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*The SCTS Board is responsible for monitoring overall performance of the organisation as part of its governance role. On a quarterly basis the Board scrutinises progress against delivery of the Annual Business Plan and assesses a range of key performance indicators (KPIs) which provide an overview of performance. These are presented to the Board in its performance scorecard.*

*This document describes the 17 KPIs reviewed by the Board on a quarterly basis – explaining what is measured, how and why it helps provide assurance. The KPIs are grouped under the 9 Strategic Priorities set out in the Corporate Plan 2014-17*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contents** | |
|  | **Page** |
|  |  |
| ***1. Strategic Priority 1 – Well Supported Judiciary*** |  |
| 1(a) Judicial satisfaction………………………………………………………………… | 3 |
|  |  |
| ***2. Strategic Priority 2 – Satisfied Court & Tribunal Users*** |  |
| 2(a) SCTS Service user satisfaction………………………………………………… | 4 |
| 2(b) Disposal of summary criminal cases within 26 weeks………………………… | 5 |
|  |  |
| ***3. Strategic Priority 3 – Skilled, Engaged and Motivated People*** |  |
| 3(a) Employee Engagement…………………………………………………………… | 6 |
| 3(b) Delivery of developmental activities……………………………………………… | 8 |
|  |  |
| ***4. Strategic Priority 4 – A Well-managed Estate*** |  |
| 4(a) Maintaining the estate……………………………………………………………... | 9 |
|  |  |
| ***5. Strategic Priority 5 – Efficient Business Processes*** |  |
| 5(a) Sheriff Summary criminal waiting periods……………………………………… | 11 |
| 5(b) JP Summary criminal waiting periods…………………………………………… | 12 |
| 5(c) Ineffective use of court time……………………………………………………… | 13 |
| 5(d) Court business waiting times (non-summary)…………………………...……... | 14 |
| 5(e) Effective tribunal operations…………………………………………….………… | 17 |
|  |  |
| ***6. Strategic Priority 6 – Digital Innovation*** |  |
| 6(a) Transactions that are carried out on line………………………………………… | 19 |
| 6(b) Availability of core IT systems…………………………………………………… | 20 |
|  |  |
| ***7. Strategic Priority 7 – Purposeful Collaboration with Partners*** |  |
| 7(a) Sufficient and effective collaboration over period……………………………… | 21 |
|  |  |
| ***8. Strategic Priority 8 – Funding*** |  |
| 8(a) Expenditure profile………………………………………………………………… | 22 |
| 8(b) Fines and fee income……………………………………………………………… | 23 |
|  |  |
| ***9. Strategic Priority 9 – Best Value*** |  |
| 9(a) Delivering our change programme……………………………………………… | 24 |
| SCTS Board Scorecard – Blank Example…………………………………………… | 25 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 1** | **Well Supported Judiciary** |
| **Measure 1(a)** | **Judicial satisfaction** |
| Description of Measure | A view taken by the SCTS Executive Team of all tiers of the judiciary to estimate the satisfaction with the services provided to them by the SCTS. This will comprise both formal and informal feedback received by the Executive Team and SCTS senior managers and builds on the insight about judicial opinion formed following the 2011 and 2015 surveys of judicial office holders. |
| Purpose of Measure | The SCTS exists to support justice through the effective operation of courts and tribunals. One important, albeit subjective, indicator of effective court and tribunal administration is the level of judicial satisfaction. The organisation can better support the judiciary and deliver its purpose if it uses feedback received by senior managers and through the judicial members of the SCTS Board. |
| Measure Owner | Chief Executive |
| Source of the data | Judicial Attitudes Survey (2015)  Quarterly SCTS Executive Team assessment |
| Basis of calculation | Assessment of Judicial satisfaction with SCTS services, using sources above. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Thresholds based on Executive Team assumptions about satisfaction of judicial office holders:  **Red** – low levels of satisfaction requiring dialogue and remedial action - <65% positive response in survey data  **Amber** moderate levels of satisfaction - 65% - 78% positive response in survey data  **Green** high levels of satisfaction - 78% or above positive response in survey data.  Nb – the most recent Judicial Attitudes survey (Feb 2015) found stronger relationships and better scores across a range of areas in Scotland compared to the rest of the UK, with 88% of Scottish Judges feeling valued by court staff. |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | . |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 2** | **Satisfied Court and Tribunal Users** |
| **Measure 2(a)** | **SCTS Service user satisfaction** |
| Description of Measure | The Court User Satisfaction Survey measures overall satisfaction and satisfaction with specific elements of the service provided by SCTS. The Customer Service Excellence Assessment (CSE) provides an independent assessment of the level of customer service provided by SCTS, based around 57 key elements. |
