

Scrutiny committee report

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: 16 September 2014



2013/14 performance review of GLL

RECOMMENDATION

That the committee considers GLL's performance in delivering the leisure management contract for the period 2013/14 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 for the period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.

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 ran from 1 April 2009 until 31 August 2014. The value of the contract to the council 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. GLL provided a comprehensive programme of activities and opportunities for residents and visitors to South Oxfordshire to enjoy sporting and leisure facilities. It operated facilities in Berinsfield, Didcot, Henley, Thame, Wallingford and Wheatley on behalf of the council through a management contract and service specification document. Within these documents were a series of key performance targets, which helped to demonstrate the achievement of the contractor in delivering important parts of the service. These targets are summarised in paragraph 11 of this report and are detailed in annex A of this report.
9. The main deliverable within the contract, which provided a minimum income to the council of £217,566 each year, was to increase participation in the council's leisure facilities and it sought to provide a varied programme of activities to cater for different age groups and preferences.
10. The contract expired on 31 August 2014, which was in line with the contract expiry dates of the leisure management contracts in the Vale of White Horse. The procurement process relating to a new joint contract is now complete with GLL being

awarded a new ten year contract to manage the facilities in both South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse districts from 1 September 2014. In line with the performance reporting process, the next report of this kind will be in 2016; however, officers will monitor and challenge GLL to ensure that action plans and service levels continue to be improved upon while the new contract is established.

DIMENSION 1 – KEY PERFORMANCE TARGETS

11. 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	2%	-10.7%	Poor	1
KPT 2	Increase physical activity usage	2%	-12.3%	Poor	1
KPT 3	Increase U16 dry course visits	2%	-38%	Poor	1
KPT 4	Increase wet course visits	2%	5.4%	Excellent	5
KPT 5	Reduce energy usage: electricity gas	-3% -3%	-3.5% -7.5%	Excellent Excellent	5 5
KPT 6	Increase GP referral clients	8%	56%	Excellent	5
KPT 7	Decrease S/V (subsidy per visit)	-£4.01	-£6.27	Excellent	5
KPT 8	Increase in community leisure cards	3%	7.5%	Excellent	5
KPT 9	Decrease operating cost per visit	£ 3.13	£3.01	Excellent	5
KPT 10	Total internet bookings as a percentage of casual bookings	25%	31.2%	Excellent	5
Overall "average" KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average)					3.91
Overall "average" KPT performance (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)					good

12. These targets were agreed at the start of the year using the actual achievements from the previous year as the baseline. The targets were set lower than the previous year to take account of the actual results in 2012/13 and reflect anticipated trends at the start of the year. The achievement by GLL in last year's performance report resulted in scores that achieved an overall average KPT score of 2.81 and an overall average KPT performance of Fair.
13. As with last year, GLL needs to carry out some further work on the reports delivered by its management reporting system (Legend). It appears that the numbers reported by Legend may not be fully representative of the actual numbers coming through the doors. For the past two years, officers have repeatedly raised this point with GLL in order that their achievements in attracting more users are properly reflected. However the difficulties in amending the reporting system and inconsistencies that the changes would create to the trend analysis would not be helpful at this stage of the contract. Therefore, officers and GLL have agreed to leave the reports as they are for the remainder of this contract on the basis that the reports will be amended from 1 September 2014. This places GLL at a significant disadvantage in achieving its KPTs and, therefore, taking in to account officers' observations of usage in the centres, the head of service feels justified in using his discretion to raise the judgement to Good for KPT 1 and Fair for KPTs 2 and 3, which generates a score of 4.54. This results in an overall judgement for the KPT section of Excellent.
14. GLL continued to offer lower-priced membership offers to targeted postcodes with some very positive results; especially at Abbey Sports Centre and Didcot Wave. . There is still 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. The overall performance in this section has improved from Fair last year to Excellent this year, although GLL will need to make further efforts to retain this score and move it higher within the excellent judgement. In particular, the introduction of further initiatives to increase usage and a review of the management reporting system to ensure it is reporting accurately in relation to the new KPTs
16. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows:

KPT judgement

Excellent

Previous KPT judgement for comparison

Fair

DIMENSION 2 – CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

17. GLL carried out and collated customer satisfaction surveys during 2013/14. A copy of the face to face survey is attached in annex B of this report.
18. The sample size for this survey was 826, which is 200 more responses than were received last year. However, this is still a very small sample for the number of visitors attending the facilities and going forwards, GLL must put sufficient resource into this work and demonstrate a full commitment to better understanding customer satisfaction.

