

## CORPORATE, FINANCE AND PROPERTY SELECT COMMITTEE

### Performance Monitoring and Reporting in Hillingdon Council – Minutes from previous meetings

20/07/21

#### **REVIEW: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND REPORTING IN HILLINGDON COUNCIL**

Naveed Mohammed, Head of Business Performance and Insight, introduced the scoping report highlighting the Terms of Reference on page 10 of the agenda pack. It was proposed that the review would focus on 3 themes – ‘Where are we now?’ ‘What do we need to do better and how?’ and ‘Where do we want to be?’ In terms of future direction, Members were informed that discussions were already underway in relation to this and it was hoped that the Committee’s review would assist in shaping the future of data collection and reporting within the Council.

Members noted the proposal for an external consultant from MD Key Intelligence to address the Committee at its second witness session in October. In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that LBH had been working with said consultant for three months. MD had been briefed to review the existing arrangements within Adults’ and Children’s Social Care and to consider how the production and use of data could be improved.

Although it was noted that Children’s / Adults’ Social Care were the most demanding areas in terms of regular and complex data, Committee Members commented that it would be useful if additional witnesses from Waste / ASB could attend the meeting in October to enable Members to hear from a wider range of officers across the Council, rather than focussing exclusively on Social Care and Housing. It was agreed that Democratic Services would liaise with Naveed Mohammed to arrange this.

Members suggested that themes 2 and 3 could potentially be combined. It was also felt that it would be useful to gain a better understanding of ‘Why we are where we are and what has hindered the Council from going further to date?’ The Committee noted that there would be a need to ascertain who the target audience was and how data could best be provided to the senior management team. It was also important to consider ‘people’ when conducting the review with a focus on staff’s attitude to the importance of data and skills. In terms of the future, a phased approach would be required – ideally predictive analytics would be achievable in the longer term. Democratic Services would liaise with the Chairman to ensure these suggestions were encapsulated within the review.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- 1. That Democratic Services liaise with Naveed Mohammed to ensure that a wider variety of witnesses were invited to attend the October Committee meeting;**

	<p><b>2. That Democratic Services liaise with the Chairman to amend the scoping report to encapsulate the Committee’s suggestions; and</b></p> <p><b>3. That the review scoping report be noted.</b></p>
<p><b>07/09/21</b></p>	<p><b>REVIEW: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND REPORTING IN HILLINGDON COUNCIL</b></p> <p>Naveed Mohammed, Head of Business Performance and Insight, introduced the report which provided an overview of how the tracking of performance and provision of insight data were arranged in the Council and how data was used to shape operational delivery and the strategic development of services.</p> <p>Members heard that the Council routinely gathered a wide spectrum of data across all directorates for a number of purposes – to ensure services were being delivered efficiently to meet the needs of residents, to plan for the future development of services and to satisfy statutory returns. It was confirmed that the Council provided over 700 services to local residents. To ensure that directorate and service colleagues had the support needed, the Council had brought together the performance resource into a central team comprising 12 FTE. This approach was beneficial as it facilitated a better use of resources with members of the corporate team having expertise across multiple areas of the Council’s business. It also ensured improved transparency and provided an opportunity to challenge services if necessary.</p> <p>The Select Committee heard that the process for developing the data was straightforward. Services were responsible for inputting data into case management systems while Business Performance were responsible for extracting the data and developing the reports necessary for the services to carry out their business. The level of support individual directorates received was dependent on 3 factors – risk, status and volume of activity. Children’s Care, Housing and Adult Social Care were high risk departments which required weekly reports therefore had a dedicated resource. In respect of other departments, analysts were each given responsibility for 2+ areas. This arrangement ensured sufficient coverage of analytical support whilst giving analysts an opportunity to develop understanding and expertise across multiple functions.</p> <p>Members were informed that operational outputs varied depending on the needs of the service areas. For statutory, high risk services there was a requirement for regular weekly / monthly data. Examples included weekly analysis of Locata applications for housing and the monthly team’s dashboard for Adults. Data that was more strategic or where there was benchmarking was produced quarterly (ChAT, LIIA). In addition to reporting at service level, Members heard that there was corporate reporting to CMT in the form of a balanced scorecard. Key metrics at service level were selected and reported to CMT on a quarterly basis. This report tracked performance and included targets and a ‘traffic-light system’ with indicators off target flagged as Red.</p> <p>It was confirmed that, in addition to performance data, the Business Performance Team was responsible for the analysis of data to establish patterns and trends.</p>

Such information was crucial when planning for strategic changes or service redesign. Finally, the service supported individual projects with ad hoc analyses; examples included a study of the educational performance of white boys and work on Covid-19 to help the Council better target local interventions to support residents.

