Notice of Meeting

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

Tuesday, 7th June, 2016 at 6.30 pm in Committee Room 1 Council Offices Market Street Newbury

Date of despatch of Agenda: Friday, 27 May 2016

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact David Lowe / Charlene Myers / Rachel Craggs on (01635) 519817 / 519695 / 5194

e-mail: <u>david.lowe@westberks.gov.uk / charlene.myers@westberks.gov.uk / rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk</u>

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at www.westberks.gov.uk



Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Tuesday, 7 June 2016 (continued)

Laszlo Zverko

To:

Substitutes:

Councillors Keith Chopping, Mike Johnston, Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe,

Richard Somner (Vice-Chairman), Emma Webster (Chairman) and

Councillors Lee Dillon, Billy Drummond, Dave Goff, Carol Jackson-

Doerge, Rick Jones, Mollie Lock, Ian Morrin and Virginia von Celsing **Agenda** Part I Page No. 1. **Apologies for Absence** To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any). 2. **Minutes** 5 - 12 To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 5th April and 19th May 2016. 3. **Declarations of Interest** To remind Members of the need to record the existence and nature of any Personal, Disclosable Pecuniary or other interests in items on the agenda, in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct. 13 - 14 4. **Actions from previous Minutes** To receive an update on actions following the previous Commission meeting. 5. West Berkshire Forward Plan 25th May 2016 to 31 August 2016 15 - 16 To advise the Commission of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council from 25th May 2016 to 31 August 2016 and decide whether to review any of the proposed items prior to the meeting indicated in the Plan. 17 - 206. **Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Work Programme** To agree and prioritise the work programme of the Commission and Select Committees for the remainder of 2016/2017. 7. Items Called-in following the Executive on 26 May 2016. To consider any items called-in by the requisite number of Members following the previous Executive meeting.



Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Tuesday, 7 June 2016 (continued)

8. Consideration of Urgent Items

To consider any items which an Urgent Decision is required to be taken by the Executive, in exception to the requirements of the Local Authorities(Executive arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.

9. Councillor Call for Action

To consider any items proposed for a Councillor Call for Action.

10. Petitions

To consider any petitions requiring an Officer response.

11. Delivery of the Council Strategy - Priority 1 & 2: Close the educational attainment gap & Improve educational attainment.

To monitor the progress made against the priority which had been set within the Council Strategy.

Andy Day Head of Strategic Support

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045.

(a)

(b)



21 - 30



Agenda Item 2.

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 5 APRIL 2016

Councillors Present: Steve Ardagh-Walter, Anthony Chadley, Lee Dillon (Substitute) (In place of Alan Macro), Dave Goff, Clive Hooker, Mike Johnston (Vice-Chairman), Rick Jones, Richard Somner, Virginia von Celsing, Emma Webster (Chairman) and Laszlo Zverko

Also Present: Mel Brain (Housing Strategy and Operations Manager), Andy Day (Head of Strategic Support), June Graves (Head of Care Commissioning, Housing & Safeguarding), Paul Hendry (Countryside Manager), Gary Lugg (Head of Planning & Countryside), Matt Scalpello (Systems Development Manager), Rachael Wardell (Corporate Director - Communities), David Lowe (Scrutiny & Partnerships Manager) and Charlene Myers (Democratic Services Officer).

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Alan Macro and Councillor Ian Morrin

PARTI

66. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2016 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

67. Declarations of Interest

Councillor(s) Lee Dillon and Emma Webster declared an interest in Agenda Item 11, but reported that, as their interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

68. Actions from previous meetings

The updates provided, in response to two actions recorded from the previous meeting, were noted.

69. West Berkshire Forward Plan 20 April 2016 to 31 July 2016

The Commission considered the West Berkshire Forward Plan (Agenda Item 5) for the period covering 20 April 2016 to 31 July 2016.

Resolved that

1. the Forward Plan be noted.

70. Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Work Programme

The Commission considered its work programme for 2016/2017.

David Lowe advised Members that, in respect of Item OSMC 12/135 (Annual Target Setting Task Group), the annual review would take place in June 2016 and required four volunteers to contribute. Councillor Emma Webster and Councillor Lee Dillon agreed that they would confirm the name of those volunteers to David Lowe.

Councillor Dillon introduced Appendix C to the Commission and advised Members that the suggested topic for scrutiny was a review of the existing income generation of the

Council. He stated that many Local Authorities had undertaken a similar activity in light financial pressures and the ongoing reductions to the Revenue Support Grants.