19. An analysis of customer satisfaction performance is also included in annex B of this report.
20. 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

21. The overall score achieved by GLL for customer satisfaction is 3.62, which delivers a judgement of Fair. In 2012/13, GLL achieved a score of 3.4. Although the judgement has not improved, the score achieved has, which is a welcome improvement. 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 **Fair**

DIMENSION 3 – COUNCIL SATISFACTION

22. The council has taken the opinions of eight 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 been used to calculate the overall satisfaction score. An analysis of council satisfaction performance appears in annex C of this report.
23. 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. Unfortunately, this degree of change has not produced a consistent level of management with both the partnership manager resigning and two general managers leaving their facilities. This degree of change distracts the client team as they provide the consistency that allows the facilities to function, and with the potential for further change at a higher level within GLL it is possible that the inconsistency may continue.
24. Riverside outdoor pool was yet again a disappointing area of service delivery, with officers finding a range of service-related issues requiring 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 within GLL in 2014/15.
25. Officers have communicated these concerns at the monthly client meetings and in quarterly progress meetings with senior GLL managers. These meetings will continue until the situation is rectified to the council’s satisfaction.

26. Despite these issues, GLL has continued to support a range of charitable initiatives and carbon reduction schemes funded by the council. These projects along with improved housekeeping at the facilities should produce reductions in the use of all utilities.
27. 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

28. The overall score achieved by GLL for council satisfaction is 3.65, which results in a judgement of fair. The score has dropped slightly from last year’s 3.86, which is disappointing, but reflects the continuing level of concern held by officers. This is the same mark that GLL achieved in 2012/13, which is disappointing as both the council and GLL were anticipating a significant improvement in 2013/14.

29. 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

30. 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.

31. Officers consider that GLL has tried to improve from 2012/13 but despite improving its KPTs and customer satisfaction scores the council’s own satisfaction score reduced slightly. This has led to an improvement in the judgement awards for KPT, and an improvement in the customer satisfaction score, all of which leads the head of service to award an overall judgement of Good for 2013/14.

Overall assessment **Good**

Previous overall assessment for comparison **Fair**

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

32. 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.

33. 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 taken forward and worked upon in 2014/2015.

CONTRACTOR'S FEEDBACK

34. 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

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

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

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

CONCLUSION

37. The head of economy, leisure and property has assessed GLL's performance as "Good" for its delivery of the leisure management contract during 2013/14, which is an improved level of performance to that achieved in 2012/13. This report is the last one on this contract, which ended on 31 August 2014. The first report on the new contract will be issued on the reporting year 2015/16, as the new contract is given eighteen months to bed in. However, officers will be ensuring standards are maintained and improved, as well as establishing new reporting mechanisms in preparation for the next report. 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 two 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 2013/14 was 895,499 the number of visits during 2012/13 was 980,449, a decrease of 8.7 per cent on the previous year's attendances, therefore 10.7 per cent below target. The two worst performing centres were Park and Didcot leisure centres, which both lack a swimming pool and rely solely on dry side activities. Thame Leisure Centre is the only facility to achieve its target in this category.

It should be noted that throughout this reporting year council officers have challenged GLL over the methodologies used to calculate their attendance figures as the council considers that the numbers reported are under representative of the actual attendances taking place. GLL acknowledged this and has only maintained the lower figures in order not to lose the trend data previously reported in this KPI.

KPT 2 – increase physical activity visits by two per cent – not achieved

This target looks at the total number of visits to the leisure centres to participate in physical activities. In 2013/14 there were 709,520 such visits and in 2012/13 there were 790,728 such visits, which is an underachievement of eleven per cent. Again, Park Sports Centre, along with Didcot Wave were the two worst performing centres; however, the Wave did experience major plant problems, which required significant replacement of equipment that caused operational difficulties and resulted in lost user figures GLL has action plans in place to tackle these reductions for 2014/15.

