

**Subject:** Deletion of Best Value  
Performance Indicators

**Status:** For Publication

---

**Report to:** Performance Scrutiny Committee

**Date:** 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008

---

**Report of:** Head of Policy and Performance

---

**Portfolio**

**Holder:** Well Managed Council

---

**Key Decision:** No

Forward Plan  General Exception  Special Urgency

---

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 The existing set of 69 Best Value Performance Indicators that the Audit Commission require the council to collect, analyse and set future three year targets for achievement against, are being deleted from the end of March 2008, and are being replaced with a new set of National Indicators.

1.2 The purpose of this report is to ask whether Members of Performance Scrutiny agree the business cases put forward by Heads of Service to entirely cease the collection of fifteen, Best Value Performance Indicators.

1.3 It was agreed by Performance Scrutiny and the council's senior management team that many of these Best Value Performance Indicators, did in fact provide the council with valuable management information in relation to the achievement of service improvement and the impact of certain internal policies and processes, for example, sickness absence; and that we would want to continue collecting and using this information.

1.4 

Appendix 1 – Shows all the completed BVPI Deletion Request Forms
--

## 2. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

2.1 The matters discussed in this report impact directly on the following corporate priorities and associated corporate objective.

- Delivering Quality Services to Customers (Customers, Improvement)
- Delivering Regeneration across the Borough (Economy, Housing)
- Keeping Our Borough Clean and Green (Environment)
- Promoting Rossendale as a cracking place to live and visit (Economy)
- Improving health and well being across the Borough (Health, Housing)
- Well Managed Council (Improvement, Community Network)

## 3. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There is a risk that some of the indicators proposed for deletion do provide information that is considered of value to the Council.

## 4. BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS

4.1 It was agreed by Performance Scrutiny and the council's senior management team that many of the current sixty nine Best Value Performance Indicators, did in fact provide the council with valuable management information. For example they assist with planning the improvement of services, and provide evidence of the achievement of improvement. They can also provide information about the impact of certain policies and procedures, for example, on sickness absence.

4.2 For these reasons it was agreed that the Council should continue to collect the majority of Best Value Performance Indicators and that any Head of Service wishing to propose that a given BVPI be no longer collected, should provide a business case stating the reasoning behind this, for consideration by Performance Scrutiny.

The following BVPI's are proposed for deletion:

Service Area	BVPI's requested to be deleted
People & Organisational Development	2b – duty to promote race equality
	11a – top 5% earners: women
	11b – top 5% earners: ethnic minorities
	11c – top 5% or earners: disabled earners
	15 – % of Ill Health retirements
	16b - % of economically active disabled people within the population
Streetscene & Neighbourhood Services	82a ii – tonnage of household waste recycled
	82b ii – tonnage of household waste composted
	84b – % change in kgs of household waste collection per head

<b>Service Area</b>	<b>BVPI's requested to be deleted</b>
	91a – kerbside collection of recyclables (one)
	91b -kerbside collection of recyclables (two)
	216a – Identifying Contaminated land
Community & Partnerships	226a,b,c - advice & guidance services

## **5. COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY OFFICERS:**

### **5.1 SECTION 151 OFFICER**

5.1.1 There are no immediate considerations attached to the recommendations within this report. .

### **5.2 MONITORING OFFICER**

5.2.1 There are no immediate legal considerations attached to the recommendations within this report.

### **5.3 HEAD OF PEOPLE AND ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (ON BEHALF OF THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE)**

5.3.1 There are no immediate human resource implications attached to the recommendations within this report.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

6.1 The main criteria for wishing to delete a Best Value Performance Indicator are:

- The indicator does not provide information that is of value to the Council
- The resources required to collect the indicator are greater than the perceived benefit provided by the information
- The information provided by the indicator can be gained in an easier way
- The indicator would be collected as a new national indicator and therefore would be duplicated

## **7. RECOMMENDATION(S)**

7.1 That Members consider the information put forward by Heads of Service in relation to each BVPI.

7.2 That Members consider whether they agree with the request to delete the BVPI

## **8. CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT**

8.1 All Heads of Service & BVPI responsible officers

**9. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Is an Equality Impact Assessment required No

Is an Equality Impact Assessment attached No

**10. BIODIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Is a Biodiversity Impact Assessment required No

Is a Biodiversity Impact Assessment required No

<b>Contact Officer</b>	
Name	Lesley Noble – Head of Policy and Performance Mgt Leanne Dixon – Performance Management Officer
Position	Head of Policy and Performance
Service / Team	Policy and Performance Management
Telephone	01706 252415
Email address	lesleynoble@rossendalebc.gov.uk leannedixon@rossendalebc.gov.uk

No background papers