

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY CHECK - Education - Schools and Local Education Authority (LEA)

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance Assessment (RAG)															
Schools Budget	£84.557m	<p>Section 52 data (2005/6)</p> <p>B&NES £3450 per pupil Ofsted Beighbours £3358 per pupil</p> <p><i>B&NES £92 per pupil higher than comparators= 2.75% Or £2.325m</i></p> <p>Audit Commission Profile (2004/5) B&NES £2816 per pupil Ofsted Beighbours £3249 per pupil</p> <p><i>B&NES £433 per pupil lower than comparators= 15% Or £11.2m</i></p> <p>Costs 2.7% above average</p>	<p>B&NES</p> <p>Key stage results % achieving expected level</p> <table> <tr> <td>Key stage 1</td> <td>92</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key stage 2</td> <td>84</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key stage 3</td> <td>81</td> <td>78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key stage 4 (GCSE)</td> <td>63</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key stage 5 (A Level) points per entry</td> <td>79</td> <td>77</td> </tr> </table> <p>Indicators show performance 2.4%-10.5% above average</p>	Key stage 1	92	89	Key stage 2	84	82	Key stage 3	81	78	Key stage 4 (GCSE)	63	57	Key stage 5 (A Level) points per entry	79	77	<p>Ofsted</p> <p>Performance scores show scores above ofsted neighbours</p> <p>Audit commission spend data out of date and comparators not necessarily appropriate for education comparison</p>	G
Key stage 1	92	89																		
Key stage 2	84	82																		
Key stage 3	81	78																		
Key stage 4 (GCSE)	63	57																		
Key stage 5 (A Level) points per entry	79	77																		
LEA spend Excluding pre existing pension costs from AVON.(pre existing pension excluded from OfSTED neighbours too). Major components of LEA Spending is analysed further overleaf.	£9.1m	<p>Section 52 data (2005/6)</p> <p>B&NES £309 per pupil Ofsted Beighbours £341 per pupil</p> <p><i>B&NES £32 per pupil lower than comparators= 9% Or £850k</i></p> <p>Costs 9% below average</p>	<p>CPA score 3</p> <p>Ofsted neighbours similar 3 LEAs scored 4 5 LEAs scored 3 1 LEA scored 2</p> <p>Performance similar to ofsted neighbours</p>	<p>Audit commission spend data out of date and comparators not necessarily appropriate for education comparison</p> <p>CPA scores shown as only overall comparison of LEA performance</p>	G															

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY CHECK - Education - Local Education Authority (LEA)

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance Assessment (RAG)
School Improvement service	£0.8m	Section 52 data (2005/6) B&NES £29 per pupil Ofsted Beighbours £36 per pupil <i>B&NES £7 per pupil lower than comparators= 19% Or £150k</i> Costs below average	See school performance data: all key stage results are positive. Additionally Fischer Family trust data shows Value Added scores to be positive Performance above average	Difficult to measure performance of school improvement teams as results are dependent on many influences	G
Statutory and regulatory duties	£1.045m	Section 52 data (2005/6) B&NES £43 per pupil Ofsted Neighbours £57 per pupil <i>B&NES £14 per pupil lower than comparators= 25% Or £250k</i> Cost below average	Audit commission survey shows school satisfaction in relation to strategic leadership to be about the same as statistical neighbours-though it is difficult to measure accurately. Performance similar to ofsted neighbours	No direct comparison of performance available to measure the strategic leadership of LEA	G
Home to School Transport	£3.283m	Section 52 data (2005/6) Total Transport costs per pupil B&NES £122 per pupil Ofsted Neighbours £143 per pupil <i>B&NES £20 per pupil lower than comparators=</i> Cost below average	Very little data to show good performance in the organisation of transport. Audit commission survey shows school satisfaction in relation the effectiveness and reliability of home to school transport to be higher than neighbours and higher than all LEAs.	Difficult to measure performance though relatively economic. Check is based on budgets - in 2005-06 this budget overspent by £567k.	G
Existing early retirement costs (commitments entered into by 31/3/99)	£900k	Section 52 data (2005/6) Total costs per pupil B&NES £37 per pupil Ofsted Neighbours £17 per pupil <i>B&NES £20 per pupil Higher than comparators= 54% Or £480k</i> Costs considerably above average	No performance indicators exist in relation to pension payments. In general spend is determined by local circumstances. In addition, this is a 'fixed' cost arising from decisions prior to 1998- ~	The analysis shows high spending that was originally incurred by the former Avon County Council. The spending is a commitment arising from past decisions and cannot be altered.	R
Special Education Services	£996k	Section 52 data (2005/6) Total costs per pupil B&NES £41 per pupil Ofsted Neighbours £30 per pupil <i>B&NES £11 per pupil Higher than comparators= 27% Or £270k</i> Cost above average	BVPI 04/05 Statements within set priod(18 weeks): Second quartile	Comparison difficult as ofsted family for costs and audit commission family for performance.	A
Total Access (excl Home to School Transport)	£920k	Section 52 data (2005/6) Total costs per pupil B&NES £38 per pupil Ofsted Beighbours £45 per pupil <i>B&NES £7 per pupil lower than comparators= 15% Or £140k</i> Costs below average	BVPI 04/05 Absence in primary and secondary both 2nd quartile Surplus places 4th quartile	Comparison difficult as ofsted family for costs and audit commission family for performance	A