It should be noted that throughout this reporting year council officers have challenged GLL over the methodologies used to calculate their attendance figures as the council considers that the numbers reported are under representative of the actual attendances taking place. GLL acknowledged this and have only maintained the lower figures in order not to lose the trend data previously reported in this KPI.

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

This target looks at the number of under 16's attending dry side courses organised at the centres. The two main concerns are Abbey and Park sports centres, which show significant drops in attendances in this category, and these along with other centre under achievements resulted in an actual reduction of 38 per cent against target. Abbey Sports Centre lost a well-attended gymnastics club, which moved to a larger venue, and despite efforts to attract other clubs the loss of these large weekly numbers has not yet been replaced. Park Sports Centre lost significant numbers through a specialist coach's long-term illness, which has impacted on its statistics.

Under 16 dry course	2012/13	2013/14	Variance
Abbey	9,082	3,547	-5,535
Henley	545	613	68
Park	11,884	5,021	-6,863
Thame	8,855	8,998	143
Didcot L C	2,329	2,704	375

Total	32,695	20,883	-11,812
--------------	--------	--------	---------

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

During 2012/13, 154,112 wet course visits were recorded; whereas in 2013/14 162,828 wet course visits were achieved, resulting in 5.4 per cent more attendances than the previous year. Thame and Abbey pools were particularly successful in reorganising their programmes and filling existing capacity.

Under 16 wet course	2012/13	2013/14	Variance
Abbey	16,362	17,885	1,523
Henley	23,556	24,355	799
Thame	49,959	56,679	6720
Didcot Wave	64,235	63,909	-326
Total	154,112	162,828	8,716

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

GLL did over achieve its target reduction in gas consumption for the reporting year, with the facilities using 7.5 per cent less than the previous year, due primarily to increased house keeping and the GLL Green initiative, which improved staff awareness of the costs associated with the consumption at their site on a weekly basis.

GLL achieved its target reduction in electricity consumption by 3.5 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 eight 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 2013/14 the contract saw a 56 per cent increase in referrals from the previous year, which exceeded the eight per cent target by 48 per cent and is a welcome result. All centres increased their attendances, which is again a welcome improvement.

	2012/13	2013/14	Variance
Abbey	433	601	168
Henley	443	1123	680
Park	440	874	434
Thame	774	930	156
Didcot Wave	495	509	14
Total	2,585	4,037	1452

KPT 7 – decrease subsidy per visit (SV) to -£4.01 - achieved

The target subsidy per visit for the centres was -£4.01 per visit. The end of year figure reported is down to -£6.27 per visit - an overachievement of -£2.26. 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. The client team are concerned that this KPT may have been achieved on the back of reduced expenditure on repairs and maintenance and other similarly important operational areas. These concerns have been raised with GLL and will be monitored up to the existing contract end.

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

	2012/13	Target S/V 2013/14	Actual S/V 2013/14	Variance 2013/14
Abbey	£0.26	£0.25	-£0.71	£0.96
Wave	-£1.40	-£1.43	-£1.42	-£0.01
Henley	-£1.15	-£1.18	-£1.33	£0.15
Park	-£1.28	-£1.30	-£2.47	£1.17
Thame	-£1.62	-£1.65	-£1.75	£0.10
Didcot Leisure Centre	£0.62	£0.60	£0.64	-£0.04
Riverside	£0.70	£0.70	£0.76	-£0.07
Overall		-£4.01	-£6.27	£2.26

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

The number of community leisure cards issued achieved a 7.5 per cent increase on the last year. The main reason for this was the increase in prepaid memberships driven by a range of price-driven incentives, which proved successful both in financial and user numbers.

	March 2013	Target	March 2014
Pay as you go 30%	3,099	3,192	3,008
Pay as you go 60%	702	723	688
Prepaid	3,470	3,574	4,294
Swimming only	501	514	770
Under 14's	2,052	2113	1,855
Total	9,824	10,116	10,615

YTD % Variance

KPT 9 – decrease operational cost per visit by two per cent to £3.13 – achieved

The target subsidy per visit for the centres was £3.13 per visit. The end of year figure reported is £3.01 per visit - an overachievement of -£0.12. The two worst performing centres were Didcot Leisure Centre and Park Sports Centre who had significantly lower customer numbers and, therefore, income received over through the till. Expenditure was well controlled, but it was the shortfall in income that resulted in the non-achievement of this KPT at these two centres.

