

A performance framework and self  
assessment process for:  
**Transport Operations**



## To Kent County Council Transport Operations primarily means:

- spending £40 million maintaining 8400km of road (including 3000 bridges, 110,000 streetlights, 512 traffic light sites, 2 tunnels )
- spending £10 million improving existing roads
- spending £14 million building new roads
- spending £4 million supporting public transport
- spending £0.5 million delivering road safety education
- working with planning authorities and developers to manage the transport aspects of new developments.
- managing the 50,000 trenches made by utility companies each year

We have aligned our preliminary Best Value process to the seven key objectives which we have developed through our Business Plan for 2002/2003. These are:

- better condition of roads and pavements
- supporting regeneration and infrastructure
- improving the quality of life
- recognising the role of the car but increase the use of public transport
- getting closer to stakeholders and customers
- best practice and continuous improvement
- developing and motivating staff

A starting point for us has been to work with a wide range of stakeholders to identify a series of 'issues' or 'concerns' for each of the seven objectives above. These issues have been used to develop a performance framework based on the TAG model. It has been designed to enable authorities to undertake a self assessment of the service against best practice which is both input and outcome based. Clearly the value of such a framework is that it allows a current service assessment as well as allowing future target setting and improvement goals. A wider benefit of model is in allowing relative comparison of performance with other authorities. This will only be possible if a validation of the framework by stakeholders and peer authorities is undertaken to ensure that both the key aspects of service and the measure of quality has been appropriately made.

Kent would very much welcome your input into the validation process. As you can see the seven objectives are broadly based and the hope is that irrespective of how you authority is structured the area of service can be recognised and assessed. Please contact David Thomas by telephone on 01622 221036, email [david.thomas@kent.gov.uk](mailto:david.thomas@kent.gov.uk) or post Kent County Council, Transport Management Unit, Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 1XX if you have any comments or wish to discuss this model further.

Level	Strategy	Survey Regime	Backlog	Planned Inspection Frequency	Defect Response	Remedial Action	Insurance	Programme	Management Systems
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4	5 Year policy Continuously reviewed and improvements implemented, code of good practice	UKPMS Walked/driven full survey CVI/DVI condition Full records kept. Supplemented with machine surveys.	UKPMS Tranche 3 projections VFM/BV	Exceed Code of Practice frequencies to meet Authority policy.	95% complete within 24 hours (emergency response only)	20mm trip 24 hour response 10-20 mm Amenity Maintenance 30 day/ planned maintenance	90% claims defended successfully	Better than annual programme continuously updated programme. Full demand coverage – backlog monitoring.	QA system in place, UKPMS Full IT, electronic ordering & mapping. Scheme Objectives and Spend Profiles monitored
3	Other policy or best practice	Condition Survey. Records kept, UKPMS or other visual surveys.	Consistent backlog monitoring.	Meets Code of Practice for all roads.	90% complete or 100% made safe within 24 hour	20mm trip 24 hour response	80% claims defended successfully	Annual programme	QA System, Full IT, UKPMS. Scheme Objectives and Spend Profiles monitored
2	Part Policy	Reactive inspection	Annual backlog only	Meets Code of Practice for classified roads and shopping areas	80-90% made safe within 24 hours.	>20mm or inspector decision (3 Day Response)	70-80% claims defended successfully	Reactive programme	Part Paper / Part IT, non-accredited procedures. No monitoring
1	No strategy or policy	Ad Hoc	Not Known	Does not meet Code of Practice Local scheme	Less than 80% made safe within 24 hours	Complaint Driven	Less than 70% claims defended successfully or no information	No Programme	No System
Score									

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"Better Condition of Roads and Pavements"

