
Report To:	Policy & Resources Committee	Date:	26 March 2013
Report By:	John Mundell, Chief Executive	Report No:	PR/082/13
Contact Officer:	Karen McCready, Corporate Policy Officer	Contact No:	712146
Subject:	SOLACE – Improving Scottish Local Government Benchmarking		

1.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Policy and Resources Committee with an overview of the Society of Local Authorities Chief Executives (SOLACE) Local Government Benchmarking project and provide an update on the latest SPI Direction.

2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 Since 2010, SOLACE has been working with the Improvement Service to develop a set of benchmarking indicators, under the project title of 'Improving Local Government' on behalf of Scottish Councils.
- 2.2 The SOLACE Benchmarking Project 'Improving Local Government' was developed in order to:
- Support SOLACE to drive improvement in local government benchmarking
 - To develop a comparative performance support framework for Scottish local government
 - To support councils in targeting transformational change in terms of areas of greatest impact – efficiency, costs, productivity and outcomes
 - Focus on the 'big ticket' areas of spend plus corporate services
- 2.3 SOLACE and the Improvement Service have devised a set of 55 indicators, of which Inverclyde reports on 50 (the remaining 5 being Housing Services). The full list of indicators is provided in Appendix 1.
- 2.4 This final indicator set that has been developed is intended to act as a corporate 'can opener' i.e. it should help Councils identify issues that merit further investigation, share good practice across authorities and drive forward improvement.
- 2.5 SOLACE and the Improvement Service published performance in relation to the benchmarking indicators for all Scottish Councils on 7 March 2013.
- 2.6 Inverclyde ranks in the top two quartiles of all Scottish local authorities for just under half of all indicators, 44% (22/50), of these 20% of all indicators lie in the top quartile. The majority of indicators, 62%, are spread over the second and third quartiles, whilst 18% of indicators lie in the fourth quartile.
- 2.7 In considering performance, it must be remembered that there will be legitimate variations in performance based on local policy choices, demographic profile, social and economic conditions and other local factors. Council policies and priorities, the structure and business

processes of the Council and service user expectations will also have an impact. The performance achievement of councils may therefore differ, not because they are better or worse performers, but because they may have different priorities for communities, demands and pressures are different or the council simply operates in a different way.

- 2.8 Data on costs should also be read together with outcome and performance data, i.e. understanding the spend data within major service areas and the context that those services operate within and how those factors affect spend.
- 2.9 All services within the Council with responsibility for the SOLACE indicator(s) have carried out an initial review of performance. Over the coming months, services will assess performance in relation to their comparator authorities, share and learn from best practice and use the data as a tool to drive improvement.
- 2.10 In its 2012 Direction on the Statutory Performance Indicators, published in December 2012, the Accounts Commission confirmed that the 25 specified Statutory Performance Indicators have been removed from the SPI Direction 2012 and will be replaced by the SOLACE Benchmarking indicators from 2014 onwards (reporting year 2013/14). The 2011 SPI Direction remains in place, and the Council will have to report on the SPIs for 2012/13 in the usual manner.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Committee note that:

- a) The SOLACE Benchmarking indicators for all Scottish Councils were published on 7 March 2013.
- b) Variations in performance amongst Councils do not necessarily reflect better or worse service providers, but may reflect differences in policies and priorities, demographic, social and economic conditions.
- c) The service areas that relate to the Benchmarking Indicators have carried out an initial review of performance. Over the coming months services will assess performance in relation to their comparator authorities, share and learn from best practice and use the data as a tool to drive improvement.
- d) The SOLACE Benchmarking indicators will replace the existing Audit Scotland set of Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs) for reporting year 2013/14.
- e) A follow up report regarding progress on benchmarking activity will be presented to a future meeting of this Committee.

