

Committee: Cabinet

Date:

Title: Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2024/25
Q1 Performance Update

Thursday, 5
September 2024

Portfolio Holder: Cllr. Petrina Lees, Leader of the Council

Report Author: Angela Knight, Director of Business
Performance and People

Key decision:

No

aknight@uttlesford.gov.uk

Paula Evans, Contract, Performance and Risk
Manager

pevans@uttlesford.gov.uk

Summary

1. This report presents members with 2024/25 Q1 (April- June) performance data outturns and analysis for the suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs).
2. The CCIs were identified and established in the 2023/24 performance reporting year with a key objective of enabling the Corporate Management Team (CMT) and Members to focus on priority areas of performance across the council.
3. As agreed by both CMT and Members, retrospective benchmarking (previous quarter outturns) has been completed and is presented as a separate analysis exercise. Therefore, for this report benchmarking outturns for Q4 2023/24 have been used.
4. Performance trends have been highlighted and analysed to identify where improvement may be needed particularly when comparing against other 'statistical nearest neighbour' authorities.

Recommendations

5. None. The report is for information only.

Financial Implications

6. There are no direct financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

7. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report:

None.

Impact

8.

Communication/Consultation	Reviewed by Corporate Management Team (CMT) and Informal Cabinet Board (ICB)
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

Corporate Core Indicators

9. The Corporate Core Indicators (CCI's) have been introduced to provide performance information on key service provision areas across the authority. They are grouped under the following themes to provide specific performance focus:

- Organisation/Governance
- Cost of Living Crisis
- Health & Safety
- Finance & Income
- Environment/Communities & Development

10. There are two CCIs that to date, have not had outturns submitted:

- **CCI 07 – Contract Management**
Indicator(s) will be identified during the 2024/25 reporting year to support the newly revised and evolving contract management process. It is anticipated that reporting will commence towards the end of the year to provide transparency and compliance for key performance requirements.
- **CCI 08 – Resident Satisfaction**
As agreed by both CMT and Cabinet, this indicator will be reported on a bi-annual/annual basis using data from an independent survey to all Uttlesford residents. Survey questions will be based on the national LGA survey. The survey is planned to be circulated in early Autumn.

11. Of the 30 indicators identified, a total of 28 have Q1 outturn data and supporting performance notes entered against them. Where applicable, outturn data is compared to both the previous quarters and year's internal data; this is set out in detail at Appendix A.

12. When reviewing the indicators, the following should be noted:

- Indicators ending with (max) means a **higher** outturn is good performance
- Indicators ending with (min) means a **lower** outturn is a good performance

13. As detailed in the tables below overall, the statuses of the indicators have improved compared with the previous quarter outturns;

- for Q1 2024/25 there are **15** at green status (achieving or exceeding target), **5** amber (within 10% of target) and **8** red (over 10% off target)
- in Q4 2023/24 there were **11** at green status, **8** amber and **8** red

14. Further analysis of the 24 indicators where both short and long trend information is available, shows the following for Q1;

- For the **short trend** there are **11** indicators improving in performance against target, **12** declining and **4** with no change.
- For the **long trend** there are more indicators, **13**, trending as improving than declining, **10**, with **1** having no change.










Status	Total	%	Short Trend	Total	Long Trend	Total
	15	54%		11		13
	5	18%		12		10
	8	28%		1		1
	28	100%		24		24

Table 1: Q1 Corporate core indicators status and trend results




Trend Arrows	Definition	Description
	Improving	If the Value is better than the calculated average, the Trend arrow will point upwards.
	Worsening	If the Value is worse than the calculated average, the Trend arrow will point downwards.
	No Change	If the Value is the same as the calculated average, the Trend arrow will be replaced with a dash.
Note: Trend Arrows will always be calculated based on if the Value is getting better or worse relative to the Target, regardless of the PI's status.		

Table 2: Trend arrow definitions.

