

SCRUTINY SCORECARD – INDICATOR REVIEW

Presented by Head of Sport and Leisure

SUMMARY

This report provides Members with a review of the Authority's current and proposed Key Performance Indicators, Corporate Performance Indicators and Open Space/Service Performance Indicators. These indicators have remained unchanged for an extended period and incorporated financial, customer, internal process and sustainability measures that had been agreed with Members.

However with the commencement of the Leisure Service Contract in April 2015 and changes to a range of processes both internal and external, it has become necessary to consider a revision of the Authority's Scorecard. This revision is designed to streamline the data provided to ensure it is current, relevant and gives Members a clearer overview of the performance of the Authority's functions.

The Trust scorecard will remain in its current format until the end of the existing contract in March 2020. The performance indicators for the new Leisure Services Contract will be considered as part of the new Leisure Services Contract by the Member led Leisure Services Contract Review Working Group.

RECOMMENDATION

Members Recommend to (1) the proposals put forward in this report.
Executive Committee:

BACKGROUND

- 1 At the Scrutiny Committee on 15 October 2009 (Paper S/02/09) it was agreed that a performance scorecard should be developed for the Authority and that this should act as a starting point for discussion that may initiate scrutiny reviews to investigate areas of concern or future development.
- 2 At the Scrutiny Committee on 27 January 2010 a scorecard for the whole Authority was presented and discussed. This resulted in a revised scorecard, incorporating Members' comments and was agreed at the Scrutiny Committee on 7 April 2010. It was agreed that officers would provide an update of the scorecard each quarter to Scrutiny Committee.
- 3 The current scorecard for the Authority is shown in detail at Appendix A to this report and contains the current indicators with the relevant

definitions/methodologies along with unit/reporting frequency/comparison period and overall target. In addition, there is a column for direction of travel (where performance has improved, worsened or stayed the same) which are also colour coded; green - achieving or exceeding target, amber - just missed target or red - below target.

- 4 The proposed scorecard for the Authority is shown in detail at Appendix B to this report and contains the proposed indicators and relevant definitions/methodologies along with unit/reporting frequency/comparison period and overall targets.
- 5 The sections below indicate which areas are under consideration for change and will outline the reason for the proposed change along with the intended improvement to the scorecard process.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPI)

6 KPI 1: Levy Contribution

The Key Performance Indicator for the levy contribution has remained as a percentage of the maximum total levy that could be charged under the Lee Valley Regional Park Act 1966. Currently £10.187m is charged which is 42.9% of the maximum chargeable of £23.754m. Members may be happy to retain this indicator or add other indicators that could be considered either in addition or instead of the current indicator. Other indicators currently used include cost per head of population per year – currently £0.88p and/or cost per Band D property per year – currently £2.63.

7 KPI 2: 2016-19 Business Plan Objectives

This indicator was originally classed in the report as 'Service Plan Progress' (up to Q4 2015/16) though shown on the scorecard as 'Business Priorities Progress'. From Q1 of the financial year 2016/17 the report showed this as 2016-19 Business Plan Objectives, though the scorecard remained unchanged. It is proposed that the scorecard and the relevant definition/methodology etc. be changed to reflect the current reporting position.

Members have already agreed the 2016-19 Business Plan and the relevant Work Plans which will continue to be updated annually and progress on these is reported to Authority at the half year/end of year as part of the Chief Executive's annual work programme update.

8 KPI 3: Customer Satisfaction

This score is generated from a sample of surveys carried out with visitors to the Park, either through face to face interviews via a research agency or through self-completion surveys. The score shown is an amalgamation of all the individual scores collated within the Performance Indicators section

The score is based on an agreed sample population number of surveys (2750) (with 95% confidence in the scoring within a confidence interval of +/-2%). Within individual venues/sites the confidence level is higher as the sample population is smaller.

It is recommended that this KPI is retained; however, previous scorecards have shown this figure as an indicator combining Trust and Authority results. It is

recommended that the new scorecard shows Authority Customer Satisfaction alone. Officers will review whether the current surveys provide robust enough data that accord with industry best practice or whether new/additional data gathering methods can improve the robustness of this score.

9 **KPI 4: Stakeholder Perception**

The stakeholder perception score is generated by asking stakeholders, mainly London councillors, a set of standard questions to assess their overall perception of the Authority at the London Councils Summit, normally held in November. The current survey document is seen in Appendix C to this report.

Considering the other stakeholders within the Park (National Governing Bodies, Wildlife Trust and other partners) it is proposed that the questionnaire is updated and circulated to a wider audience. Broadening the stakeholders survey may involve additional time and cost and is reliant on those stakeholders taking an active interest in responding to the Authority to ensure that year on year data is robust and comparable. This will require a new baseline to be agreed.

