1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to consult with the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on:

- Proposals of Performance Management arrangements will be carried out in 2011/12.

1.2

Appendix 1 – Performance Management Change Position Paper

Appendix 2 – Performance Management Change Consultation Paper

2. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

2.1 The matters discussed in this report impact directly on the following corporate priorities:

- A clean and green Rossendale – creating a better environment for all.
- A healthy and successful Rossendale – supporting vibrant communities and a strong economy.
Responsive and Value for Money local services – responding to and meeting the different needs of customers and improving the cost effectiveness of services

3. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

3.1 All the issues raised and the recommendation(s) in this report involve risk considerations as set out below:

- Ineffective performance management framework for the Council.

4. BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS

4.1 Coalition Government and Future Performance Management Arrangements

The Coalition Government has announced a number of changes to the way Local Government Authorities produce and publish performance management data, a full report of which can be seen at Appendix 1 along with a copy of various consultations carried out with officers at Appendix 2. The new arrangements call for more transparency of data as well as the abolition of National Indicators.

4.2 Abolition of National Indicators

Following the announcement of the abolition of National Indicators Central Government published a single dataset, to be used by local authorities as a guideline of what needs to be recorded and reported to government departments across Whitehall going forward. The Policy and Performance Team have met with heads of service to review the current extent and content of performance indicators within their service areas for future priority needs. The review considered all local and national indicators. In particular which, if any, of the former national indicators should continue to be monitored and recorded by the Council, which national indicators should be deleted. In addition any need and added value of developing any new local indicators was considered and informed by heads of service. The decisions were made in line with the single dataset produced by Central Government and the corporate priority of providing value for money services to our customers. The results of this consultation can be seen in Figure 4 of Appendix 1, a more detailed version is available in the consultation document Appendix 2 Figure 1.

4.3 Performance Management System

As stated in Appendix 1, Rossendale Borough Council’s current performance management software is Covalent which is well embedded and user friendly and it is recommended that the Council continues to use this system going forward to ensure robust data quality arrangements. Covalent costs the Council £5,367.71+rpi for Annual Support. The Annual support payment is made up of technical support for users, updates to PI’s/Benchmarking, costs associated with offsite hosting and ongoing releases and bug fixes etc. For Value for Money and cost saving purposes the Council has negotiated the waiving of the rpi, annual inflation increase, resulting in a saving of £270 for 2011/12.
4.4 **Performance Reports**

Going forward, performance reporting should be reviewed and a number of issues need to be considered by Overview and Scrutiny.

1. As a more in depth financial report already goes to Overview and Scrutiny consider that the current finance section of the Integrated Performance Report is reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny. Is the current way it is reported in the Integrated Performance Report sufficient for O&S or is there any changes recommended?

2. Also for review is whether or not it would be beneficial to include in the Quarterly Integrated Report other key indicators and figures from CLAW, Leisure, Capita or other performance reports? This would eliminate the need for a full report from these areas going to Overview & Scrutiny. Is the current way it is reported in the Integrated Performance Report sufficient for O&S or is there any changes recommended?

**COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY OFFICERS:**

5. **SECTION 151 OFFICER**

5.1 There may be financial savings depending on the decisions made.

6. **MONITORING OFFICER**

6.1 No legal indications arising from the report.

7. **HEAD OF PEOPLE AND POLICY (ON BEHALF OF THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE)**

7.1 No Human Resources implications arising from the report.

8. **CONCLUSION**

8.1 The Coalition Government has announced a number of changes to performance management. The immediate impact on the way Rossendale Borough Council currently manages performance is the abolition of National Indicators. This has led to a review by every team in the Council looking at what they currently monitor and what they want to monitor going forward in line with Corporate Priorities and the single dataset. This review process has provided the Council with the opportunity to look at the way it currently manages and reports on performance.

9. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

9.1 That the Overview & Scrutiny Performance Committee reviews the performance management position paper, Appendix 1.

9.2 That the Overview & Scrutiny Performance Committee agrees the list of performance indicators each team has suggested going forward, which can be seen in Appendix 1 Figure 4 (pg9 to pg14).
9.3 That Overview and Scrutiny Committee agrees to the reduction of registered users of Covalent.

9.4 That Overview and Scrutiny looks at the way performance is currently reported in the Quarterly Integrated Performance Report and suggests any changes as stated in section 4.4 of this cover report.

10. CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT

10.1 Management Team (please note that due to time constraints this report is being sent to Management Team and Overview and Scrutiny Committee simultaneously.)

10.2 All Heads of Service, Managers and Covalent Users.

10.3 Overview and Scrutiny Committee Performance. (please note that due to time constraints this report is being sent to Management Team and Overview and Scrutiny Committee simultaneously.)

11. COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Is a Community Impact Assessment required  No
Is a Community Impact Assessment attached  No

12. BIODIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Is a Biodiversity Impact Assessment required  No
Is a Biodiversity Impact Assessment attached  No
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
<th>Place of Inspection</th>
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