Level	Tracking Scheme Delivery	Lighting Public Safety & Security Policy	Residential Lighting complying with BS5489 Part 3:3	Age of Lighting Stock	Energy Costs Policy	Lighting Data Management	Lighting Testing Schedule	Procurement
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
4	All schemes within advertised programmes are delivered to time and within budget.	Proactive regime identifies high risk areas of road accidents, crime data and local circumstances	90 - 95%	95% < 30yrs Old	Negotiated as part of major consortium	Complete IT inventory of all lighting units and details of illuminaires etc	Structural Testing Visual – Annual Instrument – Annual Electrical testing Visual – Annual Instrument - Annual	More than 75 % of service head expenditure follows competitive pricing or innovation
3	Not all schemes delivered to time and within budget but scheme delivery is tracked and assessed	Response regime addressing special policy initiatives or areas	80 – 90%.	95% < 40yrs Old	Reviewed as part of local group	Part IT inventory of all lighting units	Structural Testing Visual – 1-3 years Instrument – 1-3 yrs Electrical testing Visual – 1-3 years Instrument – 1-3 yrs	As level 1 but 50% to 75%
2	Some schemes are delivered to time and budget but no tracking system in place	Response regime addressing specific incidents/requests	70 – 80%	95% < 50yrs Old	Reviewed by LA on regular basis	Paper inventory of all lighting units	Structural Testing Visual – 3-6 years Instrument – 3-6 yrs Electrical testing Visual – 3-6 years Instrument – 3-6 yrs	As level 1 but 25% to 50%
1	Few schemes are delivered to time and budget	Ad hoc	< 70%	Unknown	Reviewed Ad-Hoc	No inventory.	Structural Testing Visual – None \ ad Hoc Instrument – None\ad Hoc Electrical testing Visual – None \ ad Hoc Instrument - None\ad Hoc	Less than 25% of service head expenditure follows competitive pricing or use of innovative process
Score								

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"Better Condition of Roads and Pavements"

Level	Financial Information	Customer Service System	Customer Satisfaction	Securing Other Sources of Income	Increasing Sustainability in Road Repairs	Introducing Routines for Public Consultation	Public Perception & Balancing Priorities	Managing Roadworks Controlling Congestion	Better Quality & Speed of Repairs
	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
4	As level 3 and with preparation of an annual report	As 3 plus VWeb Site & on line forms. Recorded enquiries, 10-day response to correspondence.	Overall Net Satisfaction >10%	All avenues to secure other sources of income explored and other funding secured	All schemes subject to sustainability and waste audits, waste minimised and PIs developed and accurately recorded	Procedures for Consultation developed according to scheme and implemented consistently for all schemes and reviewed regularly	Public understand the prioritisation process, agree where the money is being spent and believe the HA is doing a good job	All roadworks managed and co-ordinated to minimise congestion, all roadworks signed with contact nos.	All repairs are carried out permanently within agreed timescales without the need to revisit the site
3	Full costing details and information available during the year for both individual jobs and budget cost centres	As 2 plus prepaid complaint cards available at civic buildings, etc 15-day response to correspondence.	Overall Net Satisfaction 0 - 10%	All avenues to secure other sources of funding explored but no other funding secured	Sustainability and Waste audits developed but not in use for all schemes. PIs developed but not recorded yet	Consultation carried out for most schemes depending on the nature of the scheme, but procedures not reviewed	Public informed of prioritisation process through Parish Councils who can influence priorities	Most roadworks managed and co-ordinated to minimise congestion, most roadworks signed with contact nos.	All repairs are carried out temporarily within agreed timescales with permanent repairs carried out later
2	Full costings known for jobs and budget heads but no adequate monitoring system.	Address & phone number published. Correspondence acknowledged within 15 days.	Overall Net Dissatisfaction 0 - 10%	Some avenues to secure other funding explored but no other funding secured	Sustainability and Waste audits developed but not in use and no PIs measured	Consultation carried out for some schemes but not consistently and not reviewed	Meetings with Parish Councils are starting to be organised to explain prioritisation process but no direct contact with public	Some roadworks managed and co-ordinated to minimise congestion, some roadworks signed with contact nos.	Most temporary repairs carried out within agreed timescales with permanent repairs carried out later
1	Totals kept, but jobs not identified separately.	Ad Hoc	Overall Net Dissatisfaction >10%	No avenues to secure other funding explored	No attempt at providing sustainable solutions for maintenance schemes	No consultation carried out	Public does not understand the prioritisation process and believes the HA is doing a bad job	Roadworks not co-ordinated and congestion not minimised	Temporary repairs not carried out to time and all repairs require subsequent visits
Score									

**Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework**

**"Better Condition of Roads and Pavements"**

Level	Corporate Team Approach	Design Standards	Contribution Sums	Legal Agreements	Customer Interface	Regenerating Depressed Areas	Performance Management
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Multi-disciplinary Teams for all major developments - issues progressed corporately.	Standards allow complete flexibility of approach - objectives led.	Detailed sums for all infrastructure documented in advance for developers.	Menu of terms published to allow "bespoke standardised" agreements to be used.	Nominated case officers identified contact details widely publicised with regular updates and meetings held.	Corporate approach feeding issues into strategic plans for implementation.	All applications processed to published timescales and all issues resolved promptly.
3	Teams formed for most major developments - general agreement on approach.	Standards for all issues published for Developers to apply in designs.	Sums negotiated on all issues through planning process.	Terms agreed by negotiation from standard list of "Heads of Terms".	Nominated people dealing with developments - meet on an ad-hoc basis as required.	Structured approach to developments within Local Plan framework.	90% applications processed in time - most major issues resolved quickly.
2	Ad-hoc Teams formed for specific developments - some in-fighting between service disciplines.	Standards for major issues published detailing infrastructure needs - some issues negotiated.	Ad-hoc negotiations giving partial contributions to infrastructure.	Standard "Heads of Terms" Published.	Periodic meetings to discuss issues - cases sometimes dealt with by different individuals.	Ad-hoc infrastructure developed to help projects on an individual basis.	70% applications processed in time - some major issues still outstanding.
1	No communication between different service disciplines - fragmented approach to major developments.	No standards published - all issues negotiated individually.	No sums secured to fund infrastructure.	No Terms published - each Agreement developed individually.	No contact with customers.	No plans to help regeneration projects.	50% applications processed in time - substantial number of outstanding issues unresolved.
Score							

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"supporting regeneration and infrastructure - development control"

Level	Consultation	Sustainable / Recycled Materials	Local Materials	Future Scheme Maintenance	Sustainable Transport	Procurement Models	Conflict Balance - Transport vs. Environment
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
4	Full engagement with focus groups developing feedback loops into design processes.	Schemes engineered and designed from outset utilising recycled / sustainable materials.	All materials sourced locally, match local environment - reduced transport impacts	All schemes costed for "whole life" published in advance of commencing construction.	Schemes developed holistically - developed equally for all modes of travel.	Full partnering approach between client - consultant - contractor.	Schemes designed with environmental issues equal to transport concerns.
3	Discussion with groups representing specific issues - "pressure" and "action" groups.	Schemes re-designed to accommodate use of recycled / sustainable materials.	Materials to match local environment used, brought in from outside scheme area.	Schemes take account of Health and Safety issues for future maintenance - costs identified at scheme development stage.	All schemes include priority elements for cycles, pedestrians and public transport.	Partial partnering between two parties - some re-engineering takes place.	Environmental Impact Assessment published early to develop managed approach to minimising damage to the environment.
2	Exhibitions and Leaflet drops / questionnaires to broad cross-section of local communities.	50% of schemes consider recycled / sustainable materials for use in contracts.	Quality materials used - do not match local environment - brought in from outside.	Health and Safety Issues for future maintenance taken into account, but no costings considered.	Schemes developed with elements for cycles, pedestrians and public transport.	Close working dialogue but not formal partnering - Value Engineering used to develop some feedback loops.	Rescue plans available to mitigate effects of environmental damage identified during scheme construction.
1	Information only - Leaflet drops and signs / boards notifying intentions.	No recycled / sustainable materials used at all.	Cheapest Materials used - no regard for local environment or transport effects of sources.	No account taken of future issues or costs.	Schemes developed without specific provision for "non-car" modes.	No partnering process considered - standard conditions of contract used to procure schemes.	No environmental mitigation included on schemes.
Score							