Members agreed that the review should be time limited – in order that it complemented the Officers' task group which had been established to consider the same matter. Councillor Dillon suggested that the review incorporated an examination of the work undertaken by other Local Authorities as a guide.

Members accepted the suggested topic for scrutiny onto their Work Programme and stated that the Terms of Reference should clearly outline the scope of the review in order that the discussions remained focused.

Councillor Dillon introduced appendix B to the commission and advised that the item sought to review the actions of West Berkshire Council associated with the Faraday Plaza planning application. It was proposed that the suggested topic of scrutiny would enable an opportunity to check the process, learn from the lessons indentified and gain confidence in decision making.

Andy Day advised Members that the Commission was not permitted to consider planning matters but it would be feasible to consider a review into the role of the Executive through the decision making process.

Councillor Webster stated that Members should be cautious when considering the case for review as were a number of complexities, including legal elements, associated with the case.

It was concluded that the suggested topic for scrutiny would more suitably considered by the Planning Policy Task Group. Therefore, it was agreed that the topic would not be added to the Commission's Work Programme.

Resolved that

- 1. Councillor Emma Webster and Councillor Lee Dillon would confirm the names of those volunteers willing to participate in the Annual Target Setting Task Group (OSMC 12/135).
- 2. The suggested topic of scrutiny to review the existing income generation of the Council and recommend further opportunities would be added to the Work Programme.
- 3. The suggested topic for scrutiny Faraday Plaza would not be added to the Work Programme.
- 4. The work programme be noted.

71. Items Called-in following the Executive on 24 March 2016

No items were called-in following the last Executive meeting.

72. Consideration of Urgent Items

There were no urgent items to consider.

73. Councillor Call for Action

There were no Councillor Calls for Action.

74. Petitions

There were no petitions received at the meeting.

75. Delivery of the Council Strategy - Priority 3: Enable the completion of more affordable housing

(Councillor Lee Dillon declared a personal interest in Agenda item 11 by virtue of the fact that he was an employee of Sovereign Housing. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he was permitted to take part in the debate).

(Councillor Emma Webster declared a personal interest in Agenda item 11 by virtue of the fact that she was an employee of a property developer. As her interest was personal and not prejudicial she was permitted to take part in the debate).

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 11) concerning an in-depth analysis of the overall performance status for the basket of measures used to monitor the progress of delivery of the Council Strategy Priority 3 - Enable More Affordable Housing.

Catalin Bogos introduced the report to Members and explained that the information contained in the report presented a detailed analysis of the performance as at Quarter three. Members heard that the Strategy Board had also considered the priority to identify opportunities to deliver more affordable housing. It was stated that the measure asked the service to investigate ways to deliver more affordable housing and Officers were present at the meeting to provide context around this target.

Andy Day advised that the Council was seeking to create capacity through volunteers within the Council to facilitate ways to move projects forward – from this the Collaborative Architects were formed. Councillor Hilary Cole advised that the volunteers received training from an external consultant who demonstrated the various skills required to drive, challenge and invigorate an effective review.

Paul Hendry (Collaborative Architect) explained that their role was to act as a catalyst for change. They facilitated a meeting between the subject matter experts (internal and external contacts) to dissect the subject and develop ideas. He advised that the first question the group considered was 'the definition of Affordable Housing'. Members heard that the group agreed that affordable housing incorporated more than social housing and a broader definition was necessary in order to alleviate the pressure on current housing demands.

Mike Scapello (Collaborative Architect) advised that the meetings were attended by housing associations, Newbury Building Society, builders, Members, planning consultants and representatives from the Homes and Communities agency (HCA).

Paul Hendry explained that in discussing the current and future demands for affordable housing the group considered four keys key areas:

- Increase housing density: Promote the change of use of agricultural land for affordable housing (AH) only.
- Rural Housing Development Programme: Increase the density of developments to deliver more affordable housing and change the perception within the market place in West Berkshire, by identifying successful projects elsewhere to be used examples.
- Incentives for affordable housing: A range of incentives (non financial) will deliver sites with a higher proportion of affordable housing than otherwise would be delivered.
- Proactive Land Assembly Now Team: Create a team to re-assess sites that 'missed the short list' with the aim of securing more affordable housing through the release of this land.

The group proposed a set of recommendations based around the four key areas which would be presented to the Strategy Board for consideration.

