

# Scrutiny Committee Report

Report of: Head of Economy Leisure and Property

Author: Chris Webb

Tel: 01491 823431

E-mail: [chris.webb@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:chris.webb@southandvale.gov.uk)

Cabinet Member responsible: Bill Service

Tel: 01235 510810

E-mail: [bill.service@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:bill.service@southoxon.gov.uk)

To: SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 3 September 2013

## 2012/13 performance review of GLL

### Recommendation

That the committee considers GLL's performance in delivering the leisure management contract for the period 2012/13 and makes any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure, grants and community safety 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 district for the period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.

### 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. The value of the contract to the council has increased since its commencement, due to major facility improvements at Park Sports Centre and Thame 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. The procurement of the joint contract is the subject of a separate procurement exercise and, therefore, does not form part of this report.

**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	8%	-6%	Poor	1
KPT 2	Increase physical activity usage	8%	-7%	Poor	1
KPT 3	Increase U16 dry course visits	15%	-42%	Poor	1
KPT 4	Increase wet course visits	3%	7%	Excellent	5
KPT 5	Reduce energy usage: electricity gas	-3%	-9%	Excellent	5
		-3%	7%	Poor	1
KPT 6	Increase GP referral clients	2.5%	10%	Excellent	5
KPT 7	Decrease S/V (subsidy per visit)	-£3.87	-£4.21	Excellent	5
KPT 8	Increase in community leisure cards	25%	-28%	Poor	1
KPT 9	Decrease operating cost per visit	£ 2.97	£3.19	Fair	3
KPT 10	Total internet bookings as a percentage of casual bookings	25%	23%	Fair	3
Overall "average" KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average)					2.81
Overall "average" KPT performance (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)					Fair

11. These targets were agreed at the start of the year using the actual achievements from the previous year. The targets were set as testing but in line with anticipated trends at

the start of the year, and the early results were encouraging. However, as the year progressed, significant underachievement was forecast and this became more evident as the year went on. The achievement by GLL in last year's performance report resulted in scores that achieved an overall average KPT score of 4.7 and an overall average KPT performance of excellent.

12. As with last year, GLL needs to carry out some further work on the reports delivered by its Legend management reporting system. It appears that the numbers reported by Legend may not be fully representative of the actual numbers coming through the doors. This needs to be clarified for the current reporting year.
13. In addition, there is a discerning trend across the district that suggests our customers are being more selective with their disposable cash and may be choosing not to spend as much on using our facilities. This is also contributing to reduced attendances, which GLL needs to address and challenge.
14. GLL responded to this trend by offering a series of reduced price membership offers, such as at Didcot Wave where the change in price is showing a change in customer take up in a positive way. There is a considerable amount of work to be undertaken in attracting new, and retaining existing, customers apart from simply price-related initiatives, although price is a key factor.
15. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows:

KPT judgement 

Fair
------

Previous KPT judgement for comparison 

Excellent
-----------

**DIMENSION 2 – CUSTOMER SATISFACTION**

16. GLL carried out and collated customer satisfaction surveys during 2012/13. A copy of the face to face survey is attached in annex B of this report.
17. The sample sizes for this reporting period were 620 face to face completed questionnaires, which is approximately 15 per cent less than in the previous reporting year. However, the questions do provide a more detailed picture of customer satisfaction and are more relevant to the services provided. In 2013/14 this sample size will be increased.
18. An analysis of customer satisfaction performance is also included in annex B of this report.
19. 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

20. The overall score achieved by GLL for customer satisfaction is 3.47. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Customer satisfaction judgement

