

WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

23 MARCH 2015

1. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2015-16

Report of the Chief Fire Officer.

RECOMMENDED

- 1.1 THAT Executive Committee notes the new tolerance based methodology to interpreting, measuring and reporting performance against the corporate performance indicators (PIs).
- 1.2 THAT Executive Committee approves the rationalisation and re-numbering of corporate PIs 2015-16.
- 1.3 THAT Executive Committee approves the corporate PIs and targets for 2015-16 as set out in Appendix 2.
- 1.4 THAT Executive Committee notes the ongoing work to synchronise the corporate performance reporting frameworks to enable more effective and influential performance management and reporting.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report is submitted to seek approval for the corporate PIs and targets for 2015-16 and to provide information to Executive Committee about the new tolerance based approach to performance measurement.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 In accordance with its planning framework, the Service has reviewed its rolling three year corporate strategy – The Plan 2015-18.

As part of this approach the Fire Authority approved the 2015-16 annual priorities, strategic objectives and outcomes set out in The Plan which are enablers to achieving our vision of 'Making West Midlands safer', at its meeting on 16 February 2015.

3.2 Following approval of the priorities, objectives and outcomes set out in The Plan, the ACFO Service Delivery, as the officer lead for scrutiny matters, has worked with stakeholders to:

- identify the appropriate PIs for 2015-16
- introduce a tolerance based methodology to performance measurement and reporting.

3.3 In accordance with the Service's commitment to enabling governance through effective engagement and transparency and in line with The Constitution, senior officers met with the Scrutiny Committee Chair on 24 February 2015. At this meeting the Chair confirmed his satisfaction with the tolerance based approach to PI measurement and reporting and approved that the proposed corporate PIs and targets for 2015-16 be submitted to Executive Committee for approval.

PI Tolerances

3.4 A tolerance based methodology to performance measurement is an approach that enables for transparent, focused and quality performance discussions around perceived areas of exceptional performance or under performance. This, in turn, enables for appropriate time and effort to be utilised in discussing performance in exactly the right areas and, where necessary, taking the steps or interventions to improve performance.

3.5 A tolerance approach works on the principle that within reason, performance against PIs will ebb and flow and that irrespective of how sophisticated the intelligence frameworks that inform quantitative PI targets are, it is quite normal and acceptable that performance will be slightly off its performance target at any given time of measurement.

- 3.6 Our current approach to measuring performance against quantitative targets can encourage reactive behaviour and be wasteful from a time, cost and value perspective. In the worst case scenario this may lead to inappropriate interventions to rectify perceived poor performance when the actual variance in performance should be interpreted as normal. Therefore introducing a tolerance based methodology will facilitate the required change in behaviours in terms of focusing time and effort in an evidenced-based way on the areas where it is really needed. For the majority of performance measures, it is proposed that tolerances are developed at upper and lower 95% confidence limits, which means that any performance within + or -5% of the PI target will be 'normal' or 'as expected' and, as such, not ordinarily require significant discussion or intervention.
- 3.7 However, when PI performance enters either the upper tolerance level (negative/poor performance which will be shown in red) or the lower tolerance level (positive or exceptional performance which will be shown in blue), this will allow for sufficient limited Officer and Member time to focus effort where it is required to discuss and understand why PI performance is as reported. If required (as this will not automatically be the case) appropriate interventions would be agreed and implemented.
- 3.8 The Service will still continue to be responsive to re-considering targets should changes in service delivery approaches, trends or external drivers determine this to be appropriate.
- 3.9 A visual example of how performance will be reported against a PI using a tolerance based methodology is attached as Appendix 1.

Rationalisation and renumbering of PIs

- 3.10 As part of the Service's commitment to continuous improvement, senior officers have rationalised the number of corporate PIs. As a consequence, it is proposed that the Service measures its performance against 25 corporate PIs in 2015-16 as opposed to the 31 currently in place.

- 3.11 The rationale for this is to enable corporate PIs to be better aligned and more appropriately balanced and meaningful to reporting performance against the priorities, objectives and outcomes set out in The Plan. This approach will enable a renewed focus in discussing and reporting performance against the indicators that matter at a corporate and member level (Scrutiny Committee). This doesn't mean that PIs currently reported upon will cease to be measured. They will continue to be monitored at a functional level in recognition that these indicators, whilst no longer relevant for corporate reporting, provide valuable intelligence and influence the performance of corporate PIs.
- 3.12 Following rationalisation, the corporate PIs have been renumbered and grouped to reflect the interconnections between the remaining PIs and aligned to the strategic objectives set out in The Plan. PI 1 will be the Response PI and will measure Service performance in achieving our response standard against our risk categories. The Prevention indicators measuring, for example, accidental fires will follow, after which will come the Protection indicators. These will be followed by the Service's range of people and environmental indicators.

