4.</p>																		
7.	<p>Performance for each measure is rated as either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blue – performance exceeds target by 10% or more</li> <li>• Green – performance is between -5% and +10% off target</li> <li>• Amber – performance is between -5% and -10% off target</li> <li>• Red – performance is -10% or more off target.</li> </ul>																		
8.	When quarter 3 figures were presented the Council Management Team and the OSMC requested that the format for variance reporting was changed to show the actual variance rather than % variance. We agreed that we would retain the format for this year for consistency and update the dials to a time series format which would present history and actual variances on a single graph. This has now been developed and 2016-17 reporting will take this updated format.																		
9.	<p>Overall, the quarter 4 scorecard shows that (for measures reported):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="435 1397 1327 1809"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>No. of measures Q4 2014/15</th> <th>No. of measures Q4 2015/16</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Blue</b></td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Green</b></td> <td>13</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Amber</b></td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Red</b></td> <td>8</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Not available</b></td> <td>11</td> <td>8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		No. of measures Q4 2014/15	No. of measures Q4 2015/16	<b>Blue</b>	2	1	<b>Green</b>	13	12	<b>Amber</b>	4	2	<b>Red</b>	8	16	<b>Not available</b>	11	8
	No. of measures Q4 2014/15	No. of measures Q4 2015/16																	
<b>Blue</b>	2	1																	
<b>Green</b>	13	12																	
<b>Amber</b>	4	2																	
<b>Red</b>	8	16																	
<b>Not available</b>	11	8																	
10.	The following tables provide a summary of those measures rated as red or amber (Table 1), off target, and those measures rated as green or blue (Table 2). These are within or exceeding an agreed tolerance. Further detail, including commentary, is available in Appendix 1.																		

**Table 1**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>RAG</b>	<b>Preferred direction</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Care Leavers not in contact or Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)	RED	↓	41.0%	54.2%
Additional supported jobs / apprenticeships created for major developments	RED	↑	255	181
City employers signed up to the minimum wage	RED	↑	6	5
Families Matter, phase 2	RED	↑	32.0%	6.3%
Older people permanently admitted to residential and nursing homes (per 100,000 population)	RED	↓	780	899
Older people still at home 91 days after hospital discharge	RED	↑	90.0%	78.6%
Children subject to repeat child protection plans	RED	↓	13.0%	23.8%
Average time taken to place a child for adoption after entering care system	RED	↓	487	1122
Average number of days between registration and approval for new approvals	RED	↓	241	313
Repeat domestic violence and abuse cases returning to a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference	RED	↓	22.5%	25.6%
Delayed Transfers of Care from Hospital (DToC)	RED	↓	800	954
People using Direct Payments	RED	↑	25.0%	18.8%
Affordable homes delivered	RED	↑	365	204
Local Authority housing stock that is non decent	RED	↓	3.0%	8.0%
Residents agreeing the Council offers value for money	RED	↑	50%	43%
Residents satisfied with how the Council runs things	RED	↑	64%	55%
Care leavers in contact and in suitable accommodation	AMBER	↑	85.0%	78.6%
Household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting	AMBER	↑	30.0%	27.0%

**Table 2**

Measure	RAG	Preferred direction	Target	Actual
Children Leaving Care for Permanence – Special Guardianship Order (SGO).	BLUE	↑	35.0%	38.7%
Pupils at Key Stage 2 attaining level 4+ in Reading, Writing and Maths	GREEN	↑	82%	80%
Pupils attaining 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE, including English and Maths	GREEN	↑	50.5%	50.6%
Young people who are NEET	GREEN	↓	5.2%	4.8%
Pupils in Early Years Foundation Phase achieving good level of development	GREEN	↑	64.0%	66.1%
Number of approved adoptive families	GREEN	↑	11.7	12
First time entrants into Youth Justice System	GREEN	↓	500	486
Young people re-offending in 12 month period from original offence	GREEN	↓	37.0%	36.5%
Residents who take part in volunteering	GREEN	↑	42%	40%
Residents satisfied with Southampton as a place to live	GREEN	↑	84%	81%
Residents who feel that Southampton is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together	GREEN	↑	70%	68%
Number of active online accounts	GREEN	↑	35000	35000
% transactions completed using self-serve methods * Target has not been set for this measure	GREEN	↑	58%	N/A

11.	The following measures are currently unavailable.	
	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Reason</b>
	Apprenticeship starts (1.5)	Normal time lag – data yet to be released by Skills Funding Agency.
	Investment in major development projects in city (1.6)	Software to calculate metric no longer licensed – alternative measure tbc
	Jobs created through major development projects in city (1.7)	Software to calculate metric no longer licensed – alternative measure tbc
	Adult participation in sport and recreation (2.5)	Normal time lag
	Smoking prevalence (2.6)	Normal time lag
	Mortality rate from preventable causes (2.7)	Normal time lag
	A roads requiring urgent structural maintenance (5.2)	Normal time lag
	Unclassified roads requiring urgent structural maintenance (5.3)	Normal time lag

### **Development of Revised Council Strategy Success Measures**

12.	A revised 4 year Council Strategy is being developed for consideration by Council in September 2016. This provides an opportunity to review the key success measures reported on quarterly. Some of the current measures are core indicators. However, others have proved less useful, such as the number of employers signed up to the Living Wage, either because the Council has limited ability to influence outcomes, or because of time lags in obtaining data, or infrequency of reporting.
13.	In developing a new Council Strategy the intention is to address these issues so that all quarterly measures are relevant, timely and accurate. Therefore, this is the last time that the Council will report performance against the current set of Council Strategy Performance Scorecard measures.
14.	OSMC are requested to provide feedback on the current set of measures, listed above and in Appendix 1, to be taken into account as part of the review and development of a revised Council Strategy.

### **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Capital/Revenue**

15. There are no resource implications for consideration as a result of this report.

#### **Property/Other**

16. There are no property or other implications for consideration as a result of this report.

### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:**

17. There are no legal implications for consideration as a result of this report.

#### **Other Legal Implications:**

18.	None
<b>POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS</b>	
19.	There are no policy framework implications for consideration as a result of this report.
<b>KEY DECISION</b>	No
<b>WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:</b>	None directly as a result of this report
<b><u>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION</u></b>	
<b>Appendices</b>	
1.	Quarter 4 scorecard
<b>Documents In Members' Rooms</b>	
1.	None
<b>Equality Impact Assessment</b>	
Do the implications/subject of the report require an Equality and Safety Impact Assessments (ESIA) to be carried out.	No
<b>Privacy Impact Assessment</b>	
Do the implications/subject of the report require a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) to be carried out.	No
<b>Other Background Documents - Equality Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:</b>	
Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
1.	None