

**PPRN Steering Group
Friday 23rd September 2005 10.00 – 12.30**

@ Hart District Council, Fleet

MINUTES

1 Present:

Jane Terry Hart DC
Richard Menhinick Hart DC
Andy Rudd Havant BC
Roger Smith Test Valley BC
Julie Petty Gosport BC
Dave Adams Portsmouth CC

Heidi Marshall Isle of Wight
Dottie Dabrowska New Forest BC
Rob Chambers East Hants DC
Nick Thomas Hampshire CC
Jacky Adams Winchester CC

2 Apologies:

Phil Raynor, Diane Foley, Melvyn Reader, Janice Brill

3 Minutes of Meeting held at Fareham on 10th June

Noted.

Julie Petty fed back that Gosport had had a disappointing presentation from Excelsis and that as a result it was not being pursued.

4 District CPA Consultation

Points arising from discussion were:

- Group A options – AC seemed to be steering LAs away from these options as being too resource hungry;
- Robustness of the Group A options v ‘Cheap and cheerful’ Group B options;
- Benefit of the last CPA round that it did raise awareness of performance and service improvement issues amongst LAs;
- Group B options will make it difficult for LAs to compare themselves with others;
- Option 3 Group A reliance on 203/4 CPA CA unacceptable (for all but excellent authorities!);
- Difficulty for public of understanding the results of CPA when comparing them with the previous round results;
- There is no mention of LAAs, LPSAs etc in joining up with CPA;
- County by County approach seems to have been dropped.
- Direction of Travel Statements – Darlington has published a good one for example.

IDEA guidance on service planning: <http://www.idea-knowledge.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pagelId=76257>

IDEA guidance on target setting: <http://www.idea-knowledge.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pagelId=261470>

5 Performance Management collaborative approach:

Strengths, weaknesses/barriers and options towards best practice were discussed for 3 key aspects of Performance Management framework.

- Performance Management
- Target Setting
- Service Planning

It was agreed that this item would be carried forward to the next meeting to select a few options to develop on a collaborative approach. Outcomes from this exercise are attached.

6 Use of Resources / Value for Money Self Assessment – feedback

Noted that the AC website and VFM Profile tool was not user friendly. Lessons from the Unitary Authorities – keep communication lines open and discuss throughout. Make sure that the AC are using the right data!

7 Feedback from Other Groups

- SPIN – had not met since the previous meeting.
- HIOWA – minutes of the HIOWA meeting on 2nd September were shared. **JT** to request CX nominated leads from Nick Goulder.

8 Forward Plan

- PPRN Forward Plan
- Performance Management – collaborative approach to developing best practice
- District CPA and VFM
- Links with HIOWA CX Group
- IDeA Advanced Leadership Programme – **RC** to feed back
- Procurement of performance monitoring software **DD**
- Joining up project software **JA**

9 AOB

- BVPI 226 (Legal Advice) - Rushmoor BC has written to AC to seek greater clarification
- Recent / Coming Inspections:
 - Winchester CC – Sustainability Inspection starts 3/10/05
 - Hart DC – Housing Inspection March 2006
 - East Hants – Planning Inspection report recently received

10 Date and venue for next 2 meetings:

- January 2006 – East Hants, Friday 20th January
RC to arrange Steering Group and agenda
- April 2006 – Isle of Wight; **HM** to advise date

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Developing a Collaborative Approach

1 Performance Management

Strengths:

Dealing with Poor Performance –
Management ownership (individual)
Theory and Practice
Driving Performance Management from the Top
Appraisals linked to Personal Development Plans and Corporate Training Plan
Drawing resources from non-priority performance (Zero based budgeting)
Capability Procedure (HR)
What's the methodology / criteria – scorecard?
Management Board (Accountability)
Key PIs that matter to the Council
Knowing why – Doing / Not doing
Staff awareness (Chat Rooms)
Staff Involvement
Communicating performance results to staff
Service Reviews / Budget Planning (Corporate priorities)
High level performance issues reported to Scrutiny Panel / Executive – top level results seen by Top level / Executive; Exceptions reporting
Member involvement in Boards
Training on performance – induction
Peer Challenge – inter-authority working

