## TEESDALE DISTRICT COUNCIL

#### Report To: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 7 April 2008

From: Lead Member for Resources: Councillor G K Robinson

Ward Member: All

Subject: DATA QUALITY REVIEW

#### 1.0 <u>SUMMARY</u>

1.1 The Audit Commission has completed its review of the Councils data quality arrangements and determined that the Council's overall management arrangements for ensuring data quality demonstrate an adequate performance. An analytical review of performance indicator results identified that they fell within expected ranges and no significant issues were found through data quality spot checks. The summary report and action plan are attached at Appendix A.

### 2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 It is recommended that

### 2.1.1 The Audit Commission report on Data Quality is received.

### 3.0 LINK TO CORPORATE KEY PRIORITIES/AMBITIONS

- 3.1 Priority: Improvement Programme
- 3.2 Ambition: Maximising Resources
- 3.3 Outcome: The Council has an objective assessment of its performance in respect of data quality.

### 4.0 BACKGROUND

4.1 The data quality review is undertaken annually by the Audit Commission to evaluate the accuracy of the performance indicators (PIs) that are relied upon by the Audit Commission in service assessments for comprehensive performance assessment (CPA). The second review was undertaken in 2007 and included three stages: a review of management arrangements, an analytical review of 2006/07 BVPI data and spot checks of a sample of 2006/07 PIs.

# 5.0 DATA QUALITY

- 5.1 The report concludes that the Council's overall management arrangements for ensuring data quality demonstrate an adequate performance. The analytical review work undertaken identified that the PI values fell within expected ranges and no significant issues were identified through the data quality spot checks.
- 5.2 The Audit Commission report and action plan is attached at Appendix A. Both have been agreed with the Assistant Chief Executive and Corporate Projects Officer.

## 6.0 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Financial Implications: None
- 6.2 Risk:

Risk	Category	Implications
The agreed action plan is not implemented	Reputational Service delivery	The Council's data quality may not be adequate and mat result in inaccurate performance data. This could influence service decisions and any future inspections.

- 6.3 Equality and Diversity: None
- 6.4 Human Resources: None
- 6.5 Community Safety: None
- 6.6 Legal Issues: None

# Background papers:

- 1. None
- Author: Joanne Kellett Chief Finance Officer 01833 696234