In terms of data sources and tools, Select Committee Members were advised that the main tools used by the Business Performance Team were SAP Business Objects (BOXI) and Microsoft Excel. BOXI was used to interrogate the data captured by the service areas while Excel enabled officers to analyse and present the data in a clear format for end users. Other bespoke systems were also used across specific areas; notably Experian which had recently been used for work around the contact centre and to 'profile' school cohorts.

In response to their requests for clarification, Members heard that individual service areas were responsible for the input and management of their own data but decisions regarding the organisation of said data / report designs were made collaboratively by the Business Performance Team and IT. In terms of CMT reporting, it was confirmed that CMT worked closely with Naveed to set out their requirements and were in receipt of quarterly reports in the form of a balanced scorecard.

Members enquired how the accuracy of the data input by the service areas was monitored. It was confirmed that the Business Performance Team relied on the departments to input their own data accurately; it was in everyone's best interest to ensure the data was recorded accurately as data reports were regularly circulated to Heads of Service and Directors for checking.

In response to further enquiries from the Committee, it was confirmed that LBH was good at using the data at its disposal to 'paint a picture' / 'tell the story' but conveying information to the service areas was an area for improvement.

James Wigley, Managing Director – Key Intelligence UK, addressed the Committee confirming that he had been working in the field of local authority data for 15 years specialising in Housing and Social Care data. Key Intelligence UK had worked with approximately 50 different local authorities to date and were currently working with 10. Members were advised that Key Intelligence UK were usually called in as an additional resource to provide technical assistance when performance teams had found that the toolkit they were using to take data from their client management systems (CMS) to present as a story was limiting them in some way. Members heard that the providers of CMS often also supplied a data warehouse to translate the heavily technical data into a slightly more digestible format. The tool Business Objects was then used by performance teams to interrogate the database and produce data set reports which could be refreshed on a regular basis. Finally, the data would be presented using Excel charts, narrative reports, tables etc. Members were informed that there was a limitation in the way warehouses had been designed which meant they were good at extracting the data but not so adept at finessing it. Key Intelligence UK were often called in to provide technical help using database skills to find a solution to this issue. They could also assist with data migration and provide additional technical support in times of statutory returns / preparation for

Ofsted. In the case of Hillingdon, there had been a short-term capacity issue around reporting due to the implementation of the Stronger Families Programme. Key Intelligence had been called in to assist with the urgent development of new reports and to provide an overview of social care reporting to get a broader picture of medium to long term reporting requirements and shorter term specific specifications for the next set of data requirements. The piece of work had now been completed.

Mr Wigley informed Members that, compared to other London boroughs, Hillingdon had a similar sized performance team with a strong knowledge of databases and business processes. However, it was confirmed that quite a few other boroughs had a technical edge either provided externally or skilled up within the team. This meant they had access to more technical support, either provided externally or through inhouse inbuilt SQL development skills to speed up the process of getting the data. This enabled performance teams to focus more on presentation, distribution of the data and analysis. It was confirmed that this additional level of support could be achieved in a number of ways; either at service area level with additional data officers working on data quality or by means of higher level technical skill within the performance team to focus on SQL type work.

Perry Scott, Corporate Director – Infrastructure, Transport & Building Services, informed the Committee that a lot of work had been undertaken in recent years to refresh IT, provide staff with new kit and move from Google to Microsoft. The focus now was on looking at where the data sat within the core systems and what was needed to extract the data and get it to people in a timely manner. A technical solution was being explored to drive this forward.

In response to requests for clarification from Committee Members, it was confirmed that certain data sets, particularly in social care, were quite small therefore it was difficult to draw meaningful statistical conclusions. Data sharing partnerships existed in London to mass up the data sets to get a broader insight from a wider population. More work on data preparation so it was in a standardised format made it more consistent and easier to analyse. It was further confirmed that, given a stronger data warehouse and SQLs, Hillingdon had the skillset to tell the story effectively. The Business Performance Team members had a thorough and nuanced understanding of the service areas and of the Borough itself therefore were well placed to spot anomalies in the data. Members heard that IT provided SQL support to the Business Performance Team. It would be possible to upskill the existing staff members and they would welcome the opportunity.