Fair

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

Good

### **DIMENSION 3 – COUNCIL SATISFACTION**

21. The council has taken the opinions of seven officers who have interaction with members of the GLL team at many levels. These officers provided scores that they considered were 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.
22. As reported in the previous year's performance report, the formal merger of Nexus Community into GLL introduced significant initial change for the management teams within the leisure centres and the senior management team who control the overall direction of the contract. Officers hoped that the second year of this merger would show a reduced amount of change and certainly its effects on staff would have reduced. However, this is not yet evidenced by officers, as there are still a number of issues that continue to occur and require our attention.
23. As described in paragraph 22 above, the client team has a number of issues that relate primarily to the volume of work it identifies on each of the sites each month that require remedial work by the GLL team. This work varies from basic cleaning issues to maintenance and identification of operational controls that are not being applied to the required standard. Whilst the remedial works are then undertaken, it is the fact that the client team, rather than the contractor, is identifying this continual volume of work that is of concern.
24. The client team considers it had to do more following up on issues and projects during this period than is reasonable. Officers also have a concern over the culture within GLL and feel that this is distracting general managers and the partnership manager away from the service management of the centres towards the financial and business elements of the contract. When considering the KPI figures in dimension one of this report, the significant reductions in users and income may have been linked in some way to this culture change and the ensuing distraction of the facility management team. It is clear that there is a continued willingness and determination by GLL to achieve a much higher score in the final performance period for this contract.
25. Further to the issues identified in paragraph 22 above, the number of comments received by GLL and the council has increased. The issues are generally of an operational nature, but reflect the council's concerns about the level of on-site management supervision provided over the reporting year either because of staff changes or through the change of emphasis as previously described. Further details on the breakdown of these comments can be found in Annex B of this report.
26. Riverside outdoor pool continues to be a difficult facility to operate; officers are consistently finding a range of service-related issues that require attention. By its nature as a seasonal facility, the outdoor pool does not have a permanent team of staff

and so to prepare, operate and decommission such a facility is new each year to most of the team. However, that does not alter the known work that is needed to prepare the site in readiness for opening and to manage it during the season. This is an unnecessary and continual drain on the client team's resources during the summer and needs to be a major area of improvement in 2013/14.

27. Officers have communicated these concerns at the monthly client meetings and in quarterly progress meetings with senior GLL managers specifically arranged to discuss these concerns. These meetings will continue until the situation is rectified to the council's satisfaction.
28. Despite these issues, GLL has continued to support a range of charitable, community and special initiatives throughout the year. The most prominent being the Olympic Games and the on-going legacy. GLL as an organisation was heavily involved in direct provision of the games and has subsequently been awarded contracts to manage two of the Olympic venues. Prior to the games starting, GLL used the council's facilities to promote the games and raise the profile of sport and healthy lifestyles and in legacy terms to recruit volunteers to work during and after the games with clubs and organisations to increase participation in sport. GLL staff were heavily involved in the Olympic Torch relay, which travelled through the district, and have hosted Inspire Days at Henley and Thame leisure centres where free use has been provided to encourage residents to try a physical activity and increase use of our facilities. All other centres in this contract will host similar days.
29. In addition, GLL's Sports Foundation has continued to support 38 aspiring athletes who come from clubs or who reside in the district. This foundation provides grant aid to athletes at different levels of their development and for a wide range of sporting activities.
30. In July 2012 GLL supported the launch of the new Riverside Jubilee Interactive Water Feature, which proved a great success during the summer. The GLL team took over the operation of the feature and combined it with the existing operation of the outdoor pool and campsite.
31. 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

32. The overall score achieved by GLL for council satisfaction is 3.86 and using the scoring matrix in paragraph 31 above this provides a score of fair. This is the same mark that GLL achieved in 2011/12, which is disappointing as both the council and GLL were anticipating a significant improvement in 2013/14.
33. 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

Fair

## Overall assessment

34. 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.
35. Officers consider that GLL did not perform well during the reporting year, primarily due to the continued significant change that occurred throughout the year, customer satisfaction has declined, KPT performance has declined significantly and council satisfaction has not improved, which leads the head of service to award an overall judgement of Fair for 2012/13.

Overall assessment

Fair

Previous overall assessment for comparison

Good

## Strengths and areas for improvement

36. 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.
37. 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 2013/14. The updated 2011/12 action plan is attached as annex E of this report.

## Contractors feedback

38. 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

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

## Legal implications

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

## Conclusion

41. The head of economy, leisure and property has assessed GLL's performance as "Fair" for its delivery of the leisure management contract during 2012/13, which is a reduction in performance from "Good" in 2011/12. In the last year of such a contract, the council would not normally provide a performance report of this type; however, as GLL's

overall performance has reduced, the head of economy, leisure and property has delegated authority to vary this provision and require officers to report in 2014/15 on GLL's performance over 2013/14. The committee is asked to make any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure, grants and community safety, 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 eight per cent – not 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 2012/13 was 980,449, a decrease of six per cent on the previous year. The two worst performing centres were Park and Didcot leisure centres, which both lack a swimming pool and rely solely on dry side activities. Didcot Wave has performed strongly and Henley Leisure Centre has shown strong growth, although both underachieved on last year's attendances.

