

Scrutiny Committee report



Listening Learning Leading

Report of: Head of Economy Leisure And Property

Author: Chris Webb

Tel: 01491 823431

E-mail: chris.webb@southandvale.gov.uk

Cabinet Member responsible: Bill Service

Tel: 01235 510810

E-mail: bill.service@southoxon.gov.uk

To: SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 7 June 2012

AGENDA ITEM NO 4

2011/12 performance review of GLL

Recommendation

That the committee considers GLL's performance in delivering the leisure management contract for the period 2011/12 and makes any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure and grants to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

Purpose of Report

1. The report considers the performance of GLL in providing the leisure management service in South Oxfordshire for the period 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2012.

Strategic Objectives

2. The review of GLL helps ensure that the council is achieving its strategic objectives in the following areas:
 - excellent delivery of key services - deliver high performing services with particular emphasis on ensuring good quality sports and leisure provision
 - effective management of resources - reducing energy usage throughout the council's operations and continue to work in partnership with Vale of White Horse District Council to extend the sharing of services and all resources.

Background

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the council's objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the council's services are outsourced (approximately half the revenue budget is spent on seven main contractors), the council cannot deliver excellent service to its residents unless its contractors are

excellent. Working jointly with contractors to review performance regularly is therefore essential.

4. The council's process for managing contractor performance focuses on continuous improvement and action planning. The council realises that the success of the framework depends on contractors and the council working together to set and review realistic, jointly agreed and measurable targets.
5. The overall framework is designed to be:
 - a consistent way for the council to consistently measure contractor performance, to help highlight and resolve operational issues
 - flexible enough to suit each contract, including smaller contracts which may not require all elements of the framework
 - a step towards managing risk more effectively and improving performance through action planning.

Overview of the Review Framework

6. The review process consists of three essential dimensions:
 1. performance measured against key performance targets (KPTs)
 2. customer satisfaction with the total service experience
 3. council satisfaction as client.
7. Each dimension is assessed and the head of service makes a judgement of classification. Contractor feedback and an assessment of strengths and areas for improvement are also included. Where some dimensions are not relevant or difficult to apply fairly to certain types of contract, the framework may be adjusted or simplified at the discretion of the heads of service.
8. The contract with GLL runs from 1 April 2009 until 31 August 2014, although the value of the contract to the council has increased since its commencement, due to major facility improvements at Park Leisure Centre and the transfer of the swimming pool at Thame Leisure Centre from Thame Town Council to South Oxfordshire District Council. As part of its tendered proposal, GLL sub contracted the day to day operations of the centres to Nexus Community. However, Nexus Community merged into GLL in January 2011 and the report refers to the contractor as GLL. GLL provides a comprehensive programme of activities and opportunities for residents and visitors to South Oxfordshire to enjoy sporting and leisure facilities. It operates facilities in Wheatley, Didcot, Thame, Henley and Wallingford on behalf of the council through a management contract and service specification document. Within these documents are a series of key performance targets, which help to demonstrate the achievement of the contractor in delivering important parts of the service. These targets are summarised in paragraph 10 of this report and are detailed in annex A of this report.
9. The main deliverable within the contract, which provides a minimum income to the council of £217,566 each year, is to increase participation in the council's leisure facilities and seeks to provide a varied programme of activities to cater for different age groups and preferences. The contract expiry date of 31 August 2014 is in line with the contract expiry dates of the leisure management contracts in the Vale of White Horse

district and provides the potential for a more effective and efficient joint contract from 1 September 2014.

Dimension 1 – Key performance targets

10. There are ten key performance targets (KPTs) measured on this contract. An analysis of performance against KPTs appears below (and in more detail in Annex A of this report).

