Introduction

Trends and Key Issues

This section of the report highlights a number of key trends and issues at national level that cut across the more disaggregated data on individual councils and services presented across the rest of this report. The trends highlighted this year are:

(i) The continuing downward pressure on council budgets.

(ii) The continued improvement in pupil attainment over time, and in post school destinations.

(iii) The continued improvement in take up of leisure and cultural services.

The current and potential future issues raised by these trends are discussed in context below.

(i) Continuing Pressure on Council Budgets

Across the period from 2010/11 to 2016/17, total current revenue funding for councils has fallen by 7.6% in real terms (taking account of inflation across the period)[2]. This real-terms reduction in Scottish Government funding has created growing pressures on council budgets, the impact of which has not been felt equally across all council services. Table 1 below illustrates the different expenditure trends for different service areas.

As can be seen, education spending has been relatively protected, and child protection and social care spending have grown substantially in cash and real terms. As these account for over 70% of the benchmarked expenditure within the LGBF, other services have taken much more substantial reductions. Expenditure on roads has fallen by 20% in real terms, on planning by 33% and on culture and leisure services by 17%. This reflects national priorities in education and care, and “ringfencing” and targeting of grants from Scottish Government through conditionalities. The effect has been to create a block of “protected” services (education, child protection and care) and a block of “unprotected” services (all the rest).

Within that context, there has still been variation between councils in spending patterns, reflecting different population trends, different challenges and different priorities in different parts of Scotland. Table 2 below shows the variation around the average across the 32 councils in Scotland.

2 Audit Scotland, Local Government in Scotland, Financial Overview 2016-17

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	2016-17	% Change from 2010/11 to 2016/17	% Change from 2015/16 to 2016/17
Education	Cash	£3,989,588	£3,903,522	£3,930,928	£3,963,880	£3,986,728	£4,094,762	£4,222,825	5.8%	3.1%
	Real	£4,388,117	£4,232,470	£4,175,442	£4,139,736	£4,104,105	£4,187,130	£4,222,825	-3.8%	0.9%
Looked After Children	Cash	£370,787	£395,030	£412,609	£431,076	£452,913	£471,420	£484,777	30.7%	2.8%
	Real	£407,826	£428,319	£438,274	£450,201	£466,248	£482,054	£484,777	18.9%	0.6%
Social Care	Cash	£2,553,788	£2,585,837	£2,672,604	£2,738,703	£2,796,594	£2,876,228	£2,986,620	16.9%	3.8%
	Real	£2,808,892	£2,803,744	£2,838,847	£2,860,204	£2,878,931	£2,941,109	£2,986,620	6.3%	1.5%
Culrture and Leisure	Cash	£444,164	£428,258	£431,687	£437,163	£421,352	£411,572	£405,626	-8.7%	-1.4%
	Real	£488,533	£464,347	£458,539	£456,558	£433,757	£420,856	£405,626	-17.0%	-3.6%
Environmental	Cash	£686,292	£679,538	£673,868	£687,391	£679,422	£702,981	£690,300	0.6%	-1.8%
	Real	£754,847	£736,802	£715,784	£717,887	£699,426	£718,839	£690,300	-8.6%	-4.0%
Roads	Cash	£628,695	£572,060	£547,915	£532,617	£518,845	£533,407	£554,057	-11.9%	3.9%
	Real	£691,497	£620,267	£581,997	£556,246	£534,121	£545,439	£554,057	-19.9 %	1.6%
Planning	Cash	£169,185	£157,054	£179,738	£132,148	£125,441	£136,933	£123,984	-26.7%	-9.5%
	Real	£186,085	£170,289	£190,918	£138,011	£129,134	£140,022	£123,984	-33.4%	-11.5%
Central Support Services	Cash	£783,855	£806,185	£796,541	£757,513	£769,090	£790,597	£742,589	-5.3%	-6.1%
	Real	£862,156	£874,122	£846,088	£791,120	£791,734	£808,431	£742,589	-13.9%	-8.1%

Note: 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. All trends represent gross expenditure, except Culture and Leisure and Residential Social Care which are based on net expenditure.

