

CARLISLE  
CITY COUNCIL



# OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

## *Committee Report*

Public

Date of Meeting: 30th January 2003

Title: REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Report of: Head of Finance

Report reference: FS10/02

**Summary:** This report appraises Members of the outcome of the review of selected Performance Indicators, relevant to this Authority, which was undertaken at the Town Clerk and Chief Executive's request in December 2002

**Recommendations:** Members are requested to note the contents of this report and to refer the report to the respective Overview and Scrutiny Committees and to the Executive for their consideration on their areas of responsibility.

Contact Officer: Ian Beckett

Ext: 7292

## **REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1. This review was undertaken following a request from the Town Clerk and Chief Executive for information which would give a "state of the nation" appraisal for the Authority.
- 1.2. The time required for this review has been taken from the block of time (72 days) which was allocated in the Audit Plan for Corporate work during 2002/03.

### **2. OBJECTIVES**

- 2.1. To review available information in order to determine this Authority's performance in relation to similar Authorities in order to highlight any major differences.

### **3. SCOPE/METHOD**

- 3.1. Discussions with the Town Clerk and Chief Executive to agree the basis of the review.
- 3.2. Review of the previous report, produced by HACAS Chapman Hendy in March 2002.
- 3.3. Obtain, collate and analyse information obtainable from the O.D.P.M.

### **4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1. In order to give some broad indication of which "quartile" the Authority may be deemed to have been in at the end of 2001, a score was awarded to each of the indicators as follows :-

Top quartile = 1 point  
Second quartile = 2 points  
Third quartile = 3 points  
Bottom quartile = 4 points

4.2. As, on this method, the score can not be below 1 or above 4, this gives a range of 3 points. There are however 4 "quartiles", and on this basis the "inter-quartile gap" has been taken as 0.75. (Three points divided by 4).

4.3. Thus it is taken, for the purpose of this paper, that the following will determine the quartiles :-

Overall score between 1 and 1.75 = top quartile

Score between 1.76 and 2.5 = second quartile

Score between 2.6 and 3.25 = third quartile

Score between 3.26 and 4 = bottom quartile.

4.4. As detailed in this report, this approach gives an overall total of 118 "points" which was then divided by the total number of indicators (54).

4.5. The overall result was an (un-weighted) average of 2.19.

4.6. As the result exceeds falls between 1.76 and 2.5, this indicates that overall the Authority was within the second quartile at that point.

4.7. On an individual basis, the results for each of the areas reviewed are :-

Corporate Health – third quartile

Environment – second quartile

Housing and Council Tax benefits – third quartile

Planning – top quartile

Community safety – second quartile

Culture and Leisure – top quartile

## 5. CAVEAT

- 5.1. It must be borne in mind, when reading this report, that the figures quoted relate to the financial year ended **31<sup>st</sup> March 2001** and it is extremely likely that improvements will have been made in a number of areas. This indeed is shown by performance indicators recently produced by the Head of Revenues relating to 2002/03 – but without comparative information relating to other Authorities, it is impossible to draw any further conclusions from the information currently available.
- 5.2. It must also be remembered that the above scoring system is unique to this Authority – the true test will be to repeat this exercise when the results are available for 2002, to determine whether there has been any measurable improvement in performance.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1. It is recommended that this exercise should be carried out again when more recent figures are available.

## REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### Points Arising

#### 1. Background Information

- 1.1. The report produced by HACAS in March 2002 compared this Authority with 14 other non-unitary Authorities using the "Audit Family" group produced by District Audit .
  - 1.1.1. This used 23 statistics to compare Carlisle with the Family Group.
  - 1.1.2. The figures used were largely based on the "Local Government Comparative Statistics" produced by CIPFA, and were 3 years out of date when the report was produced.
  - 1.1.3. The report produced by HACAS Chapman Hendy in March 2002 concentrated solely on factual information (e.g. the population of Carlisle) and measures on input. There was not a single indicator in their report to show the output of each of the services noted and even more important, no indications of outcome.
  - 1.1.4. As we are to face a Comprehensive Performance Assessment, not a Comprehensive Spending Assessment, this report concentrates as far as possible on measures of outcome – i.e. what did we achieve and were our customers satisfied with the level of service which they received?
  - 1.1.5. Enquiries made of IPF revealed that the latest set of figures which they have available refer to the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2000. Even using these figures, any comparisons drawn would now be two and a half years out of date.
  - 1.1.6. Reference was therefore made to the web-site operated by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), on which a range of performance indicators for Local Authorities is available for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2001.