Weaknesses / Barriers

Project management and programme management
Contract management
Performance management within partnerships (unaccountable)
Outcome focussed
Timely intervention and action
Member involvement
Staff awareness / ownership of performance
Moving funds to critical areas
Performance management skills @ the right level
Highlighting best practice – sharing
Links to other systems especially Risk

Options

Other Authority in challenging performance (peer challenge)
Individual officer joining panel / forum
Work shadowing / job swap (members as well as officers)
Buddying (inter-department)
Performance Champions
Organisational health Groups (EHBC) / Continuous Improvement Group (Hart DC) – act as sounding board for management

2 Target Setting

2.1 Links to Vision

Strengths:

HCC/Districts do have measures to evaluate success (developed with members)
Golden Thread
Medium Term Objective setting – members / directors

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Generating interest
Lack of measures to evaluate success
Lack of understanding – standards / targets
Members reluctant to articulate measures
Political impetus
Where is the driver – Community Strategy / Corporate Plan
Who has the authority to change targets?

Best Practice Options:

Model used by HCC

2.2 Link to Resources

Strengths:

Using decision conferencing to link budgets / projects with priorities
Budgets follow political priorities

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Budgets follow political priorities (unplanned)
Getting members to take difficult decisions / prioritise – want to do 'everything'
Management teams not being robust enough with members and middle managers / officers
View that poor performance requires more money
Silo target setting, not crossing boundaries

Best practice Options:

Zero based budgeting
Corporate management team / Cabinet Away days

2.3 SMART Target Setting

Strengths:

Clarity through corporate strategy
Guidance issued on target setting
Training on target setting

Weaknesses / Barriers:

No guidance issued on target setting
No user involvement in target setting
Understanding of standards / targets
Date targets need to be realistic and supported by a programme to achieve them
Government targets – are they always achievable / realistic?

Best practice Options:

Process for reviewing targets (with customers)
SMART targets within service improvement plans

2.4 Use of Targets to Drive Improvement

Strengths:

Targets focus thinking (on efficiency)
Targets are a driving force

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Easy to excuse poor performance
Tend to focus on short term rather than trends
Impact of targets on others
What targets actually mean

Best practice Options:

No excuses policy on reducing targets
Improvement Boards

3 SERVICE PLANNING

3.1 Link to corporate vision and priorities – Golden Thread

Strengths:

Most show some link
¾ year horizon / annual updates
Manifesto tracker v policy
Corporate Plan driving resources / budgets

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Use to set priorities
Medium term objectives
Political element will always win through
Political Will

Best practice Options:

Greater awareness of visions and priorities between neighbouring authorities

3.2 User Focus – Involvement

Strengths:

Included in performance information
Consultation results where relevant
Big partner involvement – consult
At fundamental review stage

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Equality and Diversity
Difficult to achieve on service plan itself – more during the performance assessment stage
@ corporate level – how do they link?

Best practice Options:

Collaboration of user surveys
Collaboration on evidence base

3.3 Link to resources & financial planning

Strengths:

Estimate of FTEs involved across services
Medium term resource strategy
Coordination fo Service Plans (not silos)
Gershon included in criteria
Budget bids linked intrinsically

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Absence of 3 year funding makes if difficult
Budget savings constant

Best practice Options:

Cabinet / corporate management team Away days

3.4 Members Role

Strengths:

Corporate Management Team / leader away day to review corporate plan
Lead Service Member involved in championing services – assigned responsibility

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Election learning cycle
Need more inter-active ways
Focus is difficult
Engagement

Best practice Options:

Away Days

3.5 Plan – Do – Review – Revise (Virtuous Circle)

Strengths:

6 month review of progress – through reporting and through regular team meetings
Revisit on a regular basis

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Immediate response v long term approach
Lack of Review
Impact

Best practice Options:

How to build in review and Revise!
Involvement of Portfolio Holder in delivering VFM

3.6 Staff Involvement

Strengths:

Star Chamber
Team involvement in preparing and reviewing

Weaknesses / Barriers:

Viewed as a corporate initiative – the ownership is not there
Is it driving their service?

Best practice Options: /