Table 2 – Variation in Spending Patterns Across Councils in Scotland (£000s)

		Scotland 2010-11	Scotland 2016-17	Scotland % Change from 2010/11 to 2016/17	Range Among Local Authorities % Change from 2010/11 to 2016/17
Education	Cash	£3,989,588	£4,222,825	5.8%	-12% to 18.6%
	Real	£4,388,117	£4,222,825	-3.8%	-20% to 7.8%
Looked After Children	Cash	£370,787	£484,777	30.7%	-28.6% to 121.9%
	Real	£407,826	£484,777	18.9%	-35.1% to 101.8%
Social Care	Cash	£2,553,788	£2,986,620	16.9%	-11.4% to 41.2%
	Real	£2,808,892	£2,986,620	6.3%	-19.5% to 28.4%
Culture and Leisure	Cash	£444,164	£405,626	-8.7%	-37.2% to 36.5%
	Real	£488,533	£405,626	-17.0%	-42.9% to 24.1%
Environmental	Cash	£686,292	£690,300	0.6%	-30% to 38.9%
	Real	£754,847	£690,300	-8.6%	-36.4% to 26.3%
Roads	Cash	£628,695	£554,057	-11.9 %	-52.6% to 94%
	Real	£691,497	£554,057	-19.9%	-56.9% to 76.4%
Planning	Cash	£169,185	£123,984	-26.7%	-65.7% to 68%
	Real	£186,085	£123,984	-33.4%	-68.9% to 52.8%
Central Support Services	Cash	£783,855	£742,589	-5.3%	-62.3% to 77.3%
	Real	£862,156	£742,589	-13.9%	-65.8% to 61.2%

Issues

Three key issues are raised by the trend data above. First, given the Scottish Fiscal Commission's projections of economic and fiscal pressures, it is likely that councils face continuing funding reductions for the foreseeable future. Recent analysis has shown the scale of additional expenditure required just to keep pace with the inflationary and demographic pressures facing local authorities. In 2018/19, for example, an additional £545 million (an increase of 5.7%) is estimated to be necessary simply to stand still[3] . Efficiency and productivity gains have already been made, and sustaining services across the last five years has depended on staff accepting real reductions in wages. Although greater exploitation of digital can improve productivity, it will be harder to reproduce the efficiency and productivity gains of the last five years again, especially if pay increases for staff are higher than in recent years with a consequential upward pressure on wage costs (around 60% of total costs).

Second, the relative priority for education, child protection and adult care makes policy sense given the economic, productivity and demographic challenges Scotland faces. However, it has meant that across the last five years, education and care have taken a progressively larger share of council budgets: 5% more between 2010/11 and 2016/17, increasing from 70% to 75% of benchmarked service expenditure. If that continues, there will be much greater pressure on other service budgets, and they have already taken much greater reductions across the last five years. Some of these are critical to Scotland's post Brexit offer (the quality of infrastructure, the integrity and responsiveness of the regulatory system), and some are central to health and wellbeing priorities (leisure and cultural services). If further substantial reductions are necessary, a much more fundamental and transformative change will be necessary and that will require local and national government to work together.

3 Improvement Service, Projected Cost Pressures for Scottish Local Government, 2017, http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/research.html

Finally, three related financial and fiscal issues should be noted. The level of spending that has been sustained across the last period has depended on use of reserves, but reserves are an exhaustible resource. As Audit Scotland has noted, many councils have depleted their reserves and it will be hard to rebuild them, given spending pressures. This is positively offset by the removal of the council tax freeze and the ability to raise council tax by up to 3% each year. The increased yield from the higher council tax bands will also contribute. Whether this offsets service budget cuts, or simply contributes to meeting wage pressures and reduced ability to deploy reserves is not yet clear. The increased income from charges has also helped to sustain the level of spending across the period. However, there may be limited market tolerance to this particularly for lower income households.