KPT ref	Description of KPT	Target	Performance	Individual KPT rating (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	KPT rating score (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
KPT 1	Increase Total Visits	7.75%	9.71%	Excellent	5
KPT 2	Increase Physical Activity Usage	10%	10.46%	Excellent	5
KPT 3	Increase U16 Dry Course Visits	15%	19.99%	Excellent	5
KPT 4	Increase Wet Course Visits	2%	2.23%	Excellent	5
KPT 5	Reduce Energy Usage Electricity Gas	2.5% 2.5%	-8% -8%	Excellent	5
KPT 6	Increase GP Referral Clients	2.5%	2.76%	Excellent	5
KPT 7	Decrease S/V (Subsidy Per Visit)	£-2.77	£-3.73	Excellent	5
KPT 8	Increase in Community Leisure Cards	20%	29%	Excellent	5
KPT 9	Decrease Operating Cost Per Visit	£2.94	£2.65	Excellent	5
KPT 10	Total Internet Bookings as a Percentage of Casual Bookings	30%	17%	Weak	2
Overall "average" KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average)					4.7
Overall "average" KPT performance (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)					Excellent

11. These targets were adjusted upwards at the start of the year due to a change in the reporting software, Legend, that GLL introduced at the end of the previous financial

year. The early results were highly encouraging and showed significant increases on the previous years actual results. However, as the year progressed, it became evident that the software was not providing the full picture in terms of reporting swimming lesson attendances. The usage report was amended and this provided a more accurate and realistic improvement in attendance, as observed by officers during visits to the facilities, as well as the financial improvement in the performance of the contract.. Further work is needed by GLL on the management reporting system.

12. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows:

KPT judgement

Previous KPT judgement for comparison

Dimension 2 – Customer satisfaction

13. GLL carried out and collated customer satisfaction surveys during 2011/12. As for 2010/11, both electronic and face to face surveys were undertaken and reported separately. A copy of the face to face survey is attached in annex B of this report.
14. It is clear that, as in 2010/11, customers completing the surveys electronically are more critical of the service and give lower scores than those customers completing the surveys in the centres. Both Henley and Thame leisure centres lost ground on their electronic survey results but gained ground on their face to face results. All other centres increased on last year's scores, which is very encouraging.
15. The sample sizes for this reporting period were 633 completed questionnaires for the electronic method and 193 for the manual method, a total of 826 surveys.
16. An analysis of customer satisfaction performance is also included in annex B of this report.
17. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of contractors on customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

18. The overall score achieved by GLL for customer satisfaction is 4. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Customer satisfaction judgement

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

Dimension 3 – Council satisfaction

19. The council has taken the opinions of a number of officers who have interaction with members of the GLL team at many levels. These officers have provided scores that they consider are appropriate to the performance of the contractor and these have provided the overall satisfaction score. An analysis of council satisfaction performance appears in annex C of this report.
20. The formal merger of Nexus Community into GLL introduced significant change for the management teams within the leisure centres and the senior management team who control the overall direction of the contract. A new level of management was introduced into the centres to support the business managers whose primary role is to drive the business forward.
21. GLL appointed Ben Dixon as the new managing director for the Nexus division of GLL to give a different direction and culture to the business. Ben was a senior member of the GLL organisation and has integrated many of the best practices from both companies into the contract. Since the initial merger, a number of managerial changes have occurred in the South Oxfordshire centres. As with any change, there is a period where relationships and communications need to be re-established while maintaining the existing service.
22. The client team considered it had to do more following up on issues and projects during this period, which has resulted in the slight fall in council satisfaction; however, there are no major concerns at this time. It is important to note that the drop is quite small (0.11) and it is clear that there is both a willingness and determination by GLL to achieve a much higher score in the new performance period.
23. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of contractors on customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

24. The overall mark achieved by GLL for council satisfaction is 3.86 and using the scoring matrix in paragraph 23 above this provides a score of fair. This is a decrease from good in 2009/10, which is disappointing but it should be reversed easily in 2012/13.
25. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on council satisfaction as follows:

Council satisfaction judgement

Fair

Previous council satisfaction judgement for comparison

3.97 or Good

Overall assessment

26. Taking into account the performance of the contractor against KPTs, customer satisfaction and council satisfaction, the head of service has made an overall

judgement as follows. Recognising the high importance of customer satisfaction, this dimension is accorded greater weight in the judgement.

27. GLL has generally performed well despite the significant change that has occurred throughout the year. Customer satisfaction has improved overall, KPT performance has improved (although targets were amended to recognise the change in results from the Legend management system that do not fully reflect the true performance of the swim programme). Finally, council satisfaction has decreased slightly, which leads the head of service to award an overall judgement of Good for 2011/12.