| Purpose of Measure | As a public service provider, understanding what service users think of SCTS services is important in demonstrating that the SCTS is providing value for money and is able to respond to the concerns of users.  The Court User Satisfaction Survey provides an objective evidence base to scrutinise the approach to service provision. At this point in time the survey relates to court users only, but work will progress in 2015-16 to consider how the views of tribunal users can be measured. Similarly the CSE assessment is being extended to include tribunals from 2016.  Evidence from these sources is used to direct further improvement activity. |
| Measure Owner | Head of Research |
| Source of the data | Survey data supplied by Systra Ltd (previously MVA).  Independent CSE Assessment process |
| Basis of calculation | Quantitative survey and assessment data. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red <65% satisfaction levels and/or failure to maintain CSE accreditation.  Amber 65% - 78% satisfaction levels and/or CSE maintained, but with deterioration in assessment *(i.e. net decline in level of assessment in 5 or more elements compared to previous year)*  Green > 78% satisfaction levels and CSE assessment maintaining or improving (i.e. above the threshold for amber). |
| Frequency of Collection | CSE Assessment – annual  Court User Survey – bi-annual |
| Other Comments | 2015 court user survey results likely to be available in Q3 2015-16. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 2** | **Satisfied Court and Tribunal Users** |
| **Measure 2(b)** | **Disposal of summary criminal cases within 26 weeks** |
| Description of Measure | Percentage of summary criminal cases completed within a 26 week period from caution and charge to verdict. |
| Purpose of Measure | This measure drives collaboration between the police, COPFS, SLAB and SCTS at local and national levels. The SCTS plays a significant part in delivering this target by working with partners on court programming and providing performance information and analysis.  This is a key measure of justice system effectiveness following Summary Justice Reform. |
| Measure Owner | Director Operations Delivery |
| Source of the data | Data is drawn from Crown Office & Procurator Fiscal Service by the Scottish Government and is made available to the SCTS monthly in arrears via the Criminal Justice Board Management Information System. |
| Basis of calculation | Percentage of sheriff summary and justice of the peace cases disposed of within 26 weeks of date of earliest caution and charge for any accused in the case, by the month that case is first closed. “Disposal” is defined as the latest date of verdict for any accused in the case. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red <67%  Amber 67% - 72%  Green > 72% |
| Frequency of Collection | Monthly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | This measure is the key indicator of end to end justice system performance used by the Scottish Government. Whilst SCTS control over the measure is limited it remains a focus for Local Criminal Justice Boards and Government nationally and is therefore included as a KPI on the Board Scorecard. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 3** | **Skilled, Engaged and Motivated People** | |
| **Measure 3(a)** | **Employee Engagement** | |
| Description of Measure | Basket of indicators of engagement, including:   * Voluntary staff turnover levels * Short term absence rates * Proportion of appraisals completed on time * Volumes of Complaints/Grievances * Exit Interview Data * Annual Staff Survey Rating | |
| Purpose of Measure | No one measure can give a true reflection of how employee engagement stands so this indicator seeks to balance the data received in surveys (based on what people say) with what people actually do.  Motivation leading to staff retention is a key driver of our ability to offer good customer service and technical competence. High staff turnover and absence also adds to training and recruitment costs and increases the risk of service failure.  Management activity to improve areas such as staff engagement needs to be balanced against wider policies such as pay restraint and changes to pension arrangements, which may impact upon levels of engagement. | |
| Measure Owner | Director HR | |
| Source of the data | Returns to HR through Mitre Finch time recording system, complaints and grievance monitoring and surveys of various descriptions | |
| Basis of calculation | Voluntary staff turnover | Voluntary leavers are those who have left to join other parts of the civil service, or other organisations, or have simply resigned as a percentage of overall staff complement. Retirals, dismissals etc. are not counted as voluntary. The data is provided quarterly.  Green Less than 4% annualised  Amber: 4-7% annualised  Red: More than 7% annualised |
| Short term absence; | Average calendar days lost to short term absence (less than 28 days) per full time equivalent staff member, annualised. The data is provided quarterly.  Green Less than 4.5 days  Amber: 4.5 -5.5 days  Red: More than 5.5 days |
| Proportions of appraisals completed on time | Data is provided at full year and interim (half year) reporting stages  Green – More than 75%  Amber – 60-75%  Red – Less than 60% |
| Work Issues Raised with EAP Quarterly | Green – Less than 16  Amber – 16-20  Red – More than 20 |