In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the Team did not routinely provide data for all 700 services but would provide ad hoc support when requested to do so. Recent examples included work to support the transformation of libraries and to assist waste services with its new recycling programme. It would not be feasible to provide CMT with regular reports on all 700 services at the same time. Members heard that the Business Performance Team conducted an overview of their reporting every year or two to ensure the reports produced were still relevant and useful. However, some reports were automated and would therefore be sent out regularly regardless of usage.

It was felt that the Council was now in a good position to make a step change; once officers had access to the required tools and the data had been lined up correctly, the Business Performance Team would be in a position to perform more analysis of the data and tell the detailed story with less requirement to focus on data production and checking. In terms of data culture across the Council, Members were advised that there were some areas of very good practice while other areas still had a way to go.

Members requested further clarification regarding benchmarking and heard that services were often benchmarked against statistical neighbours; however, the clients decided who they wanted to benchmark against – sometimes the West London context was most appropriate. In terms of Covid, LBH was benchmarked against near neighbours including London boroughs, Buckinghamshire and Berkshire. Benchmarking varied according to who was asking for the data and what they requested as the benchmark. The Business Performance Team had a good working relationship with the services and weekly meetings were held with service heads at which benchmarking could be discussed.

Members enquired whether back data was used for forecasting future expectations of demand. It was confirmed that this was an area for development. Straight line forecasting could be achieved based on previous trends. One area of effective forecasting was in school places planning which was supported by the GLA. Over the years, accuracy had usually been within 2.5% - 5% accuracy.

In response to further questioning from the Committee, Members heard that the CMT balanced scorecard, in one guise or another, had been in place for at least 5 years. It was presented to CMT by the Head of Business Performance and Insight as a collective piece and included information across all areas. The format of the CMT report had changed over the years and was now more dynamic. The Corporate Director – Infrastructure, Transport and Building Services confirmed that the current quarterly reporting frequency to CMT appeared to be working well. Each balanced scorecard was reviewed regularly and updated by individual service areas. It was noted that KPIs were additionally produced on a weekly and monthly cycle and seen by service managers and heads. Information could be requested on an ad hoc basis to support the needs of services. At the request of the Chairman it was agreed that the Head of Business Performance and Insight would liaise with Democratic Services to provide further detail and clarify this process further outside the meeting.

Members heard that CMT reports were usually available within 3 weeks of quarter end i.e. meetings with CMT were weekly and the Business Performance Team would attempt to gather all the information for the 3<sup>rd</sup> CMT meeting after quarter end.

The Committee was informed that options in terms of data tools to extract the data were currently being explored – the Council wanted to invest in the right product and ensure the data extracted was of value. One option was Power BI which was a Microsoft product – this was a good product but expensive. In response to further questions from Members, it was confirmed that cross departmental analysis was

carried out; one example was the provision of information extracted from Children's Social Care to support the Green Spaces team with the FIESTA programme.

It was agreed that Mike Talbot would be requested to attend the next witness session in October. James Wigley would not be required to attend again. A representative selection of witnesses across Council services would also be requested to attend the next witness session (from Adults' and Children's Social Care, ASBET, Housing and Waste Services).

**RESOLVED:**

1. **Naveed Mohammad liaise with Democratic Services to clarify current processes in relation to the CMT balanced scorecard and reporting;**
2. **That Mike Talbot and a representative selection of witnesses across key Council services be requested to attend the next witness session in October; and**
3. **That the information provided in relation to the Performance Monitoring and Reporting review be noted.**

21/10/21

**REVIEW: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND REPORTING IN HILLINGDON COUNCIL**

Officers present were invited to set out how data was used within their departments and identify any gaps or possible areas for improvement.

Alex Coman, Director – Safeguarding, Partnerships and QA, addressed the Committee advising Members that, in Children's Services, there were a number of statutory duties in terms of performance, collection of the data and reporting at a national level. Data was used both to look at performance retrospectively and to predict future demand on services and resources. It was confirmed that Children's Services were one of the biggest users of data within the Council and the department received more than 20,000 contacts annually. There were statutory requirements to report the data nationally, share data locally and Pan-London and benchmark Hillingdon against other boroughs. Additionally, data was used for specific projects – for example to respond to particular pressures on the service.

