

22 March 2012	ITEM 5
Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
CORPORATE SCORECARD PERFORMANCE REPORT – MONTH 9/ QUARTER 3 (UP TO END DECEMBER 2011)	
Portfolio Holder: Councillor P Smith; Portfolio Holder for Central Services	
Wards and communities affected: N/A	Key Decision: N/A
Accountable Head of Service: Chris Stephenson, Corporate Performance Manager	
Accountable Director: Richard Waterhouse, Director of Transformation	
This report is Public	
Purpose of Report: To advise Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee of key performance issues arising from the delivery of the Corporate Scorecard 2011-12.	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee with a summary of performance against the Corporate Scorecard 2011-12, a basket of key performance indicators, up to end of December 2011. These indicators are used to monitor the performance of key priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and enables Members, Directors and other leaders to form an opinion as to the delivery of these priorities.

At the end of Month 9, 20 (48.78%) of these indicators are meeting their target and 65.22% have improved their performance over last year.

1. RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- 1.1 Acknowledges and commends services where there is good delivery against priorities in particular processing of planning applications**
- 1.2 Notes the performance in areas of concern and identifies, where it feels necessary, any further areas of concern on which to focus**
- 1.3 Recommends this report to be forwarded to the Chairs of the other service related Overview and Scrutiny Committees for their information**

2.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

2.1 This is the Month 9/Quarter 3 [December] performance report for the Corporate Scorecard 2011/12.

3.0 Performance Report Headlines

3.1 The headline messages for this report are:

3.2 **Performance against target** - of the 41 indicators that are comparable, at the end of December 2011 (*NB KPIs = Key Performance Indicators*)

	KPIs at end of December	KPIs at end of December incl. latest thrice yearly indicators	Previous report comparison	
			<i>KPIs at end of November</i>	<i>KPIs at end of November incl. latest quarterly/thrice yearly data</i>
GREEN Met their target	48.78%	53.33%	50.00%	52.38%
AMBER Within tolerance	17.07%	15.56%	10.00%	14.29%
RED Did not meet target	34.15%	31.11%	40.00%	33.33%

3.3 **Direction of Travel (DOT)** (ie is performance better, worse or the same as last year) - of the 23 indicators that are comparable, at the end of December 2011 (based on the previous year's outturn or position at the same time last year whichever is most appropriate for the indicator):

	DOT at end of December	DOT at end of Dec incl. latest quarterly data	Previous report comparison	
			<i>DOT at end of November</i>	<i>DOT at end of Nov incl. latest quarterly /thrice yearly data</i>
↑ IMPROVED	65.22%	70.37%	47.37%	59.26%
→ STATIC	8.69%	7.41%	5.26%	3.7%
↓ DECLINED	26.09%	22.22%	47.37%	37.04%

3.4 What does this mean?

3.4.1 The basket of indicators within the corporate scorecards include a wide variety of measures. A "RED" indicator can therefore mean a number of things including:

- i) A challenging situation has arisen – often outside of the Council's control – to which the Council needs to respond. In such cases we need to monitor these indicators carefully in order to ensure we are sufficiently resourced to deal with any consequential impact on service delivery eg increase in number of child care proceedings (see section 4.3.4). However, the increase in such a figure does not necessarily relate to a deterioration in service performance.

- ii) Performance is outside that required to meet the year end target. These targets were deliberately set as challenging and aspirational in line with the Council’s aim is to be **“ambitious for the people of Thurrock and totally focused on meeting their current and future aspirations”**. It is for this reason that the Council has been robust and challenging in the targets it sets itself. For example, the target for sickness absence requires a 20% improvement during 12 months.

3.4.2 The Direction of Travel (DOT) shows how we are improving against our self-selected indicator set – those which the Council has deemed of key importance. Comparing the strong “direction of travel” figures with a less strong “RAG” (Red, Amber, Green) rating shows that the Council is improving our performance, even though we have not yet reached our aspirational levels of performance set out in the targets. This shows there is still more to be done. Sickness absence, for example is still showing as RED as it is forecast to be below target for the year. However, the underlying performance is about 10% better than last year and therefore shows a strong direction of travel.

