

Characteristics of successful performance management	Questions to ask	Best case	Worst case
Outcomes			
Outcomes are derived from evidence of local circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how have communities been engaged at all levels relevant to local needs? • are outcomes proposed in terms the local partners will recognise? • is there evidence that the outcomes respond to key problems in the local area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current high quality community strategy • local consensus on LAA strategic outcomes • outcomes are linked by evidence to the problems faced by the local area • other local and regional strategies taken into account 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conflicting political outcomes based on party or territorial divisions • everything is a priority • no clear outcomes in the LAA • local priorities not translated to outcomes • outcomes' evidence missing, or many indirect proxies used
Buy-in at the highest level – political and official – from all partners to the LAA's outcomes and targets, including both tiers in two-tier authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is there a clear strategic vision, informed by evidence and consultation that has resulted in a set of priorities? • is there LSP and council cabinet approval? • is there evidence of senior buy-in and support, underpinned by buy-in across all sectors represented in the partnership? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • honesty about what are not priorities • tangible and visible cooperation • signed letters, with evidence of cross-partner participation. • examples of pooled budgets • Joint business planning and commissioning • collegiate accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • officer agreements with no evidence of member buy-in • just signatures with no visible participation • disconnected plans • only one partner 'wants' LAA • institutional and or territorial conflict with no plans for resolution
There is clear agreement between partners about delivering the LAA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is there evidence of agreement showing the who, what and when in eg minutes of meetings • how have conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where conflicts have arisen the LAA reflects an agreed position • there is a clear map of accountabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lip service with no real change in working • reticence to contribute • LAA is simply overlain on existing

Characteristics of successful performance management	Questions to ask	Best case	Worst case
	<p>been handled?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when necessary is the LAA being used to redesign how services are delivered between partners? • is there accountability for delivery? 	<p>that is accepted across the partnership</p>	<p>arrangements and opportunities not being taken to rationalise them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unclear responsibilities • no sharing of priorities • omissions on key local improvement issues

Indicators and targets

<p>Key national regional and local priorities are reflected in the outcomes and targets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how far are national, regional, and local priorities covered by outcomes and targets for all partners? • is there a coordinated LAA process for applying high-level outcomes, targets, and indicators locally? • are priority neighbourhoods and disadvantaged groups identified? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key national, regional and local priorities are reflected in the LAA, with mandatory outcomes and indicators clearly expressed and addressed • national and regional targets are supplemented by local ones to take account of local priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gaps in outcomes and targets coverage for key national regional and local priorities • mechanistic approach to adopting national indicators and targets, with no evidence of local application
<p>Robust indicators are agreed for each outcome, underpinned with the data flows necessary to assess performance at suitably regular intervals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what does the partnership as a whole do about agreeing indicators and data? • are the indicators good proxy measures of outcomes? • is the data robust, appropriate, timely, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear evidence based connection between performance on indicators and improved outcomes • indicators and data are transparent between partners • shared outcome framework so that indicators and data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inclusion of indicators with little relevance to outcome • no quality assurance about data quality • outcome framework bolted together so partners do not cross-cut or share responsibility

Characteristics of successful performance management	Questions to ask	Best case	Worst case
	relevant ? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is data available at the most appropriate spatial level? 	prompt action across partnership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of existing systems wherever possible to avoid duplication or the need to resource new systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data is available infrequently, and at unreasonably long intervals • data is replicated unnecessarily by not using existing systems
Targets are set on all indicators, which are realistic, measurable, evidenced, and timed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are indicators specific and measurable? • can progress be regularly assessed by partnership managers at appropriate intervals? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • targets are plausible, achievable, and realistic in terms of track record analysis of trends • partners have looked at comparable LSPs areas when setting targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • targets are unquantified open-ended intentions, or implausible given recent track record of partners • partners have chosen inappropriate benchmarks, either lacking ambition or with unrealistic ambition
Targets are underpinned by trajectories so that progress can be judged at any specific time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are the trajectories plausible? • are they related to planned actions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the trajectory is based on analysis and reflects actions planned during the LAA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trajectories are not understood or not in place • straight line trajectories to targets, regardless of track record
Performance monitoring and reporting			
Reporting chains between partners on progress against targets and indicators are agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are there agreed roles and responsibilities for the monitoring of performance against outcomes? • is there a robust and inclusive mechanism for the reporting of outcomes agreed between partners ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shared system or process between partners, with clear accountabilities of partners • clear and regular process for reporting eg reporting is timely and as frequent as necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gGaps in reporting cycle • accountabilities for reporting unclear or absent • organisations are not willing to hold each other to account, or do not think it is their business to do so

