

Meeting: Audit Committee Date: 25 May 2016

Wards Affected: All

Report Title: Performance and Risk

Is the decision a key decision? No

When does the decision need to be implemented? N/A

Supporting Officer Contact Details: Jo Beer, Policy, Performance and Review Manager, joanne.beer@torbay.gov.uk, ext 7894.

1. Proposal and Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to present May's Performance and Risk dashboards (appendix 1) and highlight areas for review, challenge and possible further investigation.
- 1.2 The issues and challenges highlighted below have been identified by the PPR team, the Audit Committee are asked to identify areas which they would like to investigate further at their next meeting.
- 1.3 For areas which have been identified for further investigation and review recovery plans will be sent to the relevant SLT member for completion.

2. Highlight Report

- 2.1 It is important to note that across the performance measures there is variety in the frequency of reporting, time lag and the reporting periods e.g. some data is annual, some is quarterly and some monthly, some report over a two year period, some report for the month while others may report rolling averages or cumulative totals. This is identified against each indicator.
- 2.2 Areas of good performance to note:
 - Total recorded crime was down on the previous year end 8,586 recorded incidents in 2015/16 to 8,988 in 2014/15.
 - Average time for children entering the care system to moving in with an adoptive family is lower than the target set; 390 days against the target of 487.
 - The number of children subject to child protection was at its lowest in March 2016 at 135.
 - Number of permanent care home placements has fluctuated slightly throughout the year, although has remained on target (635 against target of 635).
 - The number of repeat safeguarding referrals for adult safeguarding in the last 12 months is lower than target (4.87% against target of 8%).
 - The proportion of stage 1 complaints dealt with on time has increased to 83%.

Attractive and Safe Place		
Issue / Risk	Challenge	
Risk – ASPR03 Increasing cost of highways improvements and maintenance	If the Asset Management Plan prioritises preventative maintenance and the budget is available then should the risk have reduced and the probability brought down to a possible?	
Risk – ASPR06 Reduction in police funding and possible cost shunt from to the Council	 Do we know how much police budgets are being reduced by? In which case is the risk probability still justifiably a 'likely'? Are there any specific departments were this would have a greater impact? 	
A review of the PIs and Risks for this dashboard has taken place and will be updated for April's report.		
Promoting Healthy Lifestyles		
Issue / Risk	Challenge	
Risk - PHLR01 Pandemic	 What do the emergency plans cover? Do they also cover how the council would function cope with increased staff sickness in such an event? Does the probability of a pandemic change throughout the year, especially if the biggest risk is flu? Should the probability be downgraded in summer months? 	
Prospe	rous Torbay	
Issue / Risk	Challenge	
No issues to raise		
	ng all Children	
Issue / Risk	Challenge	
Previous data which has been published has changed for the following indicators: • Referrals to Children's Safeguarding Service – a significant increase on the figures previously presented, explanation provided is that there was an issue with a scheduled report which produced figures that are considered to be incorrect. • Vacancy rate for social work staff – again the data provided shows an increase on the previous figures, this has been explained as the data has been updated in line with verified data from finance. Smoking status of mothers at time of delivery	 What reassurance is required that the reports and figures produced are correct and are presenting an accurate picture of the demand on children's social care service? In relation to the changes to the vacancy rate for social work staff? Why the delay in verification and how does the discrepancy come about? What influence does the Council have over 	
remains higher than the national value 16.1% compared to 11.4%.	this?How are we working cross council and cross partners to reduce this number?	
Smoking prevalence at age 15 (regular smokers) remains higher than the national value 10.4% compared to 5.5%.	 What influence does the Council have over this? How are we working cross council and cross partners to reduce this number? 	

Risk – PCR01 Increased demand for services. Risk – PCR03 Delivery of TPST and Integrated Care Organisation.	 How will the mitigations reduce demand for services? Are there any factors which could impact on the success of the partnership approach? Is the risk reduced following the mitigation rather than accepted? The description should change to reflect the risk of the not being able to deliver the move to the ICO based on our improvement programme. The mitigation should be updated to reflect an update on what is happening at the ICO working group. In which if we are improving and the ICO working group are involved then is the risk reduced 	
Protecting Vulnerable Adults		
Issue / Risk	Challenge	
No issues to raise		
Running an Efficient Council		
Issue / Risk	Challenge	
Agency staff costs remains significantly higher than target. £2,718,190 cumulative as at January 2016.	What plans are in place to bring this spend down?What monitoring of these plans takes place?	
All risks need to be reviewed and updated	•	

3. Performance and Risk Review

3.1 The performance indicators and risks for the attractive and safe dashboard have recently been reviewed and for 2016/17 the following performance indicators and risks will be presented on the dashboards:

Performance Indicators	Risks
Domestic violence incidents	Increase in Crime – performance to be included in the description including ASB
MARAC Repeat Referrals	Unsustainable funding for Domestic Abuse services
MARAC Referrals	Increased demand on housing services
The percentage of households that experience fuel poverty based on the "Low income, high cost" methodology	Failure to meet statutory thresholds
How long people stay in temporary accommodation	Increasing cost of highways improvements and maintenance
Numbers in Temporary accommodation (monthly)	Cliff and Sea defence failures through storm/ lack of maintenance
Numbers on the housing waiting list	Increasing cost of waste disposal
Number of people statutorily housed	Reduction of Police funding and possible cost shunt to the council

Number of 16 to 18 year olds statutorily housed	Reduction in funding for sport and leisure services
Residual household waste per household	Lack of appropriate and effective business continuity plans in the event of a large scale emergency
Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting (LAA)	
Percentage of municipal waste land filled (LAA)	
NI195 Improved Street and Environmental Cleanliness (needs to be reviewed to bring together four existing indicators)	
Performance of energy from waste plant over threshold of waste sent	

Appendices

Appendix 1: Performance and Risk Dashboards
Appendix 2: Smoking and Breastfeeding Indicators: Local Authority Comparison
Appendix 3: Public Health Framework Indicators – Explanation and Narrative (to Follow)