

**Local Government Benchmarking Framework**

---

**1. Summary**

The PRS Committee agreed to review the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) in four sections over the year. This paper addresses the fourth section, giving consideration to trends over the first four years of the LGBF, including an overview of our Family Group ranking.

**Douglas Hendry**  
**Executive Director, Customer Services**

For further information  
Jane Fowler  
Head of Improvement and HR

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 This paper sets out the trends across the full dataset of the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) for consideration by the PRS Committee, including our Family Group ranking.

**3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 It is recommended that the Committee notes the content of this report.

**4. DETAIL**

4.1 The PRS Committee agreed to give consideration to trends across the full dataset for the first four years of the LGBF at this meeting, including Family Group ranking.

4.2 The indicators for Corporate Services relate to our Family Group of Aberdeenshire, Dumfries & Galloway, Western Isles, Highland, Orkney, Scottish Borders and Shetland.

4.3 The indicators for People Services relate to our Family Group of Angus, East Lothian, Highland, Midlothian, Moray, Scottish Borders and Stirling.

4.4 The full data for Argyll and Bute Council is included, outlining trends over the four year's data and including our Family Group ranking.

**5. CONCLUSION**

5.1 The Local Government Benchmarking Framework is a positive development in improving services. Family Groups are able to access increasingly accurate data to develop an understanding of the drivers of best practice, leading to improved services for our communities.

**Douglas Hendry**  
**Executive Director, Customer Services**

For further information  
Jane Fowler  
Head of Improvement and HR

| Theme                   | Reference             | Indicator Description  | Family Group Rank 2013/14                          | Family Group Rank status (improved, stable, deteriorated) |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| Children's Services     | <a href="#">CHN1</a>  | Cost per Primary school Pupil  | 8 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Stable  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN2</a>  | Cost per Secondary School Pupil  | 8 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Stable  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN3</a>  | Cost per Pre-School Education Place  | 8 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Deteriorated  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN5</a>  | Percentage of Secondary Pupils in S6 achieving 5 or more Awards at Level 6   | 2 <sup>nd</sup>                                    | Improved  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN7</a>  | Percentage of Pupils Living in the 20% most Deprived Areas Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 6  | 1 <sup>st</sup>                                    | Improved  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN8a</a> | The Gross Cost of "Children Looked After" in Residential Based Services per Child per Week                                     | 5 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Stable  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN8b</a> | The Gross Cost of "Children Looked After" in a Community Setting per Child per Week  | 1 <sup>st</sup>                                    | Improved  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN9</a>  | Balance of Care for 'Looked After Children': % of Children being Looked After in the Community                                 | 5 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Improved  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN10</a> | Percentage of Adults Satisfied with Local Schools  | 2 <sup>nd</sup>                                    | Improved  |
|                         | <a href="#">CHN11</a> | Proportion of Pupils Entering Positive Destinations  | 7 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Deteriorated  |
|                         | Corporate Services    | <a href="#">CORP 1</a>   | Support Services as a % of Total Gross Expenditure | 5 <sup>th</sup>   |
| <a href="#">CORP 2</a>  |                       | Cost of Democratic Core per 1,000 population   | 5 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Deteriorated  |
| <a href="#">CORP3b</a>  |                       | The Percentage of the Highest Paid 5% Employees Who are Women  | 4 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Improved  |
| <a href="#">CORP4</a>   |                       | The Cost per Dwelling of Collecting Council Tax  | 2 <sup>nd</sup>                                    | Improved  |
| <a href="#">CORP5b2</a> |                       | (Domestic Noise) Average time (hours) between time of complaint and attendance on site, for those requiring attendance on site | 4 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Improved  |
| <a href="#">CORP6</a>   |                       | Sickness Absence Days per Employee   | 8 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Deteriorated  |
| <a href="#">CORP7</a>   |                       | Percentage of Income due from Council Tax Received by the End of the Year  | 4 <sup>th</sup>                                    | Stable  |
| <a href="#">CORP8</a>   |                       | Percentage of Invoices Sampled that were Paid Within 30 days   | 3 <sup>rd</sup>                                    | Improved  |