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"supporting regeneration and infrastructure - Scheme Development"

Level	Our "Leadership" role	Sustainability and the Environment	Access to the Highway	Influencing Others	Safer Roads	Interventions & Measurement
	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	<p>Promote road safety ethics and culture within KCC, companies, schools and other organisations; Ensure that cameras are strictly deployed and promoted as part of casualty reduction and speed management strategies; promote benefits of safer roads and the self esteem to make the best choices; ensure that positive road safety messages aimed at children are re-inforced. Follow Best Practice for Winter Maintenance Policies. Production of Kent Design Guide for use by all Developers.</p>	<p>Provide infrastructure &amp; facilities to place traffic on appropriate routes; facilities to monitor air and noise pollution; information to improve understanding of the needs of others i.e. residents, road users; apply and promote sustainable development &amp; planning benchmarks. Introduced recycling of waste aggregate materials. Monitor pollution levels at strategic sites across the county. Innovation in the production of a 'Hierarchy of Roads' for highway maintenance.</p>	<p>Exploit all opportunities to provide information to road users; promote specific key issues; provide infrastructure and facilities to ensure that the highway network is managed to an excellent standard; ensure that maximum benefits are gained from new technology and that risks are mitigated. Provide weekly Roadworks Information to advise of significant Streetworks and Roadworks. Provide sufficient snow clearing equipment to keep open strategic road network.</p>	<p>Develop and introduce policies and practices in KCC that facilitate safe and sustainable travel; promote KCC as a model of good practice for other employers; exploit opportunities to combine activities aimed at similar audiences; promote and facilitate practical support for employers. Use of UTC to minimise traffic conflicts and reduce risk of crashes. Salt carriageways throughout winter season to prevent formation of frost and ice. Quarterly Co-ordination meeting with Undertakers to agree timing of Streetworks and Roadworks.</p>	<p>Provide added value gained by aiming to reduce road crashes and road danger through data analysis; monitor and react to trends in economic and social exclusion; influence local crime audit questions and gain insight from the responses to guide activities; conduct consultation to guide strategies; establish formal links between safety, highway maintenance and economic development specialists. Install high friction surfacing to high risk crash sites. Pre-salt roads to reduce ice crashes.</p>	<p>Data led casualty reduction strategy: - engineering - education. Innovation: - two major publicity campaigns p.a. 20%.campaign recognition - NDIS c.500 trainees p.a. - Speed Awareness courses c.5,000 trainees p.a. Aim to meet: DTLR National Casualty Reduction Targets/BVPI 99 Annual crime audit. Co-ordinate Works to minimise congestion BVPI100</p>

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"improving the quality of life"