(ii) Continuing improvement in attainment

The 2016/17 data shows a continuing improvement in the attainment of Scottish school leavers. Table 3 provides the data from 2011/12 to 2016/17.

Table 3 - Average Tariff Scores by Quintile

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	% change 2011-12 to 2016-17
Overall Average Total Tariff	770	798	827	860	877	886	15.1%
Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 1	478	510	551	581	603	624	30.5%
Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 2	618	644	685	716	740	750	21.4%
Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 3	759	789	817	851	864	880	15.9%
Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 4	909	929	962	984	998	999	9.9%
Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 5	1101	1135	1149	1185	1196	1207	9.6%

As the table shows, the Scottish average tariff score has improved consistently across the period, overall by 15%, and pupils from the most deprived areas (SIMD quintile 1) have the fastest rate of improvement (30.5% across the period of 5% per annum). This has occurred despite a real reduction in spending per pupil (around 8%). The tariff score data is supported by the data on the percentage of pupils gaining 5+ qualifications at N5/standard grade, and highers. Again, the most improved group are the most deprived (SIMD quintile 1), albeit from a low base.

The data on post school destinations also shows improvement with 40.3% of school leavers going directly into higher education.[4] The UK Government's "initial participation" measure, participation in higher education between the ages of 17 and 30, records the Scottish rate as 56%[5] against an English rate of 49%[6]. In summary, the current generation of Scottish school leavers is the best qualified in our history, with the highest rate of participation in higher education in our history both directly from school and subsequently.

As the data also shows, there is still major inequalities in attainment between the most deprived pupils and others and in participation in higher education. These are the lowest ever recorded (in 2016/17) but they are still unacceptably high. There are also very varying outcomes for pupils from similar backgrounds between councils and between schools. Continuing reform and improvement is essential but it should be based on recognising the consistent pattern of improvement across the last six years despite the resource constraints in place.

4 Scottish Government initial Destinations of Senior Phase School Leavers, 2017, http://www.gov.scot/publications/2017/03/2421

5 Scottish Funding Council, Statistical publication, 2017 http://www.sfc.ac.uk/web/FILES/Statistical_publications_SFCST062017_HigherEducationStudentsandQualifiersatS/SFCST062017_HE_Students_and_Qualifiers_2015-16.pdf

6 Department of Education, participation rates in Higher Education, 2017 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/648165/HEIPR_PUBLICATION_2015-16.pdf

Three issues are raised by the above data. First, it is critical to ensure that the continued education reform process does not disrupt the stable and consistent improvement trend already there, as schools, councils and regional improvement collaboratives adjust to new roles and relationships. This is not about whether continued reform occurs but how it is designed and implemented.

Second, education reform needs linked to wider social welfare and economic policy. Ensuring children from deprived backgrounds realise their full potential is essential but so also is ensuring that fewer Scottish families experience deprivation. This will require education to be part of a multi-agency approach and schools to be hubs for wider public service support.

Third, although the sharply improved higher education participation rate is welcomed, around 30% of Scottish graduates are not in graduate employment one year after graduation. Educational improvement is an important part of national strategy for improving growth, productivity and investment in Scotland but also vice versa: if young people experience limited opportunities at the end of their educational journey, it will be harder to maintain motivation and momentum within education itself.

(iii) Continued improvement in uptake and use of leisure and cultural services

Despite a real reduction in spend of 17%, leisure and cultural services have sharply increased their use rates and reduced theirs costs per use. Table 4 gives the data for sports, libraries and museums.

