Buckinghamshire County Council

Head of Legal and Democratic Services Anne Davies, BA (Hons), Solicitor

County Hall · Aylesbury · Buckinghamshire · HP20 1UA

Hays DX97401, Aylesbury 2
www.buckscc.gov.uk

Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for Performance and Resources

Contact	Clive Parker
Direct line	01296 383685
Fax	01296 382538
E-mail	cparker@buckscc.gov.uk
Date	06 December 2007

Dear Members

ADDITIONAL PAPERS FOR THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING ON TUESDAY 11TH DECEMBER

I enclose the following additional papers :-

- Revised version of the Analysis of Medium Term Planning (Heads of Service Perspective

- Excerpt from Corporate Plan refresh 2007 detailing focus for performance priorities 2007/08

- Total Revenue Budget Summary

Yours sincerely

Clive Parker
Democratic Services Manager

Lexcel
PRACTICE MANAGEMENT STANDARD
THE LAW SOCIETY

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Performance and Resources Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Analysis of Medium Term Planning

(Heads of Service Perspective)

Introduction

The Performance and Resources Overview & Scrutiny Committee (P&R OSC) agreed to look at the process involved for the Medium Term Planning (MTP) process. As part of the Scoping document the review attempts to find out if the 06/07 financial settlement delivered the outcomes it set out to achieve and what lessons can be learnt and recommendations made for 07/08 and 08/09

This review will act as a 'check and balance' on current MTFP processes and will make recommendations intended to inform these processes in 07/08 and 08/09.

Heads of Service (HoS) were asked to contribute to this review by providing the Committee with their experiences of the MTP process; this was achieved by the distribution of a proforma. Heads of Service were asked to complete this document to provide the committee with an understanding as to the operational MTP process, highlighting any areas they consider to be good, bad or are indifferent to throughout the MTP process.

The overall response rate from all Services areas was 70%. Three Service Areas did not respond to the questionnaire

The proforma asks all Heads of Service a total of 13 questions focussing on the MTP process. The analysis that follows is a synopsis of the responses received.

1. How do you contribute to the council priorities in the Corporate Plan?

All HoS confirmed that they were clear on how their service contributed to council priorities in the Corporate Plan. Various comments from HoS express the view that

"…Specifically my service area has directly owned targets at 4c (i through to iv) and is a contributor to a number of others…"

"…The current MTP template identifies how each activity contributes towards the Council Plan Priorities/Aims…"

"…Within my service Area B we link the corporate priorities to the service planning for the service area. There are clear links between the Councils aims as defined within Council Aim 4 and our service area…."

"…MTP template indicates the broad connection between the service/activity and the corporate plan…all services contribute to Aim 1 and 2 e.g. delivering equally accessible services…"

2. How do you determine the priorities for your service?

Of the Heads of Service responding it was clear that all recognised priorities within their service area were dependent upon local demographics coupled with consultation with Elected Members, service users and residents of the County.

"…Customer and Member stakeholder feedback is used to help determine priorities"

Comments from Head of Service also included the use of national guidance and links to the Local Area Agreement determining priorities for their service area:

"…We undertake statutory duties in line with the Civil Contingencies Act (2004), Pipeline safety Regulations (1996), Radiation Emergency Preparedness and Public Information Regulations (2001) and the safety at Sports Ground Act (1975) et al…This falls into the Safer, stronger and healthier communities objective…"

From the responses received it would seem that the exercise of setting priorities for the Service Area is not a stand alone task. The use of national guidance, meeting local demand and expectation as well as having regard to County plans and initiatives informs Heads of Service priority setting:

"…By having regard to BCC plans and initiatives & national priorities for external funding bodies."

3. How do you allocate resources to these priorities?

All HoS commented on their services requirement to allocate limited funding across strategic priorities. Some services have greater access to external funding to others which enables a greater degree of flexibility to allocation of their resources. Comments received for HoS stated;

"…Not many resources to allocate – most £ goes on salaries and staff are the critical element to the team…"

"…By having detailed budgets linked to specific activities enables us to calculate the savings that could be made by discontinuing one activity and reallocating to a more pressing need…"

"…Revenue resources are allocated to the works budgets, staff costs and overhead costs for each of the priority activities to enable the Service to deliver upon performance targets set out in the Service Plan… approximately £3.0million of Revenue Grants is received by the Service annually from Government these are allocated to service delivery…"

"… A Programme Resource Allocation Methodology (PRAM) is used. This group meets on a monthly basis and examines new bids for resources that have approved Business cases or have been assessed as a priority item to maintain business as usual…"

4. How do you construct your budget and how do you link it to expected demand for services?

Responses from HoS again varied according to the nature and type of service area. Common themes and concerns emerging were maintaining the same service whilst reducing or justifying current staffing levels, demands of reducing ones budget without a noticeable reduction in service. This might be in accordance with a service level agreements, service user / employee expectation within the Council as well as resident expectations.   This is illustrated by the following comments

"…We look at what staffing we need in which area to fulfil our contract with the xxx…we make an assumption for the pay award & inflation for the 4 months which feature in the later fiscal year…we use our knowledge of what is happening in the national arena to guesstimate what our funding is likely to be and budget based on this until our funding allocation is agreed…we use historical data plus knowledge of new initiatives to predict demand…we decide what it is we need to do differently, what we need to stop doing, etc and adjust the budget accordingly…we are able to look at each area of the service in depth to determine where cuts need to be made, as we budget on an activity basis and we know what each area costs and hence the impact of discontinuing something…"

"…SLAs are adjusted to reflect current demand and available budget each year. Excess demand results in prioritisation of work and delays in non-urgent work…"

"…The budget is set by finance via MTP and we have to perform within our allowance…If services demand more they have to pay for consultancy (fee) as we cannot provide in-house due to lack of capacity…"

There also seemed to be a differing opinion on the type of budget reporting system used (activity vs. zero based budgeting.) One HoS reported using zero based budgeting

"…Each year the budget for the Service Area is constructed following guidance laid down as part of the Medium Term Guidance…the figures are constructed using a zero based budgeting and takes account of the councils corporate plan priorities, and in addition, identifies those areas where additional resources will be required to deliver the

6

based budgeting and takes account of the councils corporate plan priorities, and in addition, identifies those areas where additional resources will be required to deliver the priority outcomes whilst sustaining adequate support for existing systems…"

Whereas another HoS representing another Service Area reported that

"…The budget is created based on historic allocation and spend. We believe there are areas where zero based budgeting would be very useful but currently this is not possible through the MTP process..."