3	Demonstrable efforts at joined-up road safety	Produces good policies with support to deliver good	Engage in consultation with stakeholders for new and	Policies in place to support at-work road safety and	Collection and analysis of crash data within three	Data led casualty reduction strategy:
	service delivery; encouraging innovation i.e. work toward inclusion in the cost recovery scheme; promote personal responsibility; provide adult road safety education.	practice in: - environmental impact - route management - parking - sustainable transportation.	improved highway schemes. Ensure the correct routing of abnormal loads. Provision of a highway maintenance emergency service.	travel planning; strategy for internal improvement and external promotion of both. Production of 'Facts Sheet' for highway maintenance activities.	months; ad hoc reference to other data indicators; highly focused on measurable "core business"; links between agencies on needs led basis.	- engineering - education. DTLR National Casualty Reduction Targets BVPI 99
2	Ad hoc consultation and selective public engagement; limited commitment to monitoring; target driven; partners limited to "natural" options e.g. Road safety & Police.	Promotes a formal approach to route management; reacts to the effects of environmental impact; allows economy to out-weigh environment (or vice-verse); heavy parking restrictions with no viable public transport alternative.	Inconsistencies with management of highway trees and verges. Cycle routes are not continuous. Effective management of HGV routing, overnight parking and freight transfer facilities. Adequate 'on street' parking for residents.	At-work road safety viewed as a "bolt-on" feature; some internal development and little internal promotion; travel planning policies and initiatives in place, limited external promotion. Publication of highway maintenance programmes.	Inconsistencies in data quality and timeliness; systemic approach to data led prioritisation and activities; aims to avoid nebular work; public perception has little value	Data led casualty reduction strategy: - engineering - education. DTLR National Casualty Reduction Targets BVPI 99
1	No commitment to monitoring the effects of key issues; polarisation within service delivery with no regard for public engagement.	Reactionary measures resulting a fostering of a blame culture; disregard for local views on environmental impact; no demonstrable support for public transport as an alternative to the car.	No provision of 'live' public information re. the highway network; limited co-ordination/control of works. Backlog in construction of local bypass schemes. Policy for the prevention of bridge strikes.	No commitment to the role of "at-work road safety" in casualty reduction (internally and externally); No development and promotion of travel planning policies or practices.	No commitment to casualty reduction ethics or target; functioning without direction, priorities or strategy; no notion of added value through communication or joined up service delivery	Data led casualty reduction strategy: - engineering - education. DTLR National Casualty Reduction Targets BVPI 99
Score						

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"improving the quality of life"

Level	Bus Strategy	Relationships with Operators	Development of Quality Partnerships	Consultation
	1	2	3	4
4	The strategy complies fully with DTLR guidance and has been given an excellent rating. Widespread engagement with Stakeholders.	Regular three monthly liaison meetings with main operators. Good evidence of information/data exchange. Widespread consultation on policies.	Partnerships established with major bus and rail operators. Evidence of significant investment from public/private sector. Good quality bus/rail services evident.	A wide range of Stakeholders are consulted on local authority policy. Concerns and issues are built into the Bus Strategy.
3	Good Bus Strategy.	Less regular liaison meetings but good exchange of information/data and consultation on policies.	Partnerships being developed with evidence of investment proposals from the public/private sector. Good quality bus/rail services developing.	Some Stakeholders are regularly engaged and there is some evidence that this is built into the Bus Strategy.
2	Adequate Bus Strategy.	No formal meetings but some agreement on information/data exchange. Limited consultation	Little evidence of quality partnerships but some investment by public/private sectors leading to some service improvement.	Limited consultation with Stakeholders. Little evidence this is built into the Bus Strategy.
1	Poor Bus Strategy.	Little evidence of engagement.	Little evidence of quality partnerships. Little or no investment in improved services/infrastructure.	No consultation with Stakeholders.
<b>Score</b>				

Kent County Council Best Value – Performance Framework

"recognising the role of the car but increase the use of public transport"

Level	Public Perception	Information	Bidding for External Funding	Infrastructure for Public Transport Services and Customers
	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4</b>	Results of BVPI 103/104 are in upper quartile. Clear evidence of supplementary satisfaction studies on local bus/information provision through quality bus partnership.	Local Authority has developed a clear Information Strategy in full consultation with bus operators and other Stakeholders. Strategy is functional.	Several successful bids approved with evidence of plans for further submissions. Bids for bus and rail improvements can be demonstrated.	Clear evidence of infrastructure which enhances accessibility for bus/rail customers and provides more efficient movement for buses in congested areas.
<b>3</b>	Results of BVPI 103/104 are in upper middle quartile. Some additional testing on local bus/information through quality bus partnerships. Evidence that public/private sector are discussing improvements.	Clear Information Strategy with full consultation. Strategy not yet implemented.	Several successful bids approved for either bus or rail improvements but not both. Bids for bus and rail improvements can be demonstrated.	Limited infrastructure improvements but clear proposals developed for significant improvements.
<b>2</b>	Results of BVPI 103/104 are in lower middle quartile. Limited supplementary information on satisfaction levels. No clear evidence of public/private sector seeking improvement.	Information Strategy is being developed.	No successful bids for bus or rail improvements but evidence that bidding proposals are being developed.	Limited infrastructure improvements and limited proposals for improvements.
<b>1</b>	Results of BVPI 103/103 are in lower quartile. No evidence of supplementary information on satisfaction levels. No improvements sought.	Information Strategy not proposed at present.	No successful bids with no proposals being developed.	No clear evidence of improvements with little or no proposals for improvements
<b>Score</b>				

