

MEETING:	Board
DATE:	4 August 2010
TITLE OF REPORT:	Overview of current cumulative performance to the end of June 2010 (Quarter 1)
ACTION REQUIRED:	Decision
FINAL DECISION TAKING BODY:	Board
CLASSIFICATION:	Public
RECOMMENDATION(S):	Board Directors are recommended to note the current performance and the rectification methods in operation where this has fallen significantly off target.
REPORT AUTHOR AND CONTACT DETAILS:	Name: Andy Williams Title: Performance Manager Telephone: (01709) 822270 Email: andy.williams@2010rotherham.org
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:	<p>The purpose of this report is to give an overview of the current performance of 2010 Rotherham Ltd against monthly Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for June 2010 (Quarter 1).</p> <p>A number of these indicators have been adopted as a result of a consultation process carried out by HouseMark to produce a balanced scorecard of performance indicators.</p>
<u>IMPLICATIONS:</u>	
CONSULTATION:	Any changes to policies and practices need to demonstrate that there has been an appropriate level of customer consultation. Performance information is provided to customers at service improvement groups, when developing the 'Local Offers' and on our website.
ENVIRONMENTAL:	Effective management of empty homes and repairs can support the achievement of sustainable communities and contribute to reductions in crime and disorder.
EQUALITIES/DIVERSITY:	These performance results are compared with the targets previously agreed by 2010 Board, taking into account the diversity of customers within the

Borough.

HM 12 - the percentage of customers on whom the landlord has diversity information – The target for this indicator was reduced towards the end of the previous year following undertaking comparisons with 3 star ALMOs. Advice has also been taken from HQN (Housing Quality Network) and our level of customer knowledge held is deemed to be quite high.

It is a requirement for the organisation to utilise the information to reshape services in consultation with customer groups to ensure that services are being delivered fairly to the full spectrum of customers. Service managers are encouraged and assisted to compare performance across the diversity strands to identify variances and take remedial action to ensure equality of provision.

FINANCE AND VFM:

Several of the key performance indicators relate directly to the financial health of the company (e.g. Housing Income and Empty Homes Management).

HEALTH & SAFETY:

HM 23, Gas Safety certificates outstanding, relates to the extent to which those homes requiring a gas safety certificate have a valid certificate. Any certificates that expire are a breach of the Gas Safety (Installation and Use) Regulations 1998 and it not only places our customers at risk but could lead to action being taken against the company.

LEGAL:

The Memorandum & Articles of Association govern the conduct of the Company. The management agreement with RMBC sets out 2010's responsibilities regarding monitoring and reporting of performance. Legal implications could arise if 2010 fails to deliver on its contractual obligations to customers or where, for example, it is in breach of health and safety legislation, including the requirement for properties to have a valid CP12.

PERSONNEL:

All officers within the company have personal development plans and these contain individual targets that contribute to the overall performance of the company.

RISK:

KPIs are closely monitored and action plans are discussed with lead managers who are responsible for minimising risk.

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with an overview of performance against key performance indicators.

Background

The previous report submitted to this Board (23 June 2010) highlighted cumulative performance to the end of May 2010.

This report presents and summarises the cumulative performance to the end of June 2010 (1st Quarter) and now that quartile figures are available from HouseMark for 2009/10, compares year end performance against that quartile data.

Performance Against Indicators

The table below shows previously reported performance across 2010's KPIs for the year 2009/10 and compares it to the HouseMark quartile data, cumulative performance to the end of June 2010 (1st Quarter) and the targets for 2010/11. Further details about each indicator are given in the section following the table. Monthly performance figures are shown in Appendix A.

HouseMark Ref.	Description	2009/10 outturn	Quartile Position	Apr-Jun 2010 1 st Quarter	Monthly Control Target	2010/11 Target
12	% of customers on whom the landlord has diversity information	87.82%	Not Available	86.73%		88.00%
13	% of total repairs completed within target	87.03%	Lower	90.88%		92.00%
18	% of responsive repairs where an appointment was made and kept	87.85%	Lower	89.69%		95.00%
19	Tenants' satisfaction with the repairs service	93.93%	Upper	96.49%		90.00%
21	% of repairs completed right first time	99.30%	Upper	99.18%		88.00%
23	Gas safety certificates outstanding	0.58%	Lower	0.39% ¹		0.00%
26	% of non decent homes	6.29%	Upper Middle	4.10%	4.16%	0.00%
28	Average SAP rating	71.00	Upper Middle	72.01	71.25	72.00 (71.16)

KEY	On target	Off target by <5%	Off target by >5%
-----	-----------	-------------------	-------------------

¹ This indicator has a target set of 0.00% with a 0.40% tolerance level and therefore as it is within that level it is shown as on target.