The assumption is that all HoS have an intricate knowledge of the budget process. The Finance service provide one on one support to all HoS ensuring they are competent to complete the annual MTP. There are training sessions facilitated by the Finance service to empower all budget holders with the skills to manage their services budget effectively and with confidence. This was not felt sufficient by one HoS I who stated

"…I have found that other managers know little about the budget so I have planned to set up budget training early next year…"

.

5. During the MTP process, what criteria do you use to determine where to make efficiencies, where to reduce services and where to bid for investment?

Responses from HoS in relation to this question relate to the desire to continue to provide the same services to all internal and external users despite the service experiencing a reduction in budgetary terms. Comments received from HoS suggest

"…Reduce Services – because of limitations on finding efficiencies any budget reductions are being funded by reducing services, less personnel resource to meet demand leading to delays in some work…"

"…My service has a very tight budget with little room for manoeuvre…decisions have been made on the basis of minimising impact to direct delivery…most of the budget is taken up with staffing it is difficult to find other efficiencies. Bids for investment are based on identified need for areas of development…"

"…Efficiency" suggests that the job will be done the same with less money…"

7. Who do you consult?

Consultation was an area that all HoS commented on with a varying degree in terms of whom they consulted throughout the MTP

The table below illustrates Service Area consulting with key partner throughout the MTP

Stakeholder	Consulted	HoS responding according to Service Area
BCC Staff	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓
Service Users	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓
Suppliers	✓ ✓	✓
Govt. Body (i.e. Audit Commission)		✓ ✓
Partners & Stakeholders	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓
Finance	✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
Management Team		✓ ✓ ✓
Strategic Director	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
Elected Members	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓
Cabinet Member	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

7. How do you assess value for money?

The majority of services are making use of the corporate value for money strategy or benchmarking against other comparable authorities. Some services are further advanced with this process, but there appears to be certain tasks that lend themselves easier to this type of process

8. How do you monitor both your performance and your budget?

All services are carefully monitoring performance, through indicators that are checked either on a monthly or quarterly basis. Some services have dedicated performance officers tasked with tracking indicators.

Generally budgets are monitored in the same way, in collaboration with IT. On a monthly basis cost centre managers are providing feedback on spend against profiles to senior managers and finance officers.

9. What processes are in place to identify and manage risks of under/over achievement both of performance and budget?

Officers use the monthly monitoring mechanisms to identify risks and then decisions are made by managers to reallocate or prioritise to stabilise spend. A number of services are maintaining risk registers to identify future potential issues so that plans can be developed to mitigate.

10. In the context of the MTP process, what are the challenges you face and what improvements would you suggest?

A number of service heads commented that the process is too long, complicated and expensive. There were comments around the fact that certain services' budgets were allocated to staffing and therefore MTP process was simply a process for cutting staff. The efficiency savings desired were generally not realised and in real terms there was simply a cut in services provided. A range of responses form HoS

'task of balancing to a cash limit is artificial and unhelpful….better to work from a realistic allocation…and make best use of allocated resources'

'Complexity of process can confuse outcomes'

'MTP favours services who do not offer up reductions'

'Paperwork over complicated and lengthy'

From the responses received 3 HoS have expressed a preference to adopt and use zero based budgeting, with a strategic steer as to what the strategic priorities are so that resources can be allocated to meet them rather than the bidding process to sacrifice services.

Service heads suggested that the process was simplified and shortened, with further clarification provided at the start.

11. What real term growth were you allocated in 2007/8 and what did this deliver against?

Real term growth and its delivery varied according to the Service Area. This question attempted to ascertain if headroom had been applied to other activities within the service. HoS reported the following.

- £1.1million to focus on improved outcomes for local people and improved performance against the targets.

- £2million

- Youth Offending Service: As Per table

- Funding to support High Wycombe library

12. Did you re-allocate any of the headroom against any other activities?

From the responses received to this question an assumption was made that HoS might not fully understand the intention of Headroom. Only one HoS responded to this question by commenting that use of an alternative supplier freed up some of the original headroom to use on other priorities.

For all service areas this information is in the public having been published at the County Council meeting held on the 22nd February 2007.

13. What are the two biggest challenges for your service?

Various comments were received from HoS in terms of the challenges they faced. These included:

• Demography – rising population numbers and rising demand as we are a demand-led service and this is not recognised by the MTP process. (There is a lack of appreciation that the overall level of funding available for us nowadays leaves very little headroom for Members to allocate resources to their priorities rather than mandatory and essential expenditure and in reality our grammar school system and associated transport policy absorbs most of that scope for exercising local priorities.)

• Within my service virtually all of our budget is spent on staffing. The MTP cash limit requires me annually to identify savings in the form of posts to delete which necessarily means identifying a significant proportion of my staff team as potentially expendable. I have the choice of either concealing this from them or each year demoralising a proportion of the work force by allowing them to feel unwanted. This has caused me to lose good individuals. I would like the MTP process to recognise that my service areas is the engine room for identifying and delivering efficiencies for those two major spending departments and the concept of identifying high efficiency levels each year undermines our role.

• Recruitment of care staff.

• To ensure a robust preventative and stay safe service which continues to improve from under-performing in 2003, to performing adequately in 2007 and moving towards a strong and safe performance in the future and that supports improved life chances for our most vulnerable children.

• To maintain sufficient support services for schools in the context of changing funding and a changing role of the Local Authority as a Children's Service authority. This is especially important in the context of a 'floor authority' and our ability to pursue a reasonable Capital programme.

- Surviving as a service grouping with a significant 'low priority' element.

