

**To:                Audit, Risk and Scrutiny Board**

**On:                21 March 2022**

---

**Report by:    Chief Executive**

---

**Heading:       Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2020/21**

---

## **1.        Summary**

- 1.1        In March 2022, the Improvement Service published the 2020/21 Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) performance data for all Scottish local authorities. The Framework is a high-level benchmarking tool which allows local authorities to compare their performance across a wide range of key service areas such as education, housing, and adult social care.
- 1.2        Renfrewshire Council has participated in the development of the LGBF since its inception in 2010 and the framework has expanded to comprise 101 indicators. The purpose of the Framework is to support evidence-based comparisons and encourage shared learning and improvement.
- 1.3        This report provides an overview of Renfrewshire's performance for 2020/21, as well as outlining the wider context and trends for local authorities across Scotland. This data reflects the first year of the pandemic, including the initial national lockdown, and most service areas in local authorities were impacted by this. This may have been due to services being paused, or resources being temporarily focused on supporting residents through direct activities such as delivering food parcels or administering business grants. It is important that performance, both absolute and relative, is considered in this context. The duration of the pandemic means that the impact will be evident in data for 2021/22 and beyond.
- 1.4        Elected members will be aware of the impact of the pandemic on Renfrewshire and the extent to which council services had to respond to new needs within our communities whilst also adapting services in line with public health restrictions. Staff across the council and partner organisations worked incredibly hard to ensure that core services were still delivered and that our most vulnerable residents were supported during unprecedented times.

- 1.5 Within the LGBF, councils are ranked against each other to show relative performance but the rankings should be considered in context. It is possible for performance to improve in real terms but for this not to be reflected in rankings because other councils have also improved.
- 1.6 In relation to the rankings for 2020/21, Renfrewshire has performed as follows:
- 35 indicators have improved their ranking;
  - 32 indicators have fallen in the rankings;
  - 8 indicators have a ranking which is unchanged;
  - 26 indicators do not yet have updated data available;
  - 24 indicators are ranked in the top 8 best performing councils for that measure;
  - 11 indicators are ranked in the 8 lowest performing councils for that measure.
- 1.6 Renfrewshire Council actively contributes to national discussions and learning on the Local Government Benchmarking Framework and uses it to identify opportunities to explore areas of challenge and of best practice.
- 

## **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Audit, Risk and Scrutiny Board notes the contents of the report.
- 

## **3. Background**

- 3.1 All Scottish local authorities participate in the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF), which allows councils to compare their performance across a suite of indicators, including costs and performance of key council services, and levels of public satisfaction. Whilst there are always different views on the nature and calculation of specific indicators, the framework provides a tool for the Council to consider its performance in relation to delivering Best Value, as well as a platform for learning and sharing good practice. It is used in conjunction with other benchmarking tools, data and information that Council services use to assess performance, such as service key performance indicators, national and local surveys, inspections, and audits.
- 3.2 There are currently 101 indicators in the Framework, which cover the majority of council services across ten categories:
- Children's services;
  - Corporate services;
  - Adult social care;
  - Culture and leisure services;
  - Environmental services;
  - Housing services;
  - Corporate asset management;
  - Economic development;
  - Financial sustainability;
  - Tackling climate change.
- 3.3 There are four new indicators included in the dataset this year; three under the theme of Economic Development (Gross Value Added per capita, Claimant Count as a percentage of

working age population, Claimant Count as a percentage of 16-24 population) and one under the theme of Children's Services (percentage of children living in poverty after housing costs). No data has been provided for 2020/21 for either the GVA or child poverty indicator.

- 3.4 Whilst the framework provides a useful platform for councils to compare relative performance, it has some limitations. The way in which costs are calculated for specific indicators can vary significantly between local authorities due to the way in which services are structured, and performance may also reflect the policy choices taken by a local authority. For example, investment in a service area may lead to increased costs being reported through the LGBF, rather than being reported as a service improvement or a positive outcome for local communities.
- 3.5 The performance indicators have narrow definitions to allow for comparison, but this does not necessarily represent the full range of council service delivery and additional interventions and supports. This is particularly the case in 2020/21, when councils redirected resource towards supporting vulnerable residents and businesses and providing support to testing and vaccination programmes. An example would be the work of the economic development service, who shifted focus from business start-ups to supporting existing businesses to cope with restrictions and move into a recovery phase as restrictions eased. Part of this including administering over 3000 business grants, but that is an area of activity not captured in the LGBF.
- 3.6 The dataset reflects the impact of the pandemic on services provided by councils and must be considered in that context. During 2020/21 Renfrewshire, along with other local authority areas in the Central Belt, was subject to more stringent public health restrictions over a longer period of time than many other areas in Scotland and this impacted heavily on service delivery as well as the needs of residents.
- 3.7 The data is collated, verified, and published for all Scottish councils by the Improvement Service. The final data for 2020/21 was published on 4 March 2022. A link to the Improvement Service reporting tool is available on the [performance section of the Council website](#), and a summary of the data is provided in Appendix 1. The Improvement Service will publish a revised version in the spring which will include updates on the indicators for which data is not currently available.