#### 1.2. Method of Selection

- 1.2.1. Two elements were considered when selecting which Authorities and which indicators to review.
- 1.2.2. It was decided to extend the number of Authorities included in the HACAS report to include all of the Authorities in Cumbria, as a "geographic" comparison and to include a number of other Authorities which were not included in the Audit Family Group but which have a population size of +/- 5% of Carlisle's.
- 1.2.3. This gave a base of 31 Authorities (including Carlisle) for the basis of comparison. An alphabetical list of these Authorities forms **Appendix A** to this report.
- 1.2.4. It was also decided to increase the number of Performance Indicators from 23 to 55, from a range of almost 200 indicators available on the ODPM site.

1.2.5. The indicators chosen have been taken from the following groups, in order to give as wide a range of information as reasonable on which to form an overall opinion.

1.2.6. The groups are :-

Corporate Health – 16 indicators

Environment – 12 indicators

Housing and Council Tax Benefits – 8 indicators

Planning – 7 indicators

Community Safety – 3 indicators.

Culture and Leisure – 9 indicators

1.2.7. Each of these is dealt with in a separate section of this report.

1.2.8. The information in this report :-

compares Carlisle to the overall average for **all** Authorities;

compares Carlisle to **all** other Districts – **N.B.** where the report makes reference to “above average” or “below average”, this is by comparison to all other Districts to ensure a “like for like” result;

shows the range of results for the 31 Authorities selected as “comparators”;

states which (District Authorities) quartile Carlisle’s results fall in to.

1.2.9. The following are also **appended** to this report :-

**Appendix B** shows the results in tabular form

**Appendix C** is the key to the chart at Appendix B

**Appendix D** explains the method by which the Performance indicators were selected.

## CORPORATE HEALTH

### **2. BV1 – did the Authority adopt an LA21 plan?**

- 2.1. Carlisle has adopted such a Plan. The percentage of all Authorities which have adopted a Plan is 81.3% - the overall figure for Districts is 77%.

***Conclusion –above average. (TOP QUARTILE)***

### **2.2. BV3 – the percentage of citizens satisfied with the overall service provided**

- 2.2.1. Carlisle's result is 61%. The percentage for all Authorities is 64.3% and for all Districts is 66.9%.

***Conclusion –Unsatisfactory. Carlisle is below average in this respect. Of the 31 Authorities used for this exercise, Carlisle is in 22<sup>nd</sup> place. The range of results was from 55% ( Barrow) to 78% (Winchester). (FOURTH QUARTILE)***

### **2.3. BV4 – percentage of complainants satisfied with the handling of their complaint**

- 2.3.1. Carlisle's result is 42%. The percentage for all Authorities is 39.3% and for all Districts is 41.4%.

***Conclusion – marginally above average. Of the Authorities used for this exercise, Carlisle is in joint 13<sup>th</sup> place. The range of results was from 33.5% (Lancaster) to 53% (Stroud). (SECOND QUARTILE)***

### **2.4. BV5a – number of complaints to Ombudsman classified as maladministration**

- 2.4.1. Carlisle's result is "nil". The average for all Authorities is 0.4 and for Districts is 0.2.

***Conclusion – above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from "nil" (25 Authorities) to 4 (Barrow in Furness). (TOP QUARTILE)***

### **2.5. BV 5b - Number of complaints to Ombudsman classified as local settlement**

- 2.5.1. Carlisle's result is 2. The average for all Authorities is 9.2 and for Districts is 1.8.