- Long term planning when there is uncertainty of budgets, having to plan year on year

- Time limited grant funding, trying to mainstream services.

- Going though the annual, destabilising challenge/defence of library budgets with short term fixes, which has seen staff morale plummet.

- Getting corporate understanding of the large part that the Service can play in assisting other parts of the organisation meet their targets.

- Budget restrictions make it impossible to carry any kind of contingency plan to meet any in-year demands or to develop new areas of work.

- Recruitment of staff is a major problem because it takes a long time and we are often unsuccessful first time around. This is due to the cost of living and applies to all Home Counties.

- Another huge challenge lies in trying to offer a universal service while targeting specific groups and needs

- Waste, Planning for Waste

- We also have the corporate challenge of BCC carbon footprint.

- Satisfying public demand for all transport services in the context of a reduced capital programme and cash limited revenue budgets and specifically satisfying public demand for road and pavement maintenance work.

- Avoiding reductions or cessation of services to accommodate increasing financial pressures that cannot be met through efficiency savings or increased income.

- Meeting the increasing growth in demand for ICT services from the service areas.

- Managing the increasing risks brought about through security breaches in an environment that is seeking enhanced partnership working, shared services and open government.

- Pathfinder – Service Area M is part of the Support Services Project

- Dealing with increased demands – e.g. GC2C, increased complaints, increased committee support needed without additional funding.

- CPA requirements mean the need for a strategic property management team, if these are to be achieved. If not it is possible we will not be a 4* service / local authority.

- Services need to work with us to determine which can be co-located / delivered differently to provide capacity for capital receipts. Currently Service Area O 'charged' with finding over £100m receipts from portfolios to pay for the waste project and with the Maintenance Backlog of just over £80m the pressures are enormous if these are to be achieved.

Corporate Performance Report: Resources

Aim One

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
CP1.a1 Publish an annual programme of consultation	Bigger is Better	?	Yes	Yes		
CP1.a2 Publish results of consultations on our web site	Bigger is Better	Yes	Yes	Yes		
CP1.b1 Enquiries resolved at first point of contact	Bigger is Better	40.00	67.00	64.72		**Under-performance explanation** This figure is based on 'Completed Calls' data rather than by 'Wrap Code'. Will begin using wrap code data once it becomes totally accurate.
CP1.b2 Residents satisfied with Council performance	Bigger is Better	?	70.00	?		
CP1.e4 Members attendance to all key bodies	Bigger is Better	?	?	?		

Aim Two

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
CP2.a1 Annual Council Tax increase	Smaller is Better	0.97	1.00	0.97		**Milestone progress** The communications group and the finance officers group are implementing the CADEX decision to proceed with council tax leaflets in their current format but incorporating county council data for the next leaflet. There will be further integration and possibly a joint product for the council tax leaflet for 2009/10.
CP2.a2 Set up the publication of a single Council Tax leaflet	Bigger is Better	?	?	100.00		**Estimated data** This is an estimated outturn for the end of year (and also includes schools savings). **Under-performance explanation** Procurement & Commissioning can only support and advise services in making these efficiency savings.
CP2.b1 Secure MTP savings	Bigger is Better	441800.00	8000000.00	2850000.00		**Under-performance explanation** The forecast for delivery of cashable efficiency savings is currently £6.2m against the planned £7.0m from the Medium Term Plan. On that basis, the County Council will achieve its 3 year Gershon Efficiency target. However, the position assumes the £2.0m of procurement efficiencies will be achieved, however, there is a concern over the achievement of £1.5m of the cashable procurement savings. In order to meet its efficiency target, the Council will have to identify alternative efficiency savings that are either cashable or non-cashable within services. A report is due to be presented to COMT/EMT to identify progress and efficiency options.
CP2.b2 Annual savings as per the efficiency statement	Bigger is Better	6800000.00	7021000.00	6261000.00		
CP2.b8 Produce business case for a single 'back office' service	Bigger is Better	?	?	125.00		**Milestone progress** A business case is currently being prepared and is expected to be produced by December for consideration at the February JIB.
CP2.c1 Services represented on web site	Bigger is Better	100.00	100.00	100.00		
CP2.c2 Publish Buckinghamshire Times	Bigger is Better	Yes	Yes	Yes		
CP2.c3 Publications advise on access to alternative formats/languages	Bigger is Better	No	Yes	Yes		**Actions for improvement** Current result includes all publications that involve the Comms. Team. Bucks Times has been produced in large print and audio. All County Council publications will be included next year when central procurement of design and print is enabled.

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
CP4.a1 Equipment delivered within 7 days	Bigger is Better	76.00	86.00	94.00		
CP4.a2 Intensive home care per 1000 65 or over	Bigger is Better	7.67	12.01	8.87		**Under-performance explanation** The Helped to live at home indicators are cumulative and performance will improve throughout the year. This drive to improve performance began at the beginning of April 07 and the first 6 months were used to set up clear frameworks for achieving the target
CP4.a3 Adults physical disability helped to live at home	Bigger is Better	2.20	5.02	2.05		**Under-performance explanation** The Helped to live at home indicators are cumulative and performance will improve throughout the year. This drive to improve performance began at the beginning of April 07 and the first 6 months were used to set up clear frameworks for achieving the target
CP4.a4 Adults learning disabilities helped to live at home	Bigger is Better	1.81	3.10	1.94		**Under-performance explanation** The Helped to live at home indicators are cumulative and performance will improve throughout the year. This drive to improve performance began at the beginning of April 07 and the first 6 months were used to set up clear frameworks for achieving the target
CP4.a5 Adults with mental health problems helped to live at home	Bigger is Better	1.63	3.26	1.89		**Under-performance explanation** The Helped to live at home indicators are cumulative and performance will improve throughout the year. This drive to improve performance began at the beginning of April 07 and the first 6 months were used to set up clear frameworks for achieving the target
CP4.a6 Older people helped to live at home	Bigger is Better	56.20	80.01	43.30		**Under-performance explanation** The Helped to live at home indicators are cumulative and performance will improve throughout the year. This drive to improve performance began at the beginning of April 07 and the first 6 months were used to set up clear frameworks for achieving the target
CP4.b2 Supported accommodation	Bigger is Better	?	40.00	48.00		**Good performance** This measure includes accommodation provided by Home Options, Project Abode and Project Care. This result is from the first phase of Project Care to come on stream, i.e. 48 self contained flats with 24 hour support for people with learning disabilities. T