Table 4 – Culture and Leisure Services Expenditure and Use

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	% change 2010-11 to 2016-17
Cost per attendance at Sports facilities (£)	3.91	3.50	3.33	3.33	3.05	2.98	2.90	-25.9%
Net Expenditure Sports facilities (£000s)	177569	168626	172085	177614	160774	158429	156828	-11.7%
No. Of Attendances	45459818	48202343	51624697	53320837	52705262	53084305	54149045	19.1%
Cost Per Library Visit (£)	3.75	3.53	3.35	2.69	2.53	2.50	1.98	-47.1%
Net Expenditure Libraries (£000s)	119188	113304	110636	108569	103271	103258	92831	-22.1%
No of Library Vists	31800305	32074635	33066250	40415254	40898758	41281169	46864184	47.4%
Cost of Museums per Visit (£)	4.62	3.76	3.81	3.49	3.43	3.11	3.19	-31.0%
Net Expenditure Museums & Galleries (£000s)	42840	44076	42265	40752	40864	39428	39329	-8.2%
No of museum visits	9270129	11707609	11102498	11670085	11917948	12663109	12334652	33.1%

As can be seen, the growth in use has been spectacular, particularly for libraries and museums, and the reduction in unit cost equally so. This suggests the management of retrenchment in these services, and service redesign for charged circumstances, has been very effective. The data however raises a range of issues. First, the data reflects "net spending", i.e. net of income raised from fees and charges. If the data was purely for the public budget, the spending reductions for sports facilities would be much greater. Reductions in public funding have been offset by increasing charges and increasing market share. Given the new public health agenda in Scotland, the importance of physical activity to health, and increasing rates of obesity, it is critical that growing income does not "price out" the people that most need brought into participation. Current attendance data does not allow analysis of who is using the service and better monitoring of that is necessary.

Second, the overwhelming bulk of funding for sports and leisure facilities comes from councils or from fees and charges. Given the preventative role of these services in maintaining physical and mental health and wellbeing, other public authorities need to consider funding programmes. As most provision is through leisure and culture trusts, dependence solely on council budgets is both unnecessary and restrictive.

Finally, the library service is now the major source of online access for people who are digitally excluded. This is critical around welfare and employability and the ongoing roll out of UK welfare reform assumes that claimants are supported to access benefits online. Continuing budget reductions on the scale of the last five years will jeopardise that and support for libraries could be examined as part of devolved welfare arrangements in Scotland.

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 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 is 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 very 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 provides the platform for learning and improvement.

Councils continue to work together to 'drill-down' into the benchmarking data across service areas. This process has been organised around 'family groups' (see Appendix 2) 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. Further information, briefing notes and case studies are available on the LGBF website.[7]

7 http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/benchmarking/

The benchmarking data should not be considered in isolation. To support this, there is a growing focus to better align the benchmarking data with outcomes. A new online interactive tool[8] links the LGBF with outcomes data presented in the Community Planning Outcomes Profile[9] (a resource which provides trend data on outcomes, both at a local authority level, and at a locality level). This will help to strengthen the narrative around the contribution council services play in improving outcomes, and support more strategic use of the LGBF in decision making and greater visibility within Public Performance Reporting.

The introduction of thematic reporting in 2018/19 will provide a 'drill down' into key policy areas to re-emphasise the 'can opener' nature of the LGBF information and strengthen the link between performance information and outcomes. This will encourage a more diagnostic use of the data, particularly within family groups. These developments will link with the Outcomes, Evidence and Performance Board (OEPB)[10] and support their work to improve the availability of performance evidence that can illuminate improvement in outcomes.

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'[11] and is incorporated within councils own local approaches 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.

LGBF Framework Indicators

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 child care), 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.

