

SCRUTINY SCORECARD – INDICATOR REVIEW

Presented by Head of Sport and Leisure

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out proposed changes to the Authority's 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 have been agreed with Members.

With the commencement of the Leisure Services 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. These revisions are focused purely on what the Authority directly operates and are designed to streamline the data provided to ensure it is current, relevant and gives Members a clearer overview of the performance of the Authority functions.

The Lee Valley Leisure Trust Ltd Scorecard which covers the venues 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 by the Member led Leisure Services Contract Review Working Group.

The Scrutiny Committee at its meeting of 22 February 2018 recommended the proposed changes to Executive Committee (paper S/43/18)

RECOMMENDATION

Members Approve: (1) changes to the Authority's Key Performance Indicators, Corporate Performance Indicators and Open Space/Service Performance Indicators as set out in paper S/43/18.

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 At the Scrutiny Committee on 22 February 2018 (paper S/43/18 attached as Annex A to this report) revision of Key Performance Indicators, Corporate Performance Indicators and Open Space/Service performance Indicators was approved for recommendation to Executive Committee.
- 4 Any environmental, financial, human resource, legal, risk management and equality implications are covered within paper S/43/18.

Author: Dan Buck, 01992 709 896, dbuck@leevalleypark.org.uk

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE REPORTS


Scrutiny Committee	S/43/18	Scrutiny Scorecard – Indicator Review	22 Feb 2018
Scrutiny Committee		Scrutiny Scorecard	7 April 2010
Scrutiny Committee		Scrutiny Scorecard	27 Jan 2010
Scrutiny Committee	S/02/09	Scrutiny: Discussion Paper	15 Oct 2009

ANNEX ATTACHED

Annex A Paper S/43/18

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

the Authority	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
the Trust	Lee Valley Leisure Trust Ltd (trading as Vibrant Partnerships)

 <p>LEE VALLEY REGIONAL PARK AUTHORITY</p> <p>SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</p> <p>22 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 14:00</p>	<p><u>Agenda Item No:</u></p> <p><u>Report No:</u></p> <p>S/43/18</p>
---	---

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. These revisions are focused purely on what the Authority directly operates and are designed to streamline the data provided to ensure it is current, relevant and gives Members a clearer overview of the performance of the Authority functions.

The Trust scorecard which covers the venues 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 Approve: (1) recommendation of the report to the 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 relevant to what the Authority directly operates, their definitions and 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 will 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. Other indicators that could be considered either in addition or instead of this are: 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 the 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 the scores collated within the Performance Indicators section.

The score is based on an agreed number of surveys 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, on an ongoing basis, investigate whether the surveys provide robust enough data that accords with industry best practice or whether new/additional data gathering methods can improve reliability 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.

No change is currently suggested for this indicator at this time, though it is suggested that this indicator is eventually replaced with a more relevant process looking at the best practice of gathering the perceptions of a wider group of stakeholders who have an interest in the Authority such as sports bodies, nature organisations, community groups, and how this can be pursued to create a measurable score. Work is currently underway to carry this out.

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 Farm during 2014/15 (paper E/390/15), there has been a 36% reduction of carbon at this site compared to the 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, it is proposed to remove this KPI, with the focus on monitoring the carbon emissions of the Trust. This indicator will form part of the KPI's or PI's for the new Leisure Service Contract to commence in 2020.

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 direct services, 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 monitoring in this report on the Authority.

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 to more accurately monitor usage. In addition officers have reviewed the compilation of data from specific Sports Development, Community Access Fund, education activities and events where these are 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 colours 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.

13 Income and Budget Variance

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

Budget variance is also derived from the Finance system and is defined as the amount of expenditure plus/minus 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 has been undertaken to replace the current ageing and failing counters. The positions and calibration of these replacement counters should more faithfully reflect attendance at open spaces with the ongoing improvements in technology. Any new counters or revised locations will be re-calibrated on installation and all counters will be calibrated annually. A paper will be taken to Members in the coming months looking at the capital expenditure required to replace the failed/failing counters, most of which are over 10 years old and meeting the end of their service life.

In addition the current usage measurement process used for the three services,

Fisheries, Education and Volunteers, is sufficiently robust as not to require change and will be added to by additional figures now available from both Events and Sports Development.

No change is suggested for the format of 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 a professional Market Research agency conducting exit interviews with customers asking them their satisfaction with their visit. 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 which to date it has not. The Authority is happy with the current process, though will need to consider future provision.

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 a professional Market Research agency conducting 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

No change is currently suggested for this indicator at this time, though it is suggested that this indicator is eventually replaced with a more relevant process – as an example an analysis of social media hits (positive/negative). This would complement but not replace formal complaints/compliments by analysing Twitter/Facebook/Trip Advisor comments, but would require a new baseline set to be produced. Officers are investigating the most cost effective and efficient method for collating this information going forward and other factors to be considered over the next few years.