#### **4. National Context**

- 4.1 Alongside the performance data, the Improvement Service publishes a national overview report each year, highlighting key trends across Scotland and considering local variation. The national report notes that "In 2020/21, Councils faced exceptional conditions as a result of Covid-19 which led to significant additional costs, loss of income and undelivered savings." The report also notes both the increase in Scottish Government funding to councils and increased ring-fencing of funding and new "policy burdens".
- 4.2 Although the LGBF is a well-established framework which supports councils with improvement planning, the Improvement Service have identified four main areas of additional complexity with the latest data:
- Altered delivery and operating landscapes
  - Data timeliness
  - Methodological issues and data gaps

- Impact of inflation

- 4.3 This means that data is not always directly comparable with previous years. In some areas of service, public health restrictions may have meant a reduction in, or pausing of, some service provision. Some staff were redeployed to support tasks which would not normally be within the remit of a local authority, such as food delivery or supporting testing and vaccination centres. As such, all data should be treated with caution and considered within the pandemic context.
- 4.4 In terms of general performance across Scotland, the impact of Covid-19 is recognised as having a significant impact. The Improvement Service highlight that the data only covers the year to March 2021 and therefore “does not therefore reflect the challenges and pressures facing Local Government currently, nor the longer-term impacts of COVID-19.” It is anticipated that the effects will be evident in the data in years to come.
- 4.5 The data points to national trends such as growing levels of poverty, inequality and financial hardship. The impact of lockdowns on education are highlighted, as is some evidence of a disproportionate impact on children in more deprived communities. The national overview also notes the “exceptional efforts” of staff in health and social care in maintaining services and protecting vulnerable people.

## 5. Overview of Renfrewshire’s Performance

- 5.1 This section provides an overview of Renfrewshire’s performance with a focus on those ranked among the best performing councils (ranked between 1<sup>st</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>) and those in the lowest performing, relatively speaking (ranked between 25<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup>). This year’s data can be summarised as follows:
- 35 indicators have improved their ranking;
  - 32 indicators have fallen in the rankings;
  - 8 indicators have a ranking which is unchanged;
  - 26 do not yet have updated data available.
- 5.2 The Council is in the top quarter for 24 indicators and in the bottom quartile for 11. Appendix 1 provides the Council’s data, ranked position, the Scottish average, and the family group range for all the indicators.

### Indicators in the top quarter

- 5.3 Renfrewshire Council has 24 indicators in the LGBF which rank in the top eight best-performing councils and these are listed in the table below.

Indicator Name	Rank 2019-20	Rank 2020-21
Cost per Secondary School Pupil	2	2
Cost per Pre-School Education Registration	23	8
% of Pupils Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5	7	8
% of Pupils Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 6	9	7
Overall Average Total Tariff	8	7

Average total tariff SIMD quintile 3	7	6
Average total tariff SIMD quintile 4	5	4
Average total tariff SIMD quintile 5	4	6
% of P1, P4 and P7 pupils combined achieving expected CFE Level in Literacy	n/a	7
% of P1, P4 and P7 pupils combined achieving expected CFE Level in Numeracy	n/a	4
% of funded early years provision which is graded good/better	16	7
% of invoices sampled that were paid within 30 days	18	1
Residential costs per week per resident for people aged 65 or over	3	2
Rate of readmission to hospital within 28 days per 1,000 discharges	8	7
Net cost of waste disposal per premise	23	3
Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population	1	2
% of A Class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	4	4
% of B Class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	8	7
Cost of environmental health per 1,000 population	1	1
Gross rent arrears (all tenants) as at 31 March each year as a percentage of rent due for the reporting year	6	7
Proportion of operational buildings that are suitable for their current use	7	8
% of unemployed people assisted into work from council operated / funded employability programmes	12	2
Immediately available employment land as a % of total land allocated for employment purposes in the local development plan	22	1
Total useable reserves as a % of council annual budgeted revenue	4	4

### Indicators in the bottom quarter

- 5.4 The Council ranked in the eight lowest performing councils (25<sup>th</sup> to 32<sup>nd</sup>) for 11 of the LGBF indicators. Additional context for these indicators is summarised below, with further detail in Appendix 1.

Indicator Name	Rank 2019-20	Rank 2020-21
Support services as a % of total gross expenditure	24	30
The cost per dwelling of collecting council tax	26	25
Sickness absence days per teacher	28	30
Sickness absence days per employee (non-teacher)	32	31
% of people aged 65 and over with long-term care needs receiving personal care at home	25	30
Cost of parks & open spaces per 1,000 population	26	27
Cost of roads per kilometre	26	26
Cost of Trading Standards per 1000 population	31	30
% of procurement spend spent on local enterprises	20	25
No of business gateway start-ups per 10,000 population	19	30

Ratio of Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream - Housing Revenue Account	26	26
--	----	----

### **Support services as a percentage of total gross expenditure**

- 5.5 Indicators on cost depend, in part, on how each council chooses to allocate its budget. In Renfrewshire, support services are mainly centralised (for example, business support) rather than each service having their own budget for this. Consequently, expenditure on support services can appear larger than in other councils where support services may be spread across multiple service areas and the cost allocated under service headings. Renfrewshire's approach to support service provision has meant that the council is typically towards the lower end of rankings.