In response to their requests for clarification, Members heard that a large amount of data was received by the Children's Services Department; however, this data was not in a user-friendly format and had to be manipulated manually. In terms of future projections, Children's Services worked with Naveed's team to look at trends. The Performance Team then manually produced predictive models on an ad hoc basis. Members heard that officers would like to be able to receive the data in a more user-friendly format – a number of options had been discussed with the Performance Team about various dashboard options etc. It was reported that it would be helpful if users could have control of the data themselves thereby negating the need to ask for manual ad hoc reports. It was confirmed that the Children's Services Team regularly received automatic reports which were very helpful; however, weekly reports were run on a Sunday therefore, as the week progressed, the data became increasingly out-of-date – access to 'live' data would be preferable. The Committee heard that other boroughs used dashboards effectively

to assist with their analysis. Naveed's Team did the best they could with the software available to them, but better software was available elsewhere.

Members commented that the 20,000 contacts received by the Children's Services Department annually seemed very high. It was confirmed that every single contact received via OneFrontDoor was recorded in the same system hence the high numbers. The Committee observed that the statistical department at Brunel University could potentially assist with analysis, but it was noted that this would be complicated due to GDPR considerations.

Members enquired how the accuracy of data within Children's Services was determined. The Committee was informed that weekly, monthly and statutory reports were regularly spot checked for accuracy by officers in Children's Services. In terms of ad hoc reporting, officers relied on their colleagues in the Performance Team to ensure the accuracy of the data. Any anomalies would be discussed and ironed out between the two departments. Members heard that the data was processed at every level and made available to individual team members depending on their need. In response to their queries, Councillors were advised that it was difficult to assess how much time was spent on manually manipulating data. It was noted that some of the reports produced for Children's Services were extremely complex in nature - changing them would be challenging as they had been built up over a number of years and included a number of different macros and formulas. It was confirmed that data was extracted by Business Objects and manipulated in Excel spreadsheets due to a lack of more up-to-date tools.

Kate Kelly-Talbot, Director of Service Delivery - Adult Social Work, addressed the Committee confirming that, in Adult Services, much of the reporting was statutory and a secure case management system was utilised to store data. Naveed's team extracted the data and weekly, fortnightly and monthly reports were received on statutory operations. Bespoke dashboard style reports were also prepared for Adult Services. It was felt that all the required information was currently available to officers but not in an easily accessible format - there was a requirement to peruse several different reports in order to gain a thorough understanding. It was confirmed that dashboard brought some of this information together in a more user-friendly format, but this involved a lengthy manual exercise. Access to live data was limited hence data available to officers was at times somewhat out-of-date. Ad hoc reports on a particular issue were also prepared in collaboration with Naveed's team as necessary.

In terms of data use, it was confirmed that a wide range of statutory returns were completed by Adult Services. Data was also used for benchmarking, to assist managers in managing their teams and, at Head of Service level, to allocate resources. It was reported that the team also needed to look at data across health and social care which was an additional challenge.

In response to their requests for clarification, Members heard that all the required data was available, but accessibility could be an issue. The data was used across the team to drive practice and performance. Learning events were held to consider timelines, resident satisfaction etc and the learning from those fed into services. The Committee was informed that, in terms of KPIs, the numbers were vast.

Members enquired whether KPIs were analysed on the basis of individual members of staff / groups. It was confirmed that a range of management metrics were included in appraisals and performance reviews. In terms of predictions, there were some patterns / trends in Adult Social Care which could be planned for, for example winter pressures and hospital discharges.

In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that Adult Services and Health and Social Care had some limited secure access to each other's data; this was a potential area of growth for the future. Members heard that reporting was regularly reviewed to ensure reports prepared / received were still relevant and of use.

Rod Smith, Head of Housing and Tenancy Management, addressed the Committee confirming that the Council's landlord service managed approximately 13,300 properties with a rent roll of about £64m a year and service charges of some £1.6m. The service dealt with the end-to-end management of tenancies and was regulated by the Social Housing Regulator hence statutory returns were a necessity.

Members were informed that data was used both operationally and strategically. Operationally, weekly and monthly automated reports were produced to support the delivery of KPIs and to assist in managing the workforce. It was vital that the income line was protected and supported. Members heard that, at the height of the pandemic, debts were increasing by some £100,000 per week. Weekly data sets were developed in collaboration with the performance team which enabled staff to target bandings of debt and high risk tenants and support tasks appropriately. Said data set was vital in supporting the stabilisation of the debt and recovery work thereafter.

In terms of empty property management, the Committee was advised that work had been undertaken with the Business Performance team to produce a visual representation of the end-to-end void process, thereby enabling officers to identify bottle necks and monitor performance / resource issues.

At strategic level, reporting was of a more bespoke nature and there was a reliance on Naveed's team to produce what was needed. An example of this related to Universal Credit implementation and roll out in the Borough. Bespoke reports had enabled the team to identify and track cases, manage debt and support tenants. Members heard that data extracts had also helped with regeneration schemes in the Hayes area.

