



# SCTS Board Scorecard

## Descriptions and Definitions

Last Updated – December 2018

*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 18 KPIs contained in the scorecard – explaining what is measured, how and why it helps provide assurance. The KPIs are grouped under the 7 Strategic Priorities set out in the Corporate Plan 2017-20, plus two key financial performance indicators.*

*KPIs are subject to annual review to ensure they remain both relevant to the delivery of SCTS business and to ensure the levels at which they are set remain appropriate to maintain and, where possible, improve performance.*

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Strategic Priority 1 – Well Supported Judiciary</b>	
1(a) Judicial satisfaction	3
<b>2. Strategic Priority 2 – Satisfied Court &amp; Tribunal Users</b>	
2(a) SCTS Service user satisfaction	4
2(b) Disposal of summary criminal cases within 26 weeks	5
<b>3. Strategic Priority 3 – Skilled and Motivated People</b>	
3(a) Employee Engagement	6
3(b) Delivery of developmental activities	8
<b>4. Strategic Priority 4 – A Well-managed Estate</b>	
4(a) Maintaining the estate	9
4 (b) Sustainability and carbon reduction	11
<b>5. Strategic Priority 5 – Efficiency and Best Value</b>	
5(a) Sheriff Summary criminal waiting periods	13
5(b) JP Summary criminal waiting periods	14
5(c) Ineffective use of court time	15
5(d) Court business waiting times (non-summary)	16
5(e) Effective tribunal operations	19
5(f) Delivering our change programme	21
<b>6. Strategic Priority 6 – Digital Innovation</b>	
6(a) Transactions that are carried out on line	22
6(b) Availability of core IT systems	23
<b>7. Strategic Priority 7 – Purposeful Collaboration with Partners</b>	
7(a) Sufficient and effective collaboration over period	25
<b>8. Financial Performance Indicators</b>	
8(a) Expenditure profile	26
8(b) Fines and fee income	27
SCTS Board Scorecard – Blank Example	28

Strategic Priority 1	Well Supported Judiciary
<b>Measure 1(a)</b>	<b>Judicial satisfaction</b>
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 2015 and 2017 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 data & data validity/assurance	<p>Judicial Attitudes Survey (<i>biannual</i>)  Quarterly SCTS Executive Team assessment</p> <p><i>Data validity is ensured by using an independently verified quantitative survey and by the Corporate Secretary discussing and recording the qualitative assessment of satisfaction in person at an Executive Team meeting.</i></p>
Basis of calculation	Assessment of Judicial satisfaction with SCTS services, using sources above.
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Thresholds based on Executive Team assumptions about satisfaction of judicial office holders:</p> <p><b>Red</b> – low levels of satisfaction requiring dialogue and remedial action as assessed by the Executive Team (evidenced by &lt;65% of judicial office holders feeling valued by SCTS staff through survey data)</p> <p><b>Amber</b> moderate levels of satisfaction as assessed by the Executive Team (evidenced by 65% - 78% positive response in survey data)</p> <p><b>Green</b> high levels of satisfaction as assessed by the Executive Team (evidenced by 78% or above positive response in survey data.)</p>
Frequency of Collection	Quarterly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly

Strategic Priority 2	Satisfied Court and Tribunal Users
<b>Measure 2(a)</b>	<b>SCTS Service user satisfaction</b>
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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Evidence from these sources is used to direct further improvement activity.</p>
Measure Owner	Head of Research
Source of data & data validity/assurance	Survey data supplied by Systra Ltd (previously MVA). Independent CSE Assessment process. Results independently accredited against a recognised national framework (in the case of CSE)
Basis of calculation	Quantitative survey and assessment data.
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Red &lt;65% overall court user satisfaction levels and/or failure to maintain CSE accreditation.</p> <p>Amber 65% - 78% overall court user satisfaction levels and/or CSE maintained, but with deterioration in assessment (<i>i.e. net decline in level of assessment in 5 or more elements compared to previous year</i>)</p> <p>Green &gt; 78% overall court user satisfaction levels and CSE assessment maintaining or improving (<i>i.e. above the threshold for amber</i>).</p>
Frequency of Collection	CSE Assessment – annual Court User Survey – bi-annual