| Exit Interview Data | Staff who leave the organisation are asked to complete an on line exit interview with 4 key questions   * Did you feel valued in your job? * How would you rate staff morale? * How would you rate work/life balance? * Would you recommend the SCTS?   Each response is RAG rated (green for a positive response of 70% or more, amber for 60-69% and red for below 60%). The 4 measures are then assessed together:  Red: Reds – Greens = 2 or more  Amber 2 or more responses amber or total number of Greens - Reds or Reds - Greens = 0 or 1  Green: Greens – Reds = 2 or more |
| Annual Staff Survey Rating | Green – More than 60% engagement index  Amber – 50-60%  Red – Less than 50% |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red – Two or more indicators at red or four or more at amber  Amber – three or four measures at amber or one at red  Green – All measures at green or four at green and up to two at amber | |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly | |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly | |
| Other Comments | None | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 3** | **Skilled, Engaged and Motivated People** |
| **Measure 3(b)** | **Delivery of developmental activities** |
| Description of Measure | The proportion of staff who have attended relevant technical and developmental courses. |
| Purpose of Measure | Providing appropriately trained staff is a core responsibility of the SCTS. Ensuring that staff receive an appropriate level or training in technical, managerial and specialist areas is essential for providing high quality court services.  If training is not delivered then SCTS will not have the skills in its workforce to continue to deliver high quality services, to cope with changes to systems and the introduction of new ways of working. |
| Measure Owner | Director HR |
| Source of the data | HR training databases, workforce planning and skills assessment tool |
| Basis of calculation | Number of staff as a proportion of the total headcount who have either completed or are undertaking one or more of the following training courses since:   * Scottish Vocational Qualifications * Institute of Leadership and Management Qualifications * Middle Manager Development Programme * First Line Manager Programme * Administrative Officer Development Programme |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Success threshold for achievement of green criteria increased by 50% in 2014 (from 22% to 33%) in recognition of significant progress made.  Red – Less than 30% of staff  Amber – 30-33% of staff  Green – More than 33% of staff |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | Rebased in 2014-15 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 4** | **A Well-managed Estate** |
| **Measure 4(a)** | **Maintaining the estate** |
| Description of Measure | The annual spend on estate maintenance compared with the level of investment required to ensure the maintenance backlog does not increase. |
| Purpose of Measure | This indicator will demonstrate how well the SCTS is managing its repair and maintenance programme, taking into account budgetary constraints.  High levels of maintenance activity will reduce the overall backlog maintenance required on the estate – if the rate of maintenance activity is running ahead of the rate of deterioration of the estate. |
| Measure Owner | Director Property Services Unit |
| Source of the data | Following an independent survey of the Estate, a total figure for all backlog maintenance of £57m was established for 2012-13. Between 2013-14 and 2015-16 careful use of resources reduced that backlog by over 30% to £37m. As budgets tighten further spend on the estate will be largely confined to essential backlog maintenance and statutory compliance.  Based on the paper “A Financially Sustainable Estate” approved in September 2008 the annual target on backlog maintenance has been set at 1% of the total insurance replacement value of the estate per year.  If the 1% figure is met this means that backlog maintenance will neither increase nor decrease over the course of the year. Any excess will reduce the backlog and any shortfall will increase it |
| Basis of calculation | For each quarter the year to date expenditure on essential maintenance and the expenditure forecast for the remainder of the financial year will be combined to give an *overall forecast of essential maintenance expenditure for the full year*.  This will be divided by the *backlog maintenance target* (1% of the total insurance replacement value of the estate) to show the forecast annual maintenance spend as a proportion of that target. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | The projected level of maintenance spending for the full year (using actual and forecast expenditure) as a proportion of the backlog maintenance target.    Red – projected expenditure for the year is less than 95% of the backlog maintenance target  Amber – projected expenditure for the year is between 95% and 105% of the backlog maintenance target  Green - projected expenditure for the year is in excess of 105% of the backlog maintenance target  *(Note – for 2015/16 the backlog maintenance target is £5.07m)* |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 5** | **Efficient Business Processes** |