10 **KPI 5: CO2 Reductions from Authority Operations**

The KPI focussing on carbon emissions was originally set up in consideration of the range of venues that the Authority managed, all of which could be monitored for energy consumption. With the out-sourcing of the majority of the venues to the Leisure Services Contract, there are only two remaining venues within the Authority (Myddelton House and Holyfield Hall Farm).

Myddelton House has had its heating system replaced with a biomass boiler that runs on compressed pellets, with a conventional gas boiler as back up resulting in a reduction to utility consumption (both gas and electricity).

Following the installation of photovoltaic cells at Holyfield Hall Farm during 2014/15 (paper E/390/15), there has been a 36% reduction of carbon at this site compared to previous years.

Monitoring of carbon emissions was driven by the national Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) and as this scheme closes following the 2018-19 compliance year the Authority is not required by statute to do anything further to comply with this.

In the Budget on 16 March 2016, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that the government has decided to close the CRC scheme following the 2018-19 compliance year. Doing this will significantly streamline the business energy tax landscape by replacing it, in a revenue neutral way, with an increase in the Climate Change Levy.

With the Authority's current energy saving adaptations in place and no other substantial energy savings currently identifiable at these two sites, it is proposed to remove this KPI, with the focus on monitoring the carbon emissions of the Trust.

11 **KPI 6: Usage**

This indicator measures visitors to the Park and has been shown as a combined Trust/Authority result.

It is proposed that this indicator focusses solely on visits to Authority Open Spaces and service use, with visits to Trust venues separately reported within the Leisure Services Contract Monitoring Report. This will still enable an overall usage/visitor score to be calculated but will focus the monitoring in this report on the Authority usage in Parks and Open Spaces.

Work is currently being undertaken to look at replacing the current usage counters which have reached the end of their serviceable life. New counters are to be introduced to sites with revised locations (where appropriate) to more accurately monitor usage. In addition officers will review the compilation of data from specific Sports Development activities and the Community Access Fund where they record usage in addition to the normal usage counters.

AUTHORITY PARKLANDS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (PI)

12 Overall

The Performance Indicators for the Authority's Open Spaces are broken down into four distinct measures – Financial, Customer, Internal Process and Sustainability. Several of the performance figures such as customer satisfaction translate directly as a Key Performance Indicator as well.

All figures are colour coded in a traffic light, (red/amber/green - RAG), system on performance against target, with a figure achieving plus/minus 5% shown as green. Any figure showing between 5-10% below target is shown as amber and anything greater than 10% below target is shown as red. It is proposed that this scoring method remains the same.

13 Income and Budget Variance

Income is derived from the finance system and is the actual received income for the quarter in question.

Budget variance is reported from the monthly budget monitoring reports and is defined as the amount of actual and projected expenditure less the profiled income expectation of each site/service.

No change is suggested for this indicator and Scrutiny Committee receive the full Quarterly Revenue Monitoring report (presented to Executive Committee) as an appendix to the scorecard report.

14 Usage

Usage within sites is measured by a range of electronic counters situated at entry points and car parks. As noted above, research is being undertaken to replace the current counters with updated technology and the positions and calibration of these indicators should robustly reflect attendance at open spaces with the ongoing improvements in technology.

In addition the current usage measurement process used for the three services, Fisheries, Education and Volunteers is sufficiently robust as not to require change.

No change is suggested for this indicator, save that the combined figure would become the KPI, replacing the joint Trust/Authority figure.

15 Customer Satisfaction

Customer satisfaction is measured by market research agency exit interviews with customers asking them their satisfaction with their visit and customers are asked to rate their satisfaction with their visit with a score from 1-10. At present, the amalgamated score from all sites is combined with that of the Trust to form one of the KPI's. This score will include customer satisfaction for Youth & Schools collected and collated from the teacher evaluation form completed following school visits.

No change is suggested for this indicator, except that the figure would become the KPI as before but represent satisfaction at the Authority's Open Spaces and centres only and replace the joint Trust/Authority figure.

16 Net Promoter Score

Net Promoter Score (NPS) is measured by market research agency exit interviews with customers asking them how likely they are to recommend the site to friends/family or others and customers are asked to rate their satisfaction with their visit with a score from 1-10. The scores are then used to arrive at the NPS for that site using the standard NPS approach.

The NPS process for Youth and Schools has had some problems due to the teachers evaluation form being two sided and a significant number of teachers only completing the first side (Customer Satisfaction). However staff are aware of this issue and actively remind teachers. The NPS process for Fisheries is a direct questionnaire and requires no modification.

It is suggested that this indicator is replaced with a more relevant process - an analysis of social media hits (positive/negative). This would complement but not replace the formal complaints/compliments by analysing Twitter/Facebook/Trip Advisor comments and would require a new baseline set to be produced. Officers are currently reviewing the most cost effective and efficient method for collating this information going forward.