Strategic Priority 2	Satisfied Court and Tribunal Users
<b>Measure 2(b)</b>	<b>Disposal of summary criminal cases within 26 weeks</b>
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, providing performance information and analysis and ensuring that the period between the fixing of a trial diet and the date of that trial is within timescales considered to be optimal.
Measure Owner	Director Operations Delivery
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>Data is drawn from Crown Office &amp; 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.</p> <p>Data is checked by SCTS Management Information team and reviewed by SCTS Executive Team ahead of submission to Board.</p>
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 and Motivated People	
<b>Measure 3(a)</b>	<b>Employee Engagement</b>	
Description of Measure	Basket of indicators of engagement, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voluntary staff turnover levels</li> <li>• Short term absence rates</li> <li>• Proportion of appraisals completed on time</li> <li>• Volumes of Complaints/Grievances</li> <li>• Exit Interview Data</li> <li>• Annual Staff Survey Engagement Index Rating</li> </ul>	
Purpose of Measure	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
Measure Owner	Director HR	
Source of data & data validity/assurance	Returns to HR through corporate time recording system, appraisal system, complaints and grievance monitoring and review of interview and staff survey data. Data validity checked by the HR Director prior to submission to the SCTS People Committee for detailed scrutiny.	
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  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did you feel valued in your job?</li> <li>• How would you rate staff morale?</li> <li>• How would you rate work/life balance?</li> <li>• Would you recommend the SCTS?</li> </ul> <p>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:</p> <p>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</p>
	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	

Strategic Priority 3	Skilled and Motivated People
<b>Measure 3(b)</b>	<b>Delivery of developmental activities</b>
Description of Measure	The proportion of staff who have attended relevant technical and developmental courses.
Purpose of Measure	<p>Providing appropriately trained staff is a core responsibility of the SCTS. Ensuring that staff receive an appropriate level of training in technical, managerial and specialist areas is essential for providing high quality court services.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measure Owner	Director HR
Source of data & data validity/assurance	HR training databases, workforce planning and skills assessment tool. Data validity checked by the HR Director prior to submission to the SCTS People Committee for detailed scrutiny.
Basis of calculation	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scottish Vocational Qualifications</li> <li>• Institute of Leadership and Management Qualifications</li> <li>• Middle Manager Development Programme</li> <li>• First Line Manager Programme</li> <li>• Administrative Officer Development Programme</li> </ul>
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Success threshold for achievement of green criteria increased by 50% in 2014/15 (from 22% to 33%) in recognition of significant progress made.</p> <p>Red – Less than 35% of staff  Amber – 35-40% of staff  Green – More than 40% of staff</p> <p><i>All RAG criteria were upgraded for 2018-19 in view of them being exceeded throughout 2017-18.</i></p>
Frequency of Collection	Quarterly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly

Strategic Priority 4	A Well-managed Estate
<b>Measure 4(a)</b>	<b>Maintaining the estate</b>
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	<p>This indicator demonstrates how SCTS is managing its repair and maintenance programme, taking into account budgetary constraints.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measure Owner	Director Property Services Unit
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>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 2016-17 careful use of resources reduced that backlog by over 30% to £35m. As budgets tighten further spend on the estate will be largely confined to essential backlog maintenance and statutory compliance.</p> <p>The annual target on backlog maintenance has been set at 1% of the total insurance replacement value of the estate per year. If that 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.</p> <p>The SCTS Estates Team maintain a prioritised list of maintenance projects and account for expenditure against these through budget reporting.</p> <p>Projected spend is reviewed and signed off by Estates Unit management ahead of it being shared for the scorecard.</p> <p>These priorities and budgets are also reviewed and approved by the SCTS Estates Committee, providing additional assurance.</p>
Basis of calculation	<p>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 <i>overall forecast of essential maintenance expenditure for the full year</i>.</p> <p>This will be divided by the <i>backlog maintenance target</i> (1% of the total insurance replacement value of the estate) to show the forecast annual maintenance spend as a</p>

	proportion of that target.
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>The projected level of maintenance spending for the full year (using actual and forecast expenditure) as a proportion of the backlog maintenance target.</p> <p>Red – projected expenditure for the year is less than 95% of the backlog maintenance target</p> <p>Amber – projected expenditure for the year is between 95% and 105% of the backlog maintenance target</p> <p>Green - projected expenditure for the year is in excess of 105% of the backlog maintenance target</p>
Frequency of Collection	Quarterly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly

Strategic Priority 4	A Well-managed Estate
<b>Measure 4(b)</b>	<b>Sustainability and carbon reduction</b>
Description of Measure	The total annual carbon output from SCTS properties compared against a baseline set in the Carbon Management Plan, represented as a percentage reduction/increase in consumption.
Purpose of Measure	<p>Building and maintaining a sustainable estate is key corporate objective. In response to an internal audit review it was recognised that sustainability and carbon reduction should feature among the strategic targets of all major public sector players – particularly those with a large and diverse estate such as SCTS.</p> <p>The organisation has performed well against its carbon management programme over recent years, holds the Carbon Trust Carbon Triple accreditation and is recognised as a sustainability leader in the public sector. Achieving further reductions in carbon output will become increasingly challenging, so adding Board oversight into the process will help ensure it continues to be afforded appropriate priority.</p>
Measure Owner	Director, Property Services Unit
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>SCTS collects carbon emissions figures for electricity and natural gas. Electricity and natural gas data is captured half hourly from automatic meter readers (AMRs) in all SCTS owned buildings (c.95% of entire estate). Manual consumption data is collected from leased premises and sites using LPG. SCTS have access to an online portal through which readings from the AMRs can be taken.</p> <p>SCTS receives a monthly Energy Management Report collated by Servest. That report analyses energy consumption and estate-wide carbon emissions maintained in a rolling 12 month cycle, amongst other things. The data is provided to SCTS by SSE from SCTS' three energy suppliers: Dataserve, Energy Assets &amp; EDF.</p> <p>The data is checked by Servest and a monthly report authored by the Sustainability Coordinator. That report is approved by the Contract Director for Servest and reviewed by the Shared Services Board for SCTS and COPFS who approve the report or return it further information.</p> <p>Energy to carbon conversion factors and calculators from the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs are used to determine carbon emissions</p> <p>NOTE: The consumption of gas is weather corrected using a</p>

	Chartered Institute of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE) procedure agreed between the SCTS and Servest.
Basis of calculation	<p>The total electricity and gas consumption for the year ending with the most recent quarter is measured, and that figure is used to calculate the <b>total carbon output</b> of the SCTS managed estate over the past 12 months.</p> <p>Carbon output is then compared against the agreed reduction targets set in the Carbon Management Plan.</p> <p>The SCTS carbon management plan sets a target of a 2.5% year-on year reduction in carbon output per year using 2016-17 total carbon output as a baseline.</p> <p>NOTE: The consumption of gas is weather corrected using a Chartered Institute of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE) procedure agreed between the SCTS and Servest.</p>
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Red – Carbon output in the 12 month period is 2.5% or more behind the reduction target set in the carbon management plan.</p> <p>Amber – Carbon output in the 12 month period is between 0 and 2.4% behind the reduction target set in the carbon management plan</p> <p>Green – Carbon output in the 12 month period meets or exceeds the reduction target set in the carbon management plan.</p>
Frequency of Collection	Monthly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly
Other Comments	As SCTS holds the Carbon Triple standard we will, in future years, explore the inclusion of water and waste reduction as part of scorecard measurements on sustainability.

Strategic Priority 5	Efficiency & Best Value
<b>Measure 5(a)</b>	<b>Sheriff Summary criminal waiting periods</b>
Description of Measure	The average 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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measure Owner	Director Operations Delivery
Source of data & data validity/assurance	COP II Management Information reports. Report generation and cross-checking/approval are separated functions within the Management Information and Analysis Team to ensure data currency and integrity. Data is reviewed by the SCTS Executive Team ahead of submission to Board.
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	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>