| Theme                      | Reference                    | Indicator Description  | Family Group Rank 2013/14     | Family Group Rank status (improved, stable, deteriorated) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Social Work Services       | <a href="#">SW1</a>          | Home Care Costs per Hour for people Aged 65 or over  | 6 <sup>th</sup>               | Improved  |
|                            | <a href="#">SW2</a>          | SDS spend on adults 18+ as a % of total social work spend on adults 18+                        | 3 <sup>rd</sup>               | Stable  |
|                            | <a href="#">SW3</a>          | Percentage of people aged 65 or Over with Intensive Needs Receiving Care at Home               | 1 <sup>st</sup> (in Scotland) | Improved  |
|                            | <a href="#">SW4</a>          | Percentage of Adults satisfied with social care or social work services                        | 3 <sup>rd</sup>               | Improved  |
|                            | <a href="#">SW5</a>          | Residential costs per week per resident for people aged 65 or over                             | 8 <sup>th</sup>               | Stable  |
| Culture & Leisure Services | <a href="#">C&amp;L1</a>     | Cost per attendance at Sports facilities   | 5 <sup>th</sup>               | Deteriorated  |
|                            | <a href="#">C&amp;L2</a>     | Cost Per Library Visit   | 7 <sup>th</sup>               | Deteriorated  |
|                            | <a href="#">C&amp;L3</a>     | Cost of Museums per Visit  | 1 <sup>st</sup>               | Stable  |
|                            | <a href="#">C&amp;L4</a>     | Cost of Parks & Open Spaces per 1,000 Population   | 6 <sup>th</sup>               | Deteriorated  |
|                            | <a href="#">C&amp;L5a</a>    | Percentage of Adults Satisfied with Libraries  | 4 <sup>th</sup>               | Improved  |
|                            | <a href="#">C&amp;L5b</a>    | Percentage of Adults Satisfied with Parks and Open Spaces                                      | 5 <sup>th</sup>               | Improved  |
|                            | <a href="#">C&amp;L5c</a>    | Percentage of Adults Satisfied with Museums and Galleries                                      | 8 <sup>th</sup>               | Stable  |
|                            | <a href="#">C&amp;L5d</a>    | Percentage of Adults Satisfied with Leisure Facilities   | 8 <sup>th</sup>               | Stable  |
| CORPORATE ASSET            | <a href="#">CORP ASSET 1</a> | Proportion of operational buildings that are suitable for their current use                    | 6 <sup>th</sup>               | Stable  |
|                            | <a href="#">CORP ASSET 2</a> | Proportion of internal floor area of operational buildings in satisfactory condition           | 5 <sup>th</sup>               | Stable  |
| Economic Development       | <a href="#">Econ 1</a>       | % Unemployed People Assisted into work from Council operated / funded Employability Programmes | 1 <sup>st</sup> (in Scotland) | Stable  |

| Theme                  | Reference   | Indicator Description   | Family Group Rank 2013/14 | Family Group Rank status (improved, stable, deteriorated) |
|------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|
| Environmental Services | <a href="#">ENV1</a>                                | Gross Cost of Waste Collection per Premise                                      | 4 <sup>th</sup>           | Improved  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV1a</a>                               | Net Cost of Waste Collection per Premise  | 1 <sup>st</sup>           | Improved  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV2</a>                                | Gross Cost per Waste Disposal per Premise                                       | 5 <sup>th</sup>           | Stable  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV2a</a>                               | Net cost of Waste Disposal per Premise  | 6 <sup>th</sup>           | Improved  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV3a</a>                               | Net Cost of Street Cleaning per 1,000 Population                                | 3 <sup>rd</sup>           | Improved  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV 3c</a>                              | Street Cleanliness Score  | 7 <sup>th</sup>           | Deteriorated  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV4a</a>                               | Cost of Maintenance per Kilometre of Roads                                      | 8 <sup>th</sup>           | Deteriorated  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV4b</a>                               | Percentage of A Class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment | 8 <sup>th</sup>           | Deteriorated  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV4c</a>                               | Percentage of B Class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment | 8 <sup>th</sup>           | Stable  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV4d</a>                               | Percentage of C Class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment | 8 <sup>th</sup>           | Stable  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV 4e</a>                              | Percentage of U Class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment | 7 <sup>th</sup>           | Improved  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV5</a>                                | Cost of trading standards and environmental health per 1,000 population         | 6 <sup>th</sup>           | Stable  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV 5a</a>                              | Cost of trading standards per 1000 population                                   | 4 <sup>th</sup>           | Stable  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV 5b</a>                              | Cost of environmental health per 1000 population                                | 8 <sup>th</sup>           | Deteriorated  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV6</a>                                | Percentage of total waste arising that is recycled                              | 3 <sup>rd</sup>           | Deteriorated  |
|                        | <a href="#">ENV7a</a>                               | Percentage of adults satisfied with refuse collection                           | 3 <sup>rd</sup>           | Improved  |
| <a href="#">ENV7b</a>  | Percentage of adults satisfied with street cleaning | 4 <sup>th</sup>   | Deteriorated              |   |