17 Regionality

Regionality is based on the percentage of users coming from further than 3 miles to a site, and within the region and is measured by independent market research agency exit interviews with customers. The indicator is that used by Sydney Olympic Park and, as there aren't many other organisations with a regional remit that track visitors, this was deemed the most suitable process.

The exception is education and volunteers. For education a regional user is one who is from a non-riparian borough. This makes it much more challenging to achieve than the above target. For example an Epping school is in Epping Forest so would not be classed as regional even if they travelled 15 miles to a Youth and Schools session at the Lee Valley VeloPark. A note has been added to the scorecard that education and volunteers report non-riparian usage but this should also be noted in accompanying reports.

No other change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

18 Formal Complaints

This indicator is based on the number of complaints received per 1000 visitors that

have been recorded on the Authority's Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time although it is proposed to add comments from the teachers evaluation form completed at the time of the visit to ensure completeness of data.

19 Formal Compliments

This indicator is based on the number of compliments received per 1000 visitors that have been recorded on the Authority's Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time although it is proposed to add comments from the teachers evaluation form completed at the time of the visit to ensure completeness of data

20 Quality Score

The Quality Score was previously based upon Quality Management System (QMS) Audits of the following departments; Ranger Service, Fisheries, Holyfield Farm, Myddelton House and Youth and Schools. QMS Audits were discontinued at the end of the final quarter of the 2016/17 year as no longer being relevant. A new quality monitoring contract has commenced with Right Directions (who manage the Quest scheme) to carry out Quality Audits of Youth and Schools, Sports Development and Events teams.

It is suggested that a new baseline be established with the scores from these audits used as the Quality Score.

21 Health & Safety Audit

This indicator is based on an externally completed audit of health and safety practice against set criteria. This has been effective over many years, resulting in the Authority being rated a '5 Star' organisation by the British Safety Council.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

22 Utility Consumption

This indicator is based on the total gas and electric consumption and is based on the gas and electric usage from the relevant meters.

With improvements to heating/lighting at Myddelton House and the installation of photovoltaic cells at Holyfield Hall Farm, minimal change is expected.

It is proposed to delete this indicator for the reasons set out above in paragraph 10.

23 Cleanliness

The original cleanliness indicator was based upon NI 195 (which replaced the earlier BVPI 199), and looked at the percentage of sites that had poor levels of cleanliness. The Ranger team and others with access to the ParkTracker system record site cleanliness against set levels (agreed in the Authority's Quality Manual). The current process is to be revised to make the indicator and target

more relevant with updated definition and methodology taking into account the removal of National Indicators.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (CPI)

24 Overall

Similar to the Authority Parklands Performance Indicators, the Authority's Corporate Performance Indicators are also broken down into four distinct measures – Financial, Customer, Internal Process and Sustainability. These focus on the Authority holistically and also cover a range of awards and accreditations showing performance of corporate aspects of the organisation.

25 Website hits (distinct visits to the site)

This indicator is based on the number of distinct visits to Lee Valley's visitor facing websites – this is made up of the main destination website – visitleevalley.org.uk plus microsites for Lee Valley Park Farms and Lee Valley White Water Centre, plus leevalleypark.org.uk. This allows accurate comparisons with previous years. An external agency produces a webstats report for the Authority.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time. Although officers will investigate other points of access via social media to see if the totality of access is wider than just the Authority's website. This could lead to a refined indicator going forward.

26 Number of media articles

This indicator is based on the number of articles published in a range of media with an external agency collecting all articles.

In addition to the data that has been provided in the past, coverage which has been achieved proactively will also be reported. This, with a short commentary where needed, will give a more accurate representation of work undertaken and results achieved, and will help explain fluctuations in numbers year on year which sometime accrue due to media coverage of high profile sports events.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

27 Percentage of articles that are positive

This indicator is based on the percentage of articles that are considered to have a positive tone and is derived by the number of positive articles noted divided by all articles within the media and is provided by an external agency.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

28 Green Flags achieved (Number / Score)

This indicator is based on the number of Green Flag and Green Heritage Awards achieved. Sites submitted for the award are assessed against Green Flag/Heritage criteria by external assessors.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

29 NI 197 Improved Local Biodiversity – active management of local sites

This indicator is based on the percentage of local sites that are actively managed, with the methodology based on the number of sites actively managed divided by the total number of local sites. As with other National Indicators NI197 was scrapped in 2010. However, as there is no current indicator that meets the Authority's needs it is recommended that the current indicator is retained until completion of the new Biodiversity Action Plan where revised indicators may be considered.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

30 Quest Accreditations (Number / Score)

This indicator is based on the number of leisure sites with Quest accreditation for quality management, and their score with Quest assessors giving a score based on set criteria. Since this indicator was set, the Quest process has changed from giving a score to indicating a banding within which the site sits. As all of the leisure venues now sit within the Trust it is suggested that this CPI is replaced with a more relevant indicator. The Quest accreditation will still be monitored as part of the Trust's scorecard.