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

This target looks at the total number of visits to the leisure centres to participate in physical activities. In 2012/13 there were 790,728 such visits, which is a decrease on 2011/12 of seven per cent. Again, the two worst performing centres were Didcot and Park leisure centres, with the first three quarters of the year provided better results than the final quarter, which proved particularly challenging. This is not a unique situation in the industry or the county, with all operators evidencing a reduced attendance in many facilities. GLL has action plans in place to tackle these reductions for 2013/14.

### KPT 3 – increase under 16 dry course visits by 15 per cent – not achieved

This target looks at the number of under 16's attending dry side courses organised by the leisure centres themselves. The target was set at increasing the attendances overall by 15 per cent based on growth in the previous year of 19.66 per cent. Unfortunately, the actual attendances fell short of the target by 42 per cent. One of the reasons being offered by GLL for this shortfall is the reporting obtained from the GLL servers, which have now been in place for two years. However, a more acceptable reason is that due to finances being more restricted, customers are making a choice between learn to swim courses and dry side ones, with the consequences being evident as to which gets priority.

Under 16 dry course	2011/12	2012/13	Variance
Abbey	13,738	9,082	-4,656
Henley	1,563	545	-1,018
Park	19,326	11,884	-7,442
Thame	18,809	8,855	-9,954
Didcot L C	2,921	2,329	-592
<b>Total</b>	<b>56,357</b>	<b>32,695</b>	<b>-23,662</b>

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

During 2012/13, 154,112 wet course visits were recorded, an increase of seven per cent over target on 2011/12 figures. All facilities with pools have shown growth in their attendances, with Henley and Thame showing the largest growth. This growth does in some way support GLL's suggestion for the decline in dry sports courses, as customers would rather their children swim before having other sporting skills.

<b>Under 16 wet course</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>Abbey</b>	16,067	16,362	295
<b>Henley</b>	21,687	23,556	1,869
<b>Thame</b>	45,236	49,959	4,723
<b>Didcot Wave</b>	61,707	64,235	2,528
<b>Total</b>	144,697	154,112	9,415

**KPT 5 – reduce energy consumption by three percent - achieved**

GLL did not achieve its target reduction in gas consumption for the reporting year, in fact the facilities used seven per cent more, due primarily to the prolonged damp and cold weather over much of the year. The one exception was Riverside outdoor pool, which benefited from a period of hot and humid weather during its season.

GLL over achieved its target reduction in electricity consumption by almost six per cent showing an overall reduction by nine per cent. With the exception of Riverside outdoor pool and Thame Leisure Centre, all facilities contributed to the achievement of this target through improved housekeeping and investment in carbon reduction schemes by the council.

**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 from the previous year, in 2012/13 the increase was ten per cent, which exceeded the target and is an excellent result. Abbey Sports Centre in Berinsfield was the only facility to lose clients, whilst Thame, Didcot Wave and especially Henley had significant increases in clients.

	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>Abbey</b>	593	433	-160
<b>Henley</b>	281	443	162
<b>Park</b>	429	440	11
<b>Thame</b>	638	774	136
<b>Didcot Wave</b>	404	495	91
<b>Total</b>	2,345	2,585	240

**KPT 7 – decrease subsidy per visit (SV) to -£3.87 - achieved**

The target subsidy per visit for the centres was -£3.87 per visit. The end of year figure reported is down to -£4.21 per visit - an overachievement of -£0.34. Didcot Leisure Centre was the poorest performing centre, due to lost income from reduced attendances and additional energy costs through increased gas consumption. Overall, the contract has performed well for this KPT, despite the difficult economic conditions and extended bad weather.

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

	2011/12	Target S/V £	S/V £	Variance £
<b>Abbey</b>	£0.26	£0.26	0.08	0.18
<b>Wave</b>	-£1.37	-£1.40	-£1.47	0.07
<b>Henley</b>	-£1.13	-£1.15	-£1.41	0.26
<b>Park</b>	-£1.25	-£1.28	-£1.68	0.40
<b>Thame</b>	-£1.58	-£1.62	-£1.63	0.01
<b>Didcot Leisure Centre</b>	£0.63	£0.62	£0.98	-0.37
<b>Riverside</b>	£0.72	£0.70	£0.92	-0.21
<b>Overall</b>		<b>-£3.87</b>	<b>-£4.21</b>	<b>0.34</b>

**KPT 8 – increase number of community leisure cards by 25 per cent – not achieved**

The number of community leisure cards issued failed to achieve the target by 28 per cent in the last year. The main reason for this shortfall was the cleansing of the GLL data base, which removed approximately 6,000 loyalty cards that were not being used by residents, thereby exaggerating the decline in cards in use. Also GLL transferred the hosting of these cards from the old Nexus server onto the GLL server, which reports differently and has further confused the figures. This KPT illustrates the difficulty that the facility teams are experiencing in growing gym numbers; however, GLL introduced lower cost gym membership options at Didcot Wave and Abbey Sports Centre and a re-launch campaign is planned for May 2013.