Strategic Priority 5	Efficiency & Best Value
<b>Measure 5(b)</b>	<b>JP Summary criminal waiting periods</b>
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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measure Owner	Director Operations Delivery
Source of data & data validity/assurance	COP II Management Information reports. . Report generation and cross-checking/approval are separated functions within the Management Information and Analysis Team to ensure data currency and integrity. Data is reviewed by the SCTS Executive Team ahead of submission to Board.
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	As per indicator 5a

Strategic Priority 5	Efficiency & Best Value
<b>Measure 5(c)</b>	<b>Summary trials adjourned with no evidence led</b>
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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measure Owner	Director Operations Delivery
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>COP II management information reports.</p> <p>Report generation and cross-checking/approval are separated functions within the Management Information and Analysis Team to ensure data currency and integrity. Data is reviewed by the SCTS Executive Team ahead of submission to Board.</p>
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	<p>The baseline performance was 36.1% (2010-11). As no significant reforms have been introduced to the summary system since that date the RAG targets are considered to still be current as of the end of 2017-18</p> <p>Red &gt;35% Amber 35-30% Green &lt;30%</p>
Frequency of Collection	Monthly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly
Other Comments	The proposals of the evidence and procedure review recommend a change in approach – citing the relatively high level of summary trials called at which no evidence is led as a sign of sub-optimal performance in the current system.

Strategic Priority 5	Efficiency & Best Value
<b>Measure 5(d)</b>	<b>Court business waiting times (non-summary)</b>
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	<p>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.</p> <p>Waiting periods give an indication of how long court users may have to wait before getting access to the court. Deterioration in these figures will be indicative of pressure on the system borne of increasing demand or reduced capacity.</p>
Measure Owner	Director Operations Delivery and the Principal Clerk of Session & Judiciary.
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>COP II, CMS and operational data returns</p> <p>Report generation and cross-checking/approval are separated functions within the Management Information and Analysis Team to ensure data currency and integrity. Data is reviewed by the SCTS Executive Team ahead of submission to Board.</p>
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	<p>Red - if more than four sub-measures are at amber and/or if more than one sub-measure is at Red</p> <p>Amber - if at most four sub-measures are at amber and/or if one sub-measure is at Red</p> <p>Green - if all sub-measures are green or only one amber.</p>
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.

There are <b>twelve</b> sub measures within Measure 5(d)		
Waiting Time Indicators	RAG Criteria	Comment
<p><b>Inner House.</b> The current waiting period for the earliest available non-urgent 2 day hearing, as at the end of each quarter</p>	<p>Red – more than 4 weeks above baseline Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline</p>	<p>Baseline is 2010-11 average 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.</p>
<p><b>Criminal Appeals.</b> 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:</p> <p>There are four types of Criminal appeals sub measures:</p> <p><b>Solemn sentence – 17 weeks baseline</b></p> <p><b>Solemn conviction and sentence – 47 weeks baseline</b></p> <p><b>Summary sentence – 11 weeks baseline</b></p> <p><b>Summary stated case – 18 weeks baseline</b></p>	<p>Red – more than 4 weeks above baseline Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline</p>	<p>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 be highlighted on the scorecard. Supreme Courts will provide explanations in such instances</p>
<p><b>Outer House - Personal Injury (Ch 43).</b> The current waiting period between the lodging of defences and the first day of the proof diet, as at the end of each quarter.</p>	<p>Red – 2 months above baseline Amber – 1-2 months above baseline Green – less than 1 month above baseline or below it</p>	<p>Baseline to be set at 13 months based on Lord Coulsfield's recommendation. Measure based on an average of all cases in the quarter.</p>
<p><b>Outer House - Commercial Court.</b> The current waiting period between the first preliminary hearing and the first substantive hearing, as at the end of each quarter.</p>	<p>Red – more than 4 weeks above baseline Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p><b>Outer House – Other Actions.</b> The current waiting period for a 4 day proof diet, as at the end of each quarter.</p>	<p>Red – more than 4 weeks above baseline Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline</p>	<p>Measures the earliest 4 day hearing that can be offered by the Keeper. Baseline figure is 30 weeks, the average of 2011-12 performance.</p>
<p><b>Sheriff Court Civil.</b> 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.</p>	<p>Red – 4 or more weeks above baseline Amber – 2- 4 weeks above baseline Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline</p>	<p>Baseline based on 2011-12 average of 11 weeks.</p>
<p><b>High Court First Instance.</b> 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).</p>	<p>Red – 4 weeks above baseline Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline</p>	<p>Conclusion of the trial includes conviction, acquittal or acceptance of a plea. Baseline figure is based on 2011-12 average of 21 weeks.</p>
<p><b>Sheriff and Jury.</b> 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).</p>	<p>Red – 4 weeks above baseline Amber – 2 – 4 weeks above baseline Green – less than 2 weeks above baseline or below baseline</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Office of the Public Guardian</b>  Percentage of guardianship orders registered within 5 working days.</p>	<p>Red &lt;90% Amber 90%-94% Green &gt;94%</p>	<p>Data published on OPG website.</p>