Aim Four

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Milestone progress / Comments
CP4.b1 Establish Protection of Vulnerable Adults Board	Bigger is Better	125.00	?	125.00	✦	**Milestone progress** — A business planning day was held on 12th October of stakeholders and the Board. The Board is to meet again on the 27th November. Donald MacPhail is taking a lead as Independent Chair. The recruitment of the Safeguarding Manager at the end of August was no
Aim Five					Performance	Comments
CP5.b2 Number of carers receiving support from Carers Bucks	Bigger is Better	5042.00	6000.00	5610.00	✦	
CP5.c2 Elderly people with telephone support	Bigger is Better	297.00	350.00	314.00	▪	**Under-performance explanation** — Telephone Support will be relaunched after In Touch programme has impacted upon performance.
CP5.c3 Older people supported to build networks	Bigger is Better	9.00	12.00	10.00	✦	

19

Corporate Performance Report: Chief Executives

Aim One

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
CP1.a5 Residents who influence decisions	Bigger is Better	?	55.00	?		Annual Data
CP1.b3 Complete a needs assessment	Bigger is Better	?	?	125.00		**Milestone completed** Results have been presented to COMT. Results to be published on N:Drive.
CP1.b4 All service plans relate to needs assessment	Bigger is Better	Yes	Yes	Yes		
CP1.c1 Council makes effective use of partners	Bigger is Better	?	?	?		
CP1.c2 Partnerships are effective	Bigger is Better	?	?	?		
CP1.d1 Status in Comprehensive Performance Assessment	Bigger is Better	3.00	4.00	3.99		**Under-performance explanation** (05/06 Awaiting results of Judicial review) 06/07 Awaiting final results for constituent parts of the assessment, however if Adult Social Care regain 2* then this will no longer have an adverse impact on the overall 4* rating.
CP1.d2 Impact of Overview & Scrutiny recommendations	Bigger is Better	?	47.50	52.00		

Aim Two

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
						Milestone progress 15 member surveys to date identify 11 themes/topics to address - the most popular being Partnership Working, Managing Performance and Community Leadership. Personal development plans have yet to be piloted. A session in January on Neighbourhood Policing and GC2C - Making the Links. A session on performance management will be planned for later in the financial year, led by Bill Chapple and supported by the Policy Team.
CP2.b3 Learning and development needs of elected Members	Bigger is Better	Yes	Yes	Yes		
						Under-performance explanation Without an automatic SAP facility, data collection is very problematic. High turnover and rates of employment of agency staff has lowered statistics significantly in one large Service area.
CP2.b4 Employee appraisals	Bigger is Better	?	95.00	79.58		
CP2.b5 Learning and development days for employees	Bigger is Better	?	4.00	?		
CP2.b6 Eligible recruiting managers or head teachers	Bigger is Better	?	60.00	53.00		
CP2.b7 Carry our performance reviews of all services	Bigger is Better	?	?	125.00		**Milestone progress** Reviews are on track to be completed by March.

Aim Six

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
CP6.c6 No. voluntary and community organisations accessing advice & training	Bigger is Better	?	175.00	472.00		

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
Aim Three (a)						
CP3.a1 No. of schools achieving Healthy Schools Status	Bigger is Better	75.00	140.00	79.00		This was green for national target (from which these figures are derived) for July 2007. Schools work by academic year and therefore will not reflect target until July 2008
CP3.a2 No. of schools with a drug education policy	Bigger is Better	234.00	220.00	238.00		
CP3.a3 No. of Hours Young People in Positive Activities	Bigger is Better	39200.00	19500.00	13131.00		**Under-performance explanation** Although we just missed our summer target, many more returns have been sent to the County Team and we are confident of achieving the end of year target.
CP3.a4 No. of C&YP accessing CAMHS	Bigger is Better	1943.00	2102.00	1153.00		
CP3.a5 Percentage of obese Children under the age of 11	Smaller is Better	11.40	12.10	8.54		data for Sept 07 is provisional as at 19/10/07) awaiting validation by DH. Lesley Manning BPCT this is an average of the two year groups - but will be more accurately reported when numbers obese and number of children measured are used. Awaiting final data from Strategic health authority. Final data now received 19/11 giving absolute numbers hence reduced child obesity rate to 8.54.
CP3.a6 Percentage 5-16yrs with 2+ hours of Physical Education	Bigger is Better	81.00	85.00	87.38		
CP3.a7 % Disabled YP with good quality Transition Plans	Bigger is Better	50.00	100.00	100.00		

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
Aim 5						
CP5.a1 Looked after children who have permanency plans	Bigger is Better	100.00	95.00	95.00		
CP5.a2 Initial assessments complete within 7 days	Bigger is Better	58.00	61.00	46.50		**Under-performance explanation** Two specific areas of work are underway to enable a more complete analysis of assessments which will ensure more accurate reporting. One requirement is that all assessments begun are properly integrated into Protocol. A second key area is to ensure that all workflow tasks are
CP5.a3 Re-registrations on child protection register	Plan is Best	14.70	12.35	12.50		
CP5.a4 LAC fostered by friends or relatives	Bigger is Better	15.79	14.00	12.84		**Under-performance explanation** Of those children placed in foster care performance of placing LAC with relatives and friends is very good but because we have high numbers of LAC placed with parents
CP5.b1 Carers of children supported by respite breaks	Bigger is Better	?	?	?		