HouseMark Ref.	Description	2009/10	Quartile Position	Apr-Jun 2010 1 st quarter	Monthly Control Target	2010/11 Target
32	% satisfied with the out come of their ASB complaint	78.89%	Upper Middle	80.22%		81.00%
33	% of ASB cases resolved	87.97%	Upper Middle	90.82%		90.00%
34	Average re let times (days)	18.35	Upper	26.53	29.00	23.00
36	Rent collected as a percentage of rent owed	99.53%	Upper	94.45%	93.85%	99.12%
38	Rent arrears of current social housing tenants as a percentage of rent debit	1.71%	Upper Middle	1.98%	2.15%	1.74%
46	% of new tenants satisfied with the allocation & lettings process	97.07%	Upper	98.40%		97.25%
50	% of leaseholders satisfied with landlord services	58.00%	Middle	Not available		65.00%
55	% of empty property rent loss	1.64%	Lower Middle	1.20%	1.35%	1.20%
59	Average Number of working days lost due to sickness absence	12.18	Lower	3.02	2.44	11.50

KEY	On target	Off target by <5%	Off target by >5%
-----	-----------	-------------------	-------------------

The paragraphs below report performance by exception, i.e. for those indicators that were off target at the end of the June 2010 (1st Quarter).

☹ HouseMark Ref 12: % of customers on whom the landlord has diversity information

The overall position is that to the end of June 2010 we had received responses to our diversity questionnaires from 22,190 customers. There are currently 25,585 customers within tenanted premises. The global knowledge value is therefore 86.73% against the collection target of 88%. The Board will recall the latter target value was adjusted downwards following benchmarking of the indicator with 3 star excellent providers.

A comprehensive report has been provided by the IT team and this is being used by customer service assistants (CSAs) to contact customers whose profiling information is not currently known. This information is also broken down by area. The preparation of the new TSA (Tenant Services Authority) 'Local Offers' will also

require 2010 to demonstrate that the company has employed its knowledge of customer groups in proposing and agreeing those standards.

Additionally, this indicator reports against 6 strands of diversity information. Individual targets have been set against each strand with the results to the end of June 2010 as follows:

Strand	Target 2010/11	June 2010 Cumulative
Gender	100.00%	100.00%
Ethnicity	95.50%	95.24%
Disability	83.00%	80.41%
Age	97.50%	97.18%
Sexuality	50.00%	42.99%
Faith	60.00%	41.60%

As can be seen from the table above 2 out of the 6 strands, Sexuality and Faith, have yet to reach their respective new year end target values. It is anticipated that the annual target will be reached.

This indicator did not achieve the revised target set of 88% but is anticipated to achieve the year end target.

 **HouseMark Ref 13: % of total repairs completed within target**

The month of June saw a total of 5,148 completed repairs of which 4,781 were completed on time, giving a performance of 92.87% for the month, an improvement on the May 2010 value of 90.45%.

Cumulatively there have been 16,411 repairs completed in the quarter of which 14,914 were completed within target, giving a running total of 90.88%. This indicator has not achieved the target of 92.00%.

As was previously reported to this Board, a series of performance clinics have recently been held during which a series of issues impacting on the performance of this indicator were identified and formed part of an IHSP action plan. Work has taken place within the IHSP to identify old and duplicate jobs and to target individual operative performance where it is identified as below standard. It is anticipated that the work of the performance clinic will continue to have a beneficial impact upon this indicator and the trend of progress to date, if maintained, will result in the target being achieved.

This indicator did not achieve the target of 92%.

 **HouseMark Ref 18: % of responsive repairs where an appointment was made and kept**

Performance for the month of June saw a total of 3,134 appointments made, of which 2,898 were kept, giving a performance of 92.47%. This was a significant

improvement when compared to May's out turn of 88.06%, however, this did not achieve the monthly profiled target of 95.00%.