Councillors were informed that the Landlord Service used the Business Performance Team primarily as a 'consultancy' service. The current focus was on regulatory compliance, data manipulation and modelling, benchmarking work, tenant feedback analysis, benchmarking against peers, aligning KPIs to the Regulator's expectations and constructive challenge from the consultancy service which was very helpful. It was reported that Naveed's Team was very knowledgeable, supportive and helpful but it was noted that the structure of the team was somewhat fragile with limited capacity. It was confirmed that ideally the Landlord Service would be able to offer a digital self-service approach rather than be over-reliant on Naveed and his colleagues.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed that the Landlord Service was well served in terms of data extraction as it only relied on two main systems – a Northgate database and a workflow system.

Members heard that Business Objects was the system used to extract information for large users of data such as Children's Social Care, Adult Social Care and Housing. There were a number of ongoing digital transformation programmes within the Council. The next step would be to bring in new tools and ways of working which was likely to incur an additional expense.

In response to further requests for clarification, Councillors were advised that, to enable Hillingdon to compare itself with its peers, Housemark had been involved to ensure a consistent approach to benchmarking. The Council had also joined a benchmarking club for local authorities in London. The data was input into a portal and the output was interpreted by Naveed's team.

The Committee requested further information regarding gap analysis i.e. how data was used to identify the root causes of performance requiring improvement and how this information was used to address the issue. Members were advised that, in the case of the Landlord Service, gap analysis related to compliance with regulatory standards and was therefore more output based. The regulatory regime was in a state of flux, but the Service was being supported in realigning itself to meet the changing requirements of the regulator.

The Committee enquired whether it was possible to proactively plan for housing repairs such as the upgrade of boilers and re-wiring. Gary Penticost, Head of Repairs, Engineering, Planned Works and Facilities responded on this point advising the Committee that data was used to inform Planned Works programmes. Roof and boiler renewals were prioritised. The Team had access to extensive data regarding the age profiles of all the boiler stock. They knew the construction of all their properties and had EPC ratings of the vast majority of stock. Members heard that a bid had recently been submitted based on stock asset data for wave one of the Government's grant for funding solid wall construction. The key priority was to ensure the fabric of the building was properly insulated before considering heat pumps etc.

Members enquired whether some of the data that drove the major works programmes could be inaccurate given the changeover from Hillingdon Homes to Hillingdon Council. It was confirmed that there were some data issues. When inconsistencies were identified, surveys were undertaken and work programmes were prioritised accordingly.

Cathy Knuble, Head of Waste, addressed the Committee informing Members that, for her service area, data was backward looking, current and forward focussed with up to 2,035 current targets. Most targets were based in legislation under the Mayor of London's office or Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). Much of the data came from outside the Council and was based on tonnages and waste room i.e. what was being collected, how much and what was being done with the waste. Members heard that the Head of Waste chaired the West London Waste

Authority Partnership meeting on a fortnightly basis which was attended by Heads of Service from 6 boroughs – Hillingdon, Harrow, Hounslow, Brent, Richmond and Ealing. At these meetings, tonnages, trends, best practice and partnership projects were discussed. Members were advised that, each month, the team input data into the Defra waste data flow analysis which compared Hillingdon to all other Councils nationally in terms of recycling percentages. Regular inhouse data was received relating to complaints, compliments, missed collections etc. The Head of Waste also prepared a monthly report for the Cabinet Member which incorporated a lot of data and statistical information. MTFF was regularly analysed to ensure the department was on track for 2021/22 savings and KPIs were submitted to Naveed's team every quarter. Members heard that waste had a high presence on social media platforms which were analysed by the Comms team. The Waste Team had also been shortlisted for a national award based on the rolling out of a food waste project. In terms of new initiatives, carbon emissions were being monitored with a view to improving these. In cab technology was being rolled out which would provide useful real time data.

In terms of data reporting relevance, the Committee was advised that, when food waste collections were introduced, daily data on missed collections had been requested initially. This had subsequently been reduced to a weekly report and finally to a monthly report now that the food waste collection service had bedded in.

Members enquired whether there was any direct link between the data extracted and the dashboard. It was confirmed that, at present, data for the CMT balanced scorecard report was input manually into a spreadsheet on a quarterly basis. Members commented that, for HMRC, the plan was for all data to be directly linked from the original records. This approach was to be recommended as it would save time and eliminate the possibility of human error when inputting data manually. Officers acknowledged that, for the CMT report, the information would ideally be automatically populated from source data, but this was not a straightforward process.