4.0 KPIs identified by the Performance Board

4.1.1 As part of the Council’s performance management process, the Performance Board - a council wide group of performance leads – reviews the progress of the Corporate Scorecard on a monthly basis to provide assurance to the Directors’ Board and Cabinet of delivery.

Where the Performance Board identifies issues that it considers to be of concern or indeed merits the highlighting of good performance it recommends these to the Directors’ Board and Cabinet for their consideration

4.2 KPIs identified by the Performance Board as being ‘IN FOCUS’

4.2.1 NI157b and c – Minor and “other” planning applications

Scorecard Segment Definition		Customer	
		NI157b - This PI measures the percentage of "minor" applications that are processed by the Planning Department within 8 weeks. NI157c - This PI measures the percentage of 'other' planning applications that are processed within 8 weeks.	
Reason for IN FOCUS		Both of these two indicators have achieved 100% in December	
PI	Actual December	Latest Year to Date (Apr - Dec)	Year End Target
NI157b	100%	92%	86%
NI157c	100%	97.52%	93%

Commentary:

These indicators are IN FOCUS as they have been consistently high performing throughout the year, and in December were both 100%.

A “minor” application (NI157b) is typically one which involves development of less than 1,000m2 or between 1-9 dwellings. An example of "other" planning applications (NI157c) ie neither "major" nor "minor" is development involving change of use, householder development, listed building alterations

Of the 125 minor applications determined so far this year only 10 have gone over target. Over the last 18 months more effective and efficient processes have been put in place which have lead to this consistently high level of performance. The scale of this excellent performance is highlighted when comparing our current figures with the published figures from the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) that compared all England Authorities, for 2010/11 the Council’s performance ranked as follows (last years ranking in brackets):

Processing of Major applications on time (NI157a) = Joint 8th (Joint 32nd)
 Processing of Minor applications on time (NI157b) = Joint 10th (Joint 7th)
 Processing of Other applications on time (NI157c) = Joint 2nd (Joint 4th)

This comparison shows that Thurrock’s performance on processing of planning applications is in the top 3% nationally.

From April 2012, the Council will be taking on additional planning responsibilities with the integration of the Development Corporation. Currently, approximately 65% of major applications (ie larger scale developments) are determined by the Development Corporation, but from April they will all come under the auspices of the Council. Therefore to maintain the focus on delivery under the new arrangements it has been proposed that for the 2012-13 corporate scorecard an additional indicator monitoring the processing turnaround of “major” applications should be included.

[Commentary agreed by Andy Millard]

Update as at 1st March 2012

PI	Actual January	Latest Year to Date (Apr -Jan)	Year End Target
NI157b	88.24%	91.55%	86%
NI157c	100%	97.72%	93%

Although Minor applications dropped in January, the in month performance was still within target and the cumulative year to date position is well above target. In real terms, the year to date position is that of the 142 minor applications which have been determined so far in 2011-12 only 12 have taken longer to process than the 8 week target deadline.

[Update agreed by Andy Millard]

4.2.2 Housing Repairs

2 indicators in focus:

Scorecard Segment	Customer		
Definition	LA72 - the percentage of emergency repairs (Right to repair) to Thurrock's council housing that have been completed within the set target		
Reason for IN FOCUS	Consistently under target		
Dec Actual	Actual YTD (April - Dec)	Latest Target (April - Dec)	Year End Target
96.9%	98.14%	99%	99%
Housemark Benchmarking Group Council Average 96.33% (Councils in club only)			

Scorecard Segment	Customer		
Definition	HSG010 - tenants' satisfaction with the quality of the repairs made		
Reason for IN FOCUS	Consistently under target throughout the year		
Dec Actual	Actual YTD (April -Dec)	Latest Target (April -Dec)	Year End Target
92.8%	90.11%	95%	95%
Local indicator – no benchmark comparison			

Analysis from the monitoring of performance continues and is being closely reviewed at the operational meeting and escalated as appropriate to the Core Group meeting – a contractual governance meeting between top tier managers from the Council and contractor. As previously reported, the recovery plan was initiated from 3rd October. The plan included three main themes and some key progress is noted below.

Key Actions:

- a) **Improved client experiences** – aim to have the right jobs being completed on time. Better call handling by co-locating the repairs line and Housing client team alongside technical staff and the improved processing of jobs and job logging.

