

**HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY 22 MARCH 2004 AT 10.00A.M.**

Agenda Item  
No.

**10**

**TRAFFIC LIGHT MONITOR**

*Report of Head of Performance Improvement*

Author: Geoff Brown, Head of Performance Improvement  
Peter Stanley, Change Consultant

Tel: 01992 555370  
Tel: 01992 555306

Executive Member: David Beatty

**1. Purpose of Report**

To report the latest data for the promises monitor 2003-4 for member scrutiny. The monitor for the LPSA is also reported. These give the estimated end of year positions based on the results of the first 9 months of the financial year.

**2. Summary**

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

- i) An overview of the promises for 2003-04 showing the numbers of promises on target, under-performing, giving cause for concern or where data is not available, compared to targets for 2003-04 and compared to results for 2002-03. In addition, bar charts showing the performance of indicators are presented.
- 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.

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

- i) An overview of the targets for 2003-04, showing the number of Lpsa targets 'on target', under-performing, giving cause for concern or where data is not available, compared to targets for 2003-04. In addition, bar charts showing the performance of indicators are presented.

- ii) The target by target list compared to targets for 2003-04.
- iii) The detailed Lpsa monitor - additionally this shows performance against target for each indicator used to measure the target for 2003-04.

To comply with audit requirements the estimates for a number of the indicators in the promises and Lpsa monitors are based on incomplete or 'currently available' data but other indications are that many of these targets may still be met by the year end.

### **3. Traffic Light Monitor and LPSA Monitor Rules**

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.

### **4. Access to Service Implications**

Members attention should be drawn to the promise "to promote equality and improve access to our services, employment and buildings" in particular, which indicates that we are expecting to meet all but one of our targets associated with this promise.

### **5. Conclusion**

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

## 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.