

STRATEGY, PLANNING AND REPORTING REVIEW – PERFORMANCE REPORTING UPDATE

Executive summary

1. This paper provides LG with high level recommendations from the Performance Reporting review and the planned approach to implementing the proposals.
2. The Strategic Planning and Reporting Steering Group has discussed and endorsed the Performance Reporting approach, proposals and the planned approach to use Key Performance Questions (KPQs) to identify key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for reporting performance for run the business objectives. They also supported a timescale of six months to implement the proposals.
3. LG is invited to:
 - Note the approach adopted
 - Note the research and comparisons carried out
 - Note the recommendations and the approach to implementing these changes
 - Note the planned approach to use KPQs to identify suitable KPIs and help identify suitable Strategic Leads for the run the business objectives
 - Agree the proposed timescale of six months to implement

Background

4. The new Delivery Plan translates the ambitions of the Strategic Plan into reality and from 2019-20 reflects the ongoing work to Run the Parliament which accounts for the majority of our day-to-day activities, as well as initiatives to improve the Parliament. A number of milestones and performance measures are used to assess the Delivery Plan via performance reporting which is considered by LG and the SPCB quarterly. Performance reporting should ensure LG has the information to support decision making on operational, strategic and financial aspects. It should also be based on a robust process, with good quality and timely information on how the organisation is performing. Careful thought is required to establish meaningful performance measures and reporting for the new 'Run the Parliament' objectives. The aim is to establish, after careful evaluation, a few well thought-out measures which tell an accurate story about how we are doing as well as ensuring the approach to capturing information and producing the report is streamlined.

Approach

5. The Strategic Planning and Reporting Steering Group established a performance reporting working group in late September 2018. Membership was based on staff individuals with an interest in performance reporting, or who were providing key performance measures currently, or who have expertise in presentation of data. Information of group membership can be found in Annex A.
6. Initial effort was focused on gathering information:
 - a. Questionnaires and interviews - gathering internal views by conducting a number of interviews with LG, inviting questionnaire responses from those currently contributing to the quarterly reports and inviting questionnaire responses from the G6 network and G5 Office heads. A summary report of the [feedback from the questionnaires](#) is available.
 - b. Process mapping where the current processes to gather information for the report were reviewed and evaluated
 - c. Research was undertaken by SPICe - [Performance Reporting Review – lessons and recommendations from elsewhere](#). This included evidence from the House of Commons, the National Assembly for Wales and Audit Scotland.

Issues and Options

7. In summary, the main working group recommendations are split into four main themes:

Report format

- Continue with a quarterly report but make more visual
- Differentiate what goes to LG and SPCB
- SPCB receiving a summary (max two pages) with highlights or issues plus a one-page summary for each strategic aim plus any case studies
- LG receive all of above but more information on performance for each aim to support discussion at the relevant LG meeting
- Introduce case studies for some change activities after completion to report on the outcomes and benefits achieved
- Risk becomes a separate report which is considered by LG at same time as the Performance Report
- Compliance reporting is moved from the quarterly report to form part of dashboard reporting.

Develop/refresh KPIs

- Use a KPQ approach (see para 9) to identify appropriate KPIs for corporate reporting
- Must not create a cottage industry on KPIs but work with what exists, or stop existing requirement where no longer required, or if new reporting this has some 'value added' advantage
- Have more of a mixture of input, process, output and outcome performance measures
- Also a mixture of quantitative, qualitative and comparative measures
- Not all KPIs will be monthly, some will be quarterly, some annual, some more infrequent, depending on what makes sense
- This will result in a bit more of a story around the reported measures
- Not all KPIs gathered by business areas will go into the report, some will form part of supporting a summary KPI and others may be for office purposes only
- On change activities, update the quarterly template to ensure time, budget and deliverables are captured.

Improve Qualitative Feedback

- Improve qualitative reporting against our objectives by:
 - Consider trialling Members' interviews to include specific broad services ratings and feedback. This approach is in line with that adopted by the House of Commons where satisfaction levels on services are gathered as part of the interview process.
 - Consider surveying Members' staff (staff for member who is being interviewed that quarter). This would engage Members' staff and get their feedback on the services provided and how this helps them support their member.
 - Consider trialling interviews with Committee Conveners/Deputy Conveners on a rolling basis across the year. This would provide more specific qualitative feedback on this area.
- Consider external qualitative and comparative measures such as YouGov survey and RepTrak used by House of Commons. The You Gov survey questions developed by the House of Commons covered areas such as public views on openness, inclusiveness and accessibility, members roles and their effectiveness. RepTrak is a methodology used in the commercial and public sector to measure, investigate and strategically develop public reputation to increase awareness, build knowledge and drive engagement with an organisation or brand. Six monthly pulse surveys allow regular testing and feedback.
- Consider use of the Best Companies staff survey, which is a standard annual staff survey which enables comparison not only across years

but against other similar type organisations and has been used by Audit Scotland for a number of years.

