Introduction and Key Issues

This report examines every indicator for every service within LGBF and provides analysis of the national trends and variations, both across councils and between councils. The structure of the report is in line with previous years' reports, although the range and depth of measures for education services has been significantly expanded.

This introductory section has been changed for this year's report. Rather than summarising and introducing the main sections of the report that follows, the aim is to highlight "key issues" that arise from this year's work, both from the statistical trends identified and exploration of those trends with councils. The key issues discussed in this year's report are:

1. Resilience and performance issues that are indicated by the data on expenditure and performance trends between 2010/11 and 2015/16.
2. Performance trends in education and their implications for educational reform.
3. Changes in home and residential care expenditure and provision and their implications.

Resilience and Performance: 2010/11 to 2015/16

Across the period of the LGBF, total current spending by Scottish councils has reduced by 11% in real terms from £17.18 billion to £15.30 billion. Local government's relative share of the Scottish budget has fallen and the NHS share has grown. Reduction in spend has been variable across service areas: education has been relatively protected (-4%), child protection has grown (+19%), adult social care has grown (+6%) and waste disposal spend has grown (+11%), the latter linked to the transition from landfill to recycling.

Other areas have had substantial cuts to spending. Leisure and culture services (-12%), parks and open spaces (-18%), roads maintenance (-21%) and corporate and democratic services (-14%). Even within prioritised areas, management and administration spend has been reduced in order to protect frontline spending. Despite average real reductions of 11% across the period, the vast majority of productivity, output and outcome measures have improved. For example:

- Council spend on sports and leisure facilities is down (-8%), charges are up, but attendance has grown (+16.8%). For libraries, spending has been reduced (-13%) but use of libraries has grown (+29.8%). The cost to councils per attendance/use in both cases has fallen by around 30%.
- Spending on roads has fallen by 21% across the period but the percentage of roads requiring maintenance has fallen slightly for all category of roads, i.e. roads condition has been preserved.
- Spending on secondary education has fallen by 8% across the period, linked to falling pupil numbers, but attainment overall, attainment on average and attainment of the most deprived pupils have all substantially improved (see below).

This absorption of major cuts while improving performance is an impressive achievement and there is a danger it is taken for granted: an assumption that, because savings have been made without a crisis of performance, savings can be continuously required and made. In reality, the trends above required an overall reduction in the workforce of 13%[1], staff accepting year on year real reductions in wages, and substantial improvements in efficiency, productivity and innovation. If similar savings were necessary again across the next five years, severe issues of capacity, resilience and maintaining performance will need addressed.

1 Source: Local Government Employment, Scottish Government, http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Labour-Market/PublicSectorEmployment/LAPSE

Table 1 – Changes in Real/Cash Expenditure since 2010/11 (£'000s)*

		Scotland Level						Change
		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	10/11-15/16
Education	Cash	£4,014,907	£3,921,455	£3,946,388	£3,978,658	£4,002,342	£4,119,409	2.6%
	Real	£4,306,546	£4,148,678	£4,089,182	£4,055,758	£4,019,990	£4,119,409	-4.3%
Adult Social Care**	Cash	£2,551,691	£2,560,691	£2,688,155	£2,756,271	£2,817,141	£2,901,600	13.7%
	Real	£2,737,044	£2,709,067	£2,785,422	£2,809,683	£2,829,563	£2,901,600	6.0%
Culture and Leisure	Cash	£444,284	£428,394	£431,864	£437,382	£421,654	£418,025	-5.9%
	Real	£476,556	£453,217	£447,490	£445,858	£423,513	£418,025	-12.3%
Environmental	Cash	£614,060	£606,631	£602,181	£613,440	£610,956	£635,057	3.4%
	Real	£658,665	£641,781	£623,970	£625,327	£613,650	£635,057	-3.6%
Roads	Cash	£675,073	£324,455	£603,907	£582,995	£542,216	£570,733	-15.5%
	Real	£724,110	£343,255	£625,758	£594,293	£544,607	£570,733	-21.2%
Planning	Cash	£169,189	£157,059	£179,744	£132,155	£125,446	£137,882	-18.5%
	Real	£181,478	£166,159	£186,248	£134,716	£125,999	£137,882	-24.0%
Central Support Services	Cash	£783,855	£806,185	£796,541	£757,513	£769,090	£834,211	6.4%
	Real	£840,794	£852,898	£825,363	£772,192	£772,481	£834,211	-0.8%