This year, the suite of measures for children and young people has been expanded. This is to reflect the strategic priority given to improving outcomes for children and young people across Scotland, and to provide a more holistic picture of children's services to help inform decision making and target improvements. This suite now includes:

- Percentage of children meeting developmental milestones (27-30 months)
- Percentage of funded early years provision rated good/better
- School attendance rates (all pupils & looked after children)
- School exclusion rates (all pupils & looked after children)
- Participation rates for 16-19 year olds
- Child protection re-registrations within 18 months
- Percentage of looked after children with more than one placement in the last year

8 http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/benchmarking/outcomes-tool.html
9 http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/community-planning-outcomes-profile.html
10 www.improvementservice.org.uk/oepb
11 http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/benchmarking/tool.html

Unfortunately, 2016/17 figures are not yet available for most of these new measures and they are not therefore included in this overview report. The framework has, however, been updated to incorporate historic data, and will be refreshed with 2016/17 data as soon as this is available. Additionally, the introduction of thematic reporting will enable inclusion of this data when it is available.

A full list of service categories and indicators is attached (Appendix 1) and full technical specifications for all 75 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 it is published too late to 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 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 local context or interpretation provided by each council via their Public Performance Reporting or the depth and detail of the 'My Local Council' tool.[12]

The focus of this report is on three important areas:

1. Trends across Scotland for the key framework indicators covering the period 2010/11 to 2016/17 inclusive. For consistency, all data is presented as financial years though some data may be for calendar years or academic 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 impact of inflation over time. To explore change over time we focused on the **real term change** but to allow for other comparisons we have also included the cash figures for each relevant indicator
2. The level of variation across councils and factors shaping these trends including physical geography, population distribution, size of council and the impact of deprivation[13]. Graphs are presented showing the level of variation across councils for each benchmarking measure. To improve interpretation, these graphs include only the base year and 2 most recent years.
3. Identification of areas where unexplained variation exists, providing opportunities where councils may wish to target improvements and/or efficiencies.

Before examining each section in turn, Table 5 below presents an overview of the trends across all LGBF indicators.

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

13 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 5: Overview of Local Government Benchmarking Framework Indicators 2016/17

	Indicator Description	Scotland							Change*	
		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	%/value change base* to 16/17	%/value change 15/16 to 16/17
Children's Services	Cost Per Primary School Pupil	5317	5173	5028	4924	4780	4813	4804	-9.7%	-0.2%
	Cost per Secondary School Pupil	7022	6820	6798	6796	6756	6841	6817	-2.9%	-0.4%
	Cost per Pre-School Education Registration	3678	3342	3290	3134	3401	3928	4207	14.4%	7.1%
	% of Pupils Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5		51.0	53.0	55.0	57.0	59.0	60.0	9.0%	1.0%
	% of Pupils Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 6		26.0	27.0	29.0	31.0	33.0	34.0	8.0%	1.0%
	% of Pupils from Deprived Areas Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5 (SIMD)		29.0	32.0	34.0	37.0	40.0	41.0	12.0%	1.0%
	% of Pupils from Deprived Areas Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 6 (SIMD)		10.0	11.0	14.0	14.0	15.0	16.0	6.0%	1.0%
	The Gross Cost of "Children Looked After" in Residential Based Services per Child per Week	3091	3268	3112	3242	3264	3483	tbc	12.7%	
	The Gross Cost of "Children Looked After" in a Community Setting per Child per Week	225	240	265	276	287	298	tbc	32.4%	
	Balance of Care for looked after children: % of children being looked after in the Community	91.0	91.2	90.9	90.6	90.1	90.4	tbc	-0.7%	
	% of Adults Satisfied with Local Schools	83.1		83.0	81.0	79.0	74.0	73.0	-10.1%	-1.0%
	Proportion of Pupils Entering Positive Destinations		90.1	91.7	92.5	93.0	93.3	tbc	3.2%	
	Overall Average Total Tariff		770	798	827	860	877	886	15.1%	1.1%
	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 1		478	510	551	581	603	624	30.5%	3.5%
	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 2		618	644	685	716	740	750	21.4%	1.4%
	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 3		759	788	816	851	864	880	15.9%	1.9%
	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 4		909	929	962	984	998	999	9.9%	0.1%
	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 5		1101	1134	1149	1185	1196	1207	9.6%	0.9%
	% of Children Meeting Developmental Milestones (27-30 months)				70.9	71.6	72.4	tbc	1.5%	
	% Funded Early Years Provision Rated Good/Better	87.1	90.6	91.3	92.6	93.5	91.9	91.7	4.6%	-0.2%
	School Attendance Rates	93.1		93.6		93.7		93.3	0.2%	
	School Attendance Rates (Looked After Children)			88.5		91.6		tbc	3.1%	
	School Exclusion Rates	40.0		32.8		27.2		26.8	-32.0%	
	School Exclusion Rates (Looked After Children)			184.5		94.3		tbc	-48.9%	
	Participation Rates for 16-19 year olds						90.4	91.1	0.7%	0.7%
	Child Protection Re-registrations within 18 months			6.5	6.8	6.7	6.2	tbc	-4.7%	
	% of looked after children with more than 1 placement in the last year	21.1	21.4	21.2	21.9	21.4	20.7	tbc	-0.4%	-0.7%