### **The cost per dwelling of collecting Council Tax**

- 5.6 Although Renfrewshire has one of the higher costs of collecting Council Tax, the cost has fallen by 2.8% on the previous year, and the long-term trend is that of steadily reducing cost. In 2010/11, the first year of LGBF data, the cost was £18.87 per dwelling so the current cost of £9.07 represents a reduction in costs of 52% over a decade. This reflects a national trend. Renfrewshire is one of ten councils who outsource debt recovery and so the income from penalties cannot be included in the figures as a way of offsetting cost. In common with all local authorities during the first year of the pandemic, Renfrewshire experienced a slight reduction in the overall percentage of Council Tax collected by year end though the collection rate remained above the Scottish average.

### **Sickness absence days per employee (non-teacher) and sickness absence days per teacher**

- 5.7 Absence levels for both teaching and non-teaching staff have improved, although not to the same extent as other local authorities and so Renfrewshire remains near the bottom of the rankings. The council's Supporting Attendance policy is currently being reviewed and tackling absence levels remains a priority for the Corporate Management Team. An Absence Review Group has been established and is undertaking a range of activities including data analysis, focus groups with managers, benchmarking with other local authorities and a review of current absence policies and procedures.
- 5.8 As in 2019/20, the two most common causes of unplanned absence in 2020/21 were psychological (non-work related) and musculoskeletal; these broadly account for one-third and one-fifth of absences respectively. The council offers a range of supports which employees can access either as an early intervention measure to prevent absence or as a means to support a return to work. Staff can access an employee counselling service, Time to Talk, and short programmes of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy are also available. The Occupational Health service also offers physiotherapy services.
- 5.9 There are a range of policy and guidance documents to support managers and staff with wellbeing issues, and there are risk assessments tools available for posts which involve manual handling; these are regularly reviewed. Staff with specific health and safety requirements relating to their job are provided with training before undertaking certain tasks, such as Moving and Handling training.

## **Percentage of people aged 65 and over with long-term care needs receiving personal care at home**

- 5.10 Data for 2020/21 indicates that 53.5% of older adults with long term care needs were receiving personal care at home, compared with a national average of 61.7% and compared with local performance of 56.2% in 2019/20. This data is monitored closely and regularly at a local level, and as a snapshot of a point in time, it can be subject to considerable variation. Renfrewshire has a reablement approach which means that care packages can be relatively short-term and intensive in order to support someone to be able to regain skills and live independently or with lower levels of care (such as telecare or respite for family carers). This figure does not include those individuals with long-term care needs who are supported in extra care housing or in residential or nursing homes. There is a long term trend in Renfrewshire of reducing admissions to residential care and supporting people in the community wherever possible, but service provision is based on an assessment of the needs of each individual and will be appropriate to those needs.

## **Costs of parks and open spaces per 1,000 population**

- 5.11 The cost of parks and open spaces per 1000 population increased by 5% in 2020/21 compared with the previous year. As with all cost indicators, ranking depends to some extent on how each local authority chooses to categorise areas of spend.

## **Cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads**

- 5.12 The cost of Renfrewshire's roads maintenance is £17,495 in 2020/21 and is well above the Scottish average of £9,667. This figure is reflective of the significant capital investment that the Council has made in relation to proactive roads maintenance. The 2020/21 costs reflect not only the maintenance costs but also the £9 million programme of capital investment in roads and pavements as part of the five-year £40m programme agreed by Council in February 2019.

## **Cost of trading standards per 1,000 population**

- 5.13 The name of this indicator does not accurately reflect the range of services included within this such as additional costs relating to Advice Works, business regulation costs and external advice services etc, which not all local authorities provide. Excluding these services would give a much lower cost for Renfrewshire at under £2000 per 1000 population. Officers continue to engage with the IS around the methodology in relation to this indicator to ensure it more accurately reflects the cost of delivering these services.

## **Percentage of procurement spend spent on local enterprises**

- 5.14 The proportion of procurement spend which went to local businesses fell by almost 3 percentage points in 2020/21 and this can also be linked in part to the pandemic. Public health restrictions reduced the volume of non-essential construction work that could be carried out, and this impacted on contracts with local suppliers. There was also a requirement to purchase additional social care services to ensure frontline services could be maintained at an appropriate level despite the impact of Covid, and some of this was purchased from providers whose registered offices are not within Renfrewshire (which is the criteria for inclusion as local). As restrictions ease, opportunities for spending local will

increase. Further, procurement staff are working with economic development staff to find more opportunities to signpost local business to council tenders and this is a key priority for the service.