** Table 1 includes expenditure covered by the LGBF measures. While the LGBF measures reflect the significant areas of Local Government expenditure, there are some minor areas of spend excluded, which accounts for differences with Scottish Government published expenditure data.*

*** Two councils are excluded from these figures due to incomplete returns in 2010/11*

The Scottish Government is committed to growing the NHS budget by £500 million in real terms by 2021, fully protecting the police budget in real terms, and doubling the hours of free pre-school education and child care by 2021 at an estimated cost of £500 million. The Scottish budget is forecast to reduce across the period to 2020 by at least 3.3%, and potentially by more if devolved tax receipts grow more slowly than their UK equivalent. The implication is that other services, including those in local government, would have to reduce spend by 4% to 5% in real terms if the Scottish Government implements its priority commitments.

Within the local government settlement, education is already relatively protected and growth will be targeted particularly on areas of relatively high deprivation. Growth monies for social care are ring-fenced within the NHS budget and, given demographic pressures, spending on care for older people will need to grow. The implication is that services that took the largest reductions across the last five years will also face the largest reduction across the next. This will not only require fundamental transformational change in the organisation, design and delivery of the services, but a robust re-evaluation of policy choices and priorities over the next few years.

The forward work programme will provide a focus on non-prioritised and non-protected service areas to capture innovation in response to budget constraints, and to monitor changes in expenditure and performance over time. The growth of collaborative, joint arrangements will be monitored and the structure of LGBF itself modified over time to accommodate that.

Performance Trends in Education and Future Reform

At national and local level, education reform and improvement has high priority. Reducing inequality by reducing the "attainment gap" between deprived and non-deprived pupils has been a key goal for local councils for several years, and the "National Improvement Framework" (NIF) reflects the importance of this goal for Scotland. A review of education governance is also in progress.

Education is central to the opportunities and outcomes for children and young people, and to inclusive economic growth and development in Scotland. For this reason, an expanded suite of education measures is being developed and a range of new measures have been included this year. Further measures will be introduced as suitable data becomes available over future years to improve the scope and balance of information available on children's services. As well as existing measures of expenditure, cost per pupil and percentage of pupils achieving five passes at SCQF level 5 or higher and level 6 or higher, the tariff score at the point of leaving school[2] has been added. This is a summary measure of the number, level and grade of qualifications children had achieved during the senior phase. This can be measured back to 2011/12 and provides some information on trends over time. It also allows some comparisons to be made between more and less deprived pupils.

The trend data on senior phase attainment shows a very strong improving trend using these measures. Overall attainment (average tariff score) improved by around 14% but, within that, the most deprived pupils improved the most (25.5%). The table below shows the improvement by deprivation quintile (1 = most deprived; 5 = least deprived) from 2011/12 to 2015/16.

Table 1: Average Tariff Scores by Quintile

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2012-16
Average total tariff quintile 1	478	510	551	581	600	26%
Average total tariff quintile 2	618	644	685	716	739	20%
Average total tariff quintile 3	759	789	817	851	862	14%
Average total tariff quintile 4	909	929	962	984	997	10%
Average total tariff quintile 5	1101	1135	1149	1185	1195	9%
Average total tariff Scotland	770	798	827	860	875	13.7%

As can be seen, there appears to be a clear relationship between deprivation quintile and improvement: the more deprived, the greater the improvement. There is a strong, positive, statistically significant relationship between deprivation and improvement. This is a really important and impressive outcome. It reflects a strong emphasis on improving employability skills and wider achievement (much of which will not even be reflected in the tariff scale) of lower attaining pupils over recent years, with the introduction of Curriculum for Excellence and the Developing the Young Workforce agenda. Furthermore, it suggests the baseline for future reform should be this trend, not a single year, i.e. reform shoud be focused on enhancing the trend rate of improvement already established.

There is local variation around this national trend linked to two factors: the starting point for different councils in 2011/12 and the limitations of the measure itself. Those councils where children in the most deprived quintile were already achieving very highly in the base year have lower rates of improvement but also the highest tariff scores for that quintile in Scotland. Second, the measure gives a high weighting to qualifications with higher SCQF levels such as Highers, Advanced Highers and SVQs. Only SCQF learning programmes are included and so it does not include all accreditation that pupils achieve. It will not therefore reflect all learner journeys equally.