John W Mundell
Chief Executive

4.0 Background

- 4.1 Since 2010, SOLACE has been working with the Improvement Service to develop a set of benchmarking indicators on behalf of Scottish Councils. Benchmarking is not a new concept for Scottish Councils and some services within Inverclyde Council already share and compare data about their performance on a formal and informal basis. In addition, the Local Government in Scotland Act (2003) introduced a statutory duty of Best Value which further integrated the use of comparative analysis to consider performance and learning from other local authorities, public sector agencies or other relevant organisations.
- 4.2 Effective benchmarking can bring many benefits to an organisation including:
- An understanding of how a service or organisation performs in comparison to others
 - An understanding of why current performance levels are where they are, how well others perform in the same service area and why some organisations achieve better results
 - Supports change and improvement based upon what constitutes achievable best practice
- 4.3 The SOLACE Benchmarking Project 'Improving Local Government' was developed in order to:
- Support SOLACE to drive improvement in local government benchmarking
 - To develop a comparative performance support framework for Scottish local government
 - To support councils in targeting transformational change in terms of areas of greatest impact – efficiency, costs, productivity and outcomes
 - Focus on the 'big ticket' areas of spend plus corporate services
- 4.4 In developing the indicators, the key criteria that was applied was that any one of the indicators must be able to be collected on a comparable basis across all 32 Councils. Each indicator also had to materially improve the cost information of service delivery on a comparative basis for major service areas as well as corporate services.
- 4.5 The final indicator set that has been developed is intended to act as a corporate 'can opener' i.e. it should help Councils identify issues that merit further investigation, share good practice across authorities and drive forward improvement.
- 4.6 The indicator focus is on costs, outputs and customer satisfaction across the following areas:
- Children's Services
 - Corporate Services
 - Social Work
 - Culture and Leisure Services
 - Environmental Services
 - Housing
 - Corporate: Assets and Property
- 4.7 Where the indicator relates to service costs, the principal data source is the Local Financial Return (LFR), which has been provided directly from the Scottish Government. The LFR has been used because it is regarded as the most robust source of comparable data on council expenditure currently available. The financial data is then compared with service usage statistics to derive a unit cost.

- 4.6 Finance colleagues have flagged an issue around the use of the Local Financial Return which is that there are variations in the methods that Councils use to collect financial data, which has implications for comparing data. This should be borne in mind when considering the data.
- 4.7 Indicators that relate to customer satisfaction have been temporarily sourced from the Scottish Household Survey (SHS). SOLACE and the Improvement Service recognise that there are issues with this data in terms of its robustness, particularly for smaller Councils, however it is currently the only source of comparable customer satisfaction information that is available for all Scottish Councils. The sample size for this data at the local authority level is not robust, with the Council's own Citizens' Panel providing a more statistically robust sample. The inclusion of this data from the Scottish Household Survey is a short term measure and in future iterations, the SHS customer satisfaction data will be replaced with a more robust data source.
- 4.8 The next step for the project is to identify 'family groups' of local authorities that share comparable social and geographical characteristics for benchmarking purposes to allow councils to share and learn alongside relevant, comparable organisations.

5.0 SOLACE Benchmarking Indicators

- 5.1 The SOLACE Benchmarking Indicators for reporting years 2010/11 and 2011/12 were formally launched at the COSLA Conference on 7 March 2013. Members should have received a briefing paper from COSLA and IS in early March.
- 5.2 Inverclyde Council has a total of 50 benchmarking indicators, which are outlined in Appendix 1. It is worth noting that a small number of the indicators are the same as the current statutory performance indicators.
- 5.3 The table below shows the number of indicators in each category and where Inverclyde ranks in terms of quartiles. A full description of all the indicators, performance in 2010/11 and 2011/12, rankings (0-32) and quartile placement is provided for members in Appendix 2.