### **Number of business gateway start-ups per 10,000 population**

- 5.15 The impact of the pandemic is evident from a widespread drop in the number of new business start-ups. Renfrewshire experienced a large fall from 16.53 start-ups per 10,000 population in 2019/20 to 4.91 in 2020/21. Many individuals who had expressed an interest in setting up their own business chose to delay as a result of the uncertainty arising from the pandemic. Council services focused on supporting existing businesses to be sustainable throughout periods of restrictions and assisting them during the recovery periods when restrictions were eased. This included administering the programme of business support grants funded by central government; over £50 million was allocated to more than 3000 local businesses.

### **Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream – housing revenue account**

- 5.16 The Council has made significant investment in housing in recent years, predominantly related to the achievement of the Scottish Housing Quality Standard. The majority of this investment was funded through borrowing which was assessed as affordable and prudent over the life of the 30-year business plan which the HRA operates when assessing potential investment. Financing costs increased in 2020/21 which reflects the Council's approach to debt smoothing whereby payments are accelerated where revenue budgets allow. There was no change in Renfrewshire's ranking relative to other local authorities.

## **6. Significant Movement**

- 6.1 A number of indicators have altered significantly relative to previous performance and their position relative to other councils. There are five which have moved by 10 positions or more in the ranking. One of these – business gateway start-ups – has already been addressed in paragraph 5.15 above. A brief summary of performance for the remaining four is set out below.

### **Cost per primary school pupil**

- 6.2 The cost per pupil has increased from £5,402 to £5,807, resulting in a change in ranking from 2nd to 14th though the cost per pupil remains below the Scottish average. This indicator has limitations in terms of demonstrating performance as it is not linked to any quality measures. For context, the rankings are based on lowest cost with the highest ranked council being the one with the lowest cost.

### **The literacy attainment gap (P1,P4,P7 combined) – the percentage point gap between the least and most deprived pupils**

- 6.3 This indicator was not collected in 2019/20 as schools were closed in the summer term when teacher professional judgements are finalised, and so the comparison is based on the rankings in 2018/19 and 2020/21. Over the two-year period, the percentage point gap increased from 20 to 29, leading to a change in ranking from 11<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup>. Whilst these

measures show a drop in relative performance, overall attainment in Renfrewshire for literacy and numeracy was above the Scottish average. The widening of the gap has occurred due to a decrease in attainment of pupils living in most deprived areas, while those from least deprived areas have maintained or increased attainment levels. National evidence demonstrates that across the country it has been pupils living in deprivation that have been most negatively affected by the pandemic and local data reflects this. Children's Services are using attainment data to inform and support planning, ensuring that measures to address the impact of the pandemic on pupil attainment are in place and the support is in place for the specific needs of all pupils.

### **Cost per attendance at sports facilities**

- 6.4 All local authority areas experienced significant rises in cost per attendance; the increase in the Scottish average was 1282% in a single year. In Renfrewshire, the cost rose from £1.71 in 2019/20 to £34.35 in 2020/21, a 1904% rise. There are several factors contributing to this. Sports facilities had a long period of closure as a result of public health restrictions and therefore lost all the income from their commercial activities. When facilities reopened, the remaining restrictions reduced capacity and so still impacted significantly on income. Capacity was further reduced in some instances where leisure facilities were used as venues for Covid-19 testing and/or vaccination. OneRen, the provider of sports and leisure facilities in Renfrewshire, also report an increase in the running costs of services arising from higher inflation, increased utility costs and supply chain challenges. The operating environment is likely to remain challenging and will be monitored and responded to as required.

### **Average time per business and industry planning application (in weeks)**

- 6.5 The time taken to process planning applications relating to business and industrial proposals increased from 6.8 weeks in 2019/20 to 9.9 weeks in 2020/21. The increase reflects the complexity and nature of the applications received during the year, and the need for consultation with external stakeholders such as the Scottish Environment Protection Agency SEPA and Transport Scotland. Planning authorities have a legal obligation to wait for consultation responses from such agencies before they can make a determination on an application. Renfrewshire's performance remains above the Scottish average.

## **7. Monitoring and reporting of LGBF**

- 7.1 The performance of the LGBF indicators will continue to be monitored by the Corporate Management Team, through service improvement planning processes and through further benchmarking activities to develop and share best practice. A report on the LGBF will continue to be submitted to the Audit, Risk and Scrutiny Board annually to review performance and monitor progress.
- 7.2 Renfrewshire Council publishes its statutory Public Performance Reporting document on the Council's website in March each year. Relevant performance information gathered through the LGBF is included as part of the report. This year's data is available online [here](#).