Progress: the co-location took place as planned with the repairs line monitoring team moving across to Alexander House at Lakeside to be closer to the technical staff. In addition, we have significantly increased the number of tenants asked for feedback on their experiences. Customer satisfaction cards are now being sent out for every repair order issued instead of a random 10% sample. We continue to follow up on all comments relating to poor and dissatisfied service. In addition:

- two additional Council resources have been allocated to answer calls and log repairs due to an increase in call volume
- a report has been prepared to analyse trends across areas of dissatisfaction.

- a review of the classification of emergency work has been carried out between the Council, Morrison and Vertex
- further clarification of repairs which constitute a “batched repair” to enable cost and more effective budgetary control in planning and controlling a proportion of the responsive maintenance activity that is non-urgent
- Morrison are realigning the skills of their operatives to meet the various demands of individual trades

b) Aligned IT eg including smoother handoffs between partners, better information flows and exchanges by aligned IT systems

Progress: the interface has been developed and testing is underway and in its final phase. Following this, Morrison will be introducing hand-held devices which have the ability to send text reminders for appointments and transfers of photographs and information to enable quicker job authorisation.

c) Cost effectiveness of service – more robust contract management and pricing of jobs to ensure the council pays the right price for the right job

Progress: a new national schedule of rates was introduced which will now give us more information around work undertaken. A value for money review is undertaken annually and this is due in February 2012.

[Commentary agreed by Linda Sinclair]

Update as at 1 March 2012

<i>PI</i>	<i>January Actual</i>	<i>Actual YTD (April - Jan)</i>	<i>Latest Target (April - Jan)</i>	<i>Year End Target</i>
LA72	94.6%	97.79%	99%	99%
HSG010	89.1%	90.01%	95%	95%

For the 2012-13 Corporate Scorecard it is proposed that there is still a clear focus on the performance and improvement of housing repairs indicators and as such the following indicators have been put forward (subject to Directors’ Board and Cabinet approval):

- *% of emergency repairs completed in target timescale*
- *% of non-emergency repairs completed in target timescale*
- *No of complaints received regarding Housing Repairs*
- *Average time to re-let a council property*

It is felt that this suite of indicators together will give a fair, yet robust monitoring of the progress towards improving this service.

[Update agreed by Linda Sinclair]

4.2.3 BV12 Average sickness per employee

Scorecard Segment Definition	People		
	This PI measures the number of working days, or shifts lost due to sickness absence per individual member of the Council's workforce.		
Reason for IN FOCUS	Although still below target, following a number of different initiatives over the last year, and against the trend of high winter sickness levels, December data showed a significant reduction in sickness compared to previous months and last year		
December Actual	YTD (Apr –Dec)	Latest Target (Apr -Dec)	Year End Target
0.72 days	7.65 days	6.6 days	9 days
Benchmarks (Source: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD))	Local Government Average (2011) Public Sector Average (2011) Private Sector Average (2011) UK Average (2011)		9.6 days 9.1 days 7.1 days 7.7 days

Key Actions:

- Ongoing training for people managers
- The Staff Survey included some questions regarding Staff Health and Well-Being – the analysis of this at service level is being undertaken during January with recommendations/actions to be implemented
- Analysis report into stress related absence produced with recommended action plan
- Stress risk assessments commissioned between January and March 2012 on targeted hotspots

Commentary

This month's figures are very encouraging. The average sickness absence days per employee has dropped this month to an in year low of 0.72 days per employee. This bucks the trend of previous years which normally shows December as one of the highest months for sickness absence. Year to date levels are better than this time last year. The total absence in December was 976 days, compared to 1246 days in November.

During December there were 18 new occupational health referrals with 18 being closed (not including Vertex/school staff). Stress/anxiety related absences continue to contribute a significant percentage of the figure and is the top reason for absence again this month representing 19.48% of all absences, with flu/colds representing a further 17.41%.

Whilst there are some hotspots of high sickness within the Council many services are now showing much better levels of sickness and within their individual targets. The overall forecast for this year has reduced to 10.19 days against a target of 9 days. Although still over target this is a significant improvement on last years outturn of 11.61 days per employee.

In relation to stress/anxiety related illnesses a report with recommendations was presented to Directors Board in January and all recommendations were approved subject to relevant funding being sourced. Targeted stress risk assessments are already taking place for some staff who have been absent with long term (over 20 days) stress-related illness and will continue until March 2012.