| **Measure 5(a)** | **Sheriff Summary criminal waiting periods** |
| Description of Measure | A weighted national waiting period for Sheriff Court summary business which uses the length of the waiting period from the fixing of a trial diet to the date assigned. |
| Purpose of Measure | The interests of justice are not served by excessive waiting periods for parties. This figure provides an indication of the length of time between a case first calling and the date on which it is likely to be heard, if it proceeds to trial. Deterioration in this figure will be indicative of pressure on the court system borne of increasing demand or shrinking capacity.  SCTS is not solely responsible for delay but has a shared responsibility to provide access to justice in a reasonable timeframe – and is well placed to report on the length of time elapsing between these points in the process. |
| Measure Owner | Director Operations Delivery |
| Source of the data | COP II Management Information reports. |
| Basis of calculation | As per description of measure |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red - Over 19 weeks  Amber - Between 17 and 19 weeks  Green - Under 17 weeks |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | This indicator (and 5b which follows it) is similar to KPI 2b in that it measures the length of time it takes for certain processes to be completed. However it differs from 2b in that it measures time from the initial Sheriff summary court hearing to the fixed trial diet date – as opposed to the time between the date of caution and charge (a pre-court process) and ultimate disposal of the case (which may be a non-court process).  This allows the indicator to focus more specifically on waiting periods within the summary criminal courts. It also provides “lead” information, as the fixed trial date is known upon conclusion of the initial court hearing, whereas indicator 2b can only provide “lag” information, as the timing of disposal only becomes clear at the point of disposal itself. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 5** | **Efficient Business Processes** |
| **Measure 5(b)** | **JP Summary criminal waiting periods** |
| Description of Measure | A weighted national waiting period for Justice of the Peace Court summary business which uses the length of the waiting period from the fixing of a trial diet to the date assigned. |
| Purpose of Measure | The interests of justice are not served by excessive waiting periods for parties. This figure provides an indication of the length of time between a case first calling and the date on which it is likely to be heard, if it proceeds to trial. Deterioration in this figure will be indicative of pressure on the court system borne of increasing demand or shrinking capacity.  SCTS is not solely responsible for delay but has a shared responsibility to provide access to justice in a reasonable timeframe – and is well placed to report on the length of time elapsing between these points in the process. |
| Measure Owner | Director Operations Delivery |
| Source of the data | COP II Management Information reports. |
| Basis of calculation | As per description of measure |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red - Over 19 weeks  Amber - Between 17 and 19 weeks  Green - Under 17 weeks |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 5** | **Efficient Business Processes** |
| **Measure 5(c)** | **Summary trials adjourned with no evidence led**  Previously called *Ineffective use of court time* |
| Description of Measure | The proportion of summary trials called at which no evidence is led and that are subsequently adjourned to a further trial diet. |
| Purpose of Measure | The failure of trials to proceed when scheduled undermines the SCTS’ ability to manage a cost-effective court programme and has other dis-benefits such as wasting police time and inconveniencing witnesses.  Trials not proceeding are a consequence of a number of factors – primarily lack of preparation or witness non-attendance. A reduction in this indicator will be a result of system improvement which will directly impact the cost effectiveness of the SCTS and the efficiency of the wider system. |
| Measure Owner | Director Operations Delivery |
| Source of the data | COP II management information reports. |
| Basis of calculation | For each quarter, the proportion of accused persons who appear at a trial diet at which no evidence is led and a further trial is fixed. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | The baseline performance in 2010-11 was 36.1%.  Red >35%  Amber 35-30%  Green <30% |
| Frequency of Collection | Monthly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | This indicator is part of a shared set of assumptions monitored by the Scottish Government’s Making Justice Work Programme. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 5** | **Efficient Business Processes** |
| **Measure 5(d)** | **Court business waiting times (non-summary)** |
| Description of Measure | Waiting times for key areas of court business, other than summary criminal business (which is monitored through indicators 2b, 5a and 5b). |