---

### **Implications of this report**

1. **Financial – n/a**
2. **HR and Organisational Development – n/a**

3. **Community/Council Planning** – n/a
4. **Legal** – n/a
5. **Property/Assets** – n/a
6. **Information Technology** – n/a
7. **Equality & Human Rights** – The recommendations contained within this report have been assessed in relation to their impact on equalities and human rights. No negative impacts on equality groups or potential for infringement of individuals' human rights have been identified arising from the recommendations contained in the report because it is for noting only. If required following implementation, the actual impact of the recommendations and the mitigating actions will be reviewed and monitored, and the results of the assessment will be published on the Council's website.
8. **Health and Safety** – n/a
9. **Procurement** – n/a
10. **Risk** – n/a
11. **Privacy Impact** – n/a
12. **Cosla Policy Position** – the LGBF framework represents a joint commitment by SOLACE (Scotland) and COSLA to develop better measurement and comparable data to target resources and drive improvements.
13. **Climate Risk** – n/a

---

**List of Background Papers:**

None

---

Author: Lisa Fingland, Service Planning and Policy Development Manager,  
lisa.fingland@renfrewshire.gov.uk

## Appendix 1 – Renfrewshire’s 2020/21 data for all LGBF indicators

Family Groups were set up to facilitate comparisons and encourage discussions between similar councils. Renfrewshire is currently in the following family groups:

- Family Group 3 for population type, which includes Children Services, Adult Social Care and Housing Services – Clackmannanshire, Dumfries & Galloway, Falkirk, Fife, Renfrewshire, South Ayrshire, South Lanarkshire, and West Lothian.
- Family Group 3 for area, which includes Corporate Services, Culture and Leisure, Environmental Services, Corporate Assets, Economic Development, Financial Sustainability, Tackling Climate Change – Angus, Clackmannanshire, East Renfrewshire, Inverclyde, Midlothian, Renfrewshire, South Lanarkshire and West Lothian.

### Children’s Services

There are 32 indicators in the Children’s Services category; data is currently not available for 12 indicators. In 2020/21, eight indicators improved their ranking, one was unchanged, and six dropped some positions in the ranking. There are 11 are ranked in the top quarter and there are none in the bottom quarter of the rankings.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
CHN1 – Cost per primary school pupil	2	14	£5,402	£5,807	£5,897	£5,630 (Fife) to £6,179 (South Ayrshire)
CHN2 – Cost per secondary school pupil	2	2	£7,240	£6,830	£7,629	£6,830 (Renfrewshire) to £8,854 (Clackmannanshire)
CHN3 – Cost per pre-school education registration	23	8	£7,906	£8,020	£9,255	£7,293 (West Lothian) to £9,853 (Clackmannanshire)
CHN4 – Percentage of pupils gaining 5+ awards at Level 5	7	8	69.00%	72.00%	67.00%	58.00% (Clackmannanshire) to 75.00% (West Lothian)
CHN5 – Percentage of pupils gaining 5+ awards at Level 6	9	7	40.00%	45.00%	41.00%	30.00% (Clackmannanshire) to 52.00% (West Lothian)

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
CHN6 – Percentage of pupils living in the 20% most deprived areas gaining 5+ awards at level 5 (SIMD)	4	12	55.00%	50.00%	49.00%	40.00% (Clackmannanshire & Dumfries and Galloway) to 57.00% (Falkirk)
CHN7 – Percentage of pupils living in the 20% most deprived areas gaining 5+ awards at level 6 (SIMD)	7	14	23.00%	21.00%	23.00%	13.00% (Clackmannanshire) to 32.00% (West Lothian)
CHN8a – The gross cost of “children looked after” in residential based services per child per week	30	n/a	£6,142	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN8b -The gross cost of “children looked after” in a community setting per child per week	22	n/a	£418.66	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN9 – Balance of care for ‘looked after children’: % of children being looked after in the community	4	n/a	94.39%	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN10 – Percentage of adults satisfied with local schools	21	n/a	71.37%	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN11 - % of pupils entering positive destinations	12	n/a	93.96%	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN12a – Overall average tariff score	8	7	965	1058	972	837 (Clackmannanshire) to 1128 (Falkirk)
CHN12b – Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 1	7	9	707	700	688	551 (Clackmannanshire) to 767 (Falkirk)
CHN12c – Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 2	15	10	766	898	817	763 (Fife) to 910 (South Ayrshire)
CHN12d – Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 3	7	6	997	1070	975	859 (Fife) to 1155 (Falkirk)
CHN12e – Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 4	5	4	1166	1311	1108	1010 (Dumfries and Galloway) to 1348 (Falkirk)
CHN12f – Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 5	4	6	1312	1390	1320	1097 (Clackmannanshire) to 1440 (Falkirk)
CHN13a - % of P1, P4 and P7 pupils combined achieving expected CFE Level in Literacy	n/a	7	n/a	70%	67%	59% (Dumfries and Galloway) to 76% West Lothian
CHN13b - % of P1, P4 and P7 pupils combined achieving expected CFE Level in Numeracy	n/a	4	n/a	80%	75%	69% (Clackmannanshire & Dumfries and Galloway) to 82% (West Lothian)