Councillor Cole expressed her appreciation for the support and hard work of the Collaborative Architects associated with the first project since the scheme had been introduced.

In response to points raised by the Commission, Mel Brain explained that government policy was due to change and it was expected that the changes would detail how the government would help local councils and developers work with local communities to plan and build more affordable housing. She explained that the type of affordable housing provided by a development was assessed on a case-by-case basis but often the assessment would consider current provisions and local need. Mel Brain advised that the demand for 1 and 2 bedroom properties had increased since the Bedroom Welfare Reform Act was introduced. Furthermore, the demand for rented social housing was highest as these properties often offered accommodation for homeless people – that the Council had a legal duty to house.

Councilor Rick Jones asked whether there was sufficient confidence that the solutions offered sensible answers to problems which, he considered, might not have been defined. Paul Hendry stated that the discussions prompted suitable solutions but more detail was required before they could be pursued.

Councillor Johnston asked how it could be considered reasonable to suggest that 'household affordable' could be defined as: accommodation which is available at a price or rent which is not more than 30% of a household's net income. He suggested that the definition failed to consider fluctuations in household earnings and financial changes within the District. Mel Brain advised that the percentage was used as a benchmark

Members heard that the project was in its early stages and as part of the process the suggestions developed by the group would be presented to the Strategy Board for further consideration and potential policy changes.

Councillor Webster stated that the topic was very important and acknowledged that valuable work was underway to understand the current and future challenges. She asked whether an annual target would be submitted in order to track the number of houses delivered against the Council Priority. June Graves advised that they did not plan to provide a target because it was considered that the Local Authority was an enabler and was not in the position to directly influence the delivery of affordable housing. Councillor Webster challenged this response and advised that numerous targets were monitored although they were considered outside the direct control of the Council. Mel Brain accepted the comments from Councillor Webster but insisted that the affordable housing target was very different and it relied heavily on the commercial market to drive delivery. Gary Lugg advised that the process for delivering properties could take many years and for this reason it may appear that the target has been missed until much further down the line. He suggested that monitoring the target on a regular basis could be misleading.

Members discussed the obstacles in place which limited the number of affordable housing units that might be included within a new development scheme. It was noted that a the Viability Assessment was a key factor in agreeing the percentage of affordable units – often the number was reduced in order to improve the financial viability of a scheme. Members suggested that it would be beneficial if all viability assessments were publicly available. Gary Lugg advised that the service had sought legal advice in respect of publishing such documentation.

Councillor Clive Hooker asked what plans the Council had to use agricultural land as a space for development and what impact they might have on the Development Plan Document (DPD). Councillor Cole advised that affordable housing could be delivered outside settlement boundaries due as rural exceptions and that this had been documented within the DPD. Councillor Anthony Chadley suggested that there was a lot of work to do in order to address the stigma attached to the term 'affordable housing'. He

considered that communities should be encouraged to embrace the development of affordable housing in their area.

Councillor Jones asked whether the Commission could reassess the target in due course. Andy Day advised that the Strategy Board would consider the recommendations in May 2016 and a degree of work will be required to understand the level of resources required to deliver the suggested actions. Members were invited to reconsider the item in September 2016 in light of the longer term target to deliver 1000 homes by 2020.

Resolved that:

- 1. The topic would be scheduled for discussion again in September 2016.
- 2. The report be noted.

76. Key Accountable Performance Report 2015/16: Q3

(Councillor Richard Somner declared a personal interest in Agenda item 12 by virtue of the fact that he was an employee of The Royal Berkshire Hospital. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he was permitted to take part in the debate).

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 12) concerning the Quarter three outturns against the Key Accountable measures contained within the 2015/2016 Council Performance Framework.

Members heard that the report appraised progress against a basket of 27 key accountable measures and activities aligned to the objectives set out in the Council Strategy. Of the 27 reported measures, outturns were available for 24. Of the remainder, 2 which were reported only once a year and 1 was unavailable at the time of publication of the report. Therefore, of the measures reported:

- 19 (78%) were reported as 'Green' on track to be delivered/ achieved by year end.
- 4 (17%) were reported as 'Amber behind schedule, but still expected to achieve or complete the measure/ activity by year end.
- 1 (4%) was reported as 'Red' not achieved, or do not expect to achieve, the activity or target within the year.