***Conclusion – marginally above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from "nil" to 10 (Barrow in Furness). (THIRD QUARTILE)***

### **2.6. BV6 – turnout for local elections**

- 2.6.1. Carlisle's result is 30.7%. The average for all Authorities is 36.2% and for Districts is 34%.

***Conclusion –below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise***

*was from 24.5% (Barrow in Furness) to 62% (Ashford). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 23<sup>rd</sup> place. (THIRD QUARTILE)*

**2.7. BV7 – percentage of Electoral Form “A”s returned**

2.7.1. Carlisle's result is 98%. The average for all Authorities is 95.3% and for Districts is 96.8%.

*Conclusion –above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 87% (Shepway) to 99.9% (Stroud). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in joint 11th place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

**2.8. BV8 – percentage of undisputed invoices paid in 30 days**

2.8.1. Carlisle's result is 90%. The average for all Authorities is 85.1% and for Districts is 88.2%.

*Conclusion – above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 67% (Chorley) to 99.1% (Barrow in Furness). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in joint 13th place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

**2.9. BV9 – percentage of Council Tax collected**

2.9.1. Carlisle's result is 95.9%. The average for all Authorities is 96.2% and for Districts is 97.1%.

*Conclusion – below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 93% (Preston) to 99.1% (Eden). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 23<sup>rd</sup> place. (FOURTH QUARTILE)*

**2.10. BV10 – percentage of Business Rates collected**

2.10.1. Carlisle's result is 96.4%. The average for all Authorities is 97.6% and for Districts is 97.7%.

*Conclusion below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 93.8% (Chorley) to 99.5% (Eden). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 25<sup>th</sup> place. (FOURTH QUARTILE)*

**2.11. BV11 – percentage of Senior management posts filled by women**

2.11.1. Carlisle's result is 14.3%. The average for all Authorities is 22.4% and for Districts is 20.4%.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from zero (Scarborough) to 33.3% (Norwich). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 19<sup>th</sup> place. (THIRD QUARTILE)*



**2.12. BV12 – proportion of working days lost through sickness**

2.12.1. Carlisle's result is 12.2%. The average for all Authorities is 10% and for Districts is 9.8%.

*Conclusion above average proportion of days lost. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from zero (Scarborough) to 33.3% (Norwich). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 19<sup>th</sup> place. (FOURTH QUARTILE).*

**2.13. BV13 – Voluntary leavers as a percentage of staff.**

2.13.1. Carlisle's result is 11.1%. The average for all Authorities is 10.8% and for Districts is 10.7%.

*Conclusion slightly above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 3.4% (Durham) to 17.4% (St Edmundsbury). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 9<sup>th</sup> place. (THIRD QUARTILE)*

**2.14. BV14 – Early retirements as percentage of total work force**

2.14.1. Carlisle's result is 0.3%. The average for all Authorities is 0.6% and for Districts is 0.7%.

*Conclusion - below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from zero (Four Authorities) to 4.64% (Durham). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in joint 20<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

**2.15. BV 15 – Ill health retirements as percentage of total work force**

2.15.1. Carlisle's result is 0.6%. The average for all Authorities is 0.5% and for Districts is 0.5%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from zero (Stroud) to 1.8% (Barrow in Furness). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 15<sup>th</sup> place. (THIRD QUARTILE)*

**2.16. BV16 – Number of staff meeting DDA disability definition as percentage of workforce**

2.16.1. Carlisle's result is 1%. The average for all Authorities is 2.2% and for Districts is 2.5%.

*Conclusion below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from zero (Two Authorities) to 14% (Chesterfield). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in joint 22<sup>nd</sup> place. (QUARTILES NOT GIVEN)*

**2.17. BV17 – Minority ethnic community staff as percentage of the total workforce**

2.17.1. Carlisle's result is 0.3%. The average for all Authorities is 3.6% and for Districts is 1.4%.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from zero (Five Authorities) to 8.4% (Gloucester). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 22<sup>nd</sup> place. (FOURTH QUARTILE).*

## ENVIRONMENT

3. **BV81 – Has the Authority completed a full review of air quality in its area?**

- 3.1. Carlisle's result is "Yes". The average for all Authorities is 0.91% and for Districts is 0.93%.