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY CHECK - Waste Services

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance Assessment (RAG)
Waste Services	£7.8m	<p>Audit Commission Profile 04/05</p> <p>Waste Collection = £11.55 per head Ranking 2 / 26 Unitaries (1st Quartile)</p> <p>Waste Disposal = £33.12 per head Ranking 25/26 Unitaries (4th Quartile)</p> <p>Figures derived from 04/05 RA Forms.</p> <p>However, errors in costs classification :-</p> <p>Recycling was counted as disposal. This was because service expansion was justified from disposal savings, through the use of recycling credits. However, these are only applicable to Waste Disposal Authorities not a Unitaries. In addition, the costs of jointly operated HWRC and transfer stations were all classified as disposal, where a proportion should be a collection cost.</p> <p>Restating the performance indicators</p> <p>Waste Collection = £22.69 per head Ranking 21 / 26 Unitaries (4th Quartile)</p> <p>Waste Disposal = £21.98 per head Ranking 11/ 26 Unitaries (2nd Quartile)</p> <p>Overall Total Collection cost = £ 44.67 Unitary Average = £42.62</p> <p>Costs are 4.8% higher than average</p>	<p>Audit Commission Profile 04/05</p> <p><u>Scope</u> BVPI 84(a) Waste Collection per head =518 kg head (quartile 4th)</p> <p><u>Approach :</u> BVPI 91a - % households with kerbside recycling = 100% Unitary Average = 89.4% (1st Quartile)</p> <p><u>Performance</u> BV82 (a) Dry Recyclables = 20.13% Unitary Average = 14.10% (1st Quartile)</p> <p>BV82 (b) Composting = 11.54% Unitary Average = 6.5% (1st Quartile)</p> <p><u>ODPM Satisfaction 03/04</u> Waste Collection satisfaction = 86% Unitary Average = 83% (2nd Quartile) Recycling Service =78% Unitary Average = 66% (1st Quartile)</p> <p>The Beacon status of the waste services confirms the service as high performance.</p> <p>Performance is significantly higher than average</p>	<p>The underlying waste demand on the service is high.</p> <p>The council has approached this with a zero waste vision of high recycling and campaigns to minimise waste - BVPI 84 05/06 was lower at 475 Kg / head.</p> <p>The collection costs are therefore higher, but this realises savings in disposal to provide average overall costs.</p> <p>The service has been successful in engaging the public and has achieved top quartile recycling performance</p> <p>To ensure challenge to the weaker cost performance, the service is currently undertaking a full market review of waste collection services. As well as ensuring best value prices are obtained, the exercise is designed to bring forward innovation with regard to service provision, which will assist the authority in achieving its zero waste vision and avoid government penalties for landfill use.</p> <p>The disposal costs of the service are constrained by limited local facilities, with disposal presently transported by rail to Buckinghamshire incurring higher cost.</p>	G