Catalin Bogos advised Members that the additional narrative (performance intelligence) was not available, on this occasion, due to the prioritisation of budget pressures above other tasks. Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter was concerned to learn that all the exception reports related to measures within the same directorate. Rachael Wardell advised that in a big directorate with a large number of challenging measures it was not uncommon for measures to be reported below target, although the measures had improved through the quarter four reporting.

Rachael Wardell explained that in some cases the measures were reported against a small group of people and could therefore be easily affected by any changes to their circumstances. With this in mind, Rachael Wardell stated that it was paramount that the services were not led by targets in such a way as to drive perverse incentives. She stressed that, although there was a need to track performance, the service was directed to take the most suitable course of action based on an individual's needs, irrespective of the impact this might have upon targets.

Councillor Richard Somner asked whether the measure had been adversely affected by the inclusion of 4 clients in permanent care home placements. Rachael Wardell explained that the service was clear about their objective, aiming to keep people within their own homes with support of reablement/rehabilitation services. However, sometimes those services could not meet the needs of some individuals so an alternative provision of care was required. She advised that Members were entitled to know the circumstances but she remained clear that meeting an individual's need was paramount.

Resolved that:

1. The report be noted.

CHAIRMAN	
Date of Signature	

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 19 MAY 2016

Councillors Present: Keith Chopping, Mike Johnston, Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe, Richard Somner, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

PARTI

1. Election of Chairman

RESOLVED that Councillor Emma Webster be elected Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for the 2016/17 Municipal Year.

2. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for inability to attend the meeting received.

3. Appointment of Vice-Chairman

RESOLVED that Councillor Richard Somner be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for the 2016/17 Municipal Year.

CHAIRMAN	
Date of Signature	

(The meeting commenced at 8.03 pm and closed at 8.04 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4.

Title of Report: Actions from previous meetings

Report to be considered by:

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

Date of Meeting: 7th June 2016

Purpose of Report: To advise the Commission of the actions arising from

previous meetings

Recommended Action: To note the report

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Emma Webster
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Charlene Myers
Job Title:	Strategic Support Service
Tel. No.:	01635 519695
E-mail Address:	cmyers@westberks.gov.uk

1 Introduction

1.1 This report provides the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission with an update on the actions arising from the meeting held on 5th April 2016.

2 Actions

2.1 Action/ Response: Councillor Emma Webster and Councillor Lee Dillon would confirm the names of those volunteers willing to participate in the Annual Target Setting Task Group (OSMC 12/135).

Resolution: Liberal Democrat volunteer identified. Awaiting confirmation of Conservative volunteers at this stage.

2.2 Action/ Response: The suggested topic of scrutiny – to review the existing income generation of the Council and recommend further opportunities – would be added to the Work Programme.

Resolution: The Commission should consider its action on third item in light of the new arrangements.

2.3 Action/ Response: The topic 'Delivery of the Council Strategy - Priority 3: Enable the completion of more affordable housing' would be scheduled for discussion again in September 2016.

Resolution: The Commission should consider its action on third item in light of the new arrangements.

Appendices

There are no appendices to this report.

Agenda Item 5.

Title of Report: West Berkshire Forward Plan

Report to be considered by:

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

Date of Meeting: 7th June 2016

Purpose of Report: To advise the Overview and Scrutiny Management

Commission of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council from 25th May 2016 to 31 August 2016 and decide whether to review any of the proposed items prior to the meeting indicated in the

plan.

Recommended Action: That the Overview and Scrutiny Management

Commission considers the West Berkshire Council Forward Plan and recommends further action as

appropriate.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.: Councillor Emma Webster	
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Charlene Myers
Job Title:	Strategic Support Officer
Tel. No.:	01635 519695
E-mail Address:	cmyers@westberks.gov.uk

Supporting Information

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Forward Plan attempts to cover all decisions, not just those made by the Executive, which the Authority intends to take over the next 4 months.
- 1.2 In order to hold the Executive to account, Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Members are asked to identify any areas of forthcoming decisions which may be appropriate for future scrutiny.
- 1.3 The West Berkshire Council Forward Plan for 25th May 2016 to 31 August 2016 is available at http://info.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=29088 and will be displayed on screen during the meeting.

Appendices

There are no appendices to this report.

Agenda Item 6.

New arrangements for Overview Title of Report:

and Scrutiny

Report to be considered by:

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

7th June 2016 **Date of Meeting:**

Purpose of Report: To introduce to the Commission proposals for the

operation of Overview and Scrutiny following the

structural changes agreed by Council on 19 May 2016.