By the end of June, a total of 9,408 appointments were made, of which 8,438 were kept, giving a cumulative out turn of 88.69%. This did not achieve the profiled cumulative target of 95.00%.

This indicator was also discussed in the recent performance clinics (see comments above). The details of the IHSP action plan will be shared with the Finance and Asset Management Committee and future performance will be monitored against the agreed action plan.


This indicator did not achieve the target of 95.00%.

 **HouseMark Ref 32: % satisfied with the out come of their ASB complaint**

The month of June saw a total of 15 surveys returned with 14 satisfied with the outcome of their ASB complaint. This gave a performance for the month of 93.33% which saw cumulative performance increase to 80.22% compared to May's cumulative of 77.63%. The indicator remains just outside the 81.00% target set.

Actions taken to improve performance in June included the ASB service improvement group approving revised acknowledgement letters and the recommencement of telephone surveys. These and other ongoing actions will ensure the indicator achieves the 81% target set.

This indicator did not achieve the target of 81.00%.

 **HouseMark Ref 59: Average number of working days lost due to sickness per employee.**

Performance for the month of June saw the average number of employees fall for the 3rd month in a row to 558 and the number of working days lost also fell for the 3rd month in succession to 547 days for the month. This gave a monthly performance of 0.98 days which was within the monthly control target. However, cumulative performance to the end of June has seen a total of 1,713 working days lost at an average of 3.02 days per employee which was outside the 2.44 monthly control target.

When compared to the 1st quarter of 2009/10 the average number of employees was more, at 622, and a total of 1,604 days had been lost compared to the 1st quarter of this year of 1,713 days. In view of this and the continued under performance of the indicator it has been decided to hold a performance clinic for this indicator and any findings will be reported to the Board.

This indicator did not achieve the monthly profiled target of 2.44 days

Conclusion

Of the 22 core indicators, we are currently reporting on a monthly basis against 17 of them. As detailed previously to this Board, in relation to the other 5:

Two indicators are reported annually from the STATUS survey:

- HM 1 – Satisfaction of tenants with landlord services
- HM 45 - % of tenants satisfied their views are taken into account by their landlord.

The STATUS survey did not produce a large enough sample to provide reliable data for:

- HM 2 - Satisfaction of BME tenants with overall service

Two indicators are currently Council controlled functions:

- HM 35 - % tenants satisfied with estate services
- HM 44 - Former tenant arrears as a percentage of the rent roll

In summary:

Of the 17 core indicators examined:

- 11 (65%) indicators were on target
- 1 (6%) indicator had no data available - annual value only
- 5 (29%) did not achieve the year end target: -
 - 3 by less than 5%
 - 2 by more than 5%

Achieved the target	Missed the target by less than 5%	Missed the target by more than 5%
HM19, HM21, HM23 HM26, HM28, HM33, HM34, HM36, HM38, HM46 HM55	HM 12, HM13 , HM32,	HM18, HM59

When compared to May's cumulative performance:

- 11 (69%) have improved
- 5 (31%) have deteriorated

Improved	Stayed the same	Shown a deterioration
HM13, HM18, HM19, HM21 HM23, HM26, HM28, HM32 HM34, HM36, HM38,		HM12, HM33, HM46, HM55, HM59

Senior managers have been alerted that three of the indicators showing deterioration within the month (HM33, HM46 and HM55) are indicators that have

been noted as falling despite being above their respective target values. They have been advised to maintain close monitoring in those areas to prevent further slippage.

When comparing to the 1st Quarter in 2009/10 there is data available against 15 indicators, as follows:

- 9 (60%) have improved
- 6 (40%) have deteriorated

Improved	Stayed the same	Shown a deterioration
HM12, HM13, HM18, HM26, HM28, HM32 HM36, HM38, HM55,		HM19, HM21, HM23, HM33, HM34, HM59

Some of the things that went well in the month

HM 23- Gas safety certificates outstanding. This indicator has a target set of 0.00% with a tolerance of 0.40% and for the first time since July 2009 the cumulative performance of 0.39% to the end of June was within that tolerance. A number of performance clinics have been held to discuss performance and measures that could be put in place to improve performance. It was pleasing to announce at the clinic held on 9th July 2010 that the indicator was back within the tolerance level. Efforts will continue to further improve performance towards the 0.00% target.