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY CHECK - Public Transport

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance Assessment (RAG)
Public Transport	£3.1m	<p>Audit Commission Profile 04/05</p> <p>Public Transport = £13.59 per head Ranking 18 / 26 Unitaries (3rd Quartile)</p> <p>Derived from 04/05 RA forms Total Expenditure : £2.322m Concessionary Fares - £0.912m Supported Buses Route - £0.900m Co-ordination & Policy - £0.510m</p> <p>COST IS BELOW AVERAGE</p>	<p>Audit Commission Profile 04/05</p> <p>BVPI 102 Bus Passenger Journey 9.79m 3rd Quartile Unitary Average = 10.99m</p> <p><u>Customer Satisfaction (ODPM 03/04)</u></p> <p>BVPI 103 Transport Information 37% 4th Quartile</p> <p>BVPI 104 Local Bus Provision 42% 4th Quartile Unitary Average = 58%</p> <p>PERFORMANCE IS BELOW AVERAGE</p>	<p>The service's Annual Progress Report of July 2005 shows:</p> <p>The number of bus journeys in 2001/02 was 9.184m, and the target was for 1% growth p.a. The actual growth in the period was 2.2% p.a. Indicative 05/06 figures show that this trend is maintained against a national background of decline. The indicator is also difficult to determine, as it is not stated per head and numbers can be distorted by nature of different rural / urban councils. Customer satisfaction is being addressed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New infrastructure by Council and better enforcement of bus priorities. 2. New bus fleets of principal operators. 3. Provision of Public Transport Map to all 77,000 households 4. Investment in accessible "dial-a-ride" scheme for users unable to use commercial public transport. <p>Concessionary fare prices, reflect usage as well as prices of local operators This tends to lead to local anomalies. In additional, in 04/05 the council offered a discretionary token scheme, . This scheme allowed use in private taxis, but has now been discontinued for 06/07 with the saving re-invested in maintaining support to improved concessionary fares. The service is committed to a pro-active approach to improving the Quality of Public Transport, in line with the Council's Corporate Priorities.</p>	A

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY REVIEW - HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance
Highways Mtce	£5.0m	<p>Audit Commission Profile 04/05</p> <p>Highways Total Indicator shows spend per head = £37.75</p> <p>The key cost within this is spending on Roads & Bridges Construction Structural & Routine Maintenance = £29.79</p> <p>This is ranked 15/26 comparison authorities, where average = £29.48</p> <p>COST IS AVERAGE</p>	<p>Audit Commission Profile 04/05</p> <p>BVPI show condition of roads according to following classification.</p> <p>BV96- Principal roads = 37.84 (2nd Quartile)</p> <p>BV97a -Non Principal roads = 20.84 (4th Quartile)</p> <p>BV97b -Unclassified = 14.45 (2nd Quartile)</p> <p>PERFORMANCE IS AVERAGE</p>	<p>The indicators show average cost with broadly average performance. However, managers have difficulty in capturing the complexity of the service in accurate, repeatable Pls. This is a national problem and indicators are being updated to improve understanding.</p> <p>Future indicators need to reflect the split of both revenue and capital spend, potential 3rd party insurance claims and the condition of the network in relation to its remaining working life, and expenditure necessary to achieve a steady state. Public perceptions will also need to be addressed.</p>	A

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY CHECK - Social and Housing Services

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance Assessment (RAG)
Children and Family Services		Audit Commission Profile Ranked 17 out of 26 unitaries in spend. PSSEX1 Benchmarking 2005 Identified £539k underspend compared with average of family. Unit Costs below family average COST IS BELOW AVERAGE	CSCI Rating 2 star rating (maximum available 3 star) PERFORMANCE IS ABOVE AVERAGE		G
Older Peoples Services		Audit Commission Profile Ranked 18 out of 26 unitaries in spend PSSEX1 Benchmarking 2005 Identified £2.7m underspend compared with Unit costs are on the average of the family COST IS BELOW AVERAGE	CSCI Rating 2 star rating (maximum available 3 star) PAF Indicators Supported Admission per 10000 - 5 stars (Means we admit Numbers helped to live at home - 2 stars of 5 stars Waiting times for care packages is 4 stars As our supported admissions is low, the fact that our numbers helped to live at home is low is not a bad sign. i.e. we are a PERFORMANCE IS AVERAGE		G
Learning Difficulties		Audit Commission Profile Ranked 8 out of 26 unitaries in spend PSSEX1 Benchmarking 2005 Identified £1.1m spend above the average of the Top quartile of spend in family. Unit costs above average of family COST IS ABOVE AVERAGE	CSCI Rating 2 star rating (maximum available 3 star) PAF Indicators Numbers helped to live at home - 3 stars of 5 stars or Middle 40% - termed acceptable. PERFORMANCE IS AVERAGE	The learning difficulty service has a number of -pooled budget - strategic plan to reduce and high cost placements - Day Services strategy	A
Mental Health		Audit Commission Profile Ranked 9 out of 26 unitaries in spend PSSEX1 Benchmarking 2005 Identified £0.7m spend above the average of the Unit costs highest of family. COST IS ABOVE AVERAGE	CSCI Rating 2 star rating (maximum available 3 star) PAF Indicators Numbers helped to live at home - 5 stars of 5 or Top 10% but There are no other direct comparators in the PAF data for MH PERFORMANCE IS AVERAGE	A number of strategies for service redesign and reducing costs are being reported to and monitored by the JCB.	A
Physical Disabilities		Audit Commission Profile Ranked 23 out of 26 unitaries in spend PSSEX1 Benchmarking 2005 £1m underspend compared with family COST IS BELOW AVERAGE	CSCI Rating 2 star rating (maximum available 3 star) PAF Indicators Numbers helped to live at home - 2 stars of possible 5 stars. PERFORMANCE IS AVERAGE ?	This is a smaller service with small numbers involved.	G
Housing Services		Audit Commission Profile Ranked 3 out of 26 unitaries in spend for Other services Ranked 12th and 14th of 26 unitaries for COST IS ABOVE AVERAGE	Performance Assessment 2 star rating (maximum available 3 star) PERFORMANCE IS ABOVE AVERAGE	Authorities with Housing Revenue Accounts are known to meet management and support costs from the HRA. This would make their relative costs appear lower.	G