Recommended Action: That the Overview and Scrutiny Management

Commission

1. Agrees the proposed method of operation for

Overview and Scrutiny.

2. Identifies activities that the Select Committees

might consider.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.: Councillor Emma Webster	
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	David Lowe
Job Title:	Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager
Tel. No.:	01635 519817
E-mail Address:	david.lowe@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

1.1 The Council meeting of 19 May 2016 approved changes to the organisational structure of Overview and Scrutiny. This report provides amplification and makes proposals on how the arrangements might work in practice.

2. New structure

2.1 As set out on 19 May 2016, Overview and Scrutiny is now organised as shown below.



- 2.2 This structure will allow Overview and Scrutiny to be focussed, through the Select Committees, on the activities of each of the Council's directorates.
- 2.3 Whilst being able to carry out Overview and Scrutiny in its own right, the role of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission (OSMC) will be primarily to direct and guide the activity of the Select Committees.

3. Method of operation

3.1 In order that the new arrangement will not create any additional demand on staff in Strategic Support, the intention is that the 8 meetings per municipal year that have previously been allocated to the OSMC will now be spread between the 4 scrutiny bodies, 2 each per municipal year. The proposed diary of meetings is

Date	Meeting
12 July 2016	Resources Select Committee
6 September 2016	Environment Select Committee
1 November 2016	Communities Select Committee
6 December 2016	OSMC
17 January 2017	Resources Select Committee
28 February 2017	Environment Select Committee
11 April 2017	Communities Select Committee

4. Developing a work programme

- 4.1 Whilst members of the Commission will have their own views on what might or might not be included into the work programmes for each of the Select Committees, they may wish to give consideration to the following items
 - Communities Select Committee (1)
 - (a) Ofsted improvement plan (Children and Families Service)
 - (b) Health and Social Care integration
 - (c) Brilliant West Berkshire
 - (2) **Environment Select Committee**
 - (a) Waste Service
 - (b) Library Service
 - Resources Select Committee (3)
 - (a) Financial performance, including the development of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)
 - (b) Digital transformation
 - (c) Building stronger communities
- 4.2 In addition, all Select Committee could review the quarterly performance returns of services within their directorates, monitor progress against achievement of the priorities set within the Council Plan and understand the pressures and challenges of service delivery as the authority's budgets continue to contract.
- 4.3 Although the Select Committees should be given the freedom to carry out the Overview and Scrutiny that their members themselves chose to undertake, the OSMC also has the opportunity and mandate to provide an element of direction.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 It is recommended that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
 - Agrees the proposed method of operation for Overview and Scrutiny. (1)
 - Identifies activities that the Select Committees might consider. (2)

Appendices

There are no appendices to this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 11.

Quarter 3 In Depth Performance Report – Council Strategy

Priorities 1 – 'Improve educational attainment' and 2 – 'Close the

educational attainment gap'

Report to be considered by:

Title of Report:

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

Date of Meeting: 07/06/2016

Purpose of Report: To provide a more in depth analysis of the overall

performance status for the basket of measures used at corporate level to monitor progress of the delivery of the Council Strategy Priority 1 – 'Improve educational

attainment' and Priority 2 - 'Close the educational

attainment gap'.

Recommended Action: The members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management

Commission to note progress against the performance

measures.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.: Councillor Emma Webster (0118) 941 1676	
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Catalin Bogos
Job Title:	Research, Consultation and Performance Manager
Tel. No.:	01635 519102
E-mail Address:	Catalin.bogos@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1 This report was produced following the decision of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission on the 1st December 2015 that in addition to the quarterly performance report, an ongoing and scheduled programme of scrutiny is put in place to monitor the progress that the Council is making in the achievement of its strategic priorities.
- 1.2 Performance reports are provided on a quarterly basis to the Corporate Board, the Executive and general public to assess the overall delivery of the Council Strategy. As part of the Council's performance management approach, these reports are also submitted for consideration at the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission.
- 1.3 The focus of this paper is on the results achieved for the set of performance measures used at corporate level to monitor the progress in delivering the Council Strategy Priority 1 'Improve educational attainment' and Priority 2 'Close the educational attainment gap'. The aim is to provide a more in depth level of performance information including all the measures that have been agreed to be part of the Council Strategy Delivery Plan for reporting at corporate level.