2 This refers to cumulative attainment either to the point of leaving school or to the end of S6.

More importantly, the measure does not control for the year in which pupils left school and so does not distinguish the attainment of pupils who left at the end of S4 with those leaving at the end of S6. Pupils from the most deprived quintile are more likely to leave school earlier than those from the least deprived quintile, most often to pursue continuing academic education in a college environment, or through vocational qualifications and apprenticeship options. As this is a school based measure, these are not subsequently tracked or scored and so it does not reflect attainment achieved in other settings after leaving school.

The pattern in the total tariff score data is replicated in the data on "5+ passes at SCQF level 5 or higher" and "5+ passes at SCQF level 6 or higher". Average improvement rate on these indicators between 2011/12 and 2015/16 was 15.7% and 26.9% respectively. For the most deprived quintile, it was almost double that: 34.5% and 50.0%. There is still a very substantial "gap" between the most deprived and the average. This will reflect a wide range of factors, including, as noted above, the different choices different pupils make, and the qualifications necessary to pursue them.

The trend data for senior phase attainment raised three important issues for future reform and improvement. First, future improvement programmes need to be focused on recognising, celebrating and then enhancing the **current improvement trend**. For example, total tariff score for the most deprived quintile has been improving at around 5% per annum anyway so any improvement or reform activities should commit to improving on that trend to add value.

Second, the evidence to support the idea of an "attainment gap" as a form of inequality requires further investigation. There is a risk we undermine both the value of vocational education and the importance of young people's own views if we regard not pursuing academic qualifications through to advanced higher level as a failure and an inequality. If young people attain what they need for their own chosen path, is this usefully viewed as an inequality **or** as a choice they have made about how they fulfil their potential? Given the investment in "Developing Scotland's Young Workforce", in apprenticeships and in full time vocational programmes in colleges, the latter would seem the more sensible approach. On that basis, the whole system has improved markedly in terms of both attainment and positive post school destinations across the period, but there will always be an "attainment gap" if pupils make different post school choices and require different school based attainment to access them.

Finally, in that context, measures of both attainment and outcome for education are presently crude and need developed, particularly as a better basis for comparison between councils. "Total tariff score" needs controlled for the year in which young people left school so that we compare like with like. This needs linked to not just immediate post school destinations but to measures of sustained participation in education, training or employment post school. The LGBF work programme for 2017/18 will investigate opportunities to improve measurement in both respects.

The overarching conclusion is that attainment is improving on average and very rapidly so for young people in the most deprived quintile. Forward reform and improvement programmes need designed in a manner that will add value to that trend and avoid disrupting or diverting current momentum. However, some of the variation which exists reflects different priorities and performance levels within local authorities and this will be explored and examined further within family groups over the coming period.

Trends in Adult Social Care

Spending on care for older people has grown in real terms across the period since 2010/11 (+6%) but not at the level necessary to keep up with demographic change (2%-3% per annum). The balance of care has shifted in line with policy across the period, with a growth in home care and a relative decline in residential places. As importantly, the number of people receiving home care has **decreased** over time (-5.8%) and the hours of care they receive on average has increased, i.e. in shifting the balance of care, a greater resource has become targeted on a smaller number of people with higher needs.[3] Self-directed support has grown steadily across the period from 1.6% to 6.7% of total spend. A comparison of the base year and 2015/16, therefore, shows real growth in budgets, and steady progress on priority objectives.

This picture is qualified if the more recent years, 2014/15 and 2015/16, are focused on and the trends above are linked to wider data on the health and care system. Across the two most recent years, spending on home care grew by 3.9% but the cost per hour of care increased by 6.1% and the number of hours provided fell by 2.1%. The number of older people placed in care homes grew by 1.2%, having fallen in previous years.

Discussions with councils suggest a variety of reasons for this change but two are important for future challenges. First, the phasing of the "living wage" for care workers will increase the unit cost of home care and reduce the hours a given level of budget can fund. Some of this pressure has been offset by additional resources provided through funding transfers from the NHS for social care. However, with only a one year settlement agreed, the future impact of this is presently unknowable. Second, many councils are experiencing capacity constraints in their local context and hours are falling because less supply is available. Care providers have indicated that this is, in part, a function of very short term contracts (often annual) that do not provide a secure basis for growth.