Overall assessment

Good

Previous overall assessment for comparison

Fair

Strengths and areas for improvement

28. Annex C of this report records strengths and areas for improvement relating to the performance of the contractor over the last year. Where performance is below expectations, the contract monitoring officer will agree an improvement plan with the contractor.

29. Officers have developed an action plan based on the findings of the customer survey and council officers' comments to address areas for improvement. The plan is attached as annex F of this report and the outcomes of this plan will be reported in 2012/13. The updated 2010/11 action plan is attached as annex E of this report.

Contractors feedback

30. A key feature of the process for reviewing the performance of contractors is that the council provides them with an opportunity to give their feedback on the assessment, including suggestions for improvements to council processes. This is included in annex D attached to this report.

Financial implications

31. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Legal implications

32. There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Conclusion

33. The head of economy, leisure and property has assessed GLL's performance as "Good" for its delivery of the leisure management contract during 2011/12. The committee is asked to make any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure and grants, to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

Background Papers

- none.

Annex A – Key performance targets

KPT 1 – increase in total number of visits to leisure centres by 2.5 per cent - achieved

This target looks at the total number of visits to the leisure centres and includes figures for non sporting attendances such as spectators. The number of visits during 2011/12 was 1,027,790, an increase of 9.71 per cent on 2010/11. The only centre to report a drop in its attendances of 5.3 per cent was Abbey Sports Centre in Berinsfield. The centre lost a number of block bookings in the sports hall and on the Astroturf and the swim school lessons had some progression delays due to there being only one small pool in which to teach. However, the Abbey team is working hard to try and re-programme water space and develop new bookings for all of the activity areas. Didcot Leisure Centre has undertaken such programming works following a weak performance in 2010/11 and has improved its attendances significantly as a result. Thame Leisure Centre has also evidenced strong growth of 17.9 per cent for 2011/12 compared to 2010/11 with an increase of 49,784 visits

KPT 2 – increase physical activity visits by 10 per cent - achieved

This target looks at the total number of visits to the leisure centres to participate in physical activities. In 2011/12 there were 839,027 such visits, which is an increase on 2010/11 of 10.46 per cent. Again Abbey Sports Centre lost users as described in KPT1. Didcot Wave also lost attendances during February and March 2012, which was attributed to poor weather conditions affecting the swim programme. All of the other centres demonstrated very strong growth, especially Thame, which evidenced a 23.6 per cent growth in attendances for participation in physical activity.

KPT 3 – increase under 16 dry course visits by 15 per cent – achieved

This target looks at the number of under 16's attending dry side courses organised by the leisure centres themselves. The only centre to lose attendances over the year was Henley Leisure Centre. This was due to non-leisure centre coaching figures being included in the 2010/11 figures by GLL. Due to the change in reporting system, the 2010/11 figures cannot be accessed to provide a true comparison. Despite this anomaly, the target was achieved with a total of 56,357 attendances recorded compared to 46,966 in 2010/11 – an increase of 19.66 per cent. It is anticipated that with an accurate benchmark for the Henley figures being set in 2011/12 a significantly improved target will be achieved in 2012/13.

Under 16 Dry Course	2010/11	2011/12	Variance
Abbey	12,826	13,738	7%
Henley	5,477	1,563	-71%
Park	15,746	19,326	23%
Thame	10,918	18,809	72%
Didcot L C	1,999	2,921	46%
Total	46,966	56,357	19.99%

KPT 4 – increase in wet course visits by 2 per cent – achieved

During 2011/12, 144,697 wet course visits were recorded, an increase of 2.2 per cent on 2010/11 figures. However, both Abbey and Thame centres experienced a drop in

attendances of 13 and 15 per cent respectively. Abbey Sports Centre is restructuring its swimming programme to allow a better flow through the class levels and Thame Leisure Centre is recovering from some maintenance issues, which led to lower than normal pool water and air temperatures. These were caused by third parties, which had a detrimental effect on pool attendances, especially its swimming programme. Didcot Wave has now achieved over 1,300 members on its swim school, which is an excellent achievement.