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Aim Three (c) Latest Result	Performance	Comments
CP3.c01 Percentage of pupils achieving 5+ GCSE's: grades A*- C	Bigger is Better	68.60	70.20	69.00		**Good performance** Although we have not met our target, our result is top of statistical neighbours and of all shire counties. **Provisional data** Final results will be known when school performance tables are published. **Under-performance explanation**
CP3.c03 Percentage of Pupils achieving Level 4 at Key Stage 2 – Maths	Bigger is Better	80.00	86.00	82.00		This is an aspirational target imposed by the DCSF. Results are up 2% on last year which is a greater increase than national. Against our (new) statistical neighbours our position has improved to joint 2nd this year. **Provisional data**
CP3.c04 Percentage of Pupils achieving Level 4 at Key Stage 2 – English	Bigger is Better	84.00	?	86.00		Final results will be known when school performance tables are published. **Provisional data**
CP3.c05 Percentage of Schools below DFES Floor Targets (KS2)	Smaller is Better	11.00	10.00	9.50		Final results will be known when school performance tables are published. **Provisional data**
CP3.c06 Percentage of Schools below DFES Floor Targets (KS4)	Smaller is Better	3.00	3.00	3.00		Final results will be known when school performance tables are published. **Provisional data**
CP3.c07 Percentage of Pupils in achieving Level 4+ English	Bigger is Better	68.60	72.40	71.80		English might increase to 72%
CP3.c08 Percentage of Pupils achieving Level 4+ Maths	Bigger is Better	62.50	62.50	68.50		
CP3.c09 Percentage of 3 Yr Olds with access to early education	Bigger is Better	100.00	100.00	100.00		**Under-performance explanation**
CP3.c10a Ensure special school provision - external placements	Smaller is Better	?	6.80	7.34		There has been a significant reduction in the overall number of statements (2%) and therefore the increase in the percentage of external placements is in line with this. **Under-performance explanation**
CP3.c10b Ensure special school provision - mainstream schools	Bigger is Better	?	51.00	50.00		There has been a significant reduction in the overall number of statements (2%) and therefore the increase in the percentage of external placements is in line with this.

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Aim Three Latest Result	Performance	Comments
CP3.d1 Number of Children's Centres	Bigger is Better	9.00	24.00	14.00		
CP3.d2 Number of Schools offering extended services	Bigger is Better	84.00	160.00	160.00		**Under-performance explanation** Children with Statements of SEN are more difficult to place. Also, from September the criteria for placing children has been reduced from the 16th day to the 6th. This will consequently affect the average number of hours of tuition received the longer a child takes to place beyond the 6th day.
CP3.d3 Percentage of excluded children receiving 21+hrs alt. tuition	Bigger is Better	65.00	100.00	70.70		**Under-performance explanation** We have recently re-launched this scheme and hope to attract more providers. We are confident of achieving the end of year target.
CP3.d4 No. of Childcare providers in Bucks Q.A.S	Bigger is Better	63.00	80.00	63.00		
CP3.d5 Number of Members of Young People's Participation Network	Bigger is Better	?	250.00	409.00		**NEET Performance** NEET Performance has significant annual trends. The NEET target can only be measured in quarter 3 (December). All other quarters must be compared to previous years performance to gauge progress. NEET in September 2006
CP3.e1 Percentage of 16-19yrs who are Not in Education, Employment or Training	Smaller is Better	3.40	3.40	5.70		
CP3.b1 Reviews of child protection cases	Bigger is Better	100.00	100.00	100.00		**Under-performance explanation** 'How well does your school deal with bullying' is a new question in the schools Hands Up survey and when setting the target for this we had no baseline data. Although we are well under our target, the average national result for this question is 57%.
CP3.b3 Schools deal well with bullying	Bigger is Better	?	80.00	58.00		
CP3.b4 % multi-agency action plans in place/audited	Bigger is Better	100.00	?	100.00		

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
Aim One						
CP1.a3 Voting in UK Youth Parliament elections	Bigger is Better	14016.00	11000.00	?		Annual Data
CP1.a4 Young people involved in Youth Councils	Bigger is Better	69.00	65.00	64.00		**Youth councils** Recruiting is continuing to each of the district youth cabinets. Many (5) of the area youth councils are still not up and running but managers are aware and are working to re-launch them.
CP1.b5 Complete project plan for increasing number of Information Points	Bigger is Better	?	?	125.00		**Milestone progress** The Local Access Officer is in place (Charlotte Watts), and we have agreed the final version of the Local Access Strategy, which Dean will be presenting to COMT on 31 October. Setting up 15 Customer Access Points is given as a target for the next 12 months from October 2007.
Aim Four						
CP4.c1 Adults obtaining Qual. care and retail sectors	Bigger is Better	301.00	1000.00	118.00		**Level 2 skills** Performance against this target is still well below target. The main issue is that students are taking longer than anticipated to complete their NVQ awards. There are a further 246 currently on programme from 2006/7 who have yet to complete. A further 400 are being recruited. the risk factor is how many of these will complete before July 2008.
CP4.c2 Adults obtaining Qual. in literacy and numeracy	Bigger is Better	1174.00	1500.00	1707.00		**October report** We are still waiting for some results to come in for academic year 2006/7 but with 469 positive results in to date the overall accumulative target of 1500 has now been reached
CP4.c3 People receiving 'at home' library service	Bigger is Better	14.00	16.00	15.45		**Under-performance explanation** Adult Social Care have made BVPI 54 a priority for their service and the number of people being supported by them has now increased from 2,896 in 2005 to 3,202 in Sep 2007. The Home Library Service operates in partnership with the WRVS and their volunteers work directly with people in their homes. Despite consistently increasing the number of people that it serves (376 in 2005 to 476 in Sep 2007), it is now finding it difficult to keep pace with Adult Social Care on its existing resources. How this service will continue to be delivered in the future will now need to be reviewed.
CP4.c4 Online access to Libraries Information Service	Bigger is Better	23586.00	30000.00	21671.00		