Indicator Group	1 st Q	2 nd Q	3 rd Q	4 th Q	Total
Children's Services	3	2	6	1	12
Corporate Services	2	5	3	2	12
Social Work	-	2	2	-	4
Culture & Leisure Services	3	1	2	2	8
Environmental Services	2	2	4	4	12
Corporate Services: Asset Management & Property	-	-	2	-	2
Total	10	12	19	9	50

- 5.4 Inverclyde ranks in the top two quartiles of all Scottish local authorities for just under half of all indicators, 44% (22/50), of these 20% of all indicators lie in the top quartile. The majority of indicators, 62%, are spread over the second and third quartiles, whilst 18% of indicators lie in the fourth quartile.
- 5.5 In interpreting the data, it is vital to remember that there will be legitimate variations in performance based on local policy choices, demographic profile, social and economic conditions and other local factors. Council policies and priorities, the structure and business processes of the Council and service user expectations will also have an impact.

The performance achievement of councils may therefore differ, not because they are better or worse performers, but because they may have different priorities for communities, demands and pressures are different or the council simply operates in a different way.

- 5.6 Data on costs must be read together with outcome and performance data, i.e. understanding the spend data within major service areas and the context that those services operate within and how those factors affect spend.
- 5.7 In order to help account for the variation in performance, all services within the Council with responsibility for SOLACE indicators have reviewed their performance in relation to other councils and provided an explanation of performance within a local context.

6.0 Benchmarking Indicators and the Statutory Performance Indicators

- 6.1 Over the course of the development of the project, SOLACE and the Improvement Service have been in discussion with Audit Scotland about the potential for the SOLACE benchmarking indicators to replace the statutory performance indicators.
- 6.2 In its 2012 Direction on Statutory Performance Indicators, published in December 2012, the Accounts Commission confirmed that it has removed the 25 specified statutory performance indicators from the SPI Direction for 2012 and that in their place, there is now a requirement for Councils to report on the SOLACE Benchmarking indicators from 2014 onwards (reporting year 2013/14). The 2011 SPI Direction remains in place and the Council will have to report on the SPIs for 12/13 in the usual manner.
- 6.3 The Accounts Commission have however retained the requirement that Councils must report a range of non-prescribed information to demonstrate that it is securing Best Value in relation to SPI1: Corporate Management and SPI2: Service Performance. It is at the discretion of the Council as to which information it reports, as long as it meets the criteria set out by the Accounts Commission. These are referred to within the Council as the key performance indicators (KPIs) that the Council currently reports annually alongside the SPIs.
- 6.4 From 2013/14, the Council will have to report on 149 SPIs / KPIs (50 SOLACE Benchmarking and 99 key performance indicators). A review of the key performance indicators is planned for the autumn with the aim of streamlining this process, removing any duplication with the SOLACE indicators and to ensure that the KPIs continue to be a meaningful measure of Best Value.

7.0 Related Performance Indicator Reporting

- 7.1 The SOLACE benchmarking indicators will form one element of the Council's performance reporting framework, alongside the SOA, Corporate Directorate Improvement Plans and SPI 1 and 2 reporting.

8.0 Implications

8.1 Legal

The Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on all councils to publish performance indicators on selected services

8.2 Finance

None

8.3 Personnel

None

9.0 **Consultation**

The Services that are affected by the SOLACE Benchmarking Indicators have all been provided with an overview of performance 2010/11 and 2011/12 and asked for a commentary on performance.

10.0 **List of Background Papers**

None

SOLACE BENCHMARKING INDICATORS**APPENDIX 1****Children's Services**

CHN1	Cost per Primary school Pupil
CHN2	Cost per Secondary School Pupil
CHN3	Cost per Pre-School Education Registration
CHN 4	% pupils gaining 5+ awards at level 5 for standard grade (pre-appeal)
CHN5	Pupils gaining 5+ awards at level 6 for standard grade (pre-appeal)
CHN6	% of Pupils Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5 for Standard Grade by SIMD (Pre-Appeal)
CHN7	% of Pupils Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 6 for Higher Grade by SIMD (Pre-Appeal)
CHN8a	The Gross Cost of "Children Looked After" in Residential Based Services per Child per Week
CHN8b	The Gross Cost of "Children Looked After" in a Community Setting per Child per Week
CHN 9	Balance of Care for looked after children: % of children being looked after in the Community
CHN10	% of Adults Satisfied with local schools
CHN11	Proportion of Pupils Entering Positive Destinations