The Authority's Sports Development Department are submitted for Quest for Active Communities and the Youth and Schools Department are submitted for the Learning Outside the Classroom Accreditation.

Additionally, during the last three years, the Authority has been submitting sites for London in Bloom. This accreditation recognises a different set of criteria to Green Flag and allows the Authority to gather additional information on continuous improvement of its open spaces. Bandings vary between Bronze, Silver, Silver-Gilt and Gold. All of the sites currently submitted for the award sit within the 'Gold' band.

It is recommended that this indicator is replaced with a revised indicator to be titled 'Quality awards', with relevant targets agreed.

31 External Capital Funding

The amount of capital funding achieved in any one year is dependent on the nature of the particular schemes programmed in that year. It is important that officers continue to seek third party funding and land sale receipts to support the level of investment required across the Regional Park to deliver its corporate priorities whilst minimising the impact on the levy and therefore the tax payer. It is therefore proposed to retain a percentage target (50%) of funding across the capital programme, but this will vary between schemes, for example land acquisition is likely to attract 0% external funding whilst opportunities to create new assets e.g. the Olympic venues as a real example provided 100% of funding.

The scorecard report will need to analyse the capital programme schemes to provide a year on year analysis.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

32 Total Income Generation

This indicator is based on the total operational income for the Authority and derives directly from the financial system.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

33 Staff Satisfaction

This indicator is based on the Staff Satisfaction score from a bi-annual survey, with questionnaires sent to all staff to complete.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

34 Number of Days Sickness

This indicator is based on the total number of days sickness absence (short and long term registered on the HRIS system) divided by the number of FTE staff.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

35 Visitor Profiling

Although this section is broken down into 4 distinct sub-sets (those from the most deprived socio-economic groups, those from black & minority ethnic groups, those aged over 60yrs and those who are disabled), the four types of visitor profile are measured by a market research agency carrying out exit interviews with customers (which also covers customer satisfaction, Net Promoter Score, Regionality, etc.) The exit survey can be seen in Appendix D to this report.

No change is suggested for these indicators at this time.

36 Percentage Regional Users

This indicator (also used as an Authority Parklands Performance Indicator) is based on the percentage of users that come from further than 3 miles from the site, but within the region and is a total amalgamated figure deriving from the Performance Indicator section of the scorecard.

The exception is education and volunteers. For education a regional user is one who is from a non-riparian borough. This makes it much more challenging to achieve than the above target. For example an Epping school is in Epping Forest so would not be classed as regional even if they travelled 15 miles to a Youth and Schools session at Lee Valley VeloPark. A note has been added to the scorecard that education and volunteers report non-riparian usage but this should also be noted in accompanying reports.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

37 Waste Per Head

This indicator was based on the waste removal providers (a range of contractors were used throughout the Regional Park) sending data on a monthly basis. Historically the response has been sporadic and insufficiently robust to provide acceptable data.

Following up on all the work done previously it is now even more unlikely that we will be able to get a contractor that can provide the service/data the Authority would require. In addition waste treatment is changing radically with many landfill sites closing and new MERF'S, incinerators and composting plants replacing our current waste disposal methods.

If the Authority's non-recyclable waste goes into incinerator plants these are now highly efficient and act as CHP's recovering, gas, heat and other power from the incineration process. Reductions in waste into landfill sites in London has reduced in the last five years with four of the major landfill sites around London now either only taking small amounts of specialist commercial waste or contaminated transfer station waste.

Officers are of the view that it is unlikely that our waste goes into these landfill sites anymore with the provision of the new technologies now available.

It is proposed on this basis to remove this indicator.

38 Percentage Waste Recycled

The Authority could not find a supplier that could cover the whole of the Regional Park.

As in paragraph 37 it is proposed to remove this indicator for the reasons stated.

39 Percentage Staff Turnover

This indicator is based on the total number of staff leaving the Authority's employment (over a specific period) divided by the average total number employed (over the same period) multiplied by 100 to give a percentage. The figure is generated by the HRIS system.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

40 Average response time to complaints, enquiries and suggestions (days)

This indicator is based on the average time taken to respond to customer complaints, compliments and suggestions with all data reported from the CRM system.

No change is suggested for this indicator at this time.

NEXT STEPS

- 41 Subject to Scrutiny approval of the proposals set out in this report and any further additions put forward by Members today this paper will be put forward to Executive Committee for approval to form the basis of a new scorecard to measure the Authority's performance against agreed targets.
- 42 Where new or changed indicators are proposed officers will start to gather data to baseline or re-baseline figures and ensure robust data collection processes are put in place. Existing scorecard reporting will continue until 31 March 2018 with the first baseline year for recording commencing in the new financial year.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 43 There are no additional financial implications arising directly out of the recommendations in this report, any costs of further data compilation will be managed within existing budgets.

HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 44 Existing staff resources will be used to manage and monitor performance information.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 45 There are no legal implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 46 Ensuring the performance framework is relevant and up-to-date allows robust scrutiny of in year performance and provides a useful tool in business planning going forward.

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 47 There are no equality implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

Author: Simon Sheldon, 01992 709859 ssheldon@leevalleypark.org.uk

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE REPORTS

Scrutiny	S/37/16	Scrutiny Scorecard 2016/17 Q2	20/10/16
Scrutiny	E-Mail Dispatch	Scrutiny Scorecard 2016/17 Q1	05/09/16
Scrutiny	S/02/09	Scrutiny: Discussion Paper	15/10/09

APPENDICES ATTACHED

Appendix A	Current Authority Scrutiny Scorecard
Appendix B	Proposed Authority Scrutiny Scorecard
Appendix C	London Councils Survey
Appendix D	Lee Valley - Exit Survey 2016/17 (Parkland)

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

KPI	Key Performance Indicator
PI	Performance Indicator
CPI	Corporate Performance Indicator
the Trust	Lee Valley Leisure Trust Ltd (trading as Vibrant Partnerships)

This page is blank

Reporting Period							
		2017/18 Q1					
Key Performance Indicators		16/17 Q1 Actual	Annual Target	Performance	Q1 Actual	Expected at Year End	Comments
Levy contribution							
Customer satisfaction							
Stakeholder perception							
CO2 reductions from Authority Operations							
2016-19 Business Plan Objectives							
Usage							
Direction of travel							
↑ Performance has improved							Performance against target
↓ Performance has worsened							Achieving or exceeding target
↔ Performance has remained the same							Just missed target
							Below target

Reporting Period		2017/18 Q1																									
Authority	Performance Indicators																										
	Income (£000's)		Budget Variance		Usage		Customer Satisfaction		Net Promoter Score		Regionality		Formal Complaints		Formal Compliments		Quality Score		H&S Audit		Utility Consumption (000 kwh)		Cleanliness				
	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18			
Overall Target																											
Abbey Gardens																											
Bow Creek / EIDB																											
Gun powder Park																											
River Lee Country Park																											
Rye House Gatehouse																											
Three Mills																											
Tottenham Marshes																											
Waterworks Nature Reserve																											
North Sites																											
South Sites																											
Myd Hse Gardens & Vis Cntr																											
Holyfield Farm																											
Fisheries																											
Education																											
Volunteers																											
ALL PARKLANDS																											
Performance against target		Tolerance																									
Achieving or exceeding target		<5%																									
Just missed target		5-10%																									
Below target		>10%																									
N/A for site																											
North Sites																											
Amwell																											
Dobbs Weir																											
Glen Faba																											
Nazeing Meads / Nazeing Marsh / Green Lane																											
Spittelbrook																											
Stanstead Riverside / Innings																											
South Sites																											
Ramney Marsh																											
Sewardstone Marshes / Paddocks																											
Swan & Pike Pool																											
Walthamstow Marshes																											

Financial Measure
Customer Measure
Internal Process Measure
Sustainability Measure

Education & Volunteers report non-trip/parian usage

Fisheries: permits sold plus day tickets
Education: no. children on programmes
Volunteers: volunteer hours worked

N/A for site

North Sites
Amwell
Dobbs Weir
Glen Faba
Nazeing Meads / Nazeing Marsh / Green Lane
Spittelbrook
Stanstead Riverside / Innings

South Sites
Ramney Marsh
Sewardstone Marshes / Paddocks
Swan & Pike Pool
Walthamstow Marshes

Financial Measure
Customer Measure
Internal Process Measure
Sustainability Measure

Education & Volunteers
report non-riparian usage

Fisheries: permits sold plus day tickets
Education: no. children on programmes
Volunteers: volunteer hours worked

2017/18 Q1				
CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS				
Performance Indicators	16/17 Q1 Actual	Annual Target	Performance	Q1 Actual
Website hits (distinct visits to the site)				
No. articles				
% articles that are positive				
Green Flags achieved (Number / Score)				
NI 197 Improved local biodiversity – active management of local sites				
Quest accreditations (Number / Score)				
External Capital Funding				
Total Income Generation				
Staff Satisfaction				
No. Days Sickness				
Visitor Profiling				
- from the most deprived socio-economic groups				
- from black & minority ethnic groups				
- aged over 60yrs				
- disabled				
% Regional Users				
Waste per head				
% Waste recycled				
% staff turnover				
Average response time to complaints, enquiries and suggestions (days)				

Direction of travel	
↑	Performance has improved
↓	Performance has worsened
↔	Performance has remained the same