*Conclusion above average. Of the Authorities used in this exercise, 27 answered "Yes" to this question. (TOP QUARTILE)*

3.2. **BV82a – Percentage of household waste recycled**

- 3.2.1. Carlisle's result is 8.2%. The average for all Authorities is 9.5% and for Districts is 9.7%.

*Conclusion below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 3.9% (Preston) to 17.8% (Winchester). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 18th place. (THIRD QUARTILE)*

3.3. **BV82a(t) – Household waste tonnage recycled**

- 3.3.1. Carlisle's result is 4,301 tons. The average for all Authorities is 14,562 tons and for Districts is 6,036 tons.

*Conclusion well below average for Districts. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 1,073 tons (Allerdale) to 9,463 tons (Winchester). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 9th place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

3.4. **BV82b – Percentage of household waste composted**

- 3.4.1. Carlisle's result is 4%. The average for all Authorities is 1.6% and for Districts is 1.11%.

*Conclusion well above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from zero (Twenty Authorities) to 18.4% (St Edmundsbury). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 4th place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

3.5. **BV 84 – Kilograms of household waste collected per head**

- 3.5.1. Carlisle's result is 479 kilos. The average for all Authorities is 426 kilos and for Districts is 387 kilos.

*Conclusion well above average (i.e. an unsatisfactory result). The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 273 kilos (Worcester) to 519 kilos (Eden). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 3<sup>rd</sup> place. (BOTTOM QUARTILE)*

3.6. **BV85 – Cost per kilometre of keeping land clear of litter and refuse**

- 3.6.1. Carlisle's result is £28,266. The average for all Authorities is £128,317 and for Districts is £70,376.

*Conclusion well below average cost. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from £988 (Winchester) to £174,220 (Barrow in Furness). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 24<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

3.7. **BV86 – Cost of waste collection per household**

- 3.7.1. Carlisle's result is £18.40. The average for all Authorities is £30.47 and for Districts is £30.39.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from £15.37 (Shepway) to £49.46 (South Lakeland). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in 2<sup>nd</sup> cheapest place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

3.8. **BV88 – Number of collections missed per 100,000 collections of household waste**

- 3.8.1. Carlisle's result is (an almost unbelievably low) 1.8. The average for all Authorities is 318 and for Districts is 285.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 1.8 (Carlisle) to 1,425 (Allerdale). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was far and away the best. (TOP QUARTILE)*

3.9. **BV89 – Percentage of people satisfied with cleanliness standards in their area.**

- 3.9.1. Carlisle's result is 73%. The average for all Authorities is 63.3% and for Districts is 66.6%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 50.2% (Preston) to 86.2% (Lancaster). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in joint 5<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

3.10. **BV90a – Percentage of people satisfied with household waste collection**

- 3.10.1. Carlisle's result is 91%. The average for all Authorities is 84.3% and for Districts is 86.6%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 65.9 (Durham) to 94.4% (St Edmundsbury). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in joint 6<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

3.11. **BV90b – Percentage of people satisfied with recycling facilities**

- 3.11.1. Carlisle's result is 72%. The average for all Authorities is 66.2% and for Districts is 68.9%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 47% (Norwich) to 86.9% (Durham). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was in joint 9<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

3.12. **BV91 – Percentage of population served by kerbside collection or within 1 km of recycling centre**

- 3.12.1. Carlisle's result is 75%. The average for all Authorities is 87.6% and for Districts is 86.3%.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 72% (Eden) to 100% (Nine Authorities). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was second lowest. (FOURTH QUARTILE)*