Under 16 Wet Course	2010/11	2011/12	Variance
Abbey	18,619	16,067	-13%
Henley	19,135	21,687	11%
Thame	50,996	45,236	-15%
Didcot Wave	52,978	61,707	13%
Total	141,578	144,697	2.2%

KPT 5 – reduce energy consumption by 2.5 per cent - achieved

Based on the target figures provided in 2010/11, energy consumption has been reduced by 7.7 per cent for electricity and 7.6 per cent for gas. This is an excellent result and is accredited to the investment in carbon reduction initiatives by the council in partnership with GLL and good house keeping by the GLL team. Only Riverside and Thame increased gas consumption. Riverside experienced quite a cool summer period overall and the increase in consumption at Thame Leisure Centre can be attributed to the fully operational combined heat and power (CHP) unit, which resulted in a decrease in its electricity consumption. Henley and Didcot leisure centres performed particularly well, reducing gas consumption by 24.4 and 27.2 per cent respectively.

Electricity consumption varied widely, with Abbey Sports Centre showing a 72.9 per cent increase on consumption – although this was not reflected in the bills received and work is underway to investigate the meter integrity. All other facilities show continued reductions primarily due to investment in carbon reducing investment including valve wraps, LED lighting and invertors on major pumps. The council receives a share of these savings to reflect the investment that has been made.

KPT 6 – increase GP referral clients by 2.5 per cent - achieved

This target measures the increase in the number of people using the facilities who are referred by GP's and other referring practitioners, such as practice nurses and physiotherapists. GLL is the leading leisure contractor in the area for promoting and working in this field and invests significant resources into profiling and enabling participation. In 2011/12 the contract saw a 2.76 per cent increase in referrals with 2,345 attendances in this category. This is despite major priority changes for the referral scheme within the Primary Care Trust who co-ordinate the scheme and the lack of focus that it has been able to give to the scheme during the past year due to changes within its organisation.

In particular, Park Leisure Centre performed very well, showing a 194 per cent increase (283 additional attendances), as did Didcot Wave with a 67 per cent increase (162 additional attendances).

	2010/11	2011/12	Variance	Conversion rate to membership type
Abbey	693	593	-14%	65% PAYG 17% Pre 60+ 18% Others
Henley	289	281	-3%	88% PAYG 12% Others
Park	146	429	194%	33% 60+ 27% PAYG 27% Off Pk 13% Others
Thame	678	638	-6%	76% PAYG 11% Peak 13% Others
Didcot Wave	476	404	67%	77% PAYG 14% 60+ 9% Others
Total	2,282	2,345	2.8%	

KPT 7 – decrease subsidy per visit (SV) to -£2.77 - achieved

The target subsidy per visit for the centres was -£2.77 per visit. The end of year figure reported is down to -£3.73 per visit - an overachievement of -£0.96. Thame Leisure Centre was the poorest performing centre due to lost income from the gym and also swim school during the first six months of the year (due to inconsistent temperatures in the pool, which have now been resolved). Overall, the contract has performed well despite the difficult economic conditions.

**Negative S/V figures are GOOD, positive figures are BAD ;
Negative Var £ figures are BAD**

	2010/11	Target S/V £	S/V £	Variance £
Abbey	£0.75	£0.73	0.26	0.47
Wave	-£1.33	-£1.35	-1.37	0.02
Henley	-£1.39	-£1.42	-1.13	-0.29
Park	-£0.95	-£0.97	-1.25	0.28
Thame	-£2.16	-£2.20	-1.58	-0.62
Didcot Leisure Centre	£1.19	£1.17	0.63	0.54
Riverside	£1.30	£1.27	0.72	0.56
Overall		-2.77	-3.73	0.96

KPT 8 – increase number of community leisure cards by 20 per cent - achieved

The number of community leisure cards issued grew by 29 per cent in the last year although the number of pay as you go 60 per cent and pre paid memberships are both still under their target levels. All centre teams have been given additional training and

resources to improve these figures, as well as GLL undertaking a strategic review of the membership packages currently on offer.