Richard Dawson, Head of Community Safety and Enforcement, addressed the Committee confirming that the main source of the data used by the team related to antisocial behaviour. Members were informed that the team was in the process of moving to a new case management system as they did not currently have access to the level of data needed. It was confirmed that the team already had access to a real-time dashboard and strategic information on past performance; however, they were unable to view details of the journey of each case - which cases had yet to be allocated, which were being investigated, which were longstanding and going through a legal process etc. It was reported that the inability to access this level of data was holding the team back operationally.

In response to Members' requests for clarification it was confirmed that the Community Safety team was relatively self-sufficient; however, Business Performance had been useful in providing trend information. The team received about 12,000 jobs per year with the majority of high-volume jobs being received during the summer months particularly in relation to noise, rubbish accumulation etc.

In response to further questions from Members it was confirmed that some of the concerns relating to ASBET which had been raised in the internal audit had been linked to problems with the case management system. The Team was now using a different system, but this was not a case management system and further improvements were still required to improve the richness of the data and encompass every aspect of a case from start to finish. An improved case management system would resolve these challenges and provide managers with greater oversight. It was confirmed that the new case management system would go live at the end of the year and would provide all the required information – a bridging system was in use at present.

It was noted that, in their reports, both the Head of Waste and the Head of Community Safety and Enforcement had included information in relation to flytipping. In response to questions from the Committee, Members were advised that the data would be used differently by the two departments with a different focus – one set of figures for investigative purposes (Community Safety) and one set to analyse trends (Waste).

All Heads of Service were asked for further clarification regarding their upward reporting and engagement with Corporate Directors and the relevant Cabinet Member(s). It was confirmed that, for Children's Services, reporting of performance against KPIs was produced on a monthly basis. Performance against the MPFF was also reported and reviewed regularly. Members heard that Children's Services were held to account by two Cabinet Members on a quarterly basis. A bespoke report was produced which set out the journey of the child, education data, SEND information etc and a quarterly meeting was held with Councillor Palmer, Councillor O'Brien, the Chief Executive and Corporate Directors.

In the case of Waste Services, it was confirmed that monthly meetings were held with the Director and the Cabinet Member. There was also high scrutiny in conjunction with the Financial Team to ensure MPFF targets were met.

The Head of Business Performance and Monitoring advised Councillors that the CMT report was important in the context of upward reporting. The Team worked closely with Directors to determine which indicators would be reported to CMT on a quarterly basis. There were some 97 indicators and these were RAG (Red, Amber, Green) depending on direction of travel. Subsequent reports would pick up changes and remedial action could be taken to address underperformance.

The Head of Business Performance and Monitoring addressed the Committee in response to questions previously posed by the Chairman regarding the CMT balanced scorecard. It was confirmed that:

1. All Members of the Corporate Management Team (Directors) attended CMT meetings which were chaired by the Chief Executive;
2. Prior to the meetings, Naveed and Alison Coote (Senior Business Analyst) liaised closely with the Heads of Service and Directors to pull the narrative together. The balanced scorecard was presented by the Head of Business Performance and Monitoring. Part of the presentation focussed on exception

reporting in relation to indicators that were red – this set out the context and the story behind the figures, trends, what services were doing to remedy the matter and when it was hoped that the situation would improve;

3. Data was presented to CMT within 3 or 4 weeks of quarter end;
4. Measures were determined in conjunction with Directors on the basis of what was important for services e.g. pressures, links to MTFF, political priorities. These measures were reviewed annually. However, if something emerged mid-year, the balanced scorecard could be amended at that time – there was room for flexibility and it was not set in stone.

Members enquired how many of the Council's 700 services were represented in the quarterly CMT reports. It was confirmed that it was difficult to specify this; however, metrics were drawn from the full spectrum of key services – Finance, Building Services, Procurement, Recycling, Repairs etc. At the meetings, Directors were given an overview which triggered conversations often within a financial context. Naveed's Team would then do additional analysis and report back. In terms of annual reviews of metrics to be reported on, Members heard that this was determined by means of a collaborative exercise within CMT. The Chief Executive would also have a view on this. Members were advised that, at the quarterly meetings, the discussion regarding the dashboard would generally last approximately 45 minutes.

**RESOLVED That:**

1. **The Select Committee noted the information received from witnesses in relation to its Review of Performance Monitoring and Reporting in Hillingdon Council.**