

**HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY 17 MARCH 2004 at 10.00am

Agenda Item No.

6

TRAFFIC LIGHT MONITOR

Joint report of the Director of Children, Schools & Families and the Scrutiny Support Officer

Author: Lesley Brockington, Deputy Director - Commissioning, Performance and Resources
Tel: 01992 555710
Geoff Brown, Change Consultant
Tel: 01992 555370

Executive Members: Robert Gordon, Education
Jane Pitman, Children's Services

1. Purpose of report

To report the latest data for the promises monitor 2003/04 for Member scrutiny. This gives the estimated end of year position based on the results of the first 9 months of the financial year.

2. Summary

The monitor (circulated separately to all Members of the Council) shows:

- i) An overview of the promises for 2003-04 in the form of a pie chart, which shows the numbers of promises on target, under-performing, giving cause for concern or where data is not available.
- ii) The promise by promise list for 2003-04 compared to target and compared to 2002-03 performance. Note, 2002-03 figures used for comparison are those submitted to the Audit Commission in September 2003 following audit, and so may differ from those published in the BVPP.
- iii) The detailed traffic light monitor - additionally this shows performance against target for each indicator used to measure the promises for 2003-04.

3. Conclusion

The Scrutiny Committee is invited to note the monitor and identify issues for future scrutiny as appropriate.

1. Background

At their meeting on 12 May 2003, the Scrutiny Co-ordination Panel resolved: "*That the regular Budget Monitor and 'Traffic Light' Monitor reports be included on the agenda of Scrutiny Committees on the basis that the reports are for noting, not for discussion and to enable the Committees to identify issues for scrutiny.*"

Following discussion at the June Resources Scrutiny Committee, the rules determining whether a promise is on target or not, have been amended from simple "majority rules" to take account of potential anomalies. See Appendix 1.

2. Financial Implications

No financial implications have been identified.

3. Access to Service Implications

No access to service implications have been identified.

Background material referred to by the author while compiling this report:

None

APPENDIX 1

TRAFFIC LIGHT MONITOR RULES

- a) The status, *on target* (Green) or *under-performing/causing concern* (Yellow/Red) of the majority of PIs measuring that promise determines the overall status of that promise. The number of PIs that are Yellow and are Red are added together, as these may prompt remedial action.
- b) If the number of Yellows and Reds is the majority, then it shows the predominant category.
- c) If there is no majority, then the status of the promise is determined in the order, Red and Yellow then Green; i.e. if there are 2 red/yellow indicators and 2 green indicators, the overall status would be red/yellow. This is again based on the premise that this will provide a prompt for action.
- d) Only if all the indicators for a promise are *not available/not comparable* does the promise show as White.

Other rules (unchanged)

- e) Variance to targets is shown, with a positive result indicating good performance and a negative result indicating poor performance.
- f) All parts of performance indicators are shown as separate indicators.
- g) Weightings for each indicator are applied. The standard weighting is 1. Where an indicator has been split between its parts, the weightings are equally distributed (adding up to 1) e.g. Local L213a and Local L213b. Thus at present, no indicator has more or less effect on the overall result than any other.