Setting PI targets 2015-16

- 3.13 The methodology for setting performance indicator targets is the same as for previous years. An average of the three previous financial years has been used as a starting point. Professional judgement and some forecasting have been used in providing an estimate for the expected performance for the last quarter of 2014-15. This has enabled the Service to set realistic but challenging targets across the range of its PIs for 2015-16 which are set out in Appendix 2. The Chair of the Scrutiny Committee has been consulted and has confirmed that the PIs and targets set are appropriate. However, in the unlikely event of 2014-15 end of year outturn being significantly different to estimated performance, Members will be asked to approve new targets(s).

Reporting Performance

- 3.14 The Service is considering the timeliness and efficiency of its performance reporting framework in enabling the delivery of The Plan. To date, good progress has been made in synchronising both Quarterly Performance Reporting and Scrutiny Committee more closely to end of quarter data collecting and reporting processes. This has enabled for more timely reporting, ensuring that both Officers and Members are well positioned to discuss and importantly influence change and interventions swiftly to enable for performance improvement in support of the delivery of The Plan and 'Making the West Midlands safer'.
- 3.15 However, it is still the case that quarter 1 performance is not reported to Scrutiny Committee until September, nearly three months after it is available. Similarly, if the historical work programme is followed, quarter 2 performance will be reported to Scrutiny Committee in December which is six weeks after the Quarterly Performance Reporting meeting has taken place. These time lags are not cognisant to supporting a fluid, agile and flexible approach to managing performance – particularly corporate performance that is mission critical to the delivery of The Plan.
- 3.16 In recognition of the above, Officers will work with the Clerk to consider a more timely and aligned performance reporting framework to be implemented in 2015-16. Any proposals for change will be submitted to Members as part of the usual meeting schedule paper at the Authority Annual General Meeting in June 2015.

4. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

In preparing this report an initial Equality Impact Assessment is not required and has not been carried out. The matters contained in this report do not relate to a policy change.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. It should be noted that the Authority's approved 2015-16 budget is aligned to and will support the delivery of The Plan.

The contact officer for this report is Assistant Chief Fire Officer Gary Taylor who can be contacted on 0121 380 6914.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Fire Authority Agenda item 7, 16 February 2015, The Plan 2015-18.

PHIL LOACH
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER

Appendix 2

Number	Performance Indicator	Overall target expressed as a % +/- against 3 year performance average	Overall Target 15/16*
PI 1	Risk Based Attendance Standard	Cat 1- 5mins Cat 2-7mins Cat 3- 10mins Cat 4- 20mins	Cat 1- 5mins Cat 2-7mins Cat 3- 10mins Cat 4- 20mins
PI 2	The number of accidental fires in dwellings	0%	1710
PI 3	Injuries from accidental fires in dwellings (Taken to hospital for treatment)	0%	61
PI 4	The number of deaths from accidental fires in dwellings	We seek to minimise deaths from fires	No target set
PI 5	The percentage of Home Safety Checks referred by our partners	N/A	40%
PI 6	The number of Home Safety Checks points achieved by the Brigade	N/A	135,000
PI 7	The number of people killed or seriously injured in Road Traffic Collisions	N/A	983
PI 8	The number of arson fires in dwellings	-5%	240
PI 9	The number of arson fires in non-domestic premises	-1%	160
PI 10	The number of arson vehicle fires	-1%	601
PI 11	The number of arson rubbish fires	-6%	2311
PI 12	The number of arson fires in derelict buildings	-12%	131
PI 13	The number of accidental fires in non-domestic premises	-7%	500
PI 14	The number of false alarm calls due to fire alarm equipment	-2.5%	6307
PI 15	The percentage of employees that have disclosed their disabled status	N/A	100%

[IL0: UNCLASSIFIED]

PI 16	The number of female uniformed staff	N/A	83
Number	Performance Indicator	Overall target expressed as a % - /+ against 3 year performance average	Overall Target 15/16*
PI 17	The percentage of all staff from ethnic minority communities	N/A	14%
PI 18	The average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness – Uniformed employees	N/A	5.42
PI 19	The average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness – Non- Uniformed and Fire Control staff	N/A	7.0
PI 20	The average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness – All staff	N/A	5.8
PI 21	The total number of injuries	-5%	148
PI 22	The total number of RIDDOR injuries	-5%	18
PI 23	To reduce the Fire Authority's carbon emissions	-3%	7430 tonnes
PI 24	To reduce gas use of Fire Authority premises	-5%	13652 mwh
PI 25	To reduce electricity use of Fire Authority premises	-5%	5,908 mwh

*Based on 12/13, 13/14 out-turn and 14/15 estimated end of year out-turn and may need to be amended in line with the actual out-turn when these figures are available in May 15