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
CHN14a – Literacy Attainment Gap (P1,4,7 Combined) – percentage point gap between the least deprived and most deprived pupils	n/a	21	n/a	29	25	21 (Clackmannanshire & West Lothian) to 29 (Renfrewshire)
CHN14b – Numeracy Attainment Gap (P1,4,7 Combined) – percentage point gap between the least deprived and most deprived pupils	n/a	17	n/a	23	21	13 (Clackmannanshire) to 23 (Fife & Renfrewshire)
CHN17 - % of children meeting developmental milestones	28	n/a	80.42%	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN18 – Percentage of funded early years provision which is graded good / better	16	7	91.20%	95.45%	90.93%	86.42% (Dumfries and Galloway) to 98.04% (Fife)
CHN19a – School attendance rates (per 100 pupils)	n/a	20	n/a	91.90%	92.00%	91.10% (Fife) to 93.20% (Dumfries and Galloway)
CHN19b – School attendance rates (per 100 'looked after children')	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN20a – School exclusion rates (per 1,000 pupils)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN20b – School exclusion rates (per 1,000 'looked after children')	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN21 – Participation rate for 16-19 year olds (per 100)	18	14	92.37%	93.00%	92.18%	89.96% (Clackmannanshire) to 93.10% (Dumfries and Galloway)
CHN22 - % of child protection re-registrations within 18 months	19	n/a	8.09%	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN23 - % LAC with more than 1 placement in the last year (Aug-July)	8	n/a	14.80%	n/a	n/a	n/a
CHN24 - % of children living in poverty (after housing costs)	12	n/a	23.11%	n/a	n/a	n/a

## **Adult Services**

There are 11 indicators in the Adult Services category; data is currently not available for four indicators. In 2020/21, four indicators improved their ranking, and three fell in the ranking. There were two indicators are in the top ranked quarter and one in the bottom quarter.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
SW1 – Home care costs per hour for people aged 65 or over	16	12	£26.11	£25.71	£27.65	£16.46 (Clackmannanshire) to £36.47 (Falkirk)
SW2 – SDS (Direct Payments + Managed Personalised Budgets) spend on adults 18+ as a percentage of total social work spend on adults 18+	25	19	4.05%	4.47%	8.17%	2.52% (Clackmannanshire) to 8.22% (West Lothian)

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
SW3a - % of people aged 65 and over with long-term care needs who are receiving personal care at home	25	30	56.19%	53.51%	61.71%	53.51% (Renfrewshire) to 76.11% (Clackmannanshire)
SW4b - % of adults supported at home who agree that their services and support had an impact in improving or maintaining their quality of life	13	n/a	81.83%	n/a	n/a	n/a
SW4c – Percentage of adults supported at home who agree that they are supported to live as independently as possible	19	n/a	80.26%	n/a	n/a	n/a
SW4d – Percentage of adults supported at home who agree that they had a say in how their help, care or support was provided	25	n/a	73.13%	n/a	n/a	n/a
SW4e – Percentage of carers who feel supported to continue in their caring role	23	n/a	32.90%	n/a	n/a	n/a
SW5 – Average residential costs per week per resident for people aged 65	3	2	£277	£248	£439	£204 (Dumfries & Galloway) to £533 (South Lanarkshire)
SW6 – Rate of readmission to hospital within 28 days per 1,000 discharges	8	7	92.53	100.11	120.03	100.11 (Renfrewshire) to 163.93 (Clackmannanshire)
SW7 – Proportion of care services graded 'good' (4) or better in Care Inspectorate inspections	14	15	85.16%	85.50%	82.50%	78.50% (South Ayrshire) to 97.40% (Clackmannanshire)
SW8 – Number of days people spend in hospital when they are ready to be discharged, per 1,000 population (75+)	8	16	382.58	368.24	484.28	257.45 (Dumfries and Galloway) to 886.36 (South Ayrshire)

## Corporate

There are eight indicators in the Corporate category. In 2020/21, five indicators improved their ranking, and three fell in the ranking. There was one indicator in the top quarter in terms of performance and four in the bottom quarter.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
CORP 1 – Support services as a percentage of total gross expenditure	24	30	5.01%	5.64%	4.06%	2.85% (West Lothian) to 6.29% (Clackmannanshire)
CORP 3b – percentage of the highest paid 5% of employees who are women	17	16	55.74%	57.11%	58.30%	53.85 (Clackmannanshire) to 62.43(Inverclyde)
CORP 3c – The gender pay gap	20	17	4.31%	3.67%	3.66%	-2.08% (Angus) to 7.39% (Inverclyde)
CORP 4 – The cost per dwelling of collecting Council Tax	26	25	£9.33	£9.07	£6.64	£2.26 (West Lothian) to £15.03 (East Renfrewshire)

CORP 6a – Sickness absence days per teacher	28	30	7.78	5.70	4.16	3.45 (Inverclyde) to 7.09 (Clackmannanshire)
CORP 6b – Sickness absence days per employee (non-teacher)	32	31	14.14	11.89	9.71	7.96 (Inverclyde) to 11.89 (Renfrewshire)
CORP 7 – Percentage of income due from Council Tax received by the end of the year	18	20	96.02%	95.03%	94.77%	94.17% (Midlothian) to 96.89% (Angus)
CORP 8 – Percentage of invoices sampled that were paid within 30 days	18	1	92.06%	97.25%	91.76%	79.82% (East Renfrewshire) to 97.25% (Renfrewshire)