| Purpose of Measure | The interests of justice are not served by excessive waiting periods for parties. SCTS is not solely responsible for delay but has a responsibility to provide access to justice in a reasonable time frame.  The publication of waiting periods give an indication to the public of how long they may have to wait before getting access to the court. Deterioration in this figure will be indicative of pressure on the court system borne of increasing demand or shrinking capacity. |
| Measure Owner | Director Operations Delivery and the Principal Clerk of Session & Justiciary |
| Source of the data | COP II, CMS and manual returns |
| Basis of calculation | For each type of court business specified in the sub-measures, the waiting period will be calculated as set out. Waiting periods for sub-measures assessed at quarter end will be compared to thresholds. For other sub-measures, the waiting periods for trials and proofs set down during the quarter will be averaged and the average compared to the threshold. All sub-measures will be reported in calendar weeks not term weeks. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red - if more than three sub-measures are at amber or if any one sub-measure is at Red  Amber - if at most three sub-measures are failing to meet their thresholds and there are no sub-measures at Red  Green - if all sub-measures are meeting their agreed thresholds. |
| Frequency of Collection | Monthly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | The waiting time sub-measures for the Supreme Courts are aligned to the performance measures that have been developed by the Supreme Courts following the recommendations of the Supreme Courts Programming Board’s report “A Performance Framework For The Supreme Court”. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **There are twelve sub measures within Measure 5(d)** | | |
| **Waiting Time Indicators** | **RAG Criteria** | **Comment** |
| **Inner House.**  The current waiting period for the earliest available non-urgent 2 day hearing, as at the end of each quarter | Red – more than 4 weeks above baseline  Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline  Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline | Baseline is 2010-11average performance of 27 weeks. In 2010-11 the Court of Session moved to two day hearings as the basis of its calculations and re-calibrated 2010-11 data based on calendar weeks rather than term weeks. |
| **Criminal Appeals.**  The current waiting period from the date leave to appeal is granted to the final disposal for all cases finally disposed of during each quarter:  There are four types of Criminal appeals sub measures:  **Solemn sentence – 17 weeks baseline**  **Solemn conviction and sentence – 47 weeks baseline**  **Summary sentence – 11 weeks baseline**  **Summary stated case – 18 weeks baseline** | Red – more than 4 weeks above baseline  Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline  Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline | Baseline is set as the average performance for 2011-12.  The measure is designed to show the capacity in the Supreme Court for managing appeals business. Cases that are delayed excessively will be investigated by the Supreme Courts and where these are found to be delayed because of the actions of parties or because they are awaiting the outcome of other appeals these will highlighted on the scorecard. Supreme Courts will provide explanations in such instances |
| **Outer House - Personal Injury** (Ch 43).  The current waiting period between the lodging of defences and the first day of the proof diet, as at the end of each quarter. | Red – 2 months above baseline  Amber – 1-2 months above baseline  Green – less than 1 month above baseline or below it | Baseline to be set at 13 months based on Lord Coulsfield’s recommendation. Measure based on an average of all cases in the quarter. |
| **Outer House - Commercial Court.**  The current waiting period between the first preliminary hearing and the first substantive hearing, as at the end of each quarter. | Red – more than 4 weeks above baseline  Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline  Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline | First preliminary hearing is after the lodging of defences and first substantive hearing is a proof or debate.  Baseline figure is 45 weeks, the average of 2011-12 performance. |
| **Outer House – Other Actions.**  The current waiting period for a 4 day proof diet, as at the end of each quarter. | Red – more than 4 weeks above baseline  Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline  Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline | Measures the earliest 4 day hearing that can be offered by the Keeper.  Baseline figure is 30 weeks, the average of 2011-12 performance. |
| **Sheriff Court Civil.**  The waiting period for ordinary civil cases in each sheriff court between the closing of the record and the first available date for proof or debate. | Red – 4 or more weeks above baseline  Amber – 2- 4 weeks above baseline  Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline | Baseline based on 2011-12 average of 11 weeks. |