## HOUSING AND COUNCIL TAX BENEFITS

### 4. BV76 – Security – whether the Authority has a strategy for combating fraud

4.1. Carlisle's result is "Yes". The average for all Authorities is 80% and for Districts is 80%.

*Conclusion - above average. Of the Authorities used in this exercise, only nine answered "no". (TOP QUARTILE)*

### 4.2. BV77 – Average cost of handling a HB or CTB claim

4.2.1. Carlisle's result is £102.40. The average for all Authorities is £64.38 and for Districts is £63.40.

*Conclusion well above average cost. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from £38.61 (Newark and Sherwood) to £116.74 (Fareham). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was second most expensive. (FOURTH QUARTILE)*

### 4.3. BV78a – Average time for processing new claim – in days

4.3.1. Carlisle's result is 52 days. The average for all Authorities is 53.01 and for Districts is 48.1.

*Conclusion - above. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 29 days (Chesterfield) to 98 days (Shepway). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 16<sup>th</sup> quickest. (THIRD QUARTILE)*

### 4.4. BV78b – Average time for processing change of circumstances – in days

4.4.1. Carlisle's result is 18 days. The average for all Authorities is 19 and for Districts is 17.

*Conclusion marginally above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 6 days (Chorley) to 79 days (Copeland). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was joint 15<sup>th</sup> quickest. (THIRD QUARTILE)*

### 4.5. Bv78c – Percentage of renewal claims processed on time

4.5.1. Carlisle's result is 70.3%. The average for all Authorities is 62.3% and for Districts is 64.

*Conclusion - above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 5% (Worcester) to 99.75% (Newark and Sherwood). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 13<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

### 4.6. BV79a – Percentage of cases calculated correctly

- 4.6.1. Carlisle's result is 97%. The average for all Authorities is 95.2% and for Districts is 95.5%.

***Conclusion marginally above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 89% (Worcester) to 99% (Newark and Sherwood). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 12<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)***

4.7. **BV79b – Percentage of recoverable overpayments recovered**

- 4.7.1. Carlisle's result is 66.5%. The average for all Authorities is 57.1% and for Districts is 59.2%.

***Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 27% (Taunton Deane) to 94% (South Somerset). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 9<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)***

4.8. **BV80(i)a – Percentage of all respondents satisfied with contact facilities at the Benefits Office**

- 4.8.1. Carlisle's result is 75%. The average for all Authorities is 78.8% and for Districts is 81.2%.

***Conclusion below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 62% (Shepway; Preston) to 89% (Chestefield). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 22<sup>nd</sup> place. (FOURTH QUARTILE)***

## PLANNING

### 5. BV106 – Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land

- 5.1. Carlisle's result is 35.2%. The average for all Authorities is 61.5% and for Districts is 55.3%.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 5% (Ashford) to 95.8% (Exeter). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 22<sup>nd</sup> place. (THIRD QUARTILE)*

### 5.2. BV107 Planning cost per head of population

- 5.2.1. Carlisle's result is £8.45. The average for all Authorities is £10.77 and for Districts is £12.12.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from £5.85 (Broxtowe) to £34.04 (Winchester). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 20<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

### 5.3. BV108 – Number of advertised departures as a percentage of total permissions granted

- 5.3.1. Carlisle's result is 0.0%. The average for all Authorities is 1.1% and for Districts is 0.8%.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 0.0% (Six Authorities) to 7% (Allerdale). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was joint 1<sup>st</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

### 5.4. BV109 – Percentage of applications determined within 8 weeks

- 5.4.1. Carlisle's result is 73%. The average for all Authorities is 60% and for Districts is 65%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 46.4% (Norwich) to 86.8% (Ipswich). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was joint 9<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

### 5.5. BV110 – Average time taken to determine all applications (in weeks)

- 5.5.1. Carlisle's result is 8.3 weeks. The average for all Authorities is 12 weeks and for Districts is 10.3 weeks.

*Conclusion well below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 6.9 weeks (South Lakeland) to 15.2 weeks (Chester). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 7<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

5.6. **BV111 – Percentage of applicants satisfied with the service received**

- 5.6.1. Carlisle's result is 96%. The average for all Authorities is 77.4% and for Districts is 78.2%.