N/A

Tolerance	Performance against target
<5%	Achieving or exceeding target
5-10%	Just missed target
>10%	Below target

Financial Measure
Customer Measure
Internal Process Measure
Sustainability Measure

This page is blank

	N/A
--	-----

	Levy Contribution	Customer Satisfaction	Stakeholder perception	Business Plan Objectives Progress	Usage
Definition	Levy charged as a percentage of the maximum chargeable levy	How customers rate their satisfaction with their visit from 1-10	Perception level of stakeholders using numerical qualitative answers from Stakeholder Perception Audit using standard questionnaire	% of Business Plan Objectives completed which flow from the 3 year Business Plan	Number of people using the park and service use
Methodology	Agreed levy divided by maximum chargeable levy	Market Research agency exit interviews with customers ask satisfaction with visit	Perception score is generated by asking stakeholders, mainly London councillors (to be expanded), a set of standard questions to assess their overall perception of the Authority at the London Councils Summit	Self reported progress for each action compared to target in Business Plan Objectives. Number of actions progressing divided by total number of actions required to be completed in the relevant quarter	Vehicle and Pedestrian counters across the park along with specific Sports Development activities and the Community Access Fund
Unit	%	%	%	%	No.
Reporting frequency	Annually	6 Monthly	Annually Q3	Quarterly	Monthly
Comparison (Seasonal/last Q etc)	Last Year	Last Score	Last Score	Previous Q	Same period last Year
Overall Target	63%	83%	80%	80%	

Reporting Period		2018/19 Q1																							
Authority	Performance Indicators																								
	Income (£000's)		Budget Variance		Usage		Customer Satisfaction		Net Promoter Score		Regionality		Formal Complaints		Formal Compliments		Quality Score		H&S Audit		Utility Consumption (000 kwh)		Cleanliness		
	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	16/17	17/18	

Fisheries: permits sold plus day tickets
Education: no children on programmes
Volunteers: volunteer hours worked

Education & Volunteers report non-routine usage

Financial Measure
Customer Measure
Internal Process Measure
Sustainability Measure

Definition	Income	Budget Variance	Customer Satisfaction	Usage	Regionality	Complaints per 1000 Visitors	Compliments per 1000 Visitors	Quality Audit	H&S Audit	Park Cleanliness
	The actual received income for the quarter in question	The amount of actual and projected expenditure less the profiled income expectation of each site/service.	How customers rate their satisfaction with their visit from 1-10	Number of visitors to park and services	% of users coming from further than 3 miles to a site, and within region	No. of complaints received per 1000 visitors	No. of compliments received per 1000 visitors	Audit of compliance with Quest principles for three areas; Sports Development, Events and Youth and Schools	Audit of health and safety practice	% of sites that achieve A (Excellent) to C (Satisfactory) scores
Methodology	Income is derived from the Finance system and is the actual received income for the quarter in question	Budget variance is reported from the monthly budget monitoring reports	Market Research agency exit interviews with customers ask satisfaction with visit	Electronic counters across the Park along with usage measurement process used by the three services, Fisheries, Education and Volunteers	Market Research agency exit interviews with customers ask for home postcode	Complaints from CRM system	Compliments from CRM system	External consultants score against set criteria	H&S score against set criteria	Rangers record against set levels of cleanliness within the Quality Manual and upload to parktracker. Analysis of results is carried out monthly and forms part of the monitoring process.
Unit	£	£	%	No. People	%	No/ person	No/ person	%	%	% (higher is better)
Reporting frequency	Quarterly	Quarterly	6 Monthly	Monthly	Six Monthly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Annually	Quarterly
Comparison (Seasonal/last Q etc)	Same Q last year	Same Q last year	Last Score	Same Q last year	Last Score	Same Q last year	Same Q last year	Same Q last year	Last Year	Last Quarter
Overall Target	Budget	Budget	83%	Same as Q4 previous year	35%	1 less than previous year Q4 total	1 more than previous year Q4 total	75%	95%	90.00%

		2018/19 Q1		
CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS				
	17/18 Q1 Actual	Annual Target	Performance	Q1 Actual
Website hits (distinct visits to the site)				
No. media articles				
% articles that are positive				
Green Flags achieved (Number / Score)				
NI 197 Improved local biodiversity – active management of local sites				
Quality Awards (Number)				
External Capital Funding				
Total Income Generation				
Staff Satisfaction				
No. Days Sickness				
Visitor Profiling				
- from the most deprived socio-economic groups				
- from black & minority ethnic groups				
- aged over 60yrs				
- disabled				
% Regional Users				
Waste per head				
% Waste recycled				
% staff turnover				
Average response time to complaints, enquiries and suggestions (days)				

Performance Indicators

Direction of travel	
↑ Performance has improved	
↓ Performance has worsened	
↔ Performance has remained the same	