| **High Court First Instance.**  The average period between the date when the case was first cited to a preliminary hearing and the conclusion of the trial. (In relation to cases concluded during the quarter which proceeded to trial). | Red – 4 weeks above baseline  Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline  Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline | Conclusion of the trial includes conviction, acquittal or acceptance of a plea.  Baseline figure is based on 2011-12 average of 21 weeks. |
| **Sheriff and Jury.**  The average period between the date of the first diet and the conclusion of the trial. (In relation to cases concluded during the quarter which proceeded to trial). | Red – 4 weeks above baseline  Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline  Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline | Conclusion of the trial includes conviction, acquittal or acceptance of a plea.  Definition is mirroring that of High Court First Instance.  Baseline figure is based on 2011-12 average of 12.4 weeks. |
| **Office of the Public Guardian**  Percentage of guardianship orders registered within 5 working days. | Red<90%  Amber 90% -94%  Green >94% | Data published on OPG website. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 5** | **Efficient Business Processes** |
| **Measure 5(e)** | **Effective Tribunal Operations** |
| Description of Measure | A basket of key operational targets designed to monitor the effective administration of devolved tribunals. |
| Purpose of Measure | A range of devolved tribunals came under the control of SCTS as a consequence of the merger in April 2015. Whilst the tribunals are individually led and managed it is important that the SCTS Board has reassurance that core activities required to maintain their effective operation are being delivered to the required standard.  This indicator provides a basket of 14 target-based measures, covering key process targets in relation to the performance of the devolved tribunals. If the majority of these targets are being met the Board can be assured that tribunal administration is effective. Where a number of these indicators fall short of targeted performance the Board may wish to explore the causes in order to ensure that administration remains effective – or remedial action is taken where necessary. |
| Measure Owner | Head of Tribunal Operations |
| Source of the data | Tribunal Operations Balanced Scorecard |
| Basis of calculation | The indicator consists of 14 target-based measures – each of which is assessed quarterly. In each case the target will either be met or not. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red – Under 7 targets met in the quarter  Amber – 8 to 10 targets met in the quarter  Green – 11 or more targets met in the quarter |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | New measure added in 2015-16 as a consequence of the merger of the Scottish Court Service and the Scottish Tribunal Service.  Tribunal Operations will review the performance information collected as part of their balanced scorecard and this measure will be reviewed towards the end of 2015/16. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **There are fourteen sub measures within Measure 5(e)** | | |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Comment** |
| 1. Mental Health Tribunal for Scotland 1 | 100% of hearings to determine applications for Compulsory Treatment Orders to take place within statutory time limits. | High priority function of the tribunal |
| 2. Mental Health Tribunal for Scotland 2 | Tribunal Panel to hear multiple cases at least 50% of the time. | To make best use of panel resources |
| 3. Mental Health Tribunal for Scotland 3 | Casework checked by the quality assurance team will exceed an error free rate of 93% | Most errors are not material – but desire to avoid. |
| 4. Pension Appeals Tribunal 1 | To issue at least 98% of decisions to parties within 3 days of receipt of the signed decision from the Chairman. | Ensures timeous conclusion of business |
| 5. Pension Appeals Tribunal 2 | To list at least 98% of cases for hearing within 3 months of receipt of full papers from the Veterans' Agency | To ensure waiting periods for decisions are not excessive. |
| 6. Lands Tribunal for Scotland 1 | To issue at least 95% of decisions to parties within 8 working days of the clerk receiving the Opinion from the Tribunal. | Ensures timeous conclusion of business |
| 7. Lands Tribunal for Scotland 2 | To produce at least 95% of 1st Orders/Notices within 8 working days of full receipt of new application. | To ensure applications are timeously processed |
| 8. Additional Support Needs Tribunal 1 | Issue at least 99% of decisions to parties within 2 working days of receipt from convenor. | Ensures timeous conclusion of business |
| 9. Additional Support Needs Tribunal 2 | Issue 100% of papers to parties within 2 working days of case statement period | To ensure parties are well prepared |
| 10. Private Rented Housing Panel 1 | At least 95% of applications to be registered & acknowledged within 3 working days of receipt. | To ensure applications are timeously processed |
| 11. Private Rented Housing Panel 2 | At least 95% of notifications of first inspection and hearing to be issued to parties not less than 14 working days before date of committee | To ensure parties are well prepared |
