

**PPRN Steering Group**  
**Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2005 10.00 – 12.30**

**@ Hart District Council, Fleet**

**MINUTES**

**1 Present:**

Jane Terry Hart DC	Heidi Marshall Isle of Wight
Richard Menhinick Hart DC	Dottie Dabrowska New Forest BC
Andy Rudd Havant BC	Rob Chambers East Hants DC
Roger Smith Test Valley BC	Nick Thomas Hampshire CC
Julie Petty Gosport BC	Jacky Adams Winchester CC
Dave Adams Portsmouth CC	

**2 Apologies:**

Phil Raynor, Diane Foley, Melvyn Reader, Janice Brill

**3 Minutes of Meeting held at Fareham on 10<sup>th</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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: /