N/A

Tolerance	Performance against target
<5%	Achieving or exceeding target
5-10%	Just missed target
>10%	Below target

Financial Measure
Customer Measure
Internal Process Measure
Sustainability Measure

	Definition	Methodology	Unit	Reporting frequency	Comparison (Seasonal/last Q etc)	Overall Target
Website hits (distinct visits to the site)	Number of distinct visits to the LVRP website	Webstats report produced by external agency	No.	Quarterly	Last Quarter	Agreed level higher than Q4 previous year
No. media articles	Number of articles published in media	External agency collect all articles	No.	Quarterly	Last Quarter	Agreed after Q4 previous year
% articles that are positive	% of articles that are considered to have a positive tone	No. of positive articles divided by all articles	%	Quarterly	Last Quarter	95%
Green Flags achieved (Number / Score)	Number of Green Flag and Green Heritage Awards	Sites are assessed against Green Flag criteria by external assessors	Number of Awards	Annually	Last year	11
NI 197 Improved local biodiversity – active management of local sites	% of local sites that are actively managed	No. of sites actively managed / total no. local sites	% of sites actively managed	Quarterly	Last Quarter	60%
Quality awards (Number)	The number scored Quality Awards to include Quest for Active Communities, Learning Outside the Classroom and London in Bloom	All awards are assessed by industry professionals to pass within set criteria	No.	Quarterly	Last quarter	8
External Capital Funding	Actual external funding received on the total five year rolling capital programme.	Capital Monitoring Report - Total Capital Income (minus capital receipts) / Total Capital Expenditure. Uses estimated outturn	%	Quarterly	Last Score	15%
Total Income Generation	Total Operational Income	Report ACT041 from Efin (cost centre A01001, account RV11). Bottom level on cost centre. Total minus 646 and 651	£	Quarterly	Financial Period	Budget
Staff Satisfaction	Staff satisfaction score from survey	Staff satisfaction survey - questionnaires sent to all staff to complete	%	Bi-annually	Last Result	
No. Days Sickness	Total number of days sickness absence divided by FTE	HRIS system	No. per employee	Quarterly	Last Quarter	6 days
Visitor Profiling	Measure current profile of users	Figures from visitor tracking survey	% of visitors sampled	Six-Monthly	Last Result	
- from the most deprived socio-economic groups	As above	As above	As above	Six-Monthly	Last Result	
- from black & minority ethnic groups	As above	As above	As above	Six-Monthly	Last Result	
- aged over 60yrs	As above	As above	As above	Six-Monthly	Last Result	
- disabled	As above	As above	As above	Six-Monthly	Last Result	
% Regional Users	% of users that come from further than 3 miles from the site, but within the region	Visitor tracking - asks postcodes. These are compared to the postcode of the site visited	%	Six-Monthly	Last Result	
% staff turnover	Total number of leavers (over a specific period) divided by average total number employed (over said period) multiplied by 100.	HRIS system	%	Quarterly	Last Quarter	
Average response time to complaints, compliments and suggestions (days)	Average time taken to respond to customer complaints, compliments and suggestions	Data reported from CRM system	No. Days	Quarterly	Last Quarter	10 working days



London Councils Summit – Delegate survey 2016

Name: _____

Council: _____

Category: Cllr / Leader / Other

1.	Have you heard of Lee Valley Regional Park (Authority)?	Yes	No
----	---	-----	----

2.	How did you first become aware of Lee Valley Regional Park (Authority)? [If applicable]		
	a.	Stakeholder bulletin?	
	b.	Website?	
	c.	Constituents?	
	d.	LVRP Visitor / Customer?	
	e.	Other - please write here	

3.	How aware are you of LVRPA's objectives and work?									
	(On a scale of 1-10, 1 being not at all, to 10 completely aware)									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Not at all aware									Completely aware

4.	What do you know about the Park?	Tick
	a.	Involvement with 2012 games (any venue or Olympic Park)
	b.	Levy (only mention if prompted)
	c.	Sports development
	d.	Any of our venues (LVAC, LVIC, LVRC, Golf courses)
	e.	Any of our tourist attractions (Campsites, Marinas, Nature reserves)
	f.	Biodiversity work (projects / awards)
	g.	Regeneration (projects / awards)
	h.	Open spaces
	i.	Event programme
	j.	Know a Member of the Authority
	k.	Partnership work
	l.	Other - please write here

5.	As you may know, LVRPA is heavily involved in delivering a legacy from the London 2012 Olympic Games, particularly legacy planning. How familiar are you with our London 2012 work to date?	Tick
	Very familiar	
	Familiar	
	No knowledge	

6.	Which particular aspects of our legacy work are you aware of?	Tick
	a. Olympic Venues – Lee Valley VeloPark	
	b. Olympic Venues – Lee Valley Hockey and Tennis Centre (Eton Manor)	
	c. Olympic Venues – Lee Valley White Water Centre	
	d. Owns Olympic Park land	
	e. Other– please write here	