Characteristics of successful performance management	Questions to ask	Best case	Worst case
Partners are able to bring performance information together to monitor the outcomes and targets across the LAA, and are able to report this information to the GO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is there joint performance review of information? • can reports be understood by decision makers? • is performance information is available to monitor value for money in achieving outcomes and targets? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agreed frameworks /processes including responsibilities and resources for analysis /collation • progress reports attempt to assess VFM by comparing progress to spend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunities to rationalise reporting are not taken • spend is reported on in terms of percentage allocation consumed rather than in terms of achievements it has delivered
Partners are gathering and using data at the appropriate spatial and target group level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can performance be monitored against appropriate geographical or demographic areas – reflecting local issues eg deprivation or affluence? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the partnership can spot sub-local variation if necessary, and has the data to do so (eg crime or deprivation 'hotspots' at neighbourhood level or below] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performance reporting reflects partnership-wide averages, masking significant local variations
Performance management and improvement			
There are regular, robust and frequent processes in evidence for identifying locally when performance is succeeding, or failing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how quickly can decision makers respond in partnership to information on success or failure by reviewing action required? • What processes are in place to identify performance trends? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performance variations are reported early to partners • clear senior political involvement by leading elected members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is no regular mechanism for tracking progress against plans or performance trajectories • information is considered to be part of a monitoring arrangement rather than useful for managing performance
Local partners are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are partnership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accountabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accountabilities

Characteristics of successful performance management	Questions to ask	Best case	Worst case
clear who is responsible for which outcomes and are developing their own local 'ladder of intervention'	accountabilities for outcomes clearly defined, including who does what when about variations from agreed performance?	about action on performance clear <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a local ladder of intervention agreed between partners 	about action on performance are unclear <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no agreement about local 'ladder of intervention'
There is agreement between the local partners and GO on possible actions to correct continued under-performance and the circumstances under which they would occur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is there a coordinated process to develop plans that will address under-performance against targets? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agreement about how to deal with under-performance and the kinds of circumstances which would trigger action • focus on services with poor performance • plans have been made for effective joint responses to performance problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • denial, disengagement or deadlock between partners on arrangements for dealing with under-performance • performance regarded as an issue for single bodies/agencies
There are clear mechanisms for identifying and addressing changes in performance against the trajectories.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what procedures are there for partnerships to act collectively in response to variations in performance ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific mechanisms in place to identify source of service underperformance • plans responding to underperformance are in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data is not available to identify source of variations
Operational planning and delivery			
Strategies have been developed into operational plans within each organisation and the partnership as a whole, with timescales, milestones and responsible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is there a clear process and framework for cascading the strategic vision and priorities into other plans and actions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partnerships have asked for outcomes to be embedded in partners' action plans • there is a process for changing individual operational plans as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • middle managers of LAA partners do not buy in to what their top members /managers have agreed • junior staff have no understanding of the LAA

Characteristics of successful performance management	Questions to ask	Best case	Worst case
owners.		a result of LAA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> operational plans pre-date the LAA and have not been reviewed recently
There are processes in place at both the constituent organisation and partnership levels for tracking progress against operational plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is there a shared and integrated approach to learning from experience and reviewing performance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the monitoring of performance on outcomes is supported by review of progress against operational plans, and combined where appropriate processes are in place to track progress at partnership level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> business plans and progress tracking remain the sole remit of individual bodies or agencies