Corporate Services

CORP 1	Support services as a % of Total Gross expenditure
CORP 2	Cost of Democratic Core per 1,000 population
CORP 3a	The percentage of the highest paid 2% employees who are women
CORP 3b	The percentage of the highest paid 5% of employees who are women
CORP 4	The cost per dwelling of collecting Council Tax
CORP 5a	The number of complaints of domestic noise received during the year settled without the need for attendance on site
CORP 5b1	The number of complaints of domestic noise received during the year requiring attendance on site and not dealt with
CORP 5b2	(Domestic Noise) Average time (hours) between time of complaint and attendance on site, for those requiring attendance on site
CORP 5b3	(Domestic Noise) Average time (hours) between time of complaint and attendance on site, for those dealt with under the ASB Act 2004
CORP 6	Sickness Absence Days per Employee
CORP 7	Percentage of income due from Council Tax received by the end of the year
CORP8	Percentage of invoices sampled that were paid within 30 days

Social Work Services

SW1	Older Persons (Over65) Home Care Costs per Hour
SW2	SDS spend on adults 18+ as a % of total social work spend on adults 18+
SW3	% of people 65+ with intensive needs receiving care at home
SW4	% of Adults satisfied with social care or social work services

Culture & Leisure Services

C&L1	Gross cost per attendance at Sports facilities
C&L2	Cost Per Library Visit
C&L3	Cost per museum visit
C&L4	Cost of Parks& Open Spaces per 1,000 Populations
C&L5a	% of adults satisfied with libraries
C&L5b	% of adults satisfied with parks and open spaces
C&L5c	% of adults satisfied with museums and galleries

C&L5d	% of adults satisfied with leisure facilities
-------	---

Environmental Services

ENV 1	Gross cost of Waste collection per premise
ENV2	Gross cost per Waste disposal per premise
ENV 3a	Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population
ENV 3b	Street Cleanliness Index
ENV 4a	Cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads
ENV 4b	Percentage of A class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment
ENV 4c	Percentage of B class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment
ENV 4d	Percentage of C class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment
ENV 5	Cost of trading standards and environmental health per 1,000 population
ENV 6	The % of total waste arising that is recycled
ENV 7a	% of adults satisfied with refuse collection
ENV 7b	% of adults satisfied with street cleaning

Corporate Services: Asset Management and Property

CORPAM1	Proportion of operational buildings that are suitable for their current use
CORPAM2	Proportion of internal floor area of operational buildings in satisfactory condition

Appendix 2

Childrens' Services (12)



CNH1: Cost per primary school pupil							
Inverclyde Cost 2011/12	2011/12 Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	Cost 2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£4284	4 th	£5113	£4773	1 st	£4738	15 th	11

Indicator CHN2: Secondary cost per pupil							
Inverclyde Cost 2011/12	2011/12 Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	Cost 2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£6387	17 th	£6694	£6374	3 rd	£6445	16 th	-1

Indicator CHN3: Cost per pre-school place							
Inverclyde Cost 2011/12	2011/12 Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	Inverclyde 2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£4196	29 th	£3136	£2954	3 rd	£4492	30 th	1

Indicator CHN4: % pupils gaining 5+ awards at Level 5 for standard grade (pre-appeal)							
Inverclyde % 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	Inverclyde % 2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
33%	21 st	38.15	38	3 rd	36%	15	-6

Indicator CHN5: Pupils gaining 5+ awards at level 6 for Higher Grade by S6 (pre-appeal)							
Inverclyde % 11/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	Inverclyde % 2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
24%	19 th	26%	25%	3 rd	22%	19	-

Indicator CHN6: % pupils gaining 5+ awards at level 5 for standard grade by SIMD											
Inverclyde % 2011/12		Ranking	National Mean		National Median		LA Quartile	Inverclyde % 2010/11		Ranking	Change in Rank
20% MD	80% LD	2011/12	20% MD	80% LD	20% MD	80% LD	2011/12	20% MD	80% LD	2010/11	
22.1%	51.1%	14 th	23.1%	48%	21.7%	45.9%	2 nd	24%	58.3%	10 th	-4