*Conclusion considerably above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 35.8% (Lancaster) to 96% (Carlisle). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 1<sup>st</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

5.7. **BV112 – Score against a checklist of planning best practice**

- 5.7.1. Carlisle's result is 60%. The average for all Authorities is 58.1% and for Districts is 58.8%.

*Conclusion marginally above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 40% (Chester) to 90% (Ipswich). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was joint 12<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*



## COMMUNITY SAFETY

### 6. Bv126A – Burglaries per 1,000 households

- 6.1. Carlisle's result is 6.7. The average for all Authorities is 14.5 and for Districts is 10.7.

*Conclusion considerably below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 3.9 (Eden) to 26.8 (Chorley). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 3<sup>rd</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

### 6.2. BV127a – Violent crimes/Robberies

- 6.2.1. Carlisle's result is 14.8. The average for all Authorities is 10.3 and for Districts is 8.

*Conclusion considerably above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 4.1 (Stratford on Avon) to 27.1 (Durham). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 5<sup>th</sup> place. (FOURTH QUARTILE)*

### 6.3. BV128a – Vehicle crimes per 1,000 population

- 6.3.1. Carlisle's result is 12.8. The average for all Authorities is 16.6 and for Districts is 13.2.

*Conclusion below average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 2 (Fareham) to 26.7 (Norwich). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 12<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

## CULTURE AND LEISURE

### 7. BV113 – School pupil visits to Museums

- 7.1. Carlisle's result is 10,855. The average for all Authorities is 6,965 and for Districts is 3,229.

*Conclusion well above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 12 (Stroud) to 18,853 (Chester). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 6<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

### 7.2. BV116 – Spend on culture and leisure – per capita

- 7.2.1. Carlisle's result is £45.56. The average for all Authorities is £27.85 and for Districts is £21.61.

*Conclusion well above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from £8.28 (Norwich) to £48.37 (Exeter). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 2<sup>nd</sup> place. (BOTTOM QUARTILE) N.B. – The higher level of spending (110% above average) does not appear to be matched by the level of "satisfaction" with the services provided, as shown by the following indicators.*

### 7.3. BV119asl – Satisfaction with cultural and recreational services; Sports/leisure facilities – percentage very/fairly satisfied – all.

- 7.3.1. Carlisle's result is 60%. The average for all Authorities is 53% and for Districts is 53%.

*Conclusion well above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 27% (Gloucester) to 69% (Chesterfield). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 7<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

### 7.4. BV119amg - Satisfaction with cultural and recreational services; Museums/galleries – percentage very/fairly satisfied – all.

- 7.4.1. Carlisle's result is 61%. The average for all Authorities is 48.5% and for Districts is 53%.

*Conclusion well above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 31% (Eden) to 81% (Preston). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 7<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

### 7.5. BV119atch - Satisfaction with cultural and recreational services; Theatres/Concert halls – percentage very/fairly satisfied – all.

- 7.5.1. Carlisle's result is 52%. The average for all Authorities is 51% and for Districts is 50.2%.

*Conclusion marginally above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 34% (Gloucester) to 72% (Ashford). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 14<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

7.6. **BV119a** - Satisfaction with cultural and recreational services; Parks/Open spaces – percentage very/fairly satisfied – all.

7.6.1. Carlisle's result is 68%. The average for all Authorities is 62.8% and for Districts is 61.3%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 39.1% (Durham) to 83.4% (St Edmundsbury). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was joint 7<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

7.7. **BV119aBV3** – BV item 3 on cultural and recreational services; percentage very/fairly satisfied – all.

7.7.1. Carlisle's result is 59%. The average for all Authorities is 54.4% and for Districts is 53.8%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 40% (Gloucester) to 69% (Exeter). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was joint 12<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

7.8. **BV119wBV3** – BV item 3 on cultural and recreational services; percentage very/fairly satisfied – women.