	Actual OC/V 2012/13	Target OC/V 2013/14	Actual OC/V 2013/14	Variance 2013/14
Abbey	£3.69	£3.61	£2.52	£1.09
Wave	£2.52	£2.47	£2.57	-£0.10
Henley	£3.06	£3.00	£2.95	£0.05
Park	£3.16	£3.10	£4.21	-£1.11
Thame	£2.49	£2.44	£2.50	-£0.06
Didcot Leisure Centre	£3.46	£3.39	£3.11	£0.28
Riverside	£3.95	£3.87	£3.19	£0.68
	£3.19	£3.13	£3.01	£0.12

KPT 10 – internet bookings as a percentage of casual bookings 25 per cent – achieved

This KPT was achieved for the first time in recent years. There is continuing evidence that the level of use of internet bookings is increasing each quarter which is encouraging. The actual percentage achieved was 31.2 per cent. The number of bookings taken in the reporting year was 75,996 with 23,735 bookings taken online. This will hopefully continue to grow 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
Access							
1	Ease of getting through on telephone	3.4	3.6	3.5	4.4	3.7	3.7
2	Activity available at convenient times	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.4	3.8	4.0
3	Ease of booking	3.3	4.1	3.4	4.6	3.7	3.8
4	Ease of parking	4.3	4.8	4.8	4.7	2.9	4.3
5	Waiting time at reception	3.3	3.7	3.2	4.4	4.0	3.7
6	Activity charge	2.9	3.3	3.3	4.3	3.7	3.5
7	Range of activities available	2.6	3.3	3.7	3.6	4.1	3.4
8	Ease of contacting the centre with issues	2.2	3.6	3.5	4.3	3.9	3.5
9	If any issues, how well were they dealt with	2.4	3.9	4.3	4.2	3.6	3.6
Quality of Facilities / Services							
10	Quality of equipment	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.1
11	Water quality in the swimming pool	3.1	3.7	4.1		4.0	3.7
12	Water temperature in the swimming pool	3.9	3.5	3.1		3.8	3.5
13	Quality of food and drink	2.1	3.4	3.7	4.1	3.4	3.3
14	Quality of information / leaflets/websites	3.6	3.7	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.7
15	Availability of information	3.3	3.7	3.8	4.4	3.7	3.7
16	Quality of information on notice boards	3.9	3.8	3.7	4.3	3.6	3.8
17	Quality of flooring in sports hall/activity area	2.6	3.1	3.5	4.2	3.1	3.3
18	Quality of lighting in sports hall/activity area	3.2	3.8	3.8	4.5	3.7	3.8
19	Quality of artificial turf pitches	1.7					1.7
Cleanliness							
20	Cleanliness of changing rooms	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.1
21	Cleanliness of activity space	3.2	3.4	3.6	4.4	3.6	3.6
22	Cleanliness of cafeteria area	2.9	3.0	4.7	4.4	3.7	3.7
23	Quality of litter removal	3.3	3.9	4.1	4.6	3.9	3.9
24	Overall impression on cleanliness of centre	3.1	2.6	4.5	4.5	3.3	3.6
Cafeteria / Food & Drink / Vending							
25	Range of food and drink	2.7	3.8	3.0	3.2	3.7	3.2
26	Quality of food and drink	2.4	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.2
27	Value for money of food and drink	2.3	3.3	3.4	3.9	3.2	3.2
28	Reliability of vending services	1.0	2.4	2.1	3.7	3.9	2.6
Staff							
29	Helpfulness of reception staff	3.4	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.2
30	Helpfulness of other staff	3.2	3.9	3.7	4.4	4.3	3.9
31	Standard of coaching / instruction	3.1	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.0
32	Availability of staff	2.4	3.8	3.9	4.7	3.7	3.7
33	Visibility of staff including uniform	4.0	4.2	4.7	4.6	4.1	4.3
Value for Money							
34	Value for money of activities	3.8	3.1	3.4	4.2	3.7	3.6
35	Overall satisfaction with your visit today	3.9	3.5	4.0	4.5	3.8	3.9