	March 2011	Target	March 2012
Loyalty	9,641	11,569	13,747
Pay as you go 30%	2,712	3,254	3,428
Pay as you go 60%	676	811	544
Prepaid	3,690	4,428	3,697
Swimming only	474	569	524
Under 14's	1,180	1,416	1,761
Total	18,373	22,048	23,701
YTD % Variance			29%

KPT 9 – decrease operational cost per visit to £2.94 - achieved

The target subsidy per visit for the centres was £2.94 per visit. The end of year figure reported is down to £2.65 per visit - an overachievement of -£0.30. The only facility not to hit its target was Didcot Wave, which in the last quarter experienced a number of high cost equipment failures on fridges and freezers, which increased their expenditure unexpectedly.

	2010/11	Costs YTD	Visits YTD	Target OC/V £	O/C £	Var £
Abbey	£4.02	£321,361	89587	£3.94	3.59	0.35
Wave	£2.53	£739,591	283522	£2.48	2.61	-0.13
Henley	£3.43	£525,072	164173	£3.36	3.20	0.16
Park	3.31	£256,745	96885	£3.24	2.65	0.59
Thame	£2.92	£782,213	327827	£2.86	2.39	0.48
Didcot Leisure Centre	£3.99	£200,144	65796	£3.91	3.04	0.87
Riverside	£3.83	£55,676	15013	£3.75	3.71	0.04
			Totals	2.94	2.65	0.30

KPT 10 – internet bookings as a percentage of casual bookings 30 per cent – not achieved

Despite the ability for all leisure card holders to be able to book on-line, it is taking longer to achieve this target than anticipated. During 2011/12, only 17 per cent of bookings were made on-line. The delayed on-line booking facility for the GLL management system is the main cause, which resulted in customers reverting back to the old methods of booking. Rebuilding customer confidence in the new system is taking time. GLL is considering making the ability to book on-line a possibility for all customers in the future.

Annex B – Customer satisfaction

A copy of the face to face survey used by GLL in the centres.

Customer Survey

This survey is designed to find out what our users think about the service and facilities available at GLL Nexus Leisure Centre's and we would be most grateful if you could spend 5 minutes answering the following questions.

Please hand this back to reception once you have completed all questions.

Q1	Staffing – Reception		
	Was the reception desk staffed when you arrived?	Yes	No
	Did the receptionist greet/acknowledge you in a friendly manner when you entered?	Yes	No
	Were other staff well-presented, friendly and clearly identifiable through uniform/name badges?	Yes	No
Q2	Swimming Pool/Aqua exercise equipment (please go straight to Q4 if you did not swim today)		
	Were you satisfied with the quality of the water? (e.g. look, smell and feel)	Yes	No
	Were you satisfied with the temperature of the water?	Yes	No
	Were you satisfied with the cleanliness of the pool surroundings? (e.g. edges and bottom)	Yes	No
Q3	Staffing - lifeguards		
	Was the lifeguard on duty alert and attentive at all times?	Yes	No
	Did you feel that he/she was available and approachable if you needed help/assistance?	Yes	No
	Were you acknowledged by a lifeguard at all during your visit? (e.g. said hello or smiled at)	Yes	No
	Did you feel that the lifeguard was in control and positively managing the session? (e.g. monitoring lane usage, children's behaviour etc)	Yes	No
Q4	Fitness/group exercise equipment (please go to Q6 if you did not go to the gym or take part in a class today)		
	Were you satisfied that equipment was generally all in working order?	Yes	No
	Was the Audio Visual equipment in working order?	Yes	No
	Were you satisfied that the equipment was available for you to use when you wanted to use it?	Yes	No
	Were you satisfied that the equipment you used was generally clean?	Yes	No
Q5	Staffing - fitness		
	Was there a member of the Fitness team in the gym area during your work out?	Yes	No