As highlighted above, 69% of indicators are on target and 69% of indicators have improved on the May cumulative out turn. It should be noted that, of the 5 indicators that did not improve on the previous month's cumulative performance, 3 are on target. Also when we compare the 1st quarter of 2010/11 to that of 2009/10, 60% of indicators have shown an improvement.

When looking at monthly performance for June in Appendix A, it can be seen that, of the 16 indicators with data, 11 (69%) are on target and only 1 (6%) indicator was more than 5% off target.

Year end performance- quartile information

Since the Board last met in June, HouseMark has issued its year end benchmarking data showing where performance for each indicator sits when compared to quartile information. This has been highlighted in the table on pages 3 and 4 of this report: comparative data was available for 16 out of the 17 core indicators and it is summarised as follows:

- 5 (31%) upper quartile
- 5 (31%) upper middle
- 1 (6%) middle
- 1 (6%) lower middle
- 4 (26%) lower

Quartile	Indicator
Upper	HM 19,21,34,36,46
Upper Middle	HM 26,28,32,33,38
Middle	HM 50
Lower Middle	HM 55
Lower	HM 13,18,23,59

At the end of the 1st quarter the Board should note that performance is certainly moving in the right direction with a number of indicators not only achieving targets but, month on month, showing continuous improvement.

Every effort will be made to ensure this trend continues and with the help of performance clinics and the close monitoring of indicators we should see those indicators currently off target getting back on target.

Appendix A – Month on Month Performance

HouseMark Ref.	Description	April 10	May 10	June 10	July 10	Aug 10	Sept 10	Oct 10	Nov 10	Dec 10	Jan 11	Feb 11	Mar 11	2010/11 Target
12	% of customers on whom the landlord has diversity information	87.15%	87.15%	86.73%										88.00%
13	% of total repairs completed within target	89.70%	89.99%	92.87%										92.00%
18	% of responsive repairs where an appointment was made and kept	87.01%	88.06%	92.47%										95.00%
19	Tenants' satisfaction with the repairs service	97.57%	96.14%	96.54%										90.00%
21	% of repairs completed right first time	99.14%	99.14%	99.23%										88.00%
23	Gas safety certificates outstanding ¹	0.47%	0.45%	0.39%										0.00%
26	% of non decent homes ²	5.89%	4.98%	4.10%										0.00%
28	Average SAP rating	71.21	71.75	73.07										72.00
32	% satisfied with the outcome of their ASB complaint ³	75.00%	81.25%	93.33%										81.00%
33	% of ASB cases resolved	93.42%	90.71%	87.50%										90.00%
34	Average re let times (days) ⁴	22.09	30.99	24.89										23.00
36	Rent collected as a percentage of rent owed ⁵	80.42%	108.24%	99.73%										99.12%

HouseMark Ref.	Description	April 10	May 10	June 10	July 10	Aug 10	Sept 10	Oct 10	Nov 10	Dec 10	Jan 11	Feb 11	Mar 11	2010/11 Target
38	Rent arrears of current social housing tenants as a percentage of rent debit ⁶	2.25%	2.24%	1.98%										1.80%
46	% of new tenants satisfied with the allocation & lettings process	99.23%	99.22%	96.55%										97.25%
50	% of leaseholders satisfied with landlord services	Surveys to be returned by end of Jan 11	Surveys to be returned by end of Jan 11	Surveys to be returned by end of Jan 11										65.00%
55	% of empty property rent loss ⁷	1.35%	1.14%	1.31%										1.20%
59	Number of working days lost due to sickness absence ⁸	1.05	0.99	0.98										11.50

KEY	On target	Off target by <5%	Off target by >5%
-----	-----------	-------------------	-------------------

Notes

- 1 This indicator is only reported cumulatively. The target is 0.00% with a 0.40% tolerance
- 2 This indicator is only reported cumulatively with monthly control targets
- 3 Target against this indicator was amended in November 2009 to 78.00%
- 4 This indicator has monthly control targets set against it
- 5 This indicator has monthly control targets set against it
- 6 This indicator has monthly control targets set against it
- 7 This indicator has monthly control targets set against it
- 8 This indicator has monthly control targets set against it