	March 2012	Target	March 2013
Loyalty	13,747	<b>17,184</b>	13,129
Pay as you go 30%	3,428	<b>4,285</b>	3,099
Pay as you go 60%	544	<b>680</b>	702
Prepaid	3,697	<b>4,621</b>	3,470
Swimming only	524	<b>655</b>	501
Under 14's	1,761	<b>2,201</b>	2,052
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,701</b>	<b>29,626</b>	<b>22,953</b>
<b>YTD % Variance</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>-3%</b>

**KPT 9 – decrease operational cost per visit to £2.97 – not achieved**

The target subsidy per visit for the centres was £2.97 per visit. The end of year figure reported is £3.19 per visit - an underachievement of -£0.22. The two worst performing centres were Didcot Leisure Centre and Park Sports Centre who had significantly lower customer numbers and, therefore, income through the doors. Expenditure was well controlled, but it was the shortfall in income that resulted in the non-achievement of this KPT.

	2011/12	Target OC/V £	O/C £	Var £
<b>Abbey</b>	3.59	£3.52	3.69	-0.17
<b>Wave</b>	2.61	£2.56	2.52	0.04
<b>Henley</b>	3.20	£3.13	3.06	0.08
<b>Park</b>	2.65	£2.60	3.16	-0.57
<b>Thame</b>	2.39	£2.34	2.49	-0.15
<b>Didcot Leisure Centre</b>	3.04	£2.98	3.46	-0.48
<b>Riverside</b>	3.71	£3.63	3.95	-0.31
	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>-0.22</b>

**KPT 10 – internet bookings as a percentage of casual bookings 25 per cent – not achieved**

Although this KPT was not achieved, there is evidence that the level of use of internet bookings is reaching the higher levels achieved three years ago and the final quarter of the reporting year actually achieved a higher percentage than the target set. This will hopefully continue in the next reporting year due to the continuing efforts of the facility teams and the improved profile of this booking facility.

## Annex B – Customer satisfaction

		Abbey	Didcot	Henley	Park	Thame	Partnership
<b>Access</b>							
1	Ease of getting through on telephone	2.1	3.8	3.2	4.3	3.3	3.3
2	Activity available at convenient times	2.9	4.0	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.8
3	Ease of booking	3.1	4.1	3.3	4.6	3.6	3.7
4	Ease of parking	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.2	4.1
5	Waiting time at reception	2.2	4.0	2.9	4.3	3.8	3.4
6	Activity charge	2.8	3.4	3.2	4.3	3.7	3.5
7	Range of activities available	2.0	3.1	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.3
8	Ease of contacting the centre with issues	1.7	3.7	3.6	4.2	3.3	3.3
9	If any issues, how well were they dealt with	1.8	4.0	4.0	4.5	2.9	3.4
<b>Quality of Facilities / Services</b>							
10	Quality of equipment	3.4	3.8	3.8	4.1	3.7	3.7
11	Water quality in the swimming pool	2.5	3.6	4.0		3.9	3.5
12	Water temperature in the swimming pool	3.9	3.2	2.9		3.6	3.4
13	Quality of food and drink	2.2	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.2	3.3
14	Quality of information / leaflets/websites	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.9	3.2	3.3
15	Availability of information	3.0	3.6	3.7	4.1	3.4	3.5
16	Quality of information on notice boards	2.3	3.4	3.4	4.0	3.2	3.3
17	Quality of flooring in sports hall/activity area	2.3	3.3	3.7	4.1	3.4	3.4
18	Quality of lighting in sports hall/activity area	2.8	3.3	3.3	4.3	3.5	3.4
19	Quality of artificial turf pitches	2.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	2.5
<b>Cleanliness</b>							
20	Cleanliness of changing rooms	2.4	3.2	3.2	0.3	3.4	2.5
21	Cleanliness of activity space	2.6	3.5	3.8	4.3	3.2	3.5
22	Cleanliness of cafeteria area	2.6	3.3	4.2	4.4	3.6	3.6
23	Quality of litter removal	2.6	3.7	3.9	4.5	3.5	3.6
24	Overall impression on cleanliness of centre	2.9	2.9	4.4	4.4	3.5	3.6
<b>Cafeteria / Food &amp; Drink / Vending</b>							
25	Range of food and drink	2.5	3.9	3.1	4.4	3.4	3.5
26	Quality of food and drink	2.6	3.8	3.6	4.0	3.0	3.4
27	Value for money of food and drink	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.9	3.2	3.2
28	Reliability of vending services	1.2	2.6	2.7	3.9	3.2	2.7