	Did you feel that he/she was available and approachable if you needed help/assistance?	Yes	No
	Were you acknowledged by a member of the fitness team during your visit?	Yes	No
	Were you approached on a personal/individual basis whilst in the gym by a member of staff for example to ask how you were getting on, if you needed any advice or if your programme needed reviewing?	Yes	No
Q6	Cleanliness		
	Were you satisfied with the cleanliness of the changing areas?	Yes	No
	Were you satisfied with the cleanliness of the showers/toilets?	Yes	No
	Were you satisfied with the overall cleanliness of the rest of the centre?	Yes	No
Q7	Misc Equipment (please go to Q8 if not applicable)		
	Were the showers in working order and at the right temperature?	Yes	No
	Were the lockers clean in working order and available?	Yes	No
Q8	Group classes including pool (please go straight to Q9 if you did not take part in a class today)		
	Did the class run on time as programmed?	Yes	No
	Was your class well run and enjoyable?	Yes	No
	Were you interacted with during your class on a personal/individual basis by the instructor, to encourage you, ask how you were getting on, or to be offered help/advice?	Yes	No
Q9			
	Did/does the atmosphere at the centre make you feel like coming back soon?	Yes	No
	Did any member of staff impress you or help you in particular during you last visit? (if so give details below including name/description of staff member)	Yes	No
	<u>Details</u>		
Q10	On a scale of 1 to 10 with 1 being not at all and 10 being extremely?		
	To what extent do you feel that your custom/membership is valued by your centre management/staff? (Please give details below)	-	-
	<u>Details</u>		
	Did you see anyone who you thought was a manager on your visit?	Yes	No
Q11	Other comments		
	Are there any other comments that you would like to make about your visit to your centre (or centre in general)? (Please give details below)		
	<u>Details</u>	-	-

Q12	On a scale of 0 to 10 with 0 being not at all and 10 being extremely likely	
	<p>How likely, based on your experience of this visit to your club would you be to recommend to a colleague or friend?</p> <p>We want to provide a fair and equal service to all users. Have you experienced any problems or issues when using the Leisure centre that you believe are the result of your race, disability, gender, religion or belief, or age? (If yes, please give details below)</p> <p>Details</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes No</p> <p style="text-align: right;">-</p>	
Q13	DEMOGRAPHICS	
	<p>Location</p> <p>Age</p> <p>Gender</p> <p>Marital Status</p> <p>Postcode (Please fill in)</p> <p>Current Employment Status</p> <p>Number of children under 16 living at home?</p> <p>Occupation (please fill in)</p>	
Q14	<p><u>Equal Opportunities</u></p> <p>In order that we can ensure that we continue to provide equitable and accessible services, we would ask that you could provide the following information. All information will be treated in the strictest confidence.</p>	
	<p>Do you have a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long term impact on your ability to carry out normal day to day activities?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes No</p>	
Q15	Ethnic Origin - Please indicate which of the following you consider best applies to you.	
	<p>WHITE <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>BLACK <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>MIXED <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>ASIAN <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>OTHER ETHNIC GROUP <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other (please specify) <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Don't want to answer <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

The survey results are detailed as follows.

Centre	Electronic score %		Manual score %		Average score %	
	2010/11	2011/12	2010/11	2011/12	2010/11	2011/12
Abbey Sports Centre	70	76	78	81	74	79
Didcot Leisure Centre	73	79	77	83	75	81
Didcot Wave	72	75	83	86	77.5	81
Henley Leisure Centre	77	68	81	83	79	79
Thame Leisure Centre	69.5	68	78	86	73.75	77
Park Sports Centre	62	77	86	87	74	82
Contract average score	70.5	74	81	84	75.75	80

The average score for the contract was 80. This has been converted into a score which is measured on the council's scoring matrix detailed in paragraph 17 of this report. This translates to a score of four, which attains a judgement of good. This is an improvement from the 2009/10 outcome of fair.

In 2011/12 GLL / Nexus introduced a new externally scored monitoring regime called Leisure Client, which concentrates heavily on cleaning and other customer facing areas. These inspections, which mirror the council's own monthly inspection criteria, also show increases in the scores, which support the rise in customer satisfaction evidenced below.

In addition to the surveys, customer comments are monitored throughout the year. This feedback has reported 233 complaints and 123 compliments during 2011/12 across the contract as a whole. The two main areas of complaint revolved around cleaning and the equipment or environment provided in the centres. Both of these areas of concern are highlighted in the action plan for 2012/13. The compliments received focus on staff and the equipment and environment provided. This supports the levels of diversity and individual tastes that the service has to try and accommodate. The summary of the comments is as follows:

Type of complaint	Year total	Type of compliment	Year total
Cleaning	68	Cleaning	11

Equipment/environment	67	Equipment/environment	30
Staff	19	Staff	60
Other	66	Other	22
Parking	13		
Total	233	Total	123

Separate monitoring of equality and diversity related comments is also undertaken. Throughout the year there were 29 such comments received across the contract. The breakdown of these comments is as follows:

Group comment received from	Year total
Low Income	1
Disability	12
Ethnicity	0
Age	6
Sexuality	0
Religion or Belief	0
Gender	2
Gender Reassignment	0
Pregnant Women/New mothers	4
Others	4
Total	29

Annex C - Council satisfaction

This assessment allows the council (as a client) to record its own satisfaction with aspects of a contractor's performance which lie outside Key Performance Targets and customer satisfaction. Each officer with direct knowledge and who frequently interacts with the contractor should complete this form. Questions can be left blank if not relevant to a contract or contractor.