7.8.1. Carlisle's result is 64%. The average for all Authorities is 56.3% and for Districts is 55.7%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 36% (Chesterfield) to 70.5% (St Edmundsbury). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 9<sup>th</sup> place. (TOP QUARTILE)*

7.9. **BV119mBV3** – BV item 3 on cultural and recreational services; percentage very/fairly satisfied – men.

7.9.1. Carlisle's result is 55%. The average for all Authorities is 51.5% and for Districts is 51%.

*Conclusion above average. The range for the Authorities used for this exercise was from 31% (Chesterfield) to 67% (Exeter). Of the Authorities used in this exercise, Carlisle was 12<sup>th</sup> place. (SECOND QUARTILE)*

20<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2002  
REF. COP15

I. BECKETT  
AUDIT MANAGER

REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

COMPARATOR AUTHORITIES

ALLERDALE  
ASHFORD  
BARROW-IN-FURNESS  
BROXTOWE  
CARLISLE  
CHESTER  
CHESTERFIELD  
CHORLEY  
COPELAND  
CREWE AND NANTWICH  
DURHAM CITY  
EDEN  
EXETER  
FAREHAM  
GLOUCESTER  
IPSWICH  
LANCASTER  
NEWARK AND SHERWOOD  
NORWICH  
PRESTON  
SCARBOROUGH  
SHEPWAY  
SHREWSBURY  
SOUTH LAKELAND  
SOUTH SOMERSET  
ST EDMUNDSBURY  
STRATFORD ON AVON  
STROUD  
TAUNTON  
WINCHESTER  
WORCESTER

# PERFORMANCE INDICATORS – AS AT 31<sup>ST</sup> MARCH 2001

## APPENDIX B

	CORPORATE HEALTH	ENVIRONMENT	HOUSING AND COUNCIL BENEFITS	PLANNING	COMMUNITY SAFETY	CULTURE AND LEISURE.
QUARTILE						
TOP	BV1 BV5a	BV81 BV82b BV85 BV86 BV88 BV89 BV90a	BV76	BV107 BV108 BV109 BV110 BV111	BV126a	BV113 BV119asl BV119amg BV119apos Bv119wBV3
2 <sup>ND</sup>	BV4 BV7 BV8 BV14	BV82a(t) BV90b	BV78c BV79a BV79b	BV112	BV128a	BV119atch BV119Abv3 Bv119Mbv3
3 <sup>RD</sup>	BV5b BV6 BV11 BV13 BV15	BV82a	BV78a BV78b	BV106		
BOTTOM	BV3 BV9 BV10 BV12 BV17	BV91 BV84	BV77 BV80(i) a		BV127a	BV116

## KEY

## TOP QUARTILE

- BV1 – Adoption of LA21 Plan
- BV5a – Complaints to Ombudsman classed as maladministration
- BV81 – Completion of air quality review
- BV82b – Percentage of household waste composted
- BV85 – Cost per kilometre of keeping land clear of litter
- BV86 – Cost of waste collection per household
- BV88 – Number of collections missed per 100,000 collections of household waste
- BV89 – Percentage of people satisfied with cleanliness standards
- BV90a – Percentage of people satisfied with household waste collection
- BV76 – Strategy for combating fraud
- BV107 – Planning cost per head of population
- BV108 – Advertised departures as percentage of permission granted
- BV109 – Percentage of applications determined within 8 weeks
- BV110 – Average time taken to determine all applications (in weeks)
- BV111 – Percentage of applicants satisfied with the service received
- BV126a – Burglaries per 1,000 households
- BV113 – School pupil visits to museums
- BV119asl – Satisfaction with sports and leisure facilities – very/fairly satisfied – all
- BV119amg – Satisfaction with museums and galleries – very/fairly satisfied – all
- BV19apos – Satisfaction with parks and open spaces – very/fairly satisfied – all
- BV119wBv3 – Cultural and recreational services – fairly/very satisfied – women