[Commentary agreed by Jackie Hinchliffe]

Update as at 1 March 2012

January Actual	YTD (Apr –Jan)	Latest Target (Apr -Jan)	Year End Target
0.79 days	8.46 days	7.5 days	9 days

January has again seen a comparatively low absence rate compared with previous months and this time last year. If February and March continue this trend, it is expected that the 2011/12 outturn will be just over 10 days per employee. This is a significant improvement on the 11.61 days outturn for 2010-11.

HR continues to monitor hotspots of high sickness, both at a team level and also by cause of sickness. Long term sickness remains comparatively high but is beginning to reduce, as a result of a concentrated initiative with individuals. This includes all individuals on long term sickness (over 20 working days) being given a dedicated nurse contact to offer support and guidance to help them return to work as soon as possible.

Whilst the forecast suggests the year end outturn will be above the challenging target of 9 days, the recent reductions represent a promising trend and outcome, which has come about due to a multi-stranded approach to tackling sickness absence over the past 12-18 months.

[Update agreed by Jackie Hinchliffe]

4.2.4 FIN004 Capital Programme

Scorecard Segment	Financial	
Definition	This PI measures the percentage of the Council's Capital Programme that has been spent at any quarterly monitoring period in the year	
Reason for IN FOCUS	This indicator is significantly under target and is unlikely to make the year end target	
December Actual	Latest Target (Apr -Dec)	Year End Target
39%	65%	90%

Key Actions:

- This issue is being reviewed by the Resources Board
- Budgets are being re-profiled going forward
- A report is being produced for Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee in the new financial year giving more detailed breakdown of the budget elements.

Commentary:

The capital spend at 31st December (for the whole Council) was 39% of the approved budget. Broken down between the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account, the General Fund spent 43.38% of their approved budget and the HRA 28.13%.

However, from the work carried out by the Resources Board thus far it is clear that most of the variance between target and actual is explained by profiling issues, where projects with a completion date in the next financial year have been fully charged to the current year. Improvements in profiling the capital programme will be implemented from financial year 2012/13 onwards. In addition, a number of completed schemes have been delivered under budget, releasing capital resources for other projects. A detailed report on the variances in the 2011/12 capital programme will go to the first Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee of the new municipal year.

[Commentary agreed by Martin Hone]

Update as at 1st March 2012 – no update as this is a quarterly indicator

4.2.5 CEFCP12 Child Protection and CEFLAC09 Looked After Children

These two indicators are activity monitors rather than traditional performance indicators. As such they cannot usefully be analysed independently of other Child Protection/Looked After Children indicators.

Children’s Overview and Scrutiny committee examine the Council’s Child Protection and Children in Care services annually, reporting any areas of concern to the portfolio lead member. The last scrutiny meeting was in February and reported no concerns to the portfolio holder.

4.2.5a CEF CP12 Child Protection

Scorecard Segment	Customer	
Definition	This PI measures the number of children in Thurrock that are the subject of a Child Protection Plan. Where concerns about a child’s welfare are substantiated and the agencies most involved judge that a child may continue to suffer, or be at risk of suffering significant harm, the social care services department should convene an initial child protection conference, the result of which will decide on whether the child will become the subject of a plan or not.	
Reason for IN FOCUS	This indicator is still below target (RED)	
December Actual	Latest Target (April -December)	Year End Target
210	188	180

Key Actions:

- Service is continuing to monitor local and regional position
- Continued quality assurance monitoring

Commentary

The number of children subject to Child Protection Plans has risen. Other authorities in the eastern region are describing similar increases and it is anticipated that this year's national out turn will be higher than last year. This increase may reflect increased pressure in families arising from critical changes in the social, political and environment as well as the effects of the current economic downturn and increased awareness of child protection needs.

Since 2007/8, Thurrock's rate of children subject to Child Protection Plans per 10,000 has been higher than the national average and higher than the statistical neighbour average. This work is the focus of careful quality assurance scrutiny. The evidence shows that decision-making here is consistent with national standards of good practice.