Contractor / supplier / partner name | GLL

From (date) | 1 April 2011 | To | 31 March 2012

SERVICE DELIVERY

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatsfd
1 Understanding of the client's needs		4			
2 Response time		4			
3 Delivers to time			3		
4 Delivers to budget			3		
5 Efficiency of invoicing			3		
6 Approach to health & safety			3		
7 Easy to deal with			3		
8 Communications / keeping the client informed			3		

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatsfd
9 Quality of written documentation			3		
10 Compliance with council's corporate identity		4			
11 Listening			3		
12 Quality of relationship		4			
13 Offers suggestions beyond the scope of work			3		
14 Degree of innovation			3		

IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dissatisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
15 Goes the extra mile			3		
16 Supports the council's sustainability objectives		4			
17 Supports the council's equality objectives		4			
18 Degree of partnership working			3		

KEY DOCUMENTS

If required, has the contractor provided the council with annual updates of the following documents?

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Updated risk register (Yes / No) | Yes |
| 2. Updated business continuity plan (Yes / No) | Yes |

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths	Issues relating to health and safety are dealt with quickly and efficiently
	Good partnership working with regard to accommodating external contractors during works funded by the council.
	Good relationship with all centre managers, contract manager and senior managers.
	Easy to work with
	Good communications
	Supportive of county-wide projects such as Go Active and Active Women
	Willing to look at different ways of working in partnership to achieve shared goals.

There were a number of large projects funded and led by the council during 2011/12 that were delivered with the co-operation and support of GLL. New pool filters at Henley Leisure Centre, a gym refurbishment project at Thame Leisure Centre and various carbon management reduction projects across the properties have all required the active support of the management teams.

The council also invested £20,000 in new telephone systems for all of the leisure facilities. This provided customers with more information, such as time tables and diary dates for course enrolments, without needing to talk to a member of staff. In turn, this freed-up staff to assist customers at reception desks who have immediate needs within the buildings.

GLL was awarded an Inspire Mark for its Leisure Makers project, which uses the Olympics to develop a long-term legacy by encouraging people to volunteer in any sports-related capacity for a minimum of ten hours per person in 2012. The hope is that by making this commitment in 2012 the interest gained will be carried on beyond 2012 and, therefore, generate more infrastructure and support for clubs and activities.

Areas for improvement	Consideration to dedicated cleaning staff for all sites during the full opening hours of the centres
	More attention paid to cleaning during the day and especially at weekends.
	General maintenance works need to be carried out in a more timely fashion without a negative effect on customers.
	Payment of contract variation invoices
	Maintain a better eye on the market in terms of pricing

Annex D - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

From GLL Nexus's perspective 2011/2012 has seen an improvement in the performance of the South Oxfordshire partnership. It was very pleasing to see this perspective backed up by performance in the KPTs and Customer Satisfaction Survey. The year has seen a number of changes in procedures within the Centre as the Partnership aligns with other GLL Centres across the country. Improved access to the resources of GLL will help the Centres in their quest for providing a consistently high level of service, most notably through the GLL Quality and Audit Team. Didcot Wave it should be noted is the highest performing Centre across the whole GLL company in its Leisure Client customer audit and Henley Leisure Centre is also in the company top 10.

It was disappointing to miss out on one KPT, but the online booking function is now available to all leisure card holders and for all classes and racquet sports, this has seen an improvement in the final quarter of the year and gives confidence for 2012/2013.

2012/2013 promises to be a year of further developments as a new business to customer brand and membership architecture is introduced to meet community needs and drive the online performance of the Partnership.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

None – GLL Nexus are pleased to have moved from 'Fair' to 'Good' and feel this is reflected in the improvements made in 2011/2012.