This has also to be seen against related trends. Over the period, the annual rate of delayed discharges from hospital has grown by 12%[4], and the rate of emergency admissions to hospital has grown by 8.8%[5]. Delayed discharges are directly related to inability to source and resource the appropriate package of care for a person, and growing numbers of emergency admissions may reflect the inability to provide preventative alternatives for frail and vulnerable older people.

Three issues need addressed. First, councils have given the highest priority to the care budget, at the cost of often severe cuts to other services. Adjusting for inflation, the adult care budget has grown by 6%. This has not been sufficient to keep up with demographic change and the Kings Fund estimate of 2% to 3% per annum real growth being necessary to do so may well be correct[6]. It is very hard to see how councils could achieve this as the overall budget falls by 2% to 3% in real terms per annum across the next few years.

Second, even if greater finances were available, there is a serious capacity issue in many parts of Scotland. Councils are no longer the major providers of home care in Scotland, and residential care is 94% provided by independent private or third sector providers[7]. The issue is market capacity and providing the commissioning and contractual frameworks that allow markets to grow. Short term, year-on-year contracts will not do this, but councils themselves have had exactly that for the last three years in terms of their own funding. The absence of certainty around future income streams may, therefore, be seen to be creating a market failure that is resulting in a reluctance for private and third-sector providers to invest in provision.

Finally, shifting the balance of care has involved targeting more hours of care on fewer people with high personal care requirements. The more preventative social and domestic support elements of care have declined and people are largely provided for when they already have high dependency. Free personal care entitlement drives this but loss of social support and prevention at this juncture is likely to be counter-productive in the longer term.

3 Source: Social Care Survey, Scottish Government: http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Health/Data/HomeCare/HSCDHomecare

4 Source: Delayed Discharges, Information Services Division, http://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Health-and-Social-Community-Care/Delayed-Discharges/. Please note that this figure relates to the period June 2013-2016.

5 Source: Emergency Admissions, Information Services Division, http://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Quality-Measurement-Framework/Emergency-Admissions/

6 The King's Trust 2013, *Spending on Health and Social Care Over the Next 50 Years: Why Think Long Term?* ,p43, available at: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/files/kf/field/field_publication_file/Spending%20on%20health%20...%2050%20years%20low%20res%20for%20web.pdf

7 Source: Care Home Census for Adults, Information Services Division, http://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Health-and-Social-Community-Care/Publications/data-tables.asp?id=1315#1315

The fastest growing age range in the Scottish population across the next 20 years is the 75+ range and within that the fastest growing segment is the 85+ group[8]. The health and care system is already stressed but demand is likely to double across that period. Current entitlements, funding mechanisms, and care market development strategies need urgently reviewed to address that in order to develop a system that is sustainable and affordable.

The forward work programme in LGBF will develop a wider range of measures that allow demand, spend, capacity and impact to be monitored over time. Work with Health and Care Partnerships in the forthcoming year will focus on establishing market capacity measures and measures of assessed demand.

The LGBF Approach

The core purpose of the exercise is benchmarking. That is making comparisons on spending, performance and customer satisfaction between similar councils so that all councils can identify their strengths and weaknesses and learn from those who are achieving the best performance in order to improve local service delivery throughout Scotland. All councils continue to participate in these collective efforts towards self-improvement.

Our approach means that there are three core points to bear in mind:

1. It is important when looking at councils to compare like with like.
2. The focus presented in this report is on variations in spending and performance that councils can directly control.
3. The aim is to help councils improve and become more cost effective in delivering local services and, through that, support people in improving their life outcomes.

The benchmarking framework reported here lends itself to any type of comparison councils or citizens wish to make. What it does not support is a crude "league table" assessment: it would be as misleading to assess the performance of councils with high levels of deprivation without taking account of that as it would be to explore the performance of island councils without noting they are island groups with a very distinctive population distribution.

The purpose is to create a framework that supports evidence-based comparisons and, through that, shared learning and improvement. The indicators in the LGBF are high level indicators, and are designed to focus questions on why variations in cost and performance are occurring between similar councils. They do not supply the answers. That happens as councils engage with each other to 'drill down' and explore why these variations are happening. That process of engagement, analysis and discussion provides the platform for learning and improvement.