[Commentary agreed by Jo Olsson]

4.2.5b CEFLAC09 Looked After Children

Scorecard Segment Definition	Customer	
	This PI measures the number of looked after children in Thurrock who are aged 19 and under. Ideally children should not remain 'in care' or "Looked after" for a long period of time. Actions should be taken which will reduce the risk (and the child return home) or, if this does not occur the child may be adopted.	
Reason for IN FOCUS	This indicator is still below target (RED)	
December Actual	Latest Target (April - December)	Year End Target
241	217	216

Key Actions:

- Service is continuing to monitor local, regional and national position
- Continued quality assurance monitoring

Commentary

The numbers of children in care has risen. At the end of November we had 241 young people in care.

Quality assurance work carried out with children subject to child protection plans has led to some cases being escalated to care proceedings.

Information from other local authorities indicates that the rise we are seeing is being reflected nationally and information from the Child and Family Court Advisory & Support Service (CAFCASS) shows that there are high numbers of care proceedings across the U.K., (10% higher when compared to last year) and CAFCASS has already reported that January saw a record number of care applications nationwide.

There is an increase in the numbers of new born children subject to care proceedings. As with the children subject to a protection plan indicator, this is a good indicator of strong safeguard practice in early intervention.

[Commentary agreed by Jo Olsson]

Update as at 1st March 2012

PI	Actual January	Latest Target (Apr -Jan)	Year End Target
CP12	185	185	180
LAC09	238	216	216

January figures have showed a reduction for both of these measures and, in the case of Child Protection cases, this has now reduced in line with target. However, it would be premature to assume that high levels were no longer an issue, due to the unpredictable timing of new cases, the ongoing wider macroeconomic pressures on families and the prevalence of multi-child families. The service is continuing to monitor the situation to ensure there are sufficient resources to meet fluctuations in demand.

[Update agreed by Barbara Foster]

5.0 Indicators which have changed RAG status since previous month

In addition to those indicators which feature in the IN FOCUS section, the following indicator changed RAG (RED, AMBER, GREEN) status since previous month:-

5.1 From “RED” to “AMBER”

5.1.1 PLA102 - % of Section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money committed

Definition	This PI measures the amount of s106 income which has been committed as a percentage of the total amount of money received. In considering planning applications the Council and Development Corporation have the capacity to negotiate a Section 106 or CIL agreement with developers. Essentially this secures money from the developer for investment in infrastructure to benefit the local community. This ensures that local people benefit from development.		
	December Actual	Latest Target (Apr –Dec)	Year End Target
	35.78%	40%	40%

In considering planning applications the Council and Development Corporation have the capacity to negotiate developer contributions via Section 106 agreements (and others) with developers. Essentially this secures money from

the developer for investment in infrastructure to benefit the local community and helps to ensure that local people benefit from development.

The reasons for not achieving the level of spend hoped for during the early part of 2011-12 are complex and in many instances outside of the control of the Council. For this figure to reach 100%, it would mean that all s106 income received was spent immediately after it arrived from developers. However, this is never realistic as often projects are reliant on pots of money from a number of different sources. These are not necessarily received at the same time from all developers. Therefore a project often cannot start until all monies are available and the money already received is ring-fenced until it can be used. In most cases agreements signed by Thurrock Council have a 10 year period to spend the money once received; those signed by the Development Corporation normally have a 5 year timeframe. Planning Services update Directorates quarterly and whenever any new income is received which relates to their specific capital projects.

The management of Section 106 funds has been a high profile matter during 2011-12. As a result of a concentrated initiative, the figure for December increased to 35.78% with further significant commitments expected for January.

Essentially, this secures money from the developer for investment in infrastructure to benefit the local community and helps to ensure that local people benefit from development.

[Commentary agreed by Andy Millard]

Update as at 1st March 2012

January Actual	Latest Target (Apr –Jan)	Year End Target
61.68%	40%	40%

As anticipated, this has now considerably exceeded the target. This is as a result of a concentrated initiative with services linking, where appropriate, their capital projects with the Council's regeneration agenda thereby, in some cases, utilising s106 monies. This will also now be built into individual service budgets.

Further details were presented to Cabinet on 7th March 2012 (Item 11).

This is a significant turnaround from the starting position in April of 28.62% and an in year low of 17.87% in September. This was identified by Performance Board in Month 2 (May) as an issue and it was escalated to Directors Board for further discussion and recovery planning. It has been reviewed and monitored at corporate and service level throughout the year and is an example of where the close scrutiny has led to improved utilisation of this resource.