WHAT COULD / SHOULD THE COUNCIL DO DIFFERENTLY TO ENABLE THE CONTRACTOR TO DELIVER THE SERVICE MORE EFFICIENTLY / EFFECTIVELY / ECONOMICALLY?

Feedback provided by | Carey James – Partnership Manager

Date | 16/5/2012

Annex E – progress of previous year’s action plan

Action	Owner	Due date	Date completed	Contract monitoring office comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GLL Nexus to continue with externally delivered customer service training programme for all staff - Internal customer service training modules to be developed and complement the wider programme - Continue bespoke sessions with General Managers and Duty Managers to drive service delivery - Develop the database to ensure improved number of responses to the e-survey on customer satisfaction - Commence Customer Forums <p>Demonstrate an improvement in service delivery through improved Leisure Client performance scores</p>	HR Director	Ongoing	Ongoing	<p>Alliance Leisure Services used for external training and to develop internal core training programme that all staff attend on joining. Training sessions run each quarter for new staff and as a refresher.</p> <p>Monthly GM meetings take place locally and with other GLL Managers. DM training every quarter.</p> <p>633 responses in 2011/12 – significant improvement on 2010/11</p> <p>Forum not successful in launch at Didcot Wave, so manager surgeries being considered as an alternative.</p> <p>Leisure client scores are improving even with a change to the reporting method and scoring being geared more towards cleaning.</p>	
	HR Director	October '11	Ongoing		
	Partnership Manager	Ongoing	Ongoing		
	Centres	April '11 onwards	Continuous		
					Ongoing
	General Managers Centres	Jan '12 Ongoing	Ongoing		

- GMs to monitor daily sheets as part of opening routine and address issues immediately	General Managers	August `11		The client team would question the consistency with which this issue is being tackled, although issues are decreasing and improvements at monitoring visits are regularly noted.
- Pool Plant Training to be included in Training Plan - GLL Nexus to train a trainer to deliver courses internally - Internal Courses to be included in Training Plan - Contract Maintenance Technician to provide immediate support and guidance	HR Maintenance Manager HR Partnership Manager	April `11 April `11 April `11 May `11	Started on schedule	Training and support took place in the early part of the year to tackle the immediate issues. There were a number of duty manager changes in the recent past and this training needs to be maintained to ensure consistency.
- bespoke Legend Report to be developed - KPI Report to be completed by PM to ensure consistency - Energy Reports to be agreed quarterly as final and accurate - Energy Information to be included in quarterly SOAB Report	Partnership Manager Partnership Manager Services Director Partnership Manager	April `11 April `11 July `11 July `11	Improvements made but further work required. Information in quarterly reports with improved accuracy	Legend has not been as consistent as all parties would like and further work is needed to provide the confidence anticipated. Energy figures are better in their accuracy and consistency and are reported quarterly in the SOAB reports.
Invoice procedure clarified with SODC to ensure invoices sent to correct office and therefore payment time reduced	Finance Director	May `11	GLL have achieved their requirement	There are still some anomalies with this; however, they originate with third party suppliers to GLL not from GLL directly.

Appendix F – proposed action plan to improve performance

Action	Owner	Due date
Consideration to have dedicated cleaning staff for all sites during the full opening hours of the centres to improve cleaning standards	GLL	Review in Q1. Agree outcome in Q2
More attention paid to cleaning during the day and especially at weekends.	GLL	Review in Q1.
General maintenance works need to be carried out in a more timely fashion without a negative effect on customers.	GLL	Continual improvement
Payment of contract variation invoices needs to be speeded up	GLL SODC client team	Q1
Maintain a closer eye on the market in terms of pricing	GLL	Ongoing review
Develop an insert into the disability guide to promote attendance at casual wet and dry sessions	GLL	Q2
Place appropriate signage in all facilities asking customers not to use disabled parking bays without proper authority	GLL	Q2
Ensure all legislative documentation is retained in a uniformed style	GLL	Q1
Improve flooring at Didcot Leisure Centre reception	GLL/SODC client team/ OCC	Q4
Review the quantity and condition of equipment provided in all centres	GLL	Q1