15. Detailed CCI Q1 performance information is available in the supporting document Appendix A.

Benchmarking

16. In addition to reporting against internal performance indicator targets and performance, an external benchmarking exercise is conducted on a quarterly basis so that comparative data can be analysed.

Due to the limited availability of up-to-date data, the comparison is made using the previous quarters outturns. This report therefore details the analysis from using data from Q4 2023/24 and is attached as Appendix B.

17. The benchmarking group used for the purposes of this report represents Uttlesford District Council’s statistical near neighbours (SNN) as identified in the annual Financial Resilience Index produced by CIPFA (see table below).

Performance information from Braintree District Council is also used in the analysis as it is thought to be a good physical neighbouring authority for comparison purposes.

Authority	Area km² (2021)	Population (2022)
Uttlesford	641.18	92,578
Harborough	591.78	100,481
Winchester	660.97	130,268
Tandridge	248.19	88,707
Vale of White Horse	577.62	142,116
South Cambridgeshire	901.63	165,633
Sevenoaks	369.2	121,106
Tonbridge and Malling	240.14	133,661
Waverley	345.17	130,063
South Oxfordshire	678.53	151,820
Hart	215.27	100,910
Test Valley	627.58	132,871
Tewkesbury	414.42	97,000
Mole Valley	258.32	87,769
East Hampshire	514.44	127,319
Bromsgrove	216.97	100,076

Table 4: Statistical Near Neighbours as identified in CIPFA’s Annual Resilience Index

18. The Nearest Neighbours Model is determined by 40 different metrics across a wide range of social-economic indicators and is designed to help interpret results and deep dive into how the statistical differences between other authorities arises.

19. As there were no other formal benchmarking groups identified at the time of formalising the CCI suite, these were thought to be a good starting point on which to build benchmarking knowledge. It should be noted that this group of SNN is a very close match to the comparative data available on the LG Inform platform, Value for Money Profiles.

20. The benchmarking data contained in this report and the detailed information in Appendix B has been obtained directly from equivalent performance officers in the SNN authorities and/or published data on their authority websites.
21. At the time of this report being produced, 13 of the 15 SNNs, and Braintree DC, had published Q4 2023/24 performance data.
22. There are now up to 10 authorities benchmarked for some indicators, with an improved average of 7 authorities benchmarked per available indicator.

Please note: Where data could only be obtained for one other local authority within the group, the indicator has not been analysed.

23. Q4 2023-24 Retrospective Benchmarking Table

The following table represents UDC's Q4 performance for 9 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC.

UDC's performance was better than the benchmarked average for three indicators, the same as the average for four indicators and below the average for two indicators.

No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked	Performance Indicator	Benchmarked Performance Average	UDC's Performance
4	% Information Governance requests (FOIs & EIRs) dealt with in 20 working days	76%	74%
3	% of calls answered vs number of calls received across the council	89%	89%
10	% of Council Tax collected	98%	98%
9	% of Non-domestic Rates Collected	98%	99%
5	% of invoices paid within 30 days	91%	97%
8	Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications	85%	85%
8	Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications	89%	84%
5	% of Appeals upheld for Major Applications	11%	11%
7	% Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	44%	48%

Table 4: UDC's Q4 performance for 9 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC.

24. Further detailed retrospective benchmarked information for the CCIs in Q4 2023/24 is available in Appendix B.

Risk Analysis

25.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
<p>If performance indicators do not meet quarterly/annual targets then areas such as customer satisfaction and statutory adherence to government led requirements could be affected leading to a loss in reputation for the Council.</p>	<p>2 – The majority of performance measures perform on or above target. Where necessary, accompanying notes to individual performance indicators detail improvement plans.</p>	<p>3 – The majority of service areas in the Council are customer-facing so has the potential to impact reputationally, service delivery and financially.</p>	<p>Performance is monitored by CMT, and Cabinet on a quarterly basis. Short and long term analysis is carried out to identify performance trends, this supports the appropriate action/improvement plans to be put in place to address issues.</p>

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.