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"recognising the role of the car but increase the use of public transport"

Level	Travel Plans	Integration	New Developments	Increasing Passenger Journeys
	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>
4	Clear evidence of a well developed internal travel plan resulting in more public transport usage. Assistance to other employers in developing travel plans.	Clear evidence of physical integration between different transport modes. Through ticketing schemes evident.	Clear guidance ensuring all new developments are designed to cater for buses and that contributions are sought to support new services through section 106 Agreement.	Using BVPI 103, bus passenger journeys per annum, year on year growth can be demonstrated.
4	Clear evidence of a developing internal travel plan with assistance to other employers in developing travel plans.	Limited evidence of physical integration between different transport modes but with clear proposals. Limited through ticketing schemes evident.	Guidance being developed with some Section 106 Agreements in place.	BVPI 102 shows limited annual growth in bus passengers. BVPI 102 shows no annual growth in bus passengers.
2	Limited evidence of an internal travel plan. Some assistance given to other employers in developing travel plans.	Limited physical integration and examples of through ticketing. Limited proposals for improvement.	Guidance being developed but with little or no 106 funding in place.	BVPI 102 show an annual fall in the number of bus passengers.
1	Limited evidence of the development of internal or external travel plans.	No clear evidence of integration with no proposals for improvement.	No proposed guidance and little or no 106 funding in place.	
<b>Score</b>				

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"recognising the role of the car but increase the use of public transport"

Level	Corporate Community Strategy	Tracker Surveys	Detailed Public Satisfaction Survey	Stakeholder 'Reality Checks'	Listening through reactive contact	Reacting and shaping service provision	Equity of engagement	Explaining the services and target setting
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4	there is a clear linkage between the Unit Business Plan and the Corporate/ Community Strategy	tracker survey every two years to track improvement in performance of key service areas (road, pavement and streetlight maintenance)	household surveys undertaken every two years to explore reasons for tracker survey opinions	a broad series of reality checks regularly undertaken to understand views of particular stakeholder groups such as Parish Councils, Residents living next to roadworks, Strategic Partner providers & Members	a full set of pro-active and reactive contacts are recorded to understand the areas of concern identified by stakeholders i.e complaints, letters, insurance claims, HelpLine calls etc	stakeholder, reactive and pro-active information is regularly reported to Members and used to shape service delivery.	a wide range of interest groups are regularly engaged with to build their concerns and issues into the business plan process (i.e Access Groups, Freight, Police etc)	services provided have been developed with input for the community. Information is published outlining the standards of service and the national and local indicators to be used to measure and report performance. Positive use of the media to share information
3	some linkages between the Unit business plan and the Corporate/ Community Strategy	regular tracker surveys undertaken but greater than 2 years between data collection	regular household surveys undertaken but greater than 2 years between data collection	some regular reality checks in place but some gaps in the stakeholder groups	some regular pro-active and reactive contact recording in place but not to a wide range of information	some reporting to Members but little evidence that the information is being used to shape service delivery.	some interest groups are regularly engaged but gaps are apparent and there is some evidence that views are built into the Business Planing process.	Some evidence of community input into the service provision. Some information is published on the service the public can expect and how it will be measured.
2	little joined up links between the Unit business plan and the Corporate/ Community Strategy	ad-hoc tracker surveys	ad-hoc household surveys	ad hoc reality checks undertaken but not to a wide range of stakeholder groups.	Ad-hoc recording of pro-active and reactive contact but not to a wide range of available sources of information	ad-hoc reporting to Members and no evidence that the information is being used to shape service delivery.	interest groups are not regularly engaged and there is little evidence that views are considered as part of the business plan process.	ad-hoc engagement with the community, some leaflets produced outlining the service standards.
1	the Unit is un-aware of how its priorities fit in with the overall Corporate/ Community Strategy	very limited tracker surveys undertaken	very limited household surveys undertaken	very limited stakeholder 'reality checks' undertaken	very limited recording of pro-active and reactive customer contact	very limited reporting to Members and no evidence that the information is being used to shape service delivery	limited engagement with interest groups and no evidence that views are considered as part of the business plan process.	very limited community involvement in the shaping of the service, limited publication of leaflets outlining services provided and standards.
Score								

**Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework**

**"getting closer to stakeholders and customers"**

Level	Sharing Performance	Comparing with others	Customer Access and ease of movement on the street	Staff Development and Skills
	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4</b>	a wide range of performance against service standards, tracker surveys, local PI's and national BVPI data are regularly published, understood by stakeholders and used in the Business Planning process.	a comprehensive range of service standards, local PI's, tracker surveys are shared through a benchmarking group and actions identified and taken to improve service delivery	clear sign posting of customer access through local officers, contact centre, leaflets, AtoZ, newsletters and the media. Real time roadworks information via a web site for all works on the highway. Clear and timely signing information about all roadworks.	A wide range and regular provision of development opportunities for staff around customer care and consultation. Priorities identified through the stakeholder and customer consultation drives the staff development process
<b>3</b>	some publication of performance against service standards, , tracker surveys, local PI's and national BVPI data and limited engagement through stakeholders and use in the Business Planning process.	some comparison on a range of indicators through a benchmarking group leading to improvement in service delivery.	some sign posting through leaflets, AtoZ etc but not a comprehensive system which ensures clarity in the community. Some roadworks information and signing.	a wide range of and regular provision of development opportunities for staff but priorities identified through customer and stakeholder consultation is not used to shape the development.
<b>2</b>	National BVPI's published and limited performance against service standards.	Ad-hoc comparison of BVPI's plus other data and some evidence of use to improve service delivery	limited sign posting of services and information to the community about the services provided and contacts if problems arise. . Limited roadworks information and signing	limited and ad-hoc staff development opportunities
<b>1</b>	only national BVPI's published	limited comparison with others and only using BVPI's	no sign posting or roadworks information and signing.	No customer care staff development
<b>Score</b>				

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

"getting closer to stakeholders and customers"

Level	Comparing with Others 1	Comparing Internally 2	Setting Targets 3	Measuring What We Do 4	Driving Improvement 5	Management Systems 6	Procurement 7
4	BVPIs used to identify weaknesses. Member of Benchmarking group within national umbrella. Local PIs compared with group. Process comparisons within group. Subscribe to national database for PIs.	Comprehensive range of local PIs used to drive improvement. Regular Best practice groups. Processes compared within organisation. Recognition for best performers.	Comprehensive range of targets covering all aspects of service. Targets set based on hard fact and set to be ambitious but realistic. Targets updated annually.	All targets measured minimum annually, many more frequently, and trend analysed. Systems in place to harvest data easily. Targets adjusted in light of performance.	Empowered staff to drive improvement. Clear communication of best practice and standards. Managers & staff take responsibility to drive. Regular reviews of progress. All partners fully signed up.	Comprehensive real time systems to report all aspects of performance (finance, schemes, personnel, GIS) accessible by all. Most data can be extracted from system efficiently at any time. Most data gathered automatically. Most people have access to info they need.	Contract type chosen to best suit purpose. Work packaged for greatest efficiency. Industry consulted on process. External income maximised.
3	BVPIs used to identify weaknesses. Member of a benchmarking group. Local PIs and processes compared.	Substantial amount of comparison with local PIs and some groups to look at process. Done on formalised basis.	Targets set for most areas of service. Most targets based on fact and ambitious & realistic.	All BVPIs and most local PIs measured regularly. Most of the information used to analyse trends	Best practice groups to share. Managers & staff strive to improve but don't always follow through.	Data can be accessed only at specific times when requested /updated. Some degree of automation in data gathering.	Alternative forms of contract used. Selection process tailored to give best match of quality & price.
2	BVPIs used to identify weaknesses. Ad hoc use of other PIs/data to compare with others	Ad hoc comparison of some local PIs	Some targets set. Some set based on fact.	BVPIs and some local PIs measured, but on ad hoc basis.	Ad hoc sharing of best practice. No clear standards or accountability for driving.	Ad hoc data gathering when requested. Inefficient on staff time to gather data.	Use ICE 5th. Some use of quality as well as price in selection
1	No external comparison other than BVPIs, and those not used	No internal comparison made.	Only targets are for BVPP. No reality within target setting process	Only BVPIs measured.	Nothing done.		Always use ICE 5th. Selection solely on price
score							

**Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework**

**"Best Practice and Continuous Improvement"**

Level	Links to Business Needs	Assessment of Development	IIP Accreditation	Delivering Development & Training	Development & Training Policies	Monitoring Development & Training	Management Development	Legal Requirements
4	Clear linkage at all levels	Development needs are systematically assessed and prioritised	Full IIP accreditation	All development / training programmes organised & delivered	Clear published policies. Wide staff awareness.	Development & training monitored and evaluated by line managers; central monitoring for impact & quality control	Full Development programme for managers	Corporate lead for issues such as Equality, Health & Safety, Data protection Act etc
3	Most development can be linked to Business needs	Some systems in place to assess needs; not used at all times	Meet IIP standards & working towards full IIP accreditation	Most development is organised & co-ordinated	Some policies in place. Low staff awareness	Development monitored centrally. Most evaluated centrally. Some involvement by line managers	Organised development programme, but restricted to certain staff	Some corporate policies; some development available
2	Some linkage, but not widespread	Some assessment on ad-hoc basis	Meet most IIP standards, but not applied for accreditation	Some organisation of delivery, but little co-ordination	Ad-hoc policies. little staff awareness.	Development & training recorded; little evaluation	Ad-hoc development, on request.	Ad-hoc development on request
1	No obvious links to Business needs	No assessment	No external accreditation	No obvious systems. training & development happens on an ad-hoc basis.	No policies	No monitoring	No development available	Little or no consideration of these issues
Score								

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

**"Develop & Motivate Staff"**

Level	Motivating Staff	Development Opportunities	Customer Care	Reward / Retention	Partnership Working	Induction Training	Professional Development	Personal Development
4	Policies in place; regular monitoring; regular staff feedback; culture encouraging staff motivation	Full range of training / development opportunities available to meet all business needs	Customer care strategy; development / training for all staff	Strategy in place; regular monitoring; staff feedback	Extensive partnerships; regular joint development opportunities	Structured programme of induction to whole of organisation;	Comprehensive range of opportunities, including time off for college; widely available; encouragement & assistance to progress	Encouragement & assistance to broaden personal skills
3	Some policies; limited monitoring; occasional staff feedback; culture permits staff motivation	Most opportunities available; most development needs met.	Development / training for all front line staff	Working towards a strategy; some monitoring	Some partnership working; some joint development	Induction to work unit only	Access to a range of opportunities; some assistance to progress	Some opportunities to expand skills base
2	Ad-hoc policies; no monitoring; little opportunity to motivate staff	Some restriction on opportunities; not all development needs met	Ad-hoc development / training for critical frontline staff	Ad-hoc proposals to "firefight"; little monitoring	Ad-hoc partnership working; no joint development	induction to actual office only;	Limited opportunities for selected individuals; little assistance	Opportunities to develop only current business related needs
1	no policies; no monitoring;	Restricted range; many development needs not met	No significant customer care development	No strategy or monitoring	No partnership working	No structured induction	No opportunities for individuals	No opportunities for personal development
<b>Score</b>								

Kent County Council Best Value –Performance Framework

**"Develop & Motivate Staff"**