2. Quarter 3 results

- 2.1 The report appraises progress against a basket of 12 performance measures and activities aligned to the Council Strategy Priorities 1 and 2.
- Of the 12 reported measures, outturns are available for 10. The measure not reported is a measure that is reported once a year and was not published by the end of quarter 3. In addition, at the time of producing the report, for one measure a baseline is being established this year to inform targets for 2016/17 financial year.
- 2.3 Details are provided as part of Appendix 1 for all measures including the following information:
 - o Column 1: a reference code
 - o Column 2: the title of the measures
 - o Column 3-7 previous years' outturns and (if available) comparative performance
 - o Column 8: the current year's target.
 - o Columns 9-10: quarterly outturns and RAG ratings.
 - o Column 11: and supporting commentary or volume data.
- 2.4 A total of 8 measures are reported as 'green' or are on track to be delivered / achieved by year end.
- 2.5 There are no measures reported as 'amber'- behind schedule, but still expect to achieve or complete the measure / activity by year end.
- 2.6 Two measures are reported as 'red' that we have not achieved, or do not expect to achieve, the activities or targets within the year:

- (a) KS1-2: Proportion pupils making 2+ levels of progress in Reading
- (b) KS1-2: Proportion pupils making 2+ levels of progress in Maths
- 2.7 Exception reports are provided as part of Appendix 2 for all measures RAG rated as 'Red'.
- 2.8 Due to a technical error the wording 'To reduce the GCSE educational attainment gap to 22 percentage points' combined elements that related in fact to two performance measures. The Executive has approved the recommendation to use both performance measures:
 - (1) 'Reduce the attainment gap at KS2 (level 4+ Reading Writing Maths combined) between disadvantaged and other pupils.' Target 14/15 22 percentage points (22ppt)
 - (2) Reduce the attainment gap at GCSE (5A*-C including English and Maths) between disadvantaged and other pupils. Target 14/15 30ppt
- 2.9 Benchmarking information on all key education attainment measures is provided as contextual information as part of Appendix 3.

3. Conventions used in this report

- 3.1 Throughout the report we have used a RAG 'traffic light' system to report progress:
 - * means we have either achieved / exceeded, or expect to achieve what we set out to do:
 - means we are behind schedule, but still expect to achieve or complete the measure / activity by year end;
 - indicates that we have not achieved, or do not expect to achieve, the activity or target within the year;
 - indicates that data can only be reported at a single point of the year and progress cannot be tracked e.g. GCSE results or the road condition survey, whilst;
 - indicates that quarterly data is unavailable when this report was published
 - indicates that a measure is not targeted and results are being recorded as a baseline for future monitoring.
 - (E) indicates that an outturn is an estimate and will be confirmed during the year.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Performance at quarter 3 was as expected or exceeding the targets for the majority of the performance measures used to monitor the delivery of Priorities 1 and 2 of the

Council Strategy. Only two measures were identified as RAG rated 'red' and a range of actions are underway to address under-performance.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – 2015/16 West Berkshire Council – Council Delivery Plan Performance Report – Quarter 3

Appendix 2 – Exception reports for the measures RAG rated 'Red'

Appendix 3 – West Berkshire School and Pupil Achievement 2015 – Benchmarking Scorecard

2015/16 West Berkshire Council - Council Delivery Plan Performance Report - Quarter 3