24

Corporate Performance Report: Community Services

Aim Six

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
CP6.a1 Number of domestic burglaries	Smaller is Better	2326.00	2508.00	1066.00		
CP6.a2 Reporting of domestic violence	Bigger is Better	2893.00	2138.00	1379.00		**Under-performance explanation** The PSA board has funded Police operations targeting repeat offenders. Whilst seen as positive by both the police and those visited, it did not affect the statistics. A short evaluation is currently being undertaken on the operation, before any further funding is given. Work is continuing around both PSA targets including running a domestic abuse publicity campaign from Nov – Feb 2008 that will target repeat offenders as well as encouraging victims to report incidents, and providing support to programmes for victims (The Freedom Programme) and perpetrators (Turning Point) of domestic abuse It should be noted that 33a and 33b are very difficult to achieve together, by the very nature of domestic abuse, to increase reporting will often mean that recorded repeat incidents also increase.
CP6.a3 Percentage of domestic violence incidents which are repeat offences	Smaller is Better	23.79	20.33	25.63		
CP6.a4 Incidents of antisocial behaviour	Smaller is Better	?	?	?		
CP6.a5 Percentage of people who feel informed about tackling antisocial behaviour	Bigger is Better	?	?	?		Annual Data
CP6.a6 Number of 'no cold calling zones'	Bigger is Better	323.00	400.00	370.00		
CP6.b3 Percentage of residents who feel safe or fairly safe outside during the day	Bigger is Better	86.00	86.00	86.00		Annual Data
CP6.b4 Percentage of residents who feel safe or fairly safe outside in the dark	Bigger is Better	53.00	47.00	53.00		Annual Data

CP6.c1 Equality Standard Level	Bigger is Better	2.00	3.00	2.00	**Good performance**
CP6.c3 Number of intergenerational projects	Bigger is Better	?	?	3.00	Staff have worked with young people through out the summer break. They have worked with the older generation on different projects. One residential has taken place and another is at this moment taking place in Germany completes on Friday. All day trips to promote understanding of the sacrifice made during WW2 and to start looking at partition have been completed. A new DVD has been made to visually track the progression of young people and will be available as soon as possible.
CP6.c4 Percentage of people who feel treated with respect and consideration	Bigger is Better	?	?	?	Annual Data
CP6.c5 Percentage of people who feel their local area is a place where people get on	Bigger is Better	?	66.00	?	Annual Data

Corporate Performance Plan: Planning and Environment

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
Aim One						
CP1.e1 Planning priorities of the Council	Bigger is Better	?	?	125.00		
CP1.e2 Maintain a costed assessment of infrastructure	Bigger is Better	?	?	125.00		
CP1.e3 Capital programme delivered by external funding	Bigger is Better	?	1250000.00	2272615.00		
Aim Two						
*CP6.b1 Reduce fly-tipping	Smaller is Better	239.00	250.00	218.35		**Confirmed data**
CP6.d1 Number of people engaged in health walks	Bigger is Better	499.00	542.00	436.00		Database data improved in first 6 months of BCC ownership, and highlighted that previous data was overestimated. Q2 data now considered accurate and calculated accurately from new database software
Aim Seven						
CP7.a1 Number of businesses moved up the e-adoption ladder	Bigger is Better	130.00	50.00	10.00		**Under-performance explanation** There has been a lack of marketing due to a member of staff leaving the team, hence the reduction in numbers. At the moment a service level agreement is being developed with Bucks Enterprise, who will be helping to deliver the project. Projected outcome for end of year is 50
*CP7.a2 Exceed minimum level matched funding where maximum SEEDA grant secured - Market Town Initv	Bigger is Better	279309.00	288000.00	429423.00		
*CP7.a3 No. of pre-start and start-up businesses receiving assistance from Bus. Link	Bigger is Better	1649.00	412.50	823.00		
*CP7.b1 Percentage of household waste that is recycled and composted in the County	Bigger is Better	40.00	39.00	42.00		
*CP7.b2 % Waste Landfilled	Smaller is Better	59.96	61.00	58.00		
CP7.b4 Number of country park visitors	Bigger is Better	3983650.00	534000.00	302798.00		
CP7.b5 Resist loss to Green Belt	Smaller is Better	0.00	0.00	0.00		
CP7.b6 Resist development in AONB	Smaller is Better	0.00	0.00	0.00		
*CP7.b8 % New homes build on previously developed land	Bigger is Better	60.00	60.00	80.00		
*CP7.c5 Rights of way that are easy to use	Bigger is Better	73.90	78.00	79.00		

Corporate Performance Plan: Transportation

	Tolerance	Result 2006/07	Target 2007/08	Latest Result	Performance	Comments
Aim Four						
CP4.c6 Households within 800m of bus/train	Bigger is Better	81.60	82.00	?		
CP4.c7 Set up single concessionary fare scheme	Bigger is Better	?	?	125.00		
Aim Seven						
CP7.c1 Number of passengers on the urban bus network	Bigger is Better	4833070.00	4879168.00	?		Still awaiting data from Arriva
CP7.c2 Number of passengers on the inter-urban bus networks	Bigger is Better	5002868.00	5304225.00	?		Still awaiting data from Arriva
CP7.c3 Principal roads maintenance	Smaller is Better	8.00	8.00	?		Annual figures available at year-end
CP7.c4 Condition of surface footway	Smaller is Better	33.00	25.00	?		Annual figures available at year-end
CP7.c6 Journey time reliability	Bigger is Better	0.00	?	?		Survey planned Feb 2008