Strategic Priority 5	Efficiency & Best Value
<b>Measure 5(e)</b>	<b>Effective Tribunal Operations</b>
Description of Measure	A basket of key operational targets designed to monitor the effective administration of devolved tribunals.
Purpose of Measure	<p>SCTS is responsible for the effective administration of a range of devolved tribunals, which are in the process of migrating into the new chamber structure established under the Tribunals (Scotland) Act. Whilst the business of each tribunal (or chamber) is administered according to its own subject matter and procedure it is important that the SCTS Board has reassurance that the core activities required to maintain their effective operation are being delivered to the required standard.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measure Owner	Head of Tribunal Operations
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>Tribunal Operations Balanced Scorecard</p> <p>The data is drawn from the case management systems and processes of each devolved tribunal. These are collated into a more detailed tribunals' quarterly performance scorecard, which is reviewed by the Tribunals senior management team ahead of presentation to the Chief Operating Officer for review. The KPIs contained in the report are used to provide exception-based reporting to the SCTS Executive Team and Board.</p>
Basis of calculation	The indicator consists of 15 target-based measures – each of which is assessed quarterly. In each case the target will either have been met or not.
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Red – Under 7 targets met in the quarter</p> <p>Amber – 8 to 11 targets met in the quarter</p> <p>Green – 12 or more targets met in the quarter</p>
Frequency of Collection	Quarterly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly
Other Comments	This measure may be subject to more periodic review than others as new tribunal jurisdictions are created and move into the Chamber Structure (e.g. Social Security – planned for late 2018).

**There are fourteen sub measures within Measure 5(e)**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1. Mental Health Tribunal – 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 – 2	Tribunal Panel to hear multiple cases at least 54% of the time.	To make best use of panel resources
3. Mental Health Tribunal – 3	Casework checked by the quality assurance team will exceed an error free rate of 95%	Most errors are not material – but desire to avoid.
4. Pension Appeals Tribunal 1	To issue at least 95% of decisions to parties within 2 days of receipt of the signed decision from the Chairman.	Ensures timeous conclusion of business
5. Pension Appeals Tribunal 2	To list at least 95% 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 90% 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 90% of 1st Orders/Notices within 8 working days of full receipt of new application.	To ensure applications are timeously processed
8. First Tier Tribunal (Tax) 1	Directions issued to parties within 5 days of appeal being received (target 95%)	To avoid undue delay in directions
9. First Tier Tribunal (Tax) 2	Issue final decision to party within 3 working days of receipt from members (target 95%)	Ensures timeous conclusion of business
10. First-tier Tribunal (Health & Education Chamber)1	99% of claims are registered within 2 working days of receipt	Ensures timeous conclusion of business
11. First-tier Tribunal (Health & Education Chamber)2	Issue 100% of papers to parties within 2 working days of case statement period	To ensure parties are well prepared
12. First-tier Tribunal (Housing & Property Chamber) 1	At least 95% of applications are registered and acknowledged within 2 working days of receipt	To ensure applications are timeously processed
13. First-tier Tribunal (Housing & Property Chamber) 2	At least 95% of hearings or mediation for all cases are arranged within 3 working days following referral from the President	To ensure applications are timeously processed
14. Council Tax Reduction Review Panel 1	At least 95% of applications are registered and acknowledged within 2 working days of receipt	Ensures timeous processing
15. Council Tax Reduction Review Panel 2	At least 95% of hearings or mediation for all cases are arranged within 2 working days following referral.	To ensure applications are timeously processed