Ref:	Measure / activity	National Rank / Quartile 2012/13	2013/14 Year end outturn	National Rank / Quartile 2013/14	2014/15 Year end outturn	National Rank / Quartile 2014/15	2015/16 target	Q1 RAG	Q1 RAG / outturn	Q2 (YTD) R	AG / outturn	Q3 (YTD) RAG) / outturn	Q2 (YTD) RAG / outturn Q3 (YTD) RAG / outturn Q3 Supporting commentary
Priority 1. Impr	Priority 1. Improve educational attainment													
BEC1ed03	The number of schools judged good or better by Ofsted under the new Framework (harder test)	,			63		63	*	29	*	67	*	67	No Ofsted inspections took place in Q2 or Q3.
BEC1ed05	% of schools capital projects progressing to agreed programme (including programme dates revised with Project Board agreement)		85%	ı	%08	ı	80%	*	88.9%	*	%68	*	92%	O3: 11 / 12 The number of projects will fluctuate during the year as this measure refers to 'live' projects. As a project is completed it is removed from the list.
BEC1eday04	Yr1 Phonics: Proportion of pupils achieving expected level in Phonics decoding	4th	68% 2012/13 AY	4th	75% 2013/14 AY		AY 2014/15 76%	•	Annual	•	Annual	*	77%	
BEC1eday05	KS1-2: Proportion pupils making 2+ levels of progress in Reading	3rd	87% 2012/13 AY	3rd	91% 2013/14 AY		AY 2014/15 92%	•	Annual	•	Annual	6	91%	See exception report for details.
BEC1eday06	KS1-2: Proportion pupils making 2+ levels of progress in Writing	2nd	92% 2012/13 AY	4th	92% 2013/14 AY		AY 2014/15 93%	•	Annual	•	Annual	6	94%	
BEC1eday07	KS1-2: Proportion pupils making 2+ levels of progress in Maths	4th	84% 2012/13 AY	4th	87% 2013/14 AY		AY 2014/15 88%	•	Annual		Annual		85%	See exception report for details.
BEC1eday08	KS2: Prop'n pupils achieving at least level 4 in Reading, Writing and Maths	3rd	77% 2012/13 AY	2nd	82% 2013/14 AY		AY 2014/15 82%	•	Annual	•	Annual	*	82%	
BEC1eday09	KS4: Proportion pupils gaining 5+ A*-C at GCSE including English and Maths - First attempt results (maintained and Acad)	2nd	66% 2012/13 AY	1st	64% 2013/14 AY		AY 2014/15 61%	•	Annual	•	Annual	*	%29	
BEC2eday17	West Berkshire schools including Academies to have domestic abuse champions or designated persons				due in Q3 '15/16		Baseline	0-9	dna	0-9	dna	# 10	100.%	03:83/83
Priority 2. Clos	Priority 2. Close the educational attainment gap													
BEC2eday13	Yr1 Phonics: Proportion of pupils eligible for FSM achieving expected level in Phonics decoding	4th	42% 2012/13 AY	4th	50% 2013/14 AY	1	51%	•	Annual	•	Annual	*	%55%	
BEC2eday14	KS4: Proportion of children eligible for FSM6 who achieve 5+A*-C grades at GCSE (incl English and Maths)	4th	32% 2012/13 AY	3rd	37% (best) 2013/14 AY	tbc	33%	•	Annual	•	Annual	₩ *	33%	
BEC2eday19	To reduce the GCSE educational attainment gap to 22 percentage points	,		,	23.4 pp 2013/14 AY		AY 2014/15 22pp	•	Annual	•	Annual	e An	Annual	*Request to clarify wording / target. See main report for details.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2 – Exception reports for the measures RAG rated 'Red'

Rachel Wa	rdell / Ian Pea	arson		Education			016	RED	
BEC1eda	ay05		KS1-2: Proportion	n pupils making 2+ le	vels of progress in R	eading (2014/15 Aca	idemic Year E	nd)	
Corporate Board only	2011/12 Academic V End		2012/13 Academic Year End	2013/14 Academic Year End	2014/15 Academic Year End	2014/15 Academic Year End Target	Pol	arity	
RAG					•				
Qrtly outturn	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	92%	Higher	Higher is better	
YTD outturn	88%		87%	91%	91%				

REASON FOR RED:

The percentage of pupils achieving 2 Levels of progress in reading has fallen short of target primarily due to a drop in attainment in Level 4 reading in some large schools in the Newbury/Thatcham area which has impacted negatively on results. Attainment in reading at level 4+ is 91% which is above the national of 89% and 2 levels of progress at 91% is similar to the national score of 91%. However, these standards overall are too low for West Berkshire schools.

Note that an adjustment in WB scores of 1% is the performance of 17 pupils. (cohort is 1731 Pupils)

REMEDIAL MANAGEMENT ACTION BEING UNDERTAKEN AND ALTERNATIVE PLANS:

A range of actions are underway:

- 1. Tackling weak leadership and governance of schools where performance in mediocre (schools which require improvement)
- 2. Comprehensive training on standardisation of reading standards in the national curriculum.
- 3. Individual support for improving reading scores to targeted schools through brokering support through the service level agreement.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: None SERVICE PLAN UPDATES REQUIRED: None STRATEGIC ACTIONS REQUIRED: None

Please note that these measures will no longer be valid in the new current testing regime from 2016 onwards