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY CHECK - Other Services

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance Assessment (RAG)
Libraries	£2.3m	Cost 12% below average and only 2% above Ranked 19 out of 26 unitaries in spend. COST IS BELOW AVERAGE	Resident satisfaction 3% below average but 3% above lowest PERFORMANCE IS BELOW AVERAGE	Although performance is below average it is better than would be expected given the low cost of the service	A
Planning	£2.9m	Audit Commission Profile Cost 22% above average and 78% above lowest quartile Ranked 8 out of 26 unitaries in spend. COST IS ABOVE AVERAGE	Against Average for other similar Unitaries Planning applications: Percentage of applications decided in target time -3% Planning applications: Percentage of applications granted -3% Appeal decisions in year -2% Appeal decisions in year: % allowed 36% Major planning applications: in 13 weeks (% BV 109 a) -23% Minor planning applications: in 8 weeks (% BV 109 b) -2% Other planning applications: in 8 weeks (% BV 109 c) -11% PERFORMANCE IS BELOW AVERAGE	High spend, but the Council has one of the highest volumes of applications per head of population. Also in view of the nature of the District, it has a significant number of complex and controversial cases to deal with. It receives a large number of issued building applications which receive no fee, but has to employ specialist employees to deal with the applications as well as other specialists which reflect the characteristics of the District. In recognition of the issue, the Service has increased on-line services and development via the Customer Access Programme.	A
Economic Development	£1.5m	Audit Commission Profile Cost 1% below average and 7% above lowest quartile Ranked 16 out of 26 unitaries in spend. COST IS BELOW AVERAGE	There are no readily available performance comparisons	Below average cost per head of population	A
Heritage Services	-£2.8m	Net profit equivalent to £46 per council tax payer in 2004/05 Unique in Local Government in operating at a profit COST IS BELOW AVERAGE - OPERATES AT A PROFIT	Resident satisfaction 27% above average Profitability of whole service measured against other Whole Service: Net contribution as % of total income 178% Whole Service: Net contribution per member of staff 85% Whole Service: Labour costs as a % of total income (low cost is best) -89% PERFORMANCE IS ABOVE AVERAGE ("TOP QUARTILE")	B&NES is the only Authority to operate its museum service at no cost to the Council Tax payer. Services for which charges are levied on tourists are provided free to local residents, who demonstrate the second highest levels of satisfaction with the service in the family group. The Service received an "excellent" rating in the 2002/03 VFM study of Culture and Leisure services. When compared with other leading visitor attractions Heritage Services (and the Roman Baths in	G
Tourism	£0.6m	Audit Commission Profile Cost 7% below average but 67% above lowest quartile Ranked 12 out of 26 unitaries in spend. COST IS BELOW AVERAGE		Marginally lower spend than average; however,	A
Emergency management	£0.2m	Audit Commission Profile Cost 160% ABOVE average and 308% above lowest quartile Ranked 2 out of 26 unitaries in spend. COST IS ABOVE AVERAGE		Relatively high cost per head of population	A

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY CHECK - Financial Services