Staff							
29	Helpfulness of reception staff	3.2	4.3	4.1	4.6	4.2	4.1
30	Helpfulness of other staff	2.9	3.5	3.4	4.6	4.2	3.7
31	Standard of coaching / instruction	3.7	3.7	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.1
32	Availability of staff	2.1	3.6	3.6	4.5	3.5	3.4
33	Visibility of staff including uniform	2.6	3.4	4.2	4.5	3.7	3.7
Value for Money							
34	Value for money of activities	3.5	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.6	3.6
35	Overall satisfaction with your visit today	3.4	4.0	3.9	4.6	4.0	4.0

The survey results are detailed as follows and compared to the previous reporting year.

Centre	Partnership Results	
	2011/12	2012/13
Abbey Sports Centre	3.80	2.68
Didcot Centres	3.85	3.56
Henley Leisure Centre	3.40	3.60
Thame Leisure Centre	3.40	3.53
Park Sports Centre	3.85	4.15
<b>Contract average score</b>	3.70	3.47

The average score reached in 2011/12 was 3.7 across the contract, and the 2012/13 score has fallen, which reflects the trends identified elsewhere within this report. The centre teams at Thame and Park should be commended for their efforts in improving their scores, which in the case of Henley in particular reverses very negative trends that had existed for some time.

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 255 complaints and 137 compliments during 2012/13 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 again highlighted in the action plan for 2013/14. The compliments received focus on staff and the equipment and environment provided. These results mirror exactly the outcomes from last year and again demonstrate the levels of diversity and individual tastes that the service has to try and accommodate. The summary of the comments is as follows:

<b>Type of complaint</b>	<b>Year Total</b>	<b>Year Total</b>	<b>Type of compliment</b>	<b>Year Total</b>	<b>Year Total</b>
	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>		<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>
Cleaning	68	60	Cleaning	11	14
Equipment/environment	67	67	Equipment/environment	30	32
Staff	19	30	Staff	60	62
Other	66	98	Other	22	29
Parking	13	0			
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>137</b>

Separate monitoring of equality and diversity related comments was also undertaken. Throughout the year there were four such comments received across the contract, a reduction from 29 in the previous year. The breakdown of these comments is as follows:

<b>Group comment received from</b>	<b>Year total</b>
Low Income	0
Disability	4
Ethnicity	0
Age	0
Sexuality	0
Religion or Belief	0
Gender	0
Gender Reassignment	0
Pregnant Women/New mothers	0
Others	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>

The four complaints all referred to main entrance access difficulties at the Abbey Sports Centre and Didcot Leisure Centre. Both centres will have new self opening doors in 2013/14 provided by the leisure client team in liaison with the council's equalities officer.

# 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 2012 | To | 31 March 2013

## 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		4			
4 Delivers to budget		4			
5 Efficiency of invoicing			3		
6 Approach to health & safety		4			
7 Easy to deal with		4			
8 Communications / keeping the client informed		4			

## Communications and relations

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatsfd
9 Quality of written documentation		4			
10 Compliance with council's corporate identity		4			
11 Listening		4			
12 Quality of relationship		4			
13 Notifies Council of organisational or operational change			3		
14 Offers suggestions beyond the scope of works		4			



## Improvement and innovation

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

## 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	Partnership manager is always available, is accommodating and responds as requested
	The on-site teams work hard to deliver
	General managers and partnership manager are easy to approach and discuss/resolve issues.
	Desire from the majority of general managers to deliver the best service
	The team are friendly and approachable
	Supportive of projects such as GO Active and Active Women

Areas for improvement	Understanding and taking pro active actions for maintenance
	The use of the BETTER branding within the facilities
	Reducing the volume of items that the client team identify in the facilities, which are easily visible to both staff and customers.
	Improved technical and management support, plus appropriate resources for the operation of the outdoor pool at Riverside Park
	Management priorities re-balanced to service delivery rather than corporate or business areas.