Strategic Priority 5	Efficiency & Best Value
<b>Measure 5(f)</b>	<b>Delivering our change programme</b>
Description of Measure	The overall RAG status of the SCTS portfolio of change.
Purpose of Measure	<p>The SCTS Corporate Plan for 2017-20 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.</p> <p>This indicator provides an overview on the progress SCTS is making towards meeting these objectives.</p>
Measure Owner	Corporate Secretary
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>Business Plan Delivery Report, informed by individual project highlight reports and Programme Board assessments.</p> <p>Project and business plan delivery status is reported on by individual managers – these updates are then reviewed and collated into the Business Plan Delivery Report by the Corporate Secretary. That report is reviewed quarterly by both the SCTS Executive Team and the SCTS Board – ensuring it is accurate and scrutinised where appropriate.</p>
Basis of calculation	RAG status is determined by the SCTS Executive Team, based on the advice of the Planning, Projects and Risk Team, when it periodically reviews the business plan delivery report.
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>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.</p> <p>Amber - if the portfolio is currently not on track and issues can be handled by the Executive overseeing the delivery of change.</p> <p>Green - if the portfolio is currently on track to meet the majority of outcomes set.</p>
Frequency of Collection	Quarterly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly
Other Comments	None

<b>Strategic Priority 6</b>	<b>Digital Innovation</b>
<b>Measure 6(a)</b>	<b>Transactions that are carried out on line</b>
Description of Measure	The proportion of fine transactions that are carried out on line.
Purpose of Measure	<p>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.</p> <p>Uptake of online transactions simplifies the payment process for those using the service and eases the administrative burden on court staff. It also reduces risks associated with cash handling.</p>
Measure Owner	Head of Fines Business Unit
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>COP II fines payment data</p> <p>Report generation and cross-checking/approval are separated functions with the head of fines unit generating the initial report and a check conducted by the Management Information and Analysis Team. Data is reviewed by the SCTS Executive Team ahead of submission to Board.</p>
Basis of calculation	<p>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.</p>
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Red &lt; 18%</p> <p>Amber 18 to 23 %</p> <p>Green &gt; 23%</p> <p><i>Note – these have all been upgraded by 3% for 2018-19 in view of them being exceeded in 2017-18</i></p>
Frequency of Collection	Monthly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly
Other Comments	<p>In 2018/19 Q1, the success threshold for achievement of each criteria increased by 3%, in recognition of increasing levels of uptake. Further significant change may require a change to legislation relating to driving licence endorsement.</p>

Strategic Priority 6	Digital Innovation
<b>Measure 6(b)</b>	<b>IT Resilience and Service</b>
Description of Measure	An overarching measure (containing a variety of sub-measures) that reports on the availability (or “uptime”) of a number of internal and external systems on which the organisation relies to provide its services.
Purpose of Measure	<p>The availability of core IT systems is crucial to providing a good service and in enabling the SCTS to fulfil its responsibilities to the wider justice system.</p> <p>This indicator demonstrates the reliability of internal and external platforms, networks and applications – and will also highlight any systems that have suffered significant outages in the quarter.</p>
Measure Owner	Director, IT Unit
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>System downtime identified by IT monitoring systems and reported from local sites.</p> <p>Data is cross checked by IT managers before being shared with the Planning, Projects and Risk Team for reporting to (i) the SCTS Executive team and (ii) the SCTS Board.</p>
Basis of calculation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For each system listed in the sub-measures below the unplanned downtime for the quarter is supplied in a report generated by IT from their servicedesk system. This details all unplanned downtime incidents, their duration in minutes and the extent of their impact. This is cross-checked by IT managers.</li> <li>2. The quarterly downtime percentage for each system (sub-measure) is then calculated as follows. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1. The duration in minutes of each incident is multiplied by an “impact index”. Where a system was down nationally the index score would be 1 (100%) – but where, for example, only 20% of users were impacted, the index would be 0.2 (20%). This allows each incident to be scored according to both its duration and the number/size of locations affected.</li> <li>2.2 The figures derived at step 2.1 are added together to reach the total number of downtime minutes for the system in question for the quarter. That total is then divided by the total number of minutes in a quarter (131,400 – or 91.25 days).</li> <li>2.3. The figure derived at step 2.2 is multiplied by 100 to calculate the quarterly downtime percentage.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. The quarterly uptime percentage for each system is then calculated by subtracting the quarterly downtime percentage derived at step 2.3 from 100.</li> </ol>

Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Each of the sub-measures will be assigned its own RAG rating for the quarter, based on the following thresholds:</p> <p>Red – Quarterly uptime &lt;98%  Amber – Quarterly uptime 98% - 99%  Green – Quarterly uptime &gt; 99%</p> <p>The overall RAG status will then be determined, as follows</p> <p>Red – anything outwith the green or amber thresholds.</p> <p>Amber – two sub-measures reporting amber <u>or</u> one reporting red, <u>or</u> one reporting red &amp; one reporting amber.</p> <p>Green – all sub-measures green or only one amber</p>
<b>Measure 6(b) consists of 12 sub measures – each of which will have its own quarterly uptime percentage. The sub-measures relate to the following systems</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. COP II – Criminal Case Management System</li> <li>2. ICMS – Civil Case Management System</li> <li>3. Tribunals Case Management Systems</li> <li>4. E-mail</li> <li>5. Telephones</li> <li>6. Corporate Wi-Fi</li> <li>7. Network servers</li> <li>8. The SCTS Intranet</li> <li>9. Sigma – OPG Case Management System</li> <li>10. The SCTS website.</li> <li>11. Electronic Power of Attorney applications website. (EPOAR)</li> <li>12. Automated Telephone Payments system for fines</li> </ol>	
Frequency of Collection	Quarterly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly
Other Comments	Measure updated in 2018-19 to broaden the range of systems included and to improve the basis of calculation.

Strategic Priority 7	Purposeful Collaboration with Partners
<b>Measure 7(a)</b>	<b>Sufficient and effective collaboration over period</b>
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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measure Owner	Corporate Secretary
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>SCTS Executive Team assessment (plus any additional observations/ratings provided by the SCTS Board).</p> <p>As a qualitative indicator assessed by the Executive Team this is descriptive of the current position and does not require any data checking or assurance. That said, the fact that the full SCTS Executive Team considers and discusses the rating for this indicator on each occasion ensures a degree of calibration and a consistency in approach to the assessment of collaboration across the organisation as a whole.</p>
Basis of calculation	SCTS Executive Team assessment
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Green – collaboration currently effective, with no major issues.</p> <p>Amber – collaboration generally effective although particular issues/areas may require further focus (e.g. escalating business volumes).</p> <p>Red – concerns about level of collaboration or specific issues that require the attention of the SCTS Board.</p>
Frequency of Collection	Quarterly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly
Other Comments	

Strategic Priority 8	Funding
<b>Measure 8(a)</b>	<b>Expenditure profile</b>
Description of Measure	Year-end forecast of direct running costs variance as a percentage of budget
Purpose of Measure	<p>To monitor the risk of the SCTS under-spending or exceeding budget by the financial year end.</p> <p>To monitor the quality of financial planning by comparing budget information against 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.</p>
Measure Owner	Chief Financial Officer
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>SEAS accounting system</p> <p>Data is extracted from SEAS as part of the monthly budgeting round and cross-checked by a qualified accountant. It is then reviewed by both the Chief Finance Officer and the SCTS Executive Team prior to its submission to the SCTS Board in the Board finance report. This indicator draws on the data from that report.</p>
Basis of calculation	<p>Deduct forecast full-year running costs from budgeted full-year running costs and divide by budgeted full-year running costs. A negative figure shows an under-spend, a positive figure shows an over-spend. Running costs include both total revenue expenditure and total capital expenditure.</p> <p>As agreed with our internal auditors this calculation reports on the most up to date end-year forecast at the point when the scorecard is submitted, to provide the most timely information available and to ensure it aligns with the financial report provided to each Board meeting.</p>
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>Red - out with green and amber</p> <p>Amber : Between -2.5% and -5% of forecast</p> <p>Green : -2.50% of forecast to matching forecast</p>
Frequency of Collection	Monthly
Frequency of Reporting	Quarterly
Other Comments	<p>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.</p> <p>The RAG criteria is biased towards flagging an overspend as that is generally more challenging to manage than under spending and might require an action plan to rectify.</p>

