

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT TO AUDIT AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW
COMMITTEE ON SERVICE PERFORMANCE– 6 FEBRUARY 2008**

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S OFFICE

1. Overall summary of performance

- 1.1 This report covers key performance indicators for the Chief Executive's Office and covers the third quarter reporting period between 1 September 2007 and 31 December 2007.
- 1.2 The Chief Executive's Office performance is presented across 1 area of activity and involves 9 indicators. At this stage in the year 3 are regarded as performing well, 2 require close monitoring and 4 require action if the target is to be met.

Service	No. of Indicators	Green Performing Well	Amber Close monitoring	Red Action Required	Annual PIs
Chief Executive's Office	9	3	2	4	
Total (totals to do not equal 100% due to rounding errors)	9	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	

2. Areas of good performance

- 2.1 Chief Executive's Office
Indicator 4 – 'Freedom of Information Requests - Percentage replied to within 20 working days'
The Service has continued to exceed targets for this indicator.
- 2.2 Chief Executive's Office
Indicator 5 – 'Equalities Impact Assessments - Percentage of high priority policies assessed'
Performance for this indicator is well above target due to departments focussing their resources on completing high-priority assessments over those in the medium and low priority categories.
- 2.3 Chief Executive's Office
Indicator 9 – 'Telephone Monitoring - Percentage of calls to Moray Contact Centre answered within 7 seconds'
Performance for the Moray Contact Centre has continued to improve and to exceed targets. The Contact Centre now handles calls for the refuse collection bulky uplift service, Moray Jobs Line and council tax and housing benefit enquiries.

3. Areas of performance identified for improvement and how this will be achieved

3.1 Chief Executive's Office

Indicator 3 – 'Freedom of Information Requests - Percentage acknowledged within three working days'

Data collection has been in place for this indicator since December 2007. During that month 75% (21 of 28) of the requests received were acknowledged within the target timescale. This is below the target level of 100% but a longer period of data collection is needed in order to accurately gauge service performance.

3.2 Chief Executive's Office

Indicator 6 – 'Equalities Impact Assessments - Percentage of medium priority policies assessed'

Indicator 7 – 'Equalities Impact Assessments - Percentage of low priority policies assessed'

As detailed in 2.2 above, departments have been focussing their resources on completing high-priority assessments over those in the medium and low priority categories, and will continue to do so.

3.3 Chief Executive's Office

Indicator 8 – 'Telephone Monitoring - Percentage of calls to priority numbers answered within 7 seconds (excluding Moray Contact Centre)'

The list of priority numbers is currently being revised to cover all public-facing helplines and those additional extensions requested by departments for monitoring. Several extensions are due to be removed from the list as they no longer fall into either of these categories. As such, the results are not a true indication of the current performance of the priority telephone numbers, but indicate that there may be problems within various areas that need to be addressed. Once performance can be accurately gauged for key telephone helplines, remedial actions can be implemented, if necessary. This could take the form of adjusting how calls are handled, e.g., the introduction of voicemail, call diversion or group pickup (where available staff in an office can pick up calls from a busy extension). An alternative could be transferring of some helplines to the Moray Contact Centre.

4. Conclusion

4.1 There are four indicators currently falling into the red "action required" category. For two of these indicators (Freedom of Information acknowledgement times and telephone response rates to priority numbers) further periods of data collection are needed to accurately determine service performance levels. For the other two red indicators (medium and low priority equalities impact assessments) low performance levels have resulted from available resources being used to complete high priority impact assessments and are not therefore

believed to be a cause for concern. All other indicators are meeting or are within an acceptable threshold of targets for the quarter.

Author of Report: George Maldonado, Research and Information Officer

Background Papers: Held by author

Ref:

Signatures: _____

Designation: Chairman of Policy Committee

Name: Councillor E McGillivray