TOTAL 3.07 3.61 3.77 3.84 3.73 3.62

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

Centre	Partnership results	
	2012/13	2013/14
Abbey Sports Centre	2.68	3.07
Didcot Centres	3.56	3.61
Henley Leisure Centre	3.60	3.77
Thame Leisure Centre	3.53	3.84
Park Sports Centre	4.15	3.73
Contract average score	3.47	3.62

The average score reached in 2012/13 was 3.47 across the contract, and the 2013/14 score has increased, which reflects a welcome change to the trends identified elsewhere within this report. The centre teams with the exception of Park should be commended for their efforts in improving their scores. There is no known reason for the Park decline; however, officers will be encouraging GLL to improve the scores at that facility as well as further improving the scores at the rest of the centres.

In addition to the surveys, customer comments are monitored throughout the year. In previous years the council had access to the GLL intranet where all comments were logged by centre managers. This reporting methodology was lost in 2013/14 when the council lost its access to the GLL intranet, so the client team amended its meeting format to collate comments to ensure that this important data was not lost. The volume of comments received during the reporting year is significantly down on previous years and is a cause for concern from the client team that all data is not being provided. The partnership manager is fully co-operating to ensure that any comment is properly recorded and that a comprehensive system is in place in future years.

A summary of the comments is as follows:

Type of complaint	Year total 2012/13	Year total 2013/14	Type of compliment	Year total 2012/13	Year total 2013/14
Cleaning	60	29	Cleaning	14	0
Equipment/environment	67	29	Equipment/environment	32	0
Staff	30	11	Staff	62	6

Agenda Item 4

Other	98	69	Other	29	2
Parking	0	11	Parking	0	0
Total	255	149	Total	137	8

Separate monitoring of equality and diversity related comments was also undertaken. In 2013/14 there were no comments received across the contract relating to equalities and diversity,

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 2013 | To | 31 March 2014

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			3		
3 Delivers to time			3		
4 Delivers to budget		4			
5 Efficiency of invoicing		4			
6 Approach to health & safety			3		
7 Easy to deal with		4			
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		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		4			
14 Offers suggestions beyond the scope of works			3		

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			3		
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	
	Centre managers and partnership managers are approachable and willing to help
	General managers are quick to respond to queries or issues when highlighted
	Works well in partnership at a senior level providing updates on activity changes

Areas for improvement	
	Improve training and induction processes of duty managers to improve delivery at the sites
	Be proactive to improve site systems and procedures for a consistent approach to deliver across the contract
	Too many items of maintenance being missed by site teams, which the client team observe
	It appears that there are very few taster or activity classes for children during school holidays, leaving facilities empty during significant periods of time
	Continue to maintain staffing levels that were achieved in the last year
	Improve internal communication to front of house staff when agreeing activities with the council's partnership team

Annex D - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

GLL is pleased that the Council recognises the improvements that have been made on the previous year's performance with an improved score; from Fair to Good. However, it is recognised there is always room for improvement. Whilst not known in the period this report covers, GLL is also extremely pleased to have been successful with their bid for the new contract and fully appreciate the required standards and ambitions of the Council.

GLL is committed to continuous improvement with numerous measures already underway to achieve further improvement in 2014/2015.

It was pleasing to read that among key strengths recognised were approachable Centre managers and Partnership managers who were quick to respond and the partnership working at a senior level.

To achieve improved year on year performance against the Key Performance Targets (7 of 10 scored as Excellent) was particularly satisfying, especially as in Point 12 it is noted "officers and GLL have agreed to leave the reports as they are for the remainder of this contract on the basis that the reports will be amended from 1 September 2014. This places GLL at a significant disadvantage in achieving its KPTs".

GLL would like to record that achieving accurate data is extremely important and while GLL takes on board the Council's feedback, measures have been taken to improve accuracy but on some occasions greater accuracy produces lower figures as previous methodology assumptions are disregarded. Moving forwards the introduction of new technology e.g. fast track kiosks will improve data collection and reporting.

Improved customer satisfaction, with room for improvement, was recorded though the drop in Officer satisfaction was a surprise and steps have already being taken at a senior level to resolve this.