Appendix 3

Total Revenue Budget - Summary

15/02/07

		2006/07 £'000	Committed Exp	Other Com Exp	Efficiency savings	Increased income	Service reductions	Investment Proposals	2007/08 £'000	Difference £'000	Difference %
Leader	Chief Executive Team	**2,845**	**73**	**93**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**183**	**3,194**	**349**	**12.27**
Deputy Leader	Democratic Representation	1,477	29	0	-11	-2	-3	0	1,490	13	0.88
	Economic Development	420	16	5	0	-17	-4	95	515	95	22.62
		1,897	**45**	**5**	**-11**	**-19**	**-7**	**95**	**2,005**	**108**	**5.69**
Adult Social Care	Learning Disabilities	22,545	722	267	-312	-119	-399	2,434	25,138	2,593	11.50
	AWA MH	6,106	176	29	-50	-79	-157	212	6,237	131	2.15
	Phy & Sen Dis Services	10,991	285	309	-183	-139	-375	1,950	12,838	1,847	16.80
	Older People	32,388	972	344	-1,436	-55	0	1,506	33,719	1,331	4.11
	Older People - MH	7,478	202	17	-132	0	0	7	7,572	94	1.26
	Commissioning	1,400	38	13	0	-24	-27	0	1,400	0	0.00
	PPI	1,217	31	17	-48	0	0	0	1,217	0	0.00
		82,125	**2,426**	**996**	**-2,161**	**-416**	**-958**	**6,109**	**88,121**	**5,996**	**7.30**
Children's Services	Social Care for C & F	22,411	737	161	-256	0	0	2,000	25,053	2,642	11.79
	PPP (Non DSG)	1,710	39	-53	-39	0	0	0	1,657	-53	-3.10
	School Improvement (Non DSG)	5,580	146	204	-60	-182	-220	112	5,580	0	0.00
	Home to School Transport	16,703	533	1,832	-575	-134	0	60	18,419	1,716	10.27
	YOS	658	15	6	0	0	-21	0	658	0	0.00
	PPCP	4,813	138	37	0	0	0	200	5,188	375	7.79
	Special Education Services	3,115	82	39	-27	-14	-80	0	3,115	0	0.00
	Safeguarding Board	100	2	0	0	0	0	40	142	42	42.00
		55,090	**1,692**	**2,226**	**-957**	**-330**	**-321**	**2,412**	**59,812**	**4,722**	**8.57**
Community Services	Culture and Learning	7,831	287	402	-125	-26	-438	127	8,058	227	2.90
	Youth & Community	3,308	87	59	-6	-134	-6	0	3,308	0	0.00
	Public Protection	2,843	74	124	-21	-5	-46	100	3,069	226	7.95
	Environment	1,616	54	83	-4	-45	-7	0	1,697	81	5.01
		15,598	**502**	**668**	**-156**	**-210**	**-497**	**227**	**16,132**	**534**	**3.42**
Resources	Legal & Democratic	855	23	0	0	0	-23	0	855	0	0.00
	Cust Servs and Comms	2,132	43	38	-4	-21	-56	0	2,132	0	0.00
	Commissioning & Procurement	229	18	9	-24	0	-3	110	339	110	48.03
	Finance	7,405	181	182	-133	-63	-269	102	7,405	0	0.00
	ICT	4,730	149	65	-26	-52	-136	603	5,333	603	12.75
	Property Services	5,378	316	46	-296	0	-36	120	5,528	150	2.79
	HR/OD	2,974	81	213	-90	-90	-152	507	3,443	469	15.77
		23,703	**811**	**553**	**-573**	**-226**	**-675**	**1,442**	**25,035**	**1,332**	**5.62**
Planning & Waste	Planning	1,434	47	84	-70	-16	0	0	1,479	45	3.14
	Waste	12,522	218	756	-502	-58	-5	0	12,931	409	3.27
	Waste Invest to Save	0	0	0	0	0	0	1192	1,192	1,192	11.79
		13,956	**265**	**840**	**-572**	**-74**	**-5**	**1,192**	**15,602**	**1,646**	**11.79**
Transportation		**19,023**	**840**	**370**	**-547**	**-615**	**0**	**200**	**19,271**	**248**	**1.30**
Improvement Programme	GC2C	276	16	5	0	0	-21	455	731	455	164.86
	Transformation	0	0	0	-44	0	0	2,000	1,956	1,956	
	Customer First	0	0	0	0	0	0	569	569	569	
	Procurement Efficiencies	0	0	0	-2,000	0	0	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	
		276	**16**	**5**	**-2,044**	**0**	**-21**	**3,024**	**1,256**	**980**	**355.07**
Below The Line		**24,905**	**-37**	**0**	**0**	**-1,000**	**0**	**0**	**23,868**	**-1,037**	**-4.16**

Total Revenue Budget	239,418	6,633	5,756	-7,021	-2,890	-2,484	14,884	254,296	14,878	6.21

Total Revenue Budget - Summary

		2007/08 £'000	Committed Exp	Other Com Exp	Efficiency savings	Increased income	Service reductions	Investment Proposals	2008/09 £'000
Leader	Chief Executive Team	3,194	73	17	0	0	-69	-150	3,065
Deputy Leader	Democratic Representation	1,490	30		-3	0	-3	0	1,514
	Economic Development	515	1	7	-5	-20	17	-60	455
		2,005	**31**	**7**	**-8**	**-20**	**14**	**-60**	**1,969**
Adult Social Care	Learning Disabilities	25,138	680	38	-150	0	0	1,681	27,387
	AWA MH	6,237	168	30	-50	-39	0	191	6,537
	Phy & Sen Dis Services	12,838	287		-160	0	0	615	13,580
	Older People	33,719	977		-341	0	0	51	34,406
	Older People - MH	7,572	211	17	-211	0	0	7	7,596
	Commissioning	1,400	40	21	0	0	-61	0	1,400
	PPI	1,217	31	17	-48	0	0	0	1,217
		88,121	**2,394**	**123**	**-960**	**-39**	**-61**	**2,545**	**92,123**
Children's Services	Social Care for C & F	25,053	563	161	-193	0	0	1,000	26,584
	PPP (Non DSG)	1,657	40		-40	0	0	0	1,657
	School Improvement (Non DSG)	5,580	146	134	0	-37	-243	0	5,580
	Home to School Transport	18,419	552	16	-1,302	-97	0	15	17,603
	YOS	658	16	6	0	0	-22	0	658
	PPCP	5,188	140	37	0	0	0	0	5,365
	Special Education Services	3,115	83	39	0	0	-122	0	3,115
	Safeguarding Board	142	2		0	0	0	0	144
		59,812	**1,542**	**393**	**-1,535**	**-134**	**-387**	**1,015**	**60,706**
Community Services	Culture and Learning	8,058	238	118	-142	-8	-256	357	8,365
	Youth & Community	3,308	87	59	0	-50	-96	0	3,308
	Public Protection	3,069	72	93	-10	-5	-96	0	3,123
	Environment	1,697	67	27	0	-25	-27	0	1,739
		16,132	**464**	**297**	**-152**	**-88**	**-475**	**357**	**16,535**
Resources	Legal & Democratic	855	22	0	0	0	-22	0	855
	Cust Servs and Comms	2,132	43	38	-5	-20	-56	0	2,132
	Commissioning & Procurement	339	8	9	0	0	-17	0	339
	Finance	7,405	181	158	-28	20	-331	0	7,405
	ICT	5,333	149	65	0	-34	-180	83	5,416
	Property Services	5,528	121	14	-135	0	0	0	5,528
	HR/OD	3,443	82	46	-79	0	-48	0	3,444
		25,035	**606**	**330**	**-247**	**-34**	**-654**	**83**	**25,119**
Planning & Waste	Planning	1,479	43	45	-29	-16	-100	100	1,522
	Waste	12,931	77	156	-255	-8	0	10	12,911
	Waste Invest to Save	1,192	141	0	0	0	0	1292	2,625
		15,602	**261**	**201**	**-284**	**-24**	**-100**	**1,402**	**17,058**
Transportation		19,271	1,696	654	-660	-1,027	0	-610	19,324
Improvement Programme	GC2C	731	9	6	0	0	0	244	976
	Transformation	1,956	0	0	-44	0	0	-100	1,812
	Customer First	569	0	0	0	0	0	500	1,069
	Procurement Efficiencies	-2,000	0	0	-2,000	0	0	0	-4,000
		1,256	**9**	**6**	**-2,044**	**0**	**-14**	**644**	**-143**
Below The Line		23,868	85	0	0	0	0	0	23,953