Councils have begun to work together to 'drill-down' into the benchmarking data across a number of service areas. This process has been organised around 'family groups' of councils so that we are comparing councils that are similar in terms of the type of population that they serve (e.g. relative deprivation and affluence) and the type of area in which they serve them (e.g. urban, semi-rural, rural). The point of comparing like with like is that this is more likely to lead to useful learning and improvement. Examples of best practice emerging from this collaboration are being shared across all local authorities and are being used to inform local improvement activity within self-evaluation, service review, and service planning processes.

There is a continued commitment to make benchmarking information available to all citizens and users of council services. To further this end, an online benchmarking public reporting tool has been designed called 'My Local Council'[9] and is incorporated within councils' own local approaches

8 Source: Population Projections, National Records of Scotland, https://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/statistics-and-data/statistics/statistics-by-theme/population/population-projections/population-projections-scotland

9 http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/benchmarking/tool.html

to public performance reporting. All of the information generated by the LGBF is presented in this online benchmarking tool which contains “dashboards” for each council showing movement on indicators across the six years covered, and a comparison with the Scottish and family group average for all indicators.

Those interested in further reading may wish to visit the Community Planning Outcomes Profile[10] , an interactive tool which provides further information on outcomes, both at a local authority level, and also at a locality level.

The LGBF Framework

The framework is based on seven overall service groupings which cover the major public facing services provided to local communities, and the support services necessary to do that. This includes children’s services (education and children and families services), adult social care, environmental services, culture and leisure, housing, corporate support services and economic development and planning.

To develop precise indicators of cost and performance for comparison between councils, these broad service categories are divided into more specific sub-categories. For example, children’s services divide into: pre-school education; primary education; secondary education; and child care and protection. For each category, standard indicators of spend and performance have been applied.

A full list of service categories and indicators is attached (see Appendix 1) and full technical specifications for all 80 indicators, including source details, are available on the Local Government Benchmarking website.

The sources used to populate the measures include statistical returns to the Scottish Government, Scottish Qualifications Authority, the Scottish Housing Regulator and SEPA, among others. Where data is not currently collected/published by another body, or where the publication timeframe does not allow inclusion within the benchmarking framework, councils provide data directly to the Improvement Service. The Scottish Household Surveys and the Health and Care Experience Surveys are used to provide customer satisfaction measures.

This framework is iterative and councils continue to collaborate to strengthen indicators and address framework gaps. We welcome public views in relation to how to further improve this benchmarking framework and particularly if there are other measures which might usefully be included.

You can provide feedback and suggestions by visiting our website.
(www.improvementservice.org.uk/benchmarking).

The Purpose of this Report

This report is an overview report and does not seek to replicate the depth and detail of the ‘My Local Council’ tool[11]. The focus is on three important areas:

1. Trends across Scotland for the key framework indicators covering the period 2010/11 to 2015/16. For consistency we report the data in financial rather than calendar years. For each unit cost indicator we have calculated the change over the period in cash and in real terms, that is taking account of the impact of inflation over time. To explore change over time we focused on the **real term change.**

2. The level of variation across councils and factors shaping these trends include physical

10 http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/community-planning-outcomes-profile.html

11 http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/benchmarking/tool.html

geography, population distribution, size of council and the impact of deprivation.[12] Graphs are presented showing the level of variation across councils for each area benchmarking measure. To improve interpretation, these graphs include only the base year and the two most recent years.

3. Identification of areas where unexplained variation exists and significant improvement might be achieved by all councils getting close to the "best in class".

Before examining each section in turn, Table 2 below presents an overview of the trends across all LGBF indicators.

12 Correlation analysis and Mann-Whitney/Wilcoxon Two-Sample Tests were carried out to establish where statistically significant relationships exist between framework indicators and levels of deprivation, rurality, population distribution and size of council.