Rachel Wa	rdell / Ian Pea	rson	Education			26 January 2016		RED
BEC1eda	ay07		KS1-2: Proportio	n pupils making 2+ lo	evels of progress in I	Maths (2014/15 Acad	demic Year	End)
Corporate Board only	2011/12 Academic Y End		2012/13 Academic Year End	2013/14 Academic Year End	2014/15 Academic Year End	2014/15 Academic Year End Target	P	olarity
RAG					•			
Qrtly outturn	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	88%	Highe	er is better
YTD outturn	82%		84%	87%	85%			

REASON FOR RED:

The percentage of pupils achieving 2 Levels of progress in mathematics has fallen short of target primarily due to a drop in attainment in Level 4 mathematics in a few large schools in the Newbury/Thatcham area which has impacted negatively on results. The mathematics test this year was "harder" in preparation for the changes for next year's new testing regime which will be tougher still. Some schools which currently provide insufficient challenge for middle attaining pupils did less well in the tests. Higher attaining pupils continue to do well with LA scores above national scores.

Aⁱ separate issue is where KS2 progress rates are low but attainment is nevertheless high. This is due to an earlier over generous teacher assessment in mathematics with pupils when they were 7 years old (KS1). KS1 is based on teacher assessment and not just a test. For example, outcomes for one WB school with 58 pupils where 2 Levels of progress was 81% but outcomes at Level 4 maths were 90% and 60% at Level 5.

Note that an adjustment in WB scores of 1% is the performance of 17 pupils. (cohort is 1731 Pupils)

REMEDIAL MANAGEMENT ACTION BEING UNDERTAKEN AND ALTERNATIVE PLANS:

A range of actions are underway:

- 1. Tackling weak leadership and governance of schools where performance is mediocre (schools which require improvement)
- 2. An "enriching mathematics" strategy to support the implementation of higher demands of the new national curriculum. This includes targeted schools joining an LA maths network to ensure improvements are made; extended maths Continuous Professional Development CDP programme for all schools; "mastery CPD" School Improvement Advisers support and challenge to underperforming schools in mathematics; new strategic leadership of mathematics in the LA primary team; additional commissioned maths expertise to support targeted schools.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: None SERVICE PLAN UPDATES REQUIRED: None STRATEGIC ACTIONS REQUIRED: None

Please note that these measures will no longer be valid in the new current testing regime from 2016 onwards

Appendix 3 - West Berkshire School & Pupil Achievement 2015 – Benchmarking Scorecard

Indicator 2015 Results	Qu	artile / r	ank		
*N.B. Quartiles are based on rank within 152 LAs.	2012	2013	2014	2015	
Foundation Stage Good Level of development	26 th	11 th	22nd	22nd	
Foundation Stage Average Points	n/a	13 th	21st	10th	
Key Stage 1 Reading level 2+ * N.B. Schools' teacher assessment of R, W and M KS1 results is now more accurate than results prior to 2014	1st	6 th	26th	16th	Тор
Key Stage 1 Writing level 2+	2nd	11 th	25th	28th	quartile
Key Stage 1 Maths level 2+	7th	19 th	34th	18th	•
Key Stage 2 Reading level 4+	65 th	35 th	5th	21st	
Key Stage 2 Reading 2+ levels progress (* 2012 Eng)	106 th	108 th	100th	104nd	2 nd
Key Stage 2 Writing level 4+	58 th	23rd	25th	16th	quartile
Key Stage 2 Writing 2+ level progress	n/a	65 th	125th	71st	quartiic
Key Stage 2 Maths level 4+	120th	74 th	36th	94th	
Key Stage 2 Maths 2+ levels progress	142nd	139 th	130th	141st	3 rd
Key Stage 2 Reading Writing Maths level 4+	81st	55th	24th	50th	quartile
Key Stage 2 FSM RWM level 4	149th	99th	117th	102nd	
GCSE 5+ grades A* to G including English & maths	19th	41 st	7th	8th	6
GCSE 5+ grades A* to C including English & maths	97th	65th	28th	25th	Bottom
GCSE English Baccalaureate	13th	21st	31st	23rd	quartile
GCSE 3+ levels of progress in English	131st	75th	65th	42nd	
GCSE 3+ levels of progress in Maths	50th	41st	35th	26th	
GCSE FSM 5A*-C incl English and Maths	149th	114th	103rd	55th	
A level points per candidate	42nd	30 th	19th	19th	
A level points per entry	59th	34 th	26th	80th	2
A Level 3+ A grades	55th	35 th	41st	55th	



This page is intentionally left blank