Total Revenue Budget

254,296	7,161	2,028	-5,890	-1,366	-1,746	5,226	259,709

Total Revenue Budget - Summary

		2008/09 £'000	Committed Exp	Other Com Exp	Efficiency savings	Increased income	Service reductions	Investment Proposals	2009/10 £'000	Red'n FTE
Leader	Chief Executive Team	**3,065**	**73**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**-61**	**0**	**3,094**	**-1**
Deputy Leader	Democratic Representation	1,514	30	0	-3	0	-3	0	1,538	0
	Economic Development	455	5	5	0	-5	-5	0	455	1
		1,969	**35**	**5**	**-3**	**-5**	**-8**	**0**	**1,993**	**1**
Adult Social Care	Learning Disabilities	27,387	723	38	0	0	0	1,632	29,780	-10.7
	AWA MH	6,537	176	31	-100	0	0	74	6,718	-7.2
	Phy & Sen Dis Services	13,580	298	0	-159	0	0	615	14,334	-4.5
	Older People	34,406	1,029	0	-476	0	0	51	35,010	-5
	Older People - MH	7,596	223	17	-224	0	0	8	7,620	-0.2
	Commissioning	1,400	40	21	0	0	-61	0	1,400	-4.18
	PPI	1,217	32	17	-44	0	-5	0	1,217	-4
		92,123	**2,521**	**124**	**-1,003**	**0**	**-66**	**2,380**	**96,079**	**-36**
Children's Services	Social Care for C & F	26,584	576	161	0	0	0	1,000	28,321	0
	PPP (Non DSG)	1,657	40	0	-40	0	0	0	1,657	-1.6
	School Improvement (Non DSG)	5,580	146	0	0	-37	-109	0	5,580	0
	Home to School Transport	17,603	569	0	-1,133	-85	0	15	16,969	0
	YOS	658	16	6	0	0	-22	0	658	0
	PPCP	5,365	143	37	0	0	0	0	5,545	0
	Special Education Services	3,115	86	39	0	0	-125	0	3,115	-2.5
	Safeguarding Board	144	2	0	0	0	0	0	146	0
		60,706	**1,578**	**243**	**-1,173**	**-122**	**-256**	**1,015**	**61,991**	**-4**
Community Services	Culture and Learning	8,365	259	115	-51	-8	-315	0	8,365	-1.5
	Youth & Community	3,308	87	59	0	0	-146	0	3,308	-6
	Public Protection	3,123	72	2	0	-5	0	0	3,192	-0.6
	Environment	1,739	61	25	0	-19	-28	0	1,778	-1
		16,535	**479**	**201**	**-51**	**-32**	**-489**	**0**	**16,643**	**-9**
Resources	Legal & Democratic	855	22	0	0	0	-22	0	855	0
	Cust Servs and Comms	2,132	43	38	-5	-20	-56	0	2,132	-4.8
	Commissioning & Procurement	339	8	9	0	0	-17	0	339	-1
	Finance	7,405	181	82	0	-16	-247	0	7,405	-20
	ICT	5,416	149	65	0	-34	-180	20	5,436	-5.3
	Property Services	5,528	121	14	-135	0	0	0	5,528	-15
	HR/OD	3,444	82	46	0	0	-127	0	3,445	-8.1
		25,119	**606**	**254**	**-140**	**-70**	**-649**	**20**	**25,140**	**-54**
Planning & Waste	Planning	1,522	45	55	-38	-19	-12	0	1,553	0
	Waste	12,911	77	-233	-544	-8	0	0	12,203	0
	Waste Invest to Save	2,625	141	0	0	0	0	1,665	4,431	0
		17,058	**263**	**-178**	**-582**	**-27**	**-12**	**1,665**	**18,187**	**0**
Transportation		**19,324**	**745**	**986**	**-50**	**-246**	**-1,435**	**0**	**19,324**	**-13.5**
Improvement Programme	GC2C	976	9	5	0	0	-14	69	1,045	12.7
	Transformation	1,812	0	0	-3,000	0	0	-1,872	-3,060	-5.3
	Customer First	1,069	0	0	0	0	0	500	1,569	0
	Procurement Efficiencies	-4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	-4,000	0
		-143	**9**	**5**	**-3,000**	**0**	**-14**	**-1,303**	**-4,446**	**7**
Below The Line		**23,953**	**-310**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**23,643**	**0**

Total Revenue Budget

| 259,709 | 5,999 | 1,657 | -6,002 | -502 | -2,990 | 3,777 | 261,648 | -109.28 |