	Indicator Description	Scotland							Change*	
		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	%/value change base* to 16/17	%/value change 15/16 to 16/17
Corporate Services	Support services as a % of Total Gross expenditure	4.9	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.4	4.9	0.0%	-0.5%
	% of the highest paid 5% of employees who are women	46.3	48.5	48.7	50.7	51.7	51.9	52.0	5.7%	0.1%
	The gender pay gap						4.5	4.1	-0.4%	-0.4%
	The cost per dwelling of collecting Council Tax	15.2	14.3	14.1	12.7	11.3	10.6	9.0	-40.9%	-15.1%
	Sickness Absence Days per Teacher	6.6	6.2	6.6	6.1	6.3	6.1	6.1	-8.2%	-0.5%
	Sickness Absence Days per Employee (non-teacher)	10.8	10.4	10.9	10.3	10.8	10.6	10.9	1.1%	2.7%
	% 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	95.8	1.1%	0.7%
	% of invoices sampled that were paid within 30 days	89.5	90.2	90.5	91.9	92.5	92.8	93.1	3.6%	0.3%
Adult Social Care	Older Persons (Over65) Home Care Costs per Hour	22.15	21.44	21.74	21.15	20.84	21.67	22.54	1.7%	4.0%
	SDS spend on adults 18+ as a % of total social work spend on adults 18+	1.58	2.94	5.95	6.44	6.90	6.66	6.48	4.9%	-0.2%
	% of people 65+ with intensive needs receiving care at home	32.23	33.01	34.07	34.26	35.34	34.81	35.27	3.0%	0.5%
	% of adults receiving any care or support who rate it as excellent or good.					84.00	81.00	tbc	-3.0%	
	% of adults supported at home who agree that their services and support had an impact in improving or maintaining their quality of life					85.00	84.00	tbc	-1.0%	
	Older persons (over 65's) Residential Care Costs per week per resident	427.42	431.87	392.67	378.59	382.36	372.93	375.06	-12.2%	0.6%
Culture and Leisure Services	Cost per attendance at Sports facilities	3.91	3.50	3.33	3.33	3.05	2.98	2.90	-25.9%	-3.0%
	Cost Per Library Visit	3.75	3.53	3.35	2.69	2.53	2.50	1.98	-47.1%	-20.8%
	Cost of Museums per Visit	4.62	3.76	3.81	3.49	3.43	3.11	3.19	-31.0%	2.4%
	Cost of Parks& Open Spaces per 1,000 Population	28520.40	26326.77	25134.16	24329.89	24094.75	22285.78	21580.85	-24.3%	-3.2%
	% of adults satisfied with libraries	83.50		83.00	81.00	77.00	74.00	73.00	-10.5%	-1.0%
	% of adults satisfied with parks and open spaces	83.10		86.00	86.00	86.00	85.00	87.00	3.9%	2.0%
	% of adults satisfied with museums and galleries	75.50		78.00	76.00	75.00	71.00	70.00	-5.5%	-1.0%
	% of adults satisfied with leisure facilities	74.60		80.00	78.00	76.00	73.00	73.00	-1.6%	0.0%
Environmental Services	Net cost per Waste collection per premises			62.8	64.0	66.7	65.7	64.5	2.6%	-1.9%
	Net cost per Waste disposal per premises			98.0	96.3	93.9	99.6	98.8	0.8%	-0.8%
	Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population	21834.8	21012.9	18624.7	16962.5	16282.1	15792.3	14726.4	-32.6%	-6.7%
	Cleanliness Score (%age Acceptable)	95.4	96.1	95.8	96.1	93.9	93.4	93.9	-1.5%	0.5%
	Cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads	13269.7	11873.9	11118.4	10583.0	10152.9	10310.7	10456.2	-21.5%	2.8%
	% of A class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	30.3	30.5	29.4	28.7	29.0	29.0	29.5	-0.8%	0.5%
	% of B class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	35.8	36.3	35.0	35.2	36.1	34.8	34.8	-1.0%	0.0%
	% of C class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	35.0	36.0	34.8	36.6	37.3	34.7	34.6	-0.4%	-0.1%