## **Annex D - Contractor 360° feedback**

### **CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT**

From GLL's perspective it is disappointing that the partnership has not matched the growth that was experienced in 2011/12. 2012/13 GLL has recognised and adapted to changes in market demand and this has seen the introduction of new memberships and initiatives, the impact of which will be seen in 2013/14. Staff turnover in 2012/13 has been an issue across the partnership. This has been addressed by GLL with a full permanent staff pay review and casual pay rate review. This review has resulted in competitive pay rates for GLL staff compared to the rates inherited and will help Managers in recruitment and retention of their teams. A significant change in 2012/13 was the responsibility for OCC maintenance being taken on by GLL. The issues identified by SODC concerning maintenance reflect the period of transfer. As the year has progressed an improved understanding at a Centre level has improved the resolution of issues and GLL has applied a specific managerial resource to manage OCC maintenance.

2012/13 has seen further alignment in procedures following the full merger between GLL and Nexus and this will provide consistency, stability and an improvement in facility operations and management that will be evident in the next financial year.

GLL is committed to providing an excellent service in South Oxfordshire and has already made significant improvements in areas such as swimming lessons and sports courses. This included the introduction of a new online software system that enables the parent to track the progress of their child and make enrolment payments without the need to queue at Reception. GLL has invested in Centre and online booking systems to improve its front of house service and increase the number of bookings made on the internet. These investments have seen improvements in 2013.

### **ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT**

None – GLL recognise the Council's comments, concerns and compliments and are keen to work together to ensure an improved score in the next committee report.

**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 27.08.13

## Annex E – progress of previous year’s action plan

Action	Owner	Due date	Client officer’s comments
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	This initiative has been brought forward by GLL; however, the changes are not reflected in a reduction of customer complaints in this area compared to 2011/12. Also the number of monthly client inspections identifying cleaning as an issue remains consistently high.
More attention paid to cleaning during the day and especially at weekends.	GLL	Review in Q1.	There has been some improvement to this but it is inconsistent due to the difficulty in recruiting staff, which has a subsequent impact on service delivery. It is also dependent on staff being available from other duties to undertake the work.
General maintenance works need to be carried out in a more timely fashion without a negative effect on customers.	GLL	Continual improvement	This is still an area of concern, which will hopefully improve due to GLL being solely responsible for maintenance now after the removal of Mouchel through an agreement with Oxfordshire County Council. However, better identification of works by site teams is needed, as well as the GLL in-house staff responding quicker to work orders. However, as the new arrangements settle in, the situation is improving consistently.
Payment of contract variation invoices needs to be speeded up	GLL SODC client team	Q1	This area now seems to have improved satisfactorily
Maintain a closer eye on the market in terms of pricing	GLL	Ongoing review	There has been some movement on this aspect but it is limited and slow to be introduced.

Develop an insert into the disability guide to promote attendance at casual wet and dry sessions	GLL	Q2	Information has been updated and improved on the GLL website. A specific membership for people with disabilities has been introduced, which until this reporting year had not been available.
Place appropriate signage in all facilities asking customers not to use disabled parking bays without proper authority	GLL	Q2	It is felt that existing signage is satisfactory in all centre car parks; however, staff are making concerted efforts to monitor inappropriate use wherever possible.
Ensure all legislative documentation is retained in a uniformed style	GLL	Q1	Over the course of this reporting year GLL has introduced a full IMS system, which is in use at all SODC facilities and constantly updated.
Improve flooring at Didcot Leisure Centre reception	GLL/SODC client team/ OCC	Q4	This work is yet to be undertaken although cleaning frequencies have improved.
Review the quantity and condition of equipment provided in all centres	GLL	Q1	Some work on this has been completed at centres where shortfalls have been identified but there is a continual need to monitor the condition of equipment which will maintained until the end of the contract.

## Appendix F – proposed action plan to improve performance

Action	Owner	Due date
Understanding and taking pro active actions for maintenance	GLL	
Explaining the use of the BETTER branding within the facilities	GLL	
Reducing the volume of items that the client team identify in the facilities, which are easily visible to both staff and customers	GLL	
Improved technical and management support plus appropriate resources for the operation of the outdoor pool at Riverside Park	GLL	
Management priorities re-balanced to service delivery rather than corporate or business areas.	GLL	
Consideration to have dedicated cleaning staff for all sites during the full opening hours of the centres to improve cleaning standards	GLL	
Reduce the number of complaints received with particular focus on staff related issues	GLL	
Improve customer satisfaction sample size to a minimum equivalent of 300 completed questionnaires per facility	GLL	