## SECOND QUARTILE

- BV4 – Percentage of complainants satisfied with the handling of their complaint
- BV7 – Percentage of electoral form "A" s returned
- BV8 – Percentage of undisputed invoices paid within 30 days
- BV14 – Early retirements as percentage of total work force
- BV82a(t) – Household waste tonnage recycled
- BV90b – Percentage of people satisfied with recycling facilities
- BV78c – Percentage of renewal claims processed on time
- BV79a – Percentage of cases calculated correctly
- BV79b – Percentage of recoverable overpayments recovered
- BV112 – Score against checklist of best practice
- BV128a – Vehicle crimes per 1,000 population
- BV119atch - Satisfaction with theatres and concert halls – very/fairly satisfied – all
- BV119A bv3 - Cultural and recreational services – fairly/very satisfied – all
- BV119Mbv3 - Cultural and recreational services – fairly/very satisfied – men

## KEY

### **THIRD QUARTILE**

BV5B – Number of complaints to Ombudsman classified as local settlement  
BV6 – Turnout for local elections  
BV11 – Percentage of senior management posts filled by women  
BV13 – Voluntary leavers as percentage of staff  
BV15 – Ill health retirements as percentage of total workforce  
BV82a – Percentage of household waste recycled  
BV78a – Average time for processing new claims – days  
BV78b – Average time for processing change of circumstances – days  
BV106 – Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land

### **BOTTOM QUARTILE**

BV3 – Percentage of citizens satisfied with the overall service provided  
BV9 – Percentage of council tax collected  
BV10 – Percentage of Business Rates collected  
BV12 – proportion of working days lost through sickness  
BV17 – Minority ethnic community staff as percentage of total workforce  
B84 – Kilograms of household waste collected per head  
BV91 – Percent of pop served by kerbside collection or within 1km of recycling centre  
BV77 - Average cost of handling a HB or CTB claim  
BV80(i)a – Percent of respondents satisfied with contact facilities at Benefits Office BV116  
BV116 – Spend on culture and leisure per capita  
BV127a – Violent crimes/robberies



**INTERNAL MEMORANDUM**

---

<b>From:</b> Ian Beckett	<b>Please ask for:</b>	Ian Beckett
<b>To:</b> Peter Stybelski	<b>Extension:</b>	7292
<b>FAO:</b>	<b>E-mail:</b>	
	<b>Your ref:</b>	
	<b>Our ref:</b>	IB/COP015
		08 January 2003

---

**REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

I refer to my report relating to the above, which was forwarded to you last month, and to your subsequent request for information relating to my choice of Performance Indicators.

As noted in the report, the most up-to-date information relating to P.I.s held by CIPFA/IPF was for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2000. It was therefore found necessary to visit the web-site of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister on which a range of P.I.s for Local Authorities was found to be available for the year ending 31st March 2001.

This site contains information relating to 187 P.I.s, but of these 187 the following are not relevant to this Authority :-

- ◆ 29 relating to Education – County function
- ◆ 11 relating to Social Services – ditto
- ◆ 17 relating to Highways – ditto

- ◆ 9 relating to Public Transport – ditto
- ◆ 8 relating to Libraries – ditto
- ◆ 2 relating to Fire and Rescue - ditto
- ◆ 18 relating to Housing – now CHA function

This left a balance of 93 P.I.s which are relevant to District Councils.

The purpose of the exercise was to select a range of P.I.s which would give an overall picture of the "state of health" of the Authority as at the given date (31<sup>st</sup> March 2001), and my final choice of the Indicators related as far as possible to outcomes and achievements.

I also ignored those indicators which were in effect sub-groupings of other Indicators – for example I chose to include Indicator "BV80(i)a" which is "*The percentage of all respondents satisfied with contact facilities at Benefit Office*", but I did not include "BV80(i)s" or "BV80(i)us" as these relate to percentages of successful and unsuccessful claimants.

This left me with a balance of 55 Indicators spread over the 6 areas of activity included in the report, which I considered sufficient to form the overall picture as required by the original brief.

**I Beckett**

Audit Manager