<b>Strategic Priority 8</b>	<b>Funding</b>
<b>Measure 8(b)</b>	<b>Fines and fee income</b>
Description of Measure	The profile of receipt of fees and fines income against forecast
Purpose of Measure	<p>Fees and fines income are a variable source of income but fund approximately 25% of the overall SCTS budget.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measure Owner	Chief Financial Officer
Source of data & data validity/assurance	<p>COP II and SEAS accounting system</p> <p>Data is extracted from SEAS as part of the monthly budgeting round and cross-checked by a qualified accountant. It is then reviewed by both the Chief Finance Officer and the SCTS Executive Team prior to its submission to the SCTS Board in the Board finance report. This indicator draws on the data from that report.</p>
Basis of calculation	Deduct forecast full-year income from budgeted full-year income and divide by budgeted running costs. A negative figure shows an under-recovery; a positive figure shows an over-recovery.
Performance thresholds for Red/Amber/Green	<p>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</p> <p>As agreed with our internal auditors this calculation reports on the most up to date end-year forecast at the point when the scorecard is submitted, to provide the most timely information available and to ensure it aligns with the financial report provided to each Board meeting.</p>
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.

# SCTS Board Scorecard 2018/19 Q1



Strategic Priority	Measure	RAG Criteria			Q2 2017/18	Q3 2017/18	Q4 2017/18	Q1 2018/19	Comment
		R	A	G					
1. Well Supported Judiciary	1a. Judicial Satisfaction	Executive team assessment & commentary							
2. Satisfied Court Users	2a. SCTS service user satisfaction	Assessment based on most recent survey data							
	2b. Disposal of summary criminal cases within 26 weeks	Less than 67%	67-72%	More than 72%					
3. Skilled, Engaged and Motivated People	3a. Employee engagement	More than 4 indicators Amber or 2 at Red	3-4 indicators Amber or 1 at Red	All indicators Green or 1 - 2 at Amber					
	3b. Delivery of development activities	Less than 35% of staff	35-40% of staff	More than 40% of staff					
4. A Well-managed Estate	4a. Maintaining the estate	More than 5% below required expenditure level	Between 5% above & 5% below required expenditure level	More than 5% above required expenditure level					
	4b. Sustainability and carbon reduction	Carbon output 2.5% or more behind reduction target	Carbon output between 0% and 2.5% behind reduction target.	Carbon output meeting or exceeding target.					
5. Efficiency and Best Value	5a. Sheriff Summary criminal waiting periods	Over 19 weeks	Between 17 and 19 weeks	Under 17 weeks					
	5b. JP Summary criminal waiting periods	Over 19 weeks	Between 17 and 19 weeks	Under 17 weeks					
	5c. Summary trials adjourned with no evidence led	More than 35%	35-30%	Less than 30%					
	5d. Court business waiting times (non-summary)	More than 4 indicators Amber and/or more than 1 red	2-4 indicators amber and/or 1 red	All indicators green, or 1 amber					
	5e. Effective Tribunal Operations	Under 7 targets met in the quarter	8 to 11 targets met in the quarter	12 or more targets met in the quarter					
	5f. Delivering our Change Programme	Overall summary of programme delivery status							
6. Digital innovation	6a. Transactions carried out on-line	Less than 18%	18% - 23%	More than 23%					
	6b. IT Resilience & Service	Outwith green and amber	Two measures amber or one red	All measures green or only one amber					
7. Purposeful Collaboration with Justice Bodies	7a. Sufficient and effective collaboration over period	Executive team assessment & commentary							
8. Financial Performance	8a. Expenditure profile	Outwith green and amber	Between minus 2.5% & minus 5.0% of forecast	Between forecast & minus 2.5% of forecast					
	8b. Fines and fee income	Less than minus 2.5% of forecast	Between minus 2.5% & minus 1.5% of forecast	From over-recovery to minus 1.5% of forecast					