| 12. Home Owner Housing Panel 1 | At least 95% of applications to be registered and acknowledged within 2 working days of receipt | To ensure applications are timeously processed |
| 13. Council Tax Reduction Review Panel 1 | At least 99% of decisions to be issued to parties within 2 working days of receipt | Ensures timeous conclusion of business |
| 14. Council Tax Reduction Review Panel 2 | At least 99% of applications to be registered and acknowledged within 3 working days of receipt | To ensure applications are timeously processed |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 6** | **Digital Innovation** |
| **Measure 6(a)** | **Transactions that are carried out on line** |
| Description of Measure | The proportion of fine transactions that are carried out on line. |
| Purpose of Measure | Migrating court users to on line transactions from face to face or postal transactions is more convenient for many court users and reduces the transactional processing burden on court staff.  A larger number of on line transactions will provide a platform for process improvement and give opportunities for the SCTS to find more value adding activities for its staff resources. |
| Measure Owner | Fines Development Manager |
| Source of the data | COP II for fines payment |
| Basis of calculation | The number of fines that are paid on line as a proportion of all fines that are paid in the quarter. Fines for speeding and red light offences cannot be paid on line because the offender’s licence requires to be manually endorsed by the court and so are not included in the calculation. Some other road traffic offences can be either endorsed or not endorsed but these fine types are included because of the minimal impact on the data set and the disproportionate effort in identifying the difference. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red < 15%  Amber 15 to 20 %  Green > 20% |
| Frequency of Collection | Monthly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | In 2014/15 Q1, the success threshold for achievement of green criteria increased by 33% (from 15% of transactions paid on-line to 20%) in view of progress made. Amber and Red thresholds were adjusted accordingly. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 6** | **Digital Innovation** |
| **Measure 6(b)** | **Availability of core IT systems** |
| Description of Measure | Availability of core IT systems to users including COP II, CMS, Sigma (OPG) and e-mail during the working hours of 06:45 to 19:15 |
| Purpose of Measure | The availability of core IT systems is crucial to providing a seamless service in court and at counters and in enabling the SCTS to fulfil its responsibilities to allow data to flow electronically around the justice system.  This indicator will demonstrate the reliability of the SCTS IT network platform and applications and consequently how well the IT infrastructure is supporting service delivery. |
| Measure Owner | Director Information and Communication Technology |
| Source of the data | Service failures reported to IT and outages identified by IT monitoring systems |
| Basis of calculation | The amount of hours each of the 4 main IT systems (COPII, CMS, Sigma and e mail) are unavailable per site as a proportion of the total hours required in the quarter. This is then weighted on the basis of court workload measured in case loads to balance the impact of the failure on service delivery across the country. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red <98%  Amber 98% - 99%  Green>99% |
| Frequency of Collection | Monthly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | The RAG criteria for this indicator were made more challenging in 2014-15, in recognition of consistently high levels of system availability (previous thresholds were under 95% for red, 95 to 98% for amber and over 98% for green). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 7** | **Purposeful Collaboration with Partners** |
| **Measure 7(a)** | **Sufficient and effective collaboration over period** |
| Description of Measure | An analysis of the overall quality and quantity of collaboration between the SCTS and key partner agencies (e.g. Government, Police, COPFS, Legal Aid, victims groups). |
| Purpose of Measure | Measuring collaboration is challenging, because it entails both a quantitative (how much) and qualitative (how beneficial) element. Rather than develop a complex metric which may or may not successfully assess current levels of collaboration this measure is assessed by the SCTS Executive Team considering the current state of collaboration.  A commentary summarising the progress made in collaborative work and giving the justification for the red/amber/green rating will be provided in the scorecard – and the SCTS Board will have the opportunity to consider the assessment and commentary. |
| Measure Owner | Corporate Secretary |
| Source of the data | SCTS Executive Team assessment (plus any additional observations/ratings provided by the SCTS Board). |