Indicator CHN7: % pupils gaining 5+ awards at level 6 for higher grade by SIMD											
Inverclyde % 11/12		Ranking	National Mean		National Median		LA Quartile	Inverclyde % 2010/11		Ranking	Change in Rank
20% MD	80% LD	2011/12	20% MD	80% LD	20% MD	80% LD	2011/12	20% MD	80% LD	2010/11	
14.1%	38.5%	12	14.2%	33%	12.8%	31.9%	2 nd	11.3%	37.7%	20	8

Indicator CHN 8a: The gross cost of 'children looked after' in residential based services per children per week				
Inverclyde Cost 2010/11	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
£3,109	20 th	£3276	£2854	3 rd

Indicator CHN 8b: The gross cost of 'children looked after' in a community based setting per child per week				
Inverclyde Cost	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile
£94	3 rd	£209	£191	1st

Indicator CHN 9: Balance of care for looked after children: % being looked after in the community				
Inverclyde %	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
89.1%	17 th	89.4%	89.7%	3 rd

Indicator CHN10: % adults satisfied with local schools				
Inverclyde %	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
79.4%	29 th	84.8%	85.5%	4 th

Indicator CHN11: Proportion of pupils entering positive destinations							
Inverclyde % 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	% 2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
94.8%	3 rd	90.4%	90%	1 st	88.4%	19 th	16

Corporate Services (12)

1 st Quartile	2 nd Quartile	3 rd Quartile	4 th Quartile
2	5	3	2

Indicator CORP1: Central Support Services as a % of total gross expenditure							
Inverclyde % 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	% 2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
3.1%	4 th	5.3	4.7	1 st	2.5%	2 nd	-2

Indicator CORP2: Core Democratic Costs per 1,000 population							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£32,063	16 th	£49,385	£32,643	2 nd	£22,678	4 th	-12

Indicator CORP3A: Percentage of employees in the highest 2% of earners that are female							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
42%	12 th	39%	39.8%	2 nd	42.5%	8 th	-4

Indicator CORP3B: Percentage of employees in the highest 5% of earners that are female							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
47.6%	14	46%	47.1%	2 ND	47.6%	10	-4

Indicator CORP4: The cost per dwelling of collecting Council Tax							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£15.05	24	£12.68	£12.46	3rd	£16.61	26	2

CORP 5A The number of complaints of domestic noise received during the year settled without the need for attendance on site							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
155	19	864	357	3 RD	164	19	-

CORP 5B1 The number of domestic noise complaints received during the year requiring attendance on site and not dealt with under Part V of the ASB Act 2004							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
138	10	134	67	2 nd	121	12	2

CORP 5B2 Average time (hours) between time of complaint and attendance on site							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
25.5	20	30.5	12.5	3 RD	46.1	23	3

CORP 5B3 Average time (hours) between time of complaint and attendance on site for those dealt with under the ASB Act 2004							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
0.6	13	0.6	0.5	2 nd	0.6	15	2

Indicator CORP6: Days lost per FTE employee							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
10.5	27 th	9.6days	9.4days	4 th	10.4	25 th	-2

Indicator CORP7: % of income due from Council Tax received by the end of the year							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
94.2%	25	95.4%	95.6%	4 th	94%	25	-

Indicator CORP 8: % invoices that were paid within 30 days							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
95.6%	3 rd	88.7%	88.6%	1 st	94.4%	4 th	1

Social Work (4)

1 st Quartile	2 nd Quartile	3 rd Quartile	4 th Quartile
	2	2	

Indicator SW1: Home Care Costs per Hr (65 and over)							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£16.35	11 th	£18.80	£19.46	2 nd	£19.37	13 th	2

Indicator SW2: Self Directed Support spending on adults 18+ as a % of total SW spend on adults 18+							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
0.8%	24 th	2.6	1.6	3 rd	0.6%	25 th	1