7.	How well does LVRPA meet its objectives?									
	(On a scale of 1-10, 1 being not at all, to 10 completely)									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Objectives not met at all									Objectives met completely

8.	How well does Lee Valley Regional Park Authority deliver value for money for your residents?									
	(On a scale of 1-10, 1 being not at all, to 10 very well)									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Not at all									Very well

9.	Finally, how do you perceive the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority?									
	(On a scale of 1-10, 1 very negatively, to 10 very positively)									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Very negative									Very positive

10.	Use the space provided below for any additional comments:

LEE VALLEY - EXIT SURVEY 2016/17 (Parkland)

Appendix D to Paper S/41/17

Date: ___ / ___ / 16

Interview location name: _____

Location code: _____

Good morning / afternoon. My name is _____ working for Vector Research. We have been commissioned by Vibrant Partnerships to carry out a survey with visitors to the park. You have been selected at random for this survey, and I wonder if I could ask you a few questions? It should take approximately 10 minutes, and the answers you give will be kept completely confidential.

Q1. How often do you visit this attraction / site? (SHOWCARD 1)

- This is my first visit..... ☐1
- Once a week..... ☐2
- Once a fortnight..... ☐3
- Once a month..... ☐4
- Less than once / month but at least 2-3 times x year..... ☐5
- Once a year or less..... ☐6
- More than once a week..... ☐7

Q2. How did you get here today? (MAIN MODE SHOWCARD 2)

- Car..... ☐1 Bus..... ☐5
- Bicycle..... ☐2 Coach..... ☐6
- Motorbike..... ☐3 Walk..... ☐7
- Train..... ☐4 Other..... ☐8

Other (please specify) _____

Q3. Are you visiting on your own or with others?

- On my own ☐1 Go to Q6
- With others (all under 16's) ☐2 Go to Q4
- With others (all of whom are adults 16+) ☐3 Go to Q4
- With others (both over 16s and under 16s) ☐4 Go to Q4

Q4. Including yourself, how many people are in your party?

Q5. Including yourself, how many of the following age groups are in your group? (SHOWCARD 3)

0 - 15 _____ 16 - 24 _____ 25 - 34 _____

35-44 _____ 45-54 _____ 55-64 _____

65-74 _____ 75+ _____

Q6 Taking everything into account, how would you rate your visit to this attraction / site today? Where 1 is very poor and 10 very Good. (SHOW CARD 4)

BOX Don't know..... ☐11

Q7. What is the main reason you chose to come to this site / attraction today? Code Main Reason Only

- Running..... ☐1
- Family day out..... ☐2
- Bird / wildlife watching..... ☐3
- Walking a dog..... ☐4
- Leisurely walk..... ☐5
- Fishing..... ☐6
- Educational purposes..... ☐7
- Having a picnic..... ☐8
- Cycling..... ☐9
- Relaxation..... ☐10
- On my way to somewhere else..... ☐11
- Other..... ☐12

(please specify) _____

Q8. For each of the following, please rate on a scale of 1-10 where 1 is very poor and 10 is very good.

READ EACH STATEMENT AND WRITE SCORE (SHOWCARD 4)

- Cleanliness _____
- Standard of benches and other park furniture _____
- Parking _____
- Getting to the site today/ road signposting _____
- Provision of dog bins _____
- Internal route marking / site sign posting _____
- Quality and maintenance of pathways / walkways _____
- Landscape and appearance of the site _____

Q9. Of the aspects shown please can you state in order of priority the three that are most important to you in encouraging you to re-visit or recommend this site to others...?

CODE THREE MOST IMPORTANT (SHOWCARD 5)

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Cleanliness | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Standard of benches and other park furniture | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Parking | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Getting to the site today/ road signposting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Provision of dog bins | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Internal route marking/ site sign posting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Quality and maintenance of pathways/walkways | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Landscape and appearance of the site | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q10. Have you seen any advertising / literature about this particular attraction / site in the last 6 months?

SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes..... ☐1 No..... ☐2

Q11. Where did you see this advertising? (SHOWCARD 6)

PROBE - ANY OTHER SOURCES (twice)

- Newspaper..... ☐1
- Magazine..... ☐2
- Television/ radio..... ☐3
- Internet..... ☐4
- Notice boards at public places..... ☐5
- Posters..... ☐6
- Leaflets/ Brochure..... ☐7
- Listings magazines..... ☐8
- Specialist magazines/ annual guide.. ☐9
- Email/ E-bulletin..... ☐10
- Don't know..... ☐11
- Other..... ☐12
- Other (please specify) _____

Q12. Could you give details of where you specifically heard the advertising/ saw the advert? (probe for specific name / source)