| Basis of calculation | SCTS Executive Team assessment |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Green – collaboration currently effective, with no major issues.  Amber – collaboration generally effective although particular issues/areas may require further focus (e.g. escalating business volumes).  Red – concerns about level of collaboration or specific issues that require the attention of the SCTS Board. |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 8** | **Funding** |
| **Measure 8(a)** | **Expenditure profile** |
| Description of Measure | Year-end forecast of direct running costs variance as a percentage of budget |
| Purpose of Measure | To monitor the risk of the SCTS under-spending or exceeding budget by the financial year end.  To monitor the quality of financial planning by comparing budget information against actual expenditure during the financial year. SCTS will aim to keep its outturn expenditure as close as possible to forecast, demonstrating sound financial controls and good budgeting practice. |
| Measure Owner | Chief Financial Officer |
| Source of the data | SEAS accounting system |
| Basis of calculation | Deduct forecast running costs from budgeted running costs and divide by budgeted running costs. A negative figure shows an under-spend, a positive figure shows an over-spend. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red - out with green and amber  Amber : Between -2.5% and -5% of forecast  Green : -2.50% of forecast to matching forecast |
| Frequency of Collection | Monthly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | Budget forecasts become more accurate as the year progresses. However in an environment of shrinking budgets the ability to plan with precision and spend in line with deliverable plans will be even more important and this indicator will give an indication of how well SCTS is delivering its expenditure commitments.  The RAG criteria is biased towards flagging an overspend as it is generally more challenging to manage than under spending and might require an action plan to rectify depending on whether the overspend is expected to continue. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 8** | **Funding** |
| **Measure 8(b)** | **Fines and fee income** |
| Description of Measure | The profile of receipt of fees and fines income against forecast |
| Purpose of Measure | Fees and fines income are a variable source of income but fund approximately 25% of the overall SCTS budget.  Under recovery will signal a potential shortfall in the SCTS budget and possibly the need to scale back expenditure plans. Similarly over recovery indicates potential additional income, which should be factored into plans where appropriate and may have impacts on the resources required to recover increased levels effectively. |
| Measure Owner | Chief Financial Officer |
| Source of the data | COP II and SEAS accounting system |
| Basis of calculation | Deduct budgeted year to date income from actual year to date income and divide by budgeted year to date income. A negative figure shows an under-recovery; a positive figure shows an over-recovery. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red – Less than -2.5% of forecast  Amber - Between -1.5% and -2.5% of forecast  Green – From over-recovery to -1.5% of forecast |
| Frequency of Collection | Monthly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| When will the data be available | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | The RAG criteria reflect the importance of managing to forecast. Under-recovery has more challenging consequences than over-recovery because of the impact on the budget position. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Priority 9** | **Best Value** |
| **Measure 9(a)** | **Delivering our change programme** |
| Description of Measure | The overall RAG status of the SCTS portfolio of change. |
| Purpose of Measure | The SCTS Corporate Plan for 2014/17 sets out an ambitious plan for building a stronger service. The plan identifies a range of change initiatives which require internal process review and collaboration with other justice organisations if the plan is to be successfully delivered and its objectives met.  This indicator provides an overview on the progress SCTS is making towards meeting these objectives. |
| Measure Owner | Head of Portfolio Office |
| Source of the data | Business Plan Delivery Report, informed by individual project highlight reports and Programme Board assessments.  . |
| Basis of calculation | RAG status of SCTS Corporate Plan Implementation Portfolio will be determined by the SCTS Executive Team, based on the advice of the Portfolio Office, when it periodically reviews the business plan delivery report. |
| Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green | Red - if the portfolio is currently not on track and requires decisions (on rescheduling, commitment of resources or changes to specification) which can only be taken by the SCTS board.  Amber - if the portfolio is currently not on track, but the problems are within agreed tolerances and can be handled by the Executive overseeing the delivery of change.  Green - if the portfolio is currently on track to meet its time, cost and quality criteria. |
| Frequency of Collection | Quarterly |
| Frequency of Reporting | Quarterly |
| Other Comments | None |