Indicator SW3: % of people with 65+ with intensive needs receiving care at home							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
35.6%	17 th	33.3%	36.2%	3 rd	37.9%	10 th	-7

Indicator SW4: % adults satisfied with social care of social work services				
Inverclyde %	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
67.6%	10 th	63%	62.8%	2 nd

**Culture & Leisure
Services (8)**

1st Quartile	2nd Quartile	3rd Quartile	4th Quartile
3	1	2	2

Indicator C&L1 : Gross Cost per attendance at sports facilities							
Inverclyde 11/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£2.11	4 TH	£4.34	£4.18	1 ST	£1.72	3 RD	-1

Indicator C&L2: Cost per library visit							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£4.13	21 ST	£3.77	£3.66	3 RD	£4.65	25 TH	4

Indicator C&L3: Cost per museum visit							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£5.51	20 TH	£5.23	£4.31	3 RD	£4.13	14	-6

Indicator C&L4: Cost of parks and open spaces per 1,000 population							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£46,226	26 TH	£33,612	£33,367	4 TH	£45,832	26 TH	-

Indicator C&L5a: % of adults satisfied with Libraries				
Inverclyde %	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
92.5%	1st	84.7%	85.6%	1 ST

Indicator C&L5b: % adults satisfied with parks and open spaces				
Inverclyde % 2010/11	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
77.6%	26 TH	83%	84.4%	4 TH

Indicator C&L5c: % of adults satisfied with museums and galleries				
Inverclyde %	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
75%	11 TH	70.7%	71.2%	2 ND

Indicator C&L5d: % adults satisfied with leisure facilities				
Inverclyde Cost	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
85.3%	3 rd	75.8%	76.4%	1 st

Environmental Services (12)



Indicator ENV1: Gross waste collection cost per premise							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£50.18	1 st	£87.13	£80.05	1 st	£52.78	1 st	-

Indicator ENV2: Gross waste disposal cost per premise							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£81.64	8 th	£111.20	£95.55	1 st	£84.16	12 th	4

Indicator ENV3a: Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£18098.70	22 nd	£17,133.77	£16,298.85	3 rd	£18,904.35	19 th	-3

Indicator ENV3b: Overall Cleanliness Index							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
72	27 th	75	75	4 th	76	Joint 6 th	-21

Indicator ENV4a: Cost of maintenance per Km of Road							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£11,757	27 th	£8,614	£8,265	4 th	£13,755	25 th	2

Indicator ENV4b: % of A class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
30.7%	21	29.6%	27%	3 rd	29.3%	20	1

Indicator ENV4c: % of B class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
42%	27	34%	32.1%	4 TH	38.4%	24	-3

Indicator ENV4d: % of C class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
50.7%	29	36.4%	35.3%	4 TH	44.7%	25	-4

Indicator ENV5: Cost of trading standards and environmental health per 1,000 population							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
£22,381	17	£25,314	£22,368	3 rd	£19,895	8	-9

Indicator ENV6: % of total household waste that is recycled							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	National Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
41.9%	18	41%	43.5%	3 rd	31.5%	28	10

Indicator ENV7a: % of adults satisfied with refuse collection				
Inverclyde 2010/11	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
85.4%	12 th	83.2%	82.8%	2 nd

Indicator ENV7b: % adults satisfied with street cleaning				
Inverclyde 2010/11	Ranking	National Mean	Median	Quartile
74.5%	14 th	74.6%	74.1%	2nd

**Corporate Services:
Asset Management &
Property (2)**



Indicator Corp Asset 1: Proportion of operational buildings that are suitable for current							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
78.4%	21	78.9%	81.6%	3 RD	72.9%	24	3

Indicator Corp Asset 2: Proportion of internal floor area of operational buildings in satisfactory condition							
Inverclyde 2011/12	Ranking	National Mean	Median	LA Quartile	2010/11	2010/11 Ranking	Change in Rank
77.1%	23	81.8%	84.6%	3 RD	62.6%	28	5