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance Assessment														
Paying Bills - Creditors		Audit Commission Profile No information IPF Benchmarking 2005 <i>Total cost/invoice</i> B&NES = £1.49 UA Average = £1.68 (64 UAs) B&NES 11% lower than average = approx. £20k COST IS BELOW AVERAGE	Audit Committee Profile No information IPF Benchmarking 2005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productivity 17% higher than UA average • Compliance against best practice 9% higher than UA Best Value PIs <i>Prompt payment of invoices</i> B&NES 2005-06 = 89.1% (adjusted/unaudited) Top Quartile (UAs) 2004-05 - 93.3% Average = 88.5% Top Quartile (all England) 2004-05 = 95.4% Average = 91% April-May 06-07 = 93% PERFORMANCE IS SLIGHTLY ABOVE THE UA AVERAGE	Continued development of systems required to take more advantage of technology; self-service and e-procurement.	G														
Collecting Income - Debtors (excl. Council Tax)		Audit Commission Profile No information IPF Benchmarking Club 2005 <i>Total cost per invoice:</i> B&NES £4.72 UA Average = £8.85 (71UAs) = approx £170k <i>Total cost per £'000 raised:</i> B&NES £3.88 UA Average = £9.58 COST IS LOW	Audit Commission Profile No information IPF Benchmarking Club 2005 Debtor Day 50% of UA Average All other indicators (% debt cleared; credit notes; aged debt analysis) show high Compliance with good practice is 19% higher than the UA PERFORMANCE IS HIGH	Continued development of systems will be needed to maintain relative performance	G														
Accountancy		Audit Commission Profile No information IPF Benchmarking 2004 <i>Cost/£m Gross Revenue Turnover</i> B&NES £6.24 UAs £5.32 17% higher than UA average = £220k <i>Cost per £m spending</i> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Rev.</th> <th>Cap.</th> <th>Comb</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>B&NES</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£5.53</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£4.26</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£5.35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UA Average</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£4.97</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£3.02</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£4.61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> COSTS ARE HIGHER THAN AVERAGE		Rev.	Cap.	Comb	B&NES	£5.53	£4.26	£5.35	UA Average	£4.97	£3.02	£4.61	Audit Commission Profile No information CPA Use of Resources 2005 Financial Reporting - BANES/UA Average/Upper Tier Average 2 v 2.3 v 2.3 Financial Management - BANES/UA Average/Upper Tier Average 3 v 2.4 v 2.5 Financial Standing - BANES/UA Average/Upper Tier Average 3 v 2.6 v 2.6 PERFORMANCE IS AVERAGE TO ABOVE AVERAGE	Service appears to spend less on Strategy and Advice and more on preparing budgets and monitoring budgets than average. Disproportionately more spend on technical research and projects. The Council has made a conscious decision to provide adequate resources to manage its major and complex projects. This will inevitably have an impact on costs per £m capital and costs per £m revenue. This is borne out by the activity analysis which shows BaNES finance engaged in projects at a higher level than others.	A		
	Rev.	Cap.	Comb																
B&NES	£5.53	£4.26	£5.35																
UA Average	£4.97	£3.02	£4.61																
Council Tax Collection		IPF Benchmarking 2005 <i>Cost per Chargeable Dwelling</i> B&NES = £12.51 All Members Average = £15.82 B&NES 21% lower than average = approx. £235k COST IS LOW	IPF Benchmarking 2005 <i>% Paying by Direct Debit</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BaNES = 67%; Median = 58%; top quartile = 65.5% Best Value PIs <i>In Year Collection Rate</i> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tbody> <tr> <td>BaNES 2005-06</td> <td style="text-align: right;">97.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UA 2005-06 (27/46) Average</td> <td style="text-align: right;">96.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">BaNES is 5th out of the 27 UAs that responded to a survey</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UA Average 2004-05</td> <td style="text-align: right;">95.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UA Top Quartile 2004-05</td> <td style="text-align: right;">97.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All England Average 04/05</td> <td style="text-align: right;">97.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All England Top quartile 04/05</td> <td style="text-align: right;">98.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> PERFORMANCE IS GOOD	BaNES 2005-06	97.7%	UA 2005-06 (27/46) Average	96.6%	BaNES is 5th out of the 27 UAs that responded to a survey		UA Average 2004-05	95.8%	UA Top Quartile 2004-05	97.3%	All England Average 04/05	97.0%	All England Top quartile 04/05	98.3%		G
BaNES 2005-06	97.7%																		
UA 2005-06 (27/46) Average	96.6%																		
BaNES is 5th out of the 27 UAs that responded to a survey																			
UA Average 2004-05	95.8%																		
UA Top Quartile 2004-05	97.3%																		
All England Average 04/05	97.0%																		
All England Top quartile 04/05	98.3%																		