Table 2: Overview of Local Government Benchmarking Framework Indicators

	Indicator Description	Scotland						Change*	
		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	% change base* to 15-16	% change 14-15 to 15-16
Children's Services	Cost per primary school pupil	5,222	5,070	4,924	4,825	4,684	4,733	-9.4%	1.1%
	Cost per secondary school pupil	6,888	6,688	6,659	6,659	6,618	6,737	-2.2%	1.8%
	Cost per pre-school education place	3,604	3,270	3,219	3,066	3,324	3,854	6.9%	15.9%
	Percentage of secondary pupils achieving 5 or more awards at level 5 or higher		51.0	53.0	55.0	57.0	59.0	8.0%	2.0%
	Percentage of secondary pupils achieving 5 or more awards at level 6 or higher		26.0	27.0	29.0	31.0	33.0	7.0%	2.0%
	Percentage of pupils living in the 20% most deprived areas gaining 5+ awards at level 5 or higher		29.0	32.0	34.0	37.0	39.0	10.0%	2.0%
	Percentage of pupils living in the 20% most deprived areas gaining 5+ awards at level 6 or higher		10.0	11.0	14.0	14.0	15.0	5.0%	1.0%
	The gross cost of "children looked after" in residential based services per child per week	3,015	3,189	3,036	3,165	3,185		5.6%	0.6%
	The gross cost of "children looked after" in a community setting per child per week	220	234	259	269	280		27.3%	3.8%
	Balance of care for 'looked after children': percentage of children being looked after in the community	91.0	91.2	90.9	90.6	90.1		-0.9%	-0.5%
	Percentage of adults satisfied with local schools	83.0		83.0	81.0	79.0	74.0	-9.0%	-5.0%
	Proportion of pupils entering positive destinations	88.9	89.9	91.4	92.3	92.9		4.0%	0.6%
	Overall average total tariff		769.7	798.0	826.8	860.0	875.2	13.7%	1.8%
	Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 1		478.0	510.0	551.0	581.0	600.0	25.5%	3.3%
	Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 2		618.0	644.0	685.0	716.0	739.0	19.6%	3.2%
	Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 3		759.0	789.0	817.0	851.0	862.0	13.6%	1.3%
	Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 4		909.0	929.0	962.0	984.0	997.0	9.7%	1.3%
	Average total tariff SIMD Quintile 5		1,101.0	1,135.0	1,149.0	1,185.0	1,195.0	8.5%	0.8%

	Indicator Description	Scotland						Change*	
		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	% change base* to 15-16	% change 14-15 to 15-16
Corporate Services	Support services as a % percentage of total gross expenditure	4.9	5.2	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.4	0.6%	0.4%
	Cost of democratic core per 1,000 population	35,907	33,292	32,928	32,646	30,829	29,981	-16.5%	-2.8%
	The percentage of the highest paid 5% employees who are women	46.3	48.5	48.7	50.7	51.7	51.9	5.6%	0.2%
	The gender pay gap						4.98		
	The cost per dwelling of collecting Council Tax	14.81	13.91	13.77	12.36	11.00	10.34	-30.2%	-6.0%
	(Domestic noise) average time (hours) between time of complaint and attendance on site, for those requiring attendance on site	47.8	31.6	43.2	80.7	58.9	70.3	47%	19.4%
	Sickness absence days per teacher	6.6	6.2	6.6	6.1	6.3	6.1	-7.4%	-2.6%
	Sickness absence days per employee (non-teacher)	10.8	10.4	10.9	10.3	10.8	10.6	-1.5%	-1.5%
	Percentage of income due from Council Tax received by the end of the year	94.7	95.1	95.2	95.2	95.5	95.7	1.0%	0.2%
	Percentage of invoices sampled that were paid within 30 days	89.5	90.2	90.5	91.9	92.5	92.8	3.3%	0.2%
Adult Social Care	Home care costs per hour for people aged 65 or over	21.60	20.92	21.21	20.65	20.33	21.58	-0.1%	6.1%
	SDS spend on adults 18+ as a percentage of total social work spend on adults 18+	1.6	3.0	5.9	6.4	6.9	6.7	5.1%	-0.2%
	Percentage of people aged 65 or over with intensive needs receiving care at home	32.2	33.0	34.1	34.3	35.3	34.8	2.5%	-0.6%
	Percentage of adults receiving any care or support who rate it as excellent or good.					85.0	84.0	-1.0%	-1.0%
	Percentage of adults supported at home who agree that their services and support had an impact in improving or maintaining their quality of life					84.0	81.0	-3.0%	-3.0%
	Residential costs per week per resident for people aged 65 or over	416.83	421.39	384.96	368.45	374.29	368.85	-11.5%	-1.5%