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 a professional Market Research agency conducting 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. Research has been carried out on indicators used by other councils through the London Parks Benchmarking Group and no other indicator process has been offered.

The exception is education and volunteers. For education a non-riparian 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 an

Youth and Schools session at Lee Valley VeloPark. For Volunteers the Regionality figure comes from the postcodes of all volunteers on the database – the measure is the % of volunteers that live in the non-riparian boroughs. 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.

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 Farm, minimal change is expected.

It is proposed to delete this indicator for the reasons set out above and in paragraph 10, though the indicator will be included as one of the PI's for the Leisure Service Contract commencing in 2020 for all venues.

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 using a system based on sets of transects through sites. The Authority uses a more robust process using the ParkTracker data collection software. The Ranger team, monitoring officers and the GM contractor having access to the ParkTracker system record site cleanliness against set levels (agreed in the Authority's Quality Manual). The current indicator is to be revised to make the indicator and target more relevant/robust with updated definition and methodology taking into account the removal of National Indicators.

The indicator will have a changed definition and methodology with a new baseline to be set recognising the process change.

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 the performance of the 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 No 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 % 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 sites 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 is submitted for Quest Active Communities and the Youth and Schools Department is 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.

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 No. Days Sickness

This indicator is based on the total number of days sickness absence (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 60 years and those who are disabled), the four types of visitor profile are measured by a professional Market Research agency carrying out exit interviews with customers (which also covers customer satisfaction, Net Promoter Score, regionality, etc). The current exit survey can be seen in Appendix D to this report. With changes to retirement ages, the indicator based on those aged over 60 years is suggested to be changed to represent those who are aged over 55 years.

One minor change is suggested for these indicators at this time, based on the age of visitors, with other indicators remaining unchanged.

36 % Regional Users

This 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 (see paragraph 17).

The exception is education and volunteers. This is covered in paragraph 17 above. 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 originally based on the waste removal providers (a range of contractors were used throughout the Park at venues) sending data on a monthly basis. Historically the response was sporadic and insufficiently robust to provide acceptable data. This indicator comprised of waste collected by the range of different waste contractors used at venues, along with the litter collected by the Grounds Maintenance Contractor, (along with annual meadow cuts - grass is not collected when cut). The Authority has had a policy of having no litter bins within the Park, so litter collected is not streamed at point of source and the contractor disposes of it via skips.

Due to changes in how usage is reported looking purely at Authority open spaces, this indicator can give erroneous figures based on seasonal changes to visitors to the Park and it is also felt that utilising the total combined riparian/non-riparian population would give a misleading figure of the amount of waste produced.

It is proposed on this basis to remove this indicator, though the Authority would retain the % Waste Recycled indicator.

38 % Waste Recycled

The Authority's Grounds Maintenance contractor can provide sufficiently robust data to allow for analysis of the percentage of waste produced within the parklands that can be recycled as indicated in para 37 above. As this indicator will be Authority waste only, a new baseline will have to be produced for comparison year on year.

All waste collected by the GM Contractor is placed in the general waste skips within the Glendale depot, where waste is collected once the skip is full and transferred to Enfield's Skips Depot in Theobalds Park Road. It is then sorted on a processing belt, waste is separated into recycle streams and approximately only 8 - 10% is considered unrecyclable and is sent to incinerator plants or in the last resort, landfill. Green waste is sent to a biomass plant in Crews Hill to generate electricity. Metal/Hard-core/Soil waste is all 100% recycled via relevant companies.

As indicated above, 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 declined 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.

It is suggested that a new baseline be established with the information from the contractor used to create a new score.

39 % 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.

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

LSC	Leisure Services Contract
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
PI	Performance Indicator
CPI	Corporate Performance Indicator
CRC	Carbon Reduction Commitment
NPS	Net Promoter Score
CRM	Customer Relationship Management
QMS	Quality Management System
GM	Grounds Maintenance
HRIS	Human Resource Information System
FTE	Full Time Equivalent

	N/A
--	-----

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				+/-5%			0		85%		0%		0%		-1		1		80%		95%		0		90%
Abbey Gardens																									
Bow Creek / EIDB																									
Gunpowder 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	<div></div>																								
Just missed target	<div></div>																								
Below target	<div></div>																								
N/A for site	<div></div>																								
North Sites	<div></div>																								
Amwell	<div></div>																								
Dobbs Weir	<div></div>																								
Glen Faba	<div></div>																								
Nazeing Meads / Nazeing Marsh / Green Lane	<div></div>																								
Slatebrook	<div></div>																								
Stanstead Riverside / Innings	<div></div>																								
South Sites	<div></div>																								
Ramsey Marsh	<div></div>																								
Sewardstone Marshes / Paddocks	<div></div>																								
Swan & Pike Pool	<div></div>																								
Walthamstow Marshes	<div></div>																								

CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS					2017/18 Q1	
					Performance	Q1 Actual
					Annual Target	Comments
					16/17 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)						

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

This page is blank

[illegible]

	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%	

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

Education & Volunteers report non-riparian usage

Financial Measure
Customer Measure
Internal Process Measure
Sustainability Measure

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

	Income	Budget Variance	Customer Satisfaction	Usage	Regionality	Complaints per 1000 visitors	Compliments per 1000 visitors	Quality Audit	H&S Audit	Park Cleanliness
Definition	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 Comparison (Seasonal/last Q etc)	Quarterly Same Q last year	Quarterly Same Q last year	6 Monthly Last Score	Monthly Same Q last year	Six Monthly Last Score	Quarterly Same Q last year	Quarterly Same Q last year	Quarterly Same Q last year	Annually Last Year	Quarterly 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%

CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS				
	17/18 Q1 Actual	Annual Target	2018/19 Q1 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 187 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)

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 .. ☐ 9Email/ E-bulletin ☐ 10Don't know..... ☐ 11Other ☐ 12

Other (please specify) _____

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

Q13. How long did you (or will you) spend at the attraction / site today?

Under an hour..... ☐ 1 4-8 hours..... ☐ 41-2 hours..... ☐ 2 Visit more than once a day . ☐ 52-4 hours..... ☐ 3

Q14. How likely are you to recommend the attraction / site to friends, family and others? (On a scale of 0-10, 0=not at all likely to 10=extremely likely) (SHOW CARD 7)

BOX

Q15. What are the main reasons for giving this score? (Open)

Q16. Have you visited any similar attractions / places in the last 6 months?

Yes.....☐ 1 No☐ 2 Go to Q21

Q17. What was the last similar attraction / place you visited? (Open – Name attractions)

Q18. Would you rate that similar attraction / place as better or worse than here...

Considerably better than our site or attraction ☐ 1A bit better than our site or attraction ☐ 2About the same..... ☐ 3A bit worse than our site or attraction..... ☐ 4Considerably worse than our site or attraction..... ☐ 5

Q19. What, if anything could be done to this particular attraction / site that would improve your experience of it?
INTERVIEWER WRITE TWO MOST IMPORTANT

Most Important (FIRST):

Most important (SECOND):

Don't Know.....☐ 1Nothing☐ 2

Q20. Can you state approximately how much you and your immediate party have spent on the following in relation to this visit?

Accommodation £ _____

Shopping £ _____

Eating and drinking (restaurants /pubs/cafes) £ _____

Entertainment and attractions £ _____

Transport in the area £ _____

(petrol, public transport, parking, etc)

Q21. What age bracket do you fall into? (SHOWCARD 8)

16 – 24☐ 145 - 54☐ 425 – 34☐ 255+.....☐ 535 - 44☐ 3Refused.....☐ 6

Q22. What's your Ethnic Origin? Circle One only (SHOWCARD 9)

White - British ☐ 1 Pakistani ☐ 9White - Irish ☐ 2 Bangladeshi ☐ 10White - Other ☐ 3 Other ☐ 11**Mixed** **Black /Black British**White & Black Caribbean ☐ 4 Caribbean ☐ 12White & Black African ☐ 5 African ☐ 13White & Asian ☐ 6 Other ☐ 14Mixed - Other ☐ 7 Chinese ☐ 15**Asian or Asian British** Other (please specify) ☐ 16Asian or Asian British- Indian ☐ 8 _____

Q23. Are you, yourself, employed?

Yes.....☐ 1 No☐ 2 Refused☐ 3

Q24. Is that more or less than 30 hours per week?

Employed full-time (30+ hours) ☐ 1Employed part-time..... ☐ 2Refused number of hours ☐ 3

Q25. Occupation of the household's main income earner? (Do not ask respondents socio-economic group)

Position: _____

Industry: _____

Q26. Is your home town in the UK or abroad?

UK ☐ 1 - Can I take full postcode: _____Overseas☐ 2 - Which country (specify): _____

Q27. Are you or is a member of your household currently registered disabled?

Yes.....☐ 1 No☐ 2 Don't know☐ 3

Q28. Are you?

Male.....☐ 1 Female☐ 2

Q29. Finally, could I have your name and email address or telephone number if you do not have an email address? This will be in the strictest of confidence and will only be used for back-checking this questionnaire.

Our strict quality assurance policy requires us to contact a sample of the respondents to check that they were interviewed.

Name of respondent: _____

Email / Tel: _____

THANK RESPONDENT AND CLOSE

CONSENT FORM – Vibrant partnerships provides a mailing service to keep interested parties informed of news and events. If you would like to be added to their list please provide your full contact details. This information will not be used for any other reason than agreed above.

Refused☐2

Email: _____

This page is blank