	Indicator Description	Scotland							Change*	
		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	%/value change base* to 16/17	%/value change 15/16 to 16/17
Environmental Services	% of unclassified roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	41.9	38.3	40.1	39.4	39.3	40.1	39.5	-2.4%	-0.6%
	Cost of trading standards, money advice and citizen advice per 1,000 population			5438.2	5853.7	5758.0	5865.1	5438.5	0.0%	-7.3%
	Cost of environmental health per 1,000 population			17248.2	18045.7	17169.8	16980.4	16117.3	-6.6%	-5.1%
	% of total household waste arising that is recycled	38.7	40.1	41.1	42.2	42.8	44.2	45.2	6.5%	1.0%
	% of adults satisfied with refuse collection	80.9		83.0	83.0	84.0	82.0	79.0	-1.9%	-3.0%
	% of adults satisfied with street cleaning	73.3		75.0	74.0	74.0	73.0	70.0	-3.3%	-3.0%
Housing Services	Gross rent arrears as a % of rent due for the reporting year				5.6	5.9	6.2	6.5	0.9%	3.0%
	% of rent due in the year that was lost due to voids	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.1	0.9	-0.4%	-0.2%
	% of dwellings meeting SHQS	53.6	66.1	76.6	83.7	90.4	92.5	93.6	40.0%	1.1%
	Average time taken to complete non-emergency repairs				10.2	9.9	9.4	8.7	-14.2%	-7.0%
	% of council dwellings that are energy efficient	74.9	81.2	88.8	94.0	96.5	96.2	96.6	21.7%	0.4%
Corp. Asset	Proportion of operational buildings that are suitable for their current use	73.7	74.8	75.9	78.2	79.0	79.6	79.8	10.8%	4.9%
	Proportion of internal floor area of operational buildings in satisfactory condition	81.3	82.7	82.6	80.9	82.9	81.5	84.5	-1.5%	-1.7%
Economic Development	% of Unemployed People Assisted into work from Council Funded/ Operated Employability Programmes			9.1	12.5	14.1	14.2	14.0	4.9%	-0.2%
	Cost per Planning application	5376.0	5186.4	6572.7	4634.5	4376.1	4907.0	4635.6	-13.8%	-5.5%
	Average Time Per Business and Industry Planning Application			13.0	12.9	10.9	11.2	9.3	-28.2%	-16.8%
	% of procurement spent on local small/medium enterprises	21.2	21.0	20.6	20.1	20.1	20.2	20.3	-1.0%	
	No of business gateway start-ups per 10,000 population				19.0	18.9	16.9	16.6	-12.7%	-1.7%