## **Culture and Leisure**

There are eight indicators in the Culture and Leisure category; data is currently not available for five indicators. In 2020/21, one indicator improved its ranking, and two fell in the ranking. There were none in the top ranked group and one in the bottom group.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
C&L1 – Cost per attendance at sports facilities	7	18	£1.71	£34.35	£40.36	£9.73 (Inverclyde) to £113.11 (Angus)
C&L2 – Cost per library visit	32	18	£9.37	£5.22	£2.88	£1.90 (Clackmannanshire) to £17.17 (East Renfrewshire)
C&L3 – Cost of museums per visit	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	£10.14	Only 4 councils in family group have data – Angus, Inverclyde, South Lanarkshire and West Lothian.
C&L4 – Costs of parks and open spaces per 1,000 population	26	27	£26,903	£28,240	£19,112	£3,618 (Midlothian) to £31,254 (South Lanarkshire)
C&L5a – Percentage of adults satisfied with libraries	18	n/a	73.73%	n/a	n/a	n/a
C&L5b – Percentage of adults satisfied with parks and open spaces	18	n/a	83.77%	n/a	n/a	n/a
C&L5c – Percentage of adults satisfied with museums and galleries	10	n/a	69.33%	n/a	n/a	n/a
C&L5d – Percentage of adults satisfied with leisure facilities	7	n/a	75.80%	n/a	n/a	n/a

## Environment

There are 15 indicators in the Environment category, data is currently not available for two indicators. In 2020/21, six indicators improved their ranking, three were unchanged, and four fell in the ranking. Five indicators were ranked in the top eight councils and two were ranked in the bottom eight.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
ENV1a – Net cost per waste collection per premise	20	15	£72.34	£66.67	£72.35	£45.09 (Clackmannanshire) to £87.72 (East Renfrewshire)
ENV2a – Net cost of waste disposal per premise	23	3	£113.63	£61.59	£104.50	£34.02 (Midlothian) to £121.66 (West Lothian)
ENV3a – Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population	1	2	£6,373	£6,472	£14,845	£6,472 (Renfrewshire) to £20,413 (Inverclyde)
ENV3c – Cleanliness Score (% acceptable)	12	13	94.50%	93.59%	90.10%	85.45% (Midlothian) to 95.39% (East Renfrewshire)
ENV4a – Cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads	26	26	£19,128	£17,495	£9,667	£7,366 (Midlothian) to £24,411 (East Renfrewshire)
ENV4b – Percentage of A class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	4	4	19.97%	19.40%	29.80%	17.30% (East Renfrewshire) to 26.50% (Clackmannanshire)
ENV4c – Percentage of B class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	8	7	24.09%	23.70%	34.00%	18.50% (Clackmannanshire) to 37.30% (Angus)
ENV4d – Percentage of C class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	17	19	34.19%	33.50%	33.60%	27.40% (Clackmannanshire) to 38.90% (Inverclyde)
ENV4e – Percentage of unclassified roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	15	11	35.39%	34.30%	38.30%	27.50% (West Lothian) to 43.20% (Clackmannanshire)
ENV5 – Cost of Trading Standards and environmental health per 1,000 population	15	20	£19,470	£19,360	£18,463	£13,935 (Angus) to £24,124 (Inverclyde)
ENV5a – Cost of trading standards, money advice and citizens advice per 1,000 population	31	30	£13,454	£12,699	£5,857	£1,891 (Clackmannanshire) to £12,699 (Renfrewshire)
ENV5b – Cost of environmental health per 1,000 population	1	1	£6,015	£6,661	£12,606	£6,661 (Renfrewshire) to £20,568 (Inverclyde)
ENV6 – The percentage of total waste arising that is recycled	13	11	53.05%	49.10%	42.00%	37.10% (Inverclyde) to 57.90% (Angus)

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
ENV7a – Percentage of adults satisfied with refuse collection	24	n/a	70.63%	n/a	n/a	n/a
ENV7b – Percentage of adults satisfied with street cleaning	31	n/a	52.77%	n/a	n/a	n/a

## Housing

There are five indicators in the Housing category. For 2020/21, three have improved their ranked position, one is unchanged and one has fallen in the ranking. One of the indicators was in the best performing eight councils and none were in the bottom group.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
HSN1b – Gross rent arrears (all tenants) as at 31 March each year as a percentage of rent due for the reporting year	6	7	5.73%	6.42%	8.19%	3.79% (South Ayrshire) to 10.17% (Falkirk)
HSN2 – Percentage of rent due in the year that was lost due to voids	19	18	1.52%	1.58%	1.38%	0.42% (South Lanarkshire) to 1.58% (Renfrewshire & Falkirk)
HSN3 – Percentage of council dwellings meeting SHQS	17	13	94.65%	91.65%	90.26%	88.14% (West Lothian) to 98.77% (Clackmannanshire)
HSN4b – Average number of days taken to complete non-emergency repairs	17	17	7.76	10.71	7.28	4.24 (Clackmannanshire) to 13.88 (Falkirk)
HSN5 – Percentage of council dwellings that are energy efficient	20	14	78.01%	86.63%	86.35%	78.39% (Clackmannanshire) to 96.51% (Falkirk)