[Update agreed by Andy Millard]

5.2 From “RED” to “GREEN”

5.2.1 CUL400b Number of volunteer opportunities supported by the Council

Definition	This PI measures the total number of volunteer opportunities that are supported by the Council to enable local people to work in community organisations	
December Actual	Latest Target (Apr –Dec)	Year End Target
749	500	500

Since September the number of volunteers supporting the community via Council grants has grown significantly to 749. Given the infancy of this initiative, this is very encouraging.

In September Ngage launched Thurrock's Volunteer Centre - this promotes volunteering across all agencies and charities in the borough and is funded via the council. This enables volunteer placements to be developed within organisations, supporting local people to be involved.

Part of the increase in this figure is also due to the work undertaken by Ngage and the Community Development Team to better capture the number of active volunteers as well as those who have registered in interest.

[Commentary agreed by Natalie Warren]

Update as at 1st March 2012

- no further data update as this is a quarterly indicator

5.3 From “GREEN” to “RED”

5.3.1 FIN002 Overall spend to budget on Housing Revenue Account







Definition	This PI measures the income versus expenditure of the Housing Service's Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	
December Actual	Latest Target (Apr –Dec)	Year End Target
£756,000 or 1.7% unfavourable variance	0% variance	0% variance

The Housing Revenue Account is under significant pressure through the cost of its repairs programme. A cross-Council team is currently working with the Council's partners, Morrison, to bring ongoing expenditure back into line with the agreed budget. However, it is inevitable that there will be an overspend in 2011/12 and that the preferred level of HRA reserves of £1.7m will not be maintained.

[Commentary agreed by Martin Hone]

There is no change to this indicator as at time of report deadline. Should there be any further update by the time of the meeting, this will be verbally presented.

6.0 The full summary of performance is set out below:

Scorecard Segment	No. of PIs (not inc. Annual KPIs)	Performance against Target				Direction of Travel			
		No. of KPIs unavailable for comparison (na)	No. of KPIs at Green 	No. of KPIs at Amber 	No. of KPIs at Red 	No. of KPIs unavailable for comparison n/a	No. Improved since 2010-11 	No. Unchanged since 2010-11 	No. Decreased since 2010-11 
Community Leadership	13	0	8	4	1	8	1	2	2
Customer	18	1 (+4)	5	2	6	5 (+4)	7	0	2
Business Process	6	1	3	1	1	1	4	0	1
People	5	0	1	0	4	1	3	0	1
Finance	5	0	3	0	2	5	0	0	0
TOTAL	47	2 (+4)	20	7	14	20 (+4)	15	2	6
		PIs available = 41	48.78%	17.07%	34.15%	PIs available = 23	65.22%	8.69%	26.09%

*Please note it is possible to have a different number of indicators comparable against "Direction of Travel" than "Against Target" because

- 1) For some indicators we only have one year's worth of data and therefore cannot compare Direction of Travel
- 2) Some indicators have not had targets set, but are still being monitored as have strategic importance to the Council

7.0 IMPACT ON CORPORATE POLICIES, PRIORITIES, PERFORMANCE AND COMMUNITY IMPACT

7.1 This monitoring report will help decision makers and other interested parties, form a view of the success of the Council's actions in meeting its political and community priority ambitions.

8.0 IMPLICATIONS

8.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Funke Nana**
Telephone and email: **01375 652451** fnana@thurrock.gov.uk

This is a monitoring report and there are no direct financial implications arising. However any recovery planning commissioned by the Council may well entail future financial implications.

8.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Daniel Toohey**
Telephone and email: **01375 652049** dtoohey@thurrock.gov.uk

This is a monitoring report and there are no direct legal implications arising.

8.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Samson DeAlyn**
Telephone and email: **01375 652472** sdealyn@thurrock.gov.uk

This is a monitoring report and there are direct diversity implications arising. The KPI report provides data and commentary on the diversity profile with regard to employees who have a disability, average sickness and long term sickness.

8.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Section 17, Risk Assessment, Health Impact Assessment, Sustainability, IT, Environmental

There are no other relevant implications.

Report Author Contact Details:

Name: Sarah Welton
Telephone: 01375 652019
E-mail: swelton@thurrock.gov.uk