HIGH LEVEL VALUE FOR MONEY CHECK - Financial Services

Service	Cost 2006/07	Cost Performance	Service Performance	Comments/ Further Action	VFM Cost/ Performance Assessment (RAG) & Hold/ Squeeze/ Drive																
Business Rates Collection		<p>Audit Commission Profile No information</p> <p>IPF Benchmarking <i>The Council will be participating in the 2006</i></p> <p>COMPARATIVE COST IS UNKNOWN</p>	<p>Audit Commission Profile No information</p> <p>IPF Benchmarking 2005 • BaNES = 67%; Median = 58%; top quartile = 65.5%</p> <p>Best Value Pls <i>In Year Collection Rate</i></p> <table> <tr> <td>BaNES 2005-06</td> <td>97.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UA 2005-06 (27/46) Average</td> <td>98.6%</td> </tr> </table> <p>BaNES is 20th = out of the 27 UAs that responded to a</p> <table> <tr> <td>UA Average 2004-05</td> <td>98.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UA Top Quartile 2004-05</td> <td>99.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All England Average 04/05</td> <td>98.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All England Top quartile 04/05</td> <td>99.10%</td> </tr> </table> <p>PERFORMANCE IS BELOW AVERAGE/BOTTOM</p>	BaNES 2005-06	97.7%	UA 2005-06 (27/46) Average	98.6%	UA Average 2004-05	98.20%	UA Top Quartile 2004-05	99.10%	All England Average 04/05	98.50%	All England Top quartile 04/05	99.10%		A				
BaNES 2005-06	97.7%																				
UA 2005-06 (27/46) Average	98.6%																				
UA Average 2004-05	98.20%																				
UA Top Quartile 2004-05	99.10%																				
All England Average 04/05	98.50%																				
All England Top quartile 04/05	99.10%																				
Benefits		<p>Audit Commission Profile</p> <p>IPF Benchmarking 2005 <i>Gross cost per weighted case</i> B&NES £59.3 All Members £69.3 Lowest Quartile £56.7m</p> <p>COST IS LOW</p>	<p>Audit Commission Profile</p> <p>IPF Benchmarking 2005</p> <p>Best Value Pls <i>BV078a Days to Process New Claims</i></p> <table> <tr> <td>BaNES 2005-06</td> <td>42.1 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All England Median 04/05</td> <td>39 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All England Top quartile 04/05</td> <td>29 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Current BaNES (May 2006)</td> <td>29 days</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>BV078b Days to Process Change of Circumstances</i></p> <table> <tr> <td>BaNES 2005-06</td> <td>38.75 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All England Median 04/05</td> <td>12.3 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All England Top quartile 04/05</td> <td>7.4 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Current BaNES (May 2006)</td> <td>13 days</td> </tr> </table> <p>PERFORMANCE IS ABOVE AVERAGE (Based on current data)</p>	BaNES 2005-06	42.1 days	All England Median 04/05	39 days	All England Top quartile 04/05	29 days	Current BaNES (May 2006)	29 days	BaNES 2005-06	38.75 days	All England Median 04/05	12.3 days	All England Top quartile 04/05	7.4 days	Current BaNES (May 2006)	13 days	Costs are low and performance in 2005-06 significantly above average. However, the service has focused on clearing its backlog and current performance at or above average. The key issue is to maintain this significant improvement and build on it.	G
BaNES 2005-06	42.1 days																				
All England Median 04/05	39 days																				
All England Top quartile 04/05	29 days																				
Current BaNES (May 2006)	29 days																				
BaNES 2005-06	38.75 days																				
All England Median 04/05	12.3 days																				
All England Top quartile 04/05	7.4 days																				
Current BaNES (May 2006)	13 days																				
Internal Audit		<p>Audit Commission Profile</p> <p>IPF Benchmarking 2005</p> <p>Cost Per Audit Day £226 Unitary Average £250</p> <p>O/H Cost per Auditor £5K - Unitary Average £8k COST IS LOW</p>	<p>Audit Commission Profile</p> <p>IPF Benchmarking 2005</p> <p>Chargeable Days per Auditor - 170 Unitary Average - 165</p> <p>CPA Use of Resources Internal Control - BANES/UA Average/Upper Tier Average 2 v 2.3 v 2.3</p> <p>PERFORMANCE IS Average</p>		G																