## Corporate Asset

There are 2 indicators in the Corporate Asset category. In 2020/21, one indicator improved it's ranking and one fell in the ranking. One was in the top-performing quarter of the rankings and none were in the bottom quarter.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
CORP-ASSET 1 – Proportion of operational buildings that are suitable for their current use	7	8	92.14%	92.11%	82.31%	67.25% (Midlothian) to 97.50% (West Lothian)

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
CORP-ASSET 2 – Proportion of internal floor area of operational buildings in satisfactory positions	10	9	94.45%	95.12%	89.20%	84.12% (East Renfrewshire) to 99.73% (West Lothian)

## **Economic Development**

There are 13 indicators in the Economic Development category; data is currently not available for one indicator. In 2020/21, four indicators improved their ranking, and eight fell in the ranking. There were two indicators in the top performing group of councils and two in the bottom group.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
ECON1 – Percentage of unemployed people assisted into work from Council operated / funded Employability programmes	12	2	15.27%	17.85%	5.98%	1.48% (Angus) to 17.85% (Renfrewshire)
ECON2 – Cost per planning application	10	18	£4,204	£5,278	£5,044	£3,575 (Clackmannanshire) to £6,979 (Midlothian)
ECON3 – Average time per business and industry planning application (wk)	5	15	6.80	9.88	11.08	6.49 (Clackmannanshire) to 16.75 (South Lanarkshire)
ECON4 – Percentage of procurement spend on local enterprises	20	25	22.16%	19.30%	29.11%	11.26% (East Renfrewshire) to 26.10% (Angus)
ECON5 – Number of business gateway start-ups per 10,000 population	19	30	16.53	4.91	11.19	4.91 (Renfrewshire) to 26.86 (Inverclyde)
ECON6 – Cost of Economic Development & Tourism per 1,000 population	27	24	£157,395	£109,426	£87,793	£17,791 (East Renfrewshire) to £109,426 (Renfrewshire)
ECON7 – Proportion of people earning less than the living wage	22	19	23.20%	21.60%	15.20%	13.5% (West Lothian) to 30.9% (East Renfrewshire)
ECON8 – Proportion of properties receiving superfast broadband	9	10	96.80%	96.50%	93.79%	88.10% (Angus) to 97.40% (West Lothian)
ECON9 – Town Vacancy Rates	16	17	11.09%	11.72%	12.41%	5.10% (Midlothian) to 21.92% (Inverclyde)

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
ECON10 – Immediately available employment land as a % of total land allocated for employment purposes in the local development plan	22	1	24.91%	98.05%	38.91%	1.26% (Angus) to 98.05% (Renfrewshire)
ECON11 – Gross Value Added (GVA) per capita	10	n/a	£24,745.95	n/a	n/a	n/a
ECON12a – Claimant Count as a % of Working Age Population	21	22	3.50%	6.30%	6.10%	3.70% (East Renfrewshire) to 6.40% (Clackmannanshire)
ECON12b – Claimant Count as a % of 16-24 Population	17	20	4.24%	7.77%	7.17%	4.43% (East Renfrewshire) to 9.26% (Clackmannanshire)

## **Financial Sustainability**

There are five indicators in the Financial Sustainability category. In 2020/21, one improved its ranked position, two were unchanged, and two fell in the ranking. One was in the top performing group of councils and one was in the bottom group.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
FINSUS1 – Total usable reserves as a % of council annual budgeted revenue	4	4	37.94%	43.29%	23.60%	18.33% (South Lanarkshire) to 57.73% (Midlothian)
FINSUS2 – Uncommitted General Fund Balance as a % of council annual budgeted net revenue	25	19	1.64%	2.51%	3.52%	0.50% (West Lothian) to 4.78% (Clackmannanshire)
FINSUS3 – Ratio of Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream – General Fund	4	9	3.97%	4.70%	6.24%	2.03% (Midlothian) to 12.28% (Inverclyde)
FINSUS4 – Ratio of Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream – Housing Revenue Account	26	26	46.51%	51.40%	22.91%	8.80% (Clackmannanshire) to 51.40% (Renfrewshire)
FINSUS5 – Actual outturn as a percentage of budgeted expenditure	6	15	100.22%	98.85%	97.44%	93.13% (Clackmannanshire) to 100.00% (South Lanarkshire)

## **Tackling Climate Change**

There are two indicators in the Tackling Climate Change category, but data is not yet available for 2020/21.

Indicator	Ranked Position		Data		Scottish Average	Family Group Range
	2019/20	2020/21	2019/20	2020/21		
CLIM1 - CO2 emissions area wide per capita	11	n/a	4.84	n/a	5.68	n/a
CLIM2 - CO2 emissions are wide: emissions within scope of LA per capita	11	n/a	4.09	n/a	4.62	n/a