Major improvements to staffing levels were achieved which aided consistent service. Whilst there were changes at Partnership and General Manager levels, this change also provided opportunities and successful staff development and succession planning resulted in a number of internal promotions.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

Re point 23. GLL are keen to record that the merger between Nexus Community and GLL was actually back in January 2011 and that whilst the benefits of the merger are appreciated at a senior level, there is clearly work to be done to make these benefits more widely recognised. There were some initial and understandable, minor integration issues following the merger but there were also numerous benefits e.g. financial stability, increased capacity for training and career development, improved ICT platforms, significant central support in many areas.

Re point 24. GLL recognise that whilst there were some minor issues surrounding the operation of Riverside outdoor pool, it was one of the busiest and most successful seasons on record. The location of the pool adjacent to the Council offices keeps the pool high-profile and GLL are keen to minimise the Officer time spent addressing input issues. Despite significant issues caused by flooding at the start of 2014 preparations for this season were effective despite a limited lead time with customer service being the top priority.

Re point 25. GLL would like to record that the monthly client meetings and quarterly progress meetings are part of a planned and ongoing agenda not simply in place to resolve any dissatisfaction.

Re point 26. GLL would like to clarify that the carbon reduction schemes and improved housekeeping have actually produced significant reductions in the use of all utilities as reflected by the Excellent score in KPT 5.

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

A review, which is already underway, of the Key Performance Targets, will enable much more accurate and meaningful benchmarking of performance.

A review of the frequency and content of various meetings between contractor and Client might aid the interaction between the two parties as this is a key focus for an improved score to be achieved.

Feedback provided by

Ben Whaymand, Partnership Manager GLL
--

Date

26 August 2014

Annex E – progress of previous year’s action plan

Action	Owner	Due date	Client officer’s comments
Understanding and taking pro active actions for maintenance	GLL	Immediate	Some improvements have been evidenced at a senior level with the main central team supporting the sites and the council. Further on site improvements to identifying faults are required
Explaining the use of the BETTER branding within the facilities	GLL	September 2013	As the volume of BETTER branding has increased and customers have discussed with site staff more, the understanding has improved
Reducing the volume of items that the client team identify in the facilities, which are easily visible to both staff and customers	GLL	Immediate	This area still has significant improvement to take place.
Improved technical and management support, plus appropriate resources for the operation of the outdoor pool at Riverside Park	GLL	September 2014	Additional central support has taken place and is starting to impact positively, there is still room to improve the knowledge and awareness on site of technical issues
Management priorities re-balanced to service delivery, rather than corporate or business areas.	GLL	Immediate	There have been some major improvements on this issue; however, the remaining matter of concern is the amount of time general managers are on site driving their businesses, rather than at head office meetings or training
Consideration to have dedicated cleaning staff for all sites during the full opening hours of the centres to improve cleaning standards	GLL	September 2014	Changes to cleaning teams have taken place at some facilities; however, the introduction of dedicated cleaning teams has not taken place. More reliance on outside contractors appears to have been the preferred option. Cleaning is still a consistent issue.

Agenda Item 4

Reduce the number of complaints received with particular focus on staff related issues	GLL	Immediate	As noted in the report complaints significantly down on previous year with those relating specifically to staff down from 30 to 11. Review of logging system underway.
Improve customer satisfaction sample size to a minimum equivalent of 300 completed questionnaires per facility	GLL	January 2014	This was achieved however the samples provided are far less than the council will continue to accept. Taking into account the number of customers attending the facilities.

Appendix F – proposed action plan to improve performance

Action	Owner	Due date
Improve customer satisfaction response size for future consultation processes	GLL	As required
Improve induction and training processes for duty managers to improve service delivery at facilities	GLL	Ongoing
Improve site systems and staff awareness to deliver a consistent level of back office systems	GLL	Ongoing
Improve training and awareness for on-site staff to recognise items needing repair or maintenance	GLL	Ongoing
Improve holiday play schemes to encourage school holiday usage	GLL	July 2014
Improve staffing levels and focus on customer service, rather than sales	GLL	Ongoing
Improve internal communication to front of house staff when agreeing activities with the council's participation team	GLL	Ongoing
Improve and ensure that all customer comment is recorded by every facility and reported monthly in the client report	GLL	August 2014

This page is intentionally left blank