	Indicator Description	Scotland						Change*	
		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	% change base* to 15-16	% change 14-15 to 15-16
Culture & Leisure Services	Cost per attendance at sports facilities	3.81	3.41	3.25	3.25	2.98	2.99	-21.4%	0.6%
	Cost per library visit	3.66	3.45	3.26	2.62	2.46	2.44	-33.2%	-1.0%
	Cost of museums per visit	4.52	3.69	3.73	3.43	3.24	3.07	-32.1%	-5.2%
	Cost of parks and open spaces per 1,000 population	27,814	25,688	24,518	23,748	23,509	22,232	-20.1%	-5.4%
	Percentage of adults satisfied with libraries	84.0		83.0	81.0	77.0	74.0	-10.0%	-3.0%
	Percentage of adults satisfied with parks and open spaces	83.0		86.0	86.0	86.0	85.0	2.0%	-1.0%
	Percentage of adults satisfied with museums and galleries	76.0		78.0	76.0	75.0	71.0	-5.0%	-4.0%
	Percentage of adults satisfied with leisure facilities	75.0		80.0	78.0	76.0	73.0	-2.0%	-2.3%
Environmental Services	Net cost of waste collection per premise			61.26	62.50	65.41	63.40	3.5%	-3.1%
	Net cost of waste disposal per premise			95.62	93.80	91.47	97.02	1.5%	6.1%
	Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population	21,294	20,503	18,169	16,557	15,886	15,480	-27.3%	-2.6%
	Street Cleanliness score	95.40	96.14	95.80	96.09	93.90	93.40	-2.0%	-0.5%
	Cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads	13,896	12,462	11,954	11,307	10,352	10,791	-22.3%	4.2%
	Percentage of A class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	30.3	30.5	29.4	28.7	29.0	29.0	-1.3%	-0.1%
	Percentage of B class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	35.8	36.3	35.0	35.2	36.1	34.8	-1.0%	-1.3%
	Percentage of C class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	35.0	36.0	34.8	36.6	37.3	34.7	-0.3%	-2.6%
	Percentage of U class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	41.9	38.3	40.1	39.4	39.3	40.1	-1.8%	0.8%
	Cost of trading standards per 1,000 population			5,502	5,809	5,764	5,873	6.7%	1.9%
	Cost of environmental health per 1,000 population			17,750	18,621	17,776	16,849	-5.1%	-5.2%
	Percentage of total household waste arising that is recycled	38.7	41.0	41.7	42.2	42.8	44.3	5.6%	1.5%
	Percentage of adults satisfied with refuse collection	81.0		83.0	83.0	84.0	82.0	1.0%	-2.0%
	Percentage of adults satisfied with street cleaning	73.0		75.0	74.0	74.0	73.0	0%	-1.0%

	Indicator Description	Scotland						Change*	
		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	% change base* to 15-16	% change 14-15 to 15-16
Housing Services	Gross rent arrears (all tenants) as at 31 March each year as a percentage of rent due for the reporting year				5.6	5.9	6.2	0.7%	0.3%
	Percentage of rent due in the year that was lost due to voids	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.1	-0.2%	-0.1%
	Percentage of council dwellings meeting Scottish Housing Standards	53.6	66.1	76.6	83.7	90.4	92.5	38.9%	2.1%
	Percentage of repairs completed within target times	93.3	93.6	93.1				-0.2%	-0.5%
	Average length of time taken to complete non-emergency repairs				10.2	9.9	9.4	7.7%	5.1%
	Percentage of council dwellings that are energy efficient	74.9	81.2	88.8	94.0	96.5	96.2	21.3%	-0.4%
Corporate Asset	Proportion of operational buildings that are suitable for their current use	73.70	74.80	75.90	78.21	79.01	79.61	5.9%	0.6%
	Proportion of internal floor area of operational buildings in satisfactory condition	81.30	82.70	82.64	80.92	82.92	81.49	0.2%	-1.4%
Economic Development	Percentage of unemployed people assisted into work from council operated / funded employability programmes			9.56	12.48	14.14	13.91	4.3%	-0.2%
	Cost per planning application	5,243	5,061	6,412	4,524	4,270	4,832	-7.8%	13.2%
	Average time per commercial planning application			12.96	12.88	10.95	11.19	-13.6%	2.2%
	Percentage of procurement spent on local small/medium enterprises	20.9	20.5	20.3	19.6	19.6	19.7	-1.2%	0.1%
	No of Business Gateway start-ups per 10,000 population				19.0	18.9	16.9	-11.1%	-10.5%