- At this stage, the recommendations are to be discussed further with Grade 6's/office heads to flesh out how this could work and what it adds to reporting and then come back to LG for sign off in autumn

Capturing KPIs/Dashboard

- The working group has investigated means of improving how we capture data and the usage of dashboarding to report. Many bodies have developed this approach to the recording and reporting of their KPIs, which sits independently of the quarterly reporting. The dashboard is updated with the KPIs monthly, or as appropriate, and these are available on a take note basis.
- The ambition is to develop this approach over time.

8. Work is continuing on these areas to implement the proposals. This includes the quarterly reporting format and the investigating of the development of a KPI and compliance reporting dashboard. To identify appropriate KPIs, a Key Performance Question approach is being adopted.

Key Performance Questions (KPQs)

9. Key Performance Questions identify the questions required to be answered by an organisation before identifying the KPIs to help answer these questions. Key to developing successful KPQs include identifying between 1 and 3 questions for each objective; making these questions open, short and clear and focusing on the present and the future. Only 1-2 KPIs should then be reported on each KPQ. Effectively a 'golden thread' runs from the organisation's overarching Strategic Goals, Aims and Key Objectives through to Key Performance Objectives, Key Performance Questions and Key Performance Indicators. Audit Scotland have demonstrated to us how they have successfully adopted this approach.

10. Six recommended steps which an organisation use to develop successful KPQs are:

- Start with the organisation's strategic objectives.
- Engage staff in the design for KPQs in their service/office.
- Make them open questions.
- Focus on the present and future – "e.g. to what extent are we...".
- Keep them short and clear.
- Refine them by using them.

11. The working group reviewed the five Strategic Aims of the Scottish Parliament and the underpinning "Run the Parliament" objectives to identify KPQs. These were considered by the Steering Group, who endorsed this approach and their feedback was incorporated in the [draft template](#). These will

be used to form the discussion with the strategic lead office on the KPIs for inclusion in the 2019-20 performance report. Where possible, the group have also mapped current KPIs that could be used to help answer these KPQs. In addition, the Group have identified opportunities to collect new KPIs to help answer KPQs and the most relevant strategic leads for each objective. Please note this is a working document and provides a snapshot of the group's work to date. Further work to agree new KPIs for 2019-20 is planned to take place with Office Heads over the next 2 months.

12. LG are invited to support the development of the KPQ approach as a means of establishing a small number of KPIs against each objective. We have set out the business areas we think that should be engaged in answering these questions and LG is also invited to nominate individuals from their business areas to support this work over the next 6 months.

13. If there are any specific issues on the KPQs then please feed back to Lis Craig afterwards.

Resource Implications

14. Over the next six months, appropriate KPIs will be identified and reported within the Q2 report where available. The revised report format will be introduced from the Q1 report which will be on the LG agenda for the August 2019 meeting to enable discussion and feedback on the revised document. The use of a dashboard will be developed, using Excel initially, but exploring low-cost options for further development, based on the House of Commons model. This may result in a separate resource requirement once evaluated, which would be discussed with SRB.

15. As part of the KPI identification process, some existing performance measures may no longer be required. However, there will be some new requirements. Overall no more staff time should be required and the information provided will be more streamlined and meaningful, and staff throughout the organisation will become more 'invested in' how their everyday work and tasks contribute to the overarching purpose, vision and strategic goals of the parliament. The introduction of any external benchmarking measures such as the Best Companies will have a cost associated (£15k per annum for this survey). A separate proposal on the different options and their benefits will be brought forward once we have more information on costs.

Dependencies

16. Discussion is required with Offices on the KPIs and BIT on any technological possibilities to improve reporting.

Governance issues

17. LG will be invited to note the proposed KPIs and any further costs associated with some of the external qualitative benchmarking that is flagged up for further consideration. This will be reported in the autumn.

Publication Scheme

18. This paper can be published

Communications

19. Further work will be developed, with Group and Office Heads to communicate performance reporting timetable, reporting requirements on KPIs and change projects.

Next steps

20. As highlighted in the paper.

21. KPQs can be considered by LG at the time of the development of the delivery plan for 2020/21 to see whether they impact on the objectives set.

Decision

22. LG is invited to:

- a) **Note the overall progress of the performance review and the forward plan for Q1 and Q2 of 2019-20**
- b) **Note the KPQ planned approach working with Offices to identify appropriate KPIs**
- c) **Agree the timetable to deliver**

Michelle Hegarty
Assistant Chief Executive
April 2019

Lis Craig
Financial Controller

Annex A

Performance Reporting Review Working Group

Name	Office	Role/interest
Fiona Anderson	BIT	Current KPI contributor
James Burton	Solicitor's Office	Compliance report compiler
Allan Campbell	SPICe	Research, reporting format and data visualisation
Lis Craig	Finance	Project Lead
Andrew Degnan	Finance	Performance report compiler
Gary Gibson	FM	FM KPIs
Anne Jepson	SPICe	Research on best practice
Andy Munro	Internal Audit	Risk register and reporting
Stuart Nicol	BIT	Programme/project reporting
Michael Peters	Public Information and Resources	Reporting formats
Lynn Russell	Committee	Previous performance reporting experience with Audit Scotland