

Joint Scrutiny committee report

Report of head of corporate strategy

Author: Chris Webb and Jo Paterson

Tel: 01235 540358 / 01235 422253

E-mail: chris.webb@southandvale.gov.uk : jo.paterson@southandvale.gov.uk

Cabinet Members responsible: Anna Badcock and Charlotte Dickson

Tel: 07733 111 554 / 01235 767848

E-mail: annabadcock1@gmail.com / charlotte@leahouse.com

To: JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 22 September 2016

2015/16 performance review of GLL

RECOMMENDATION

That the committee considers GLL's performance in delivering the joint leisure management contract for the period 2015/16 and makes any recommendations to the cabinet members for leisure to enable them to make a final assessment on performance.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The report considers the performance of GLL in providing the joint leisure management service in South Oxfordshire and Vale of the White Horse for the period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016. This is the first report of the new joint contract which started on 1 September 2014.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

2. The review of GLL helps ensure that the council's achieve their strategic objectives in the following areas:
 - South Oxfordshire's strategic objective to 'build thriving communities' through the corporate priority to 'help people to be healthy and active'
 - Vale of White Horse's strategic objective for 'sustainable communities and well-being' through the corporate priority to 'increase participation in sport and leisure through continuous improvement programmes for our leisure centres, facilities and schemes'.

BACKGROUND

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the council's objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the council's services are outsourced (approximately half the revenue budget is spent on seven main contractors), the councils cannot deliver excellent service to their residents unless their contractors are excellent. Working jointly with contractors to review performance regularly is therefore essential.
4. The council's process for managing contractor performance focuses on continuous improvement and action planning. The councils realise that the success of the framework depends on contractors and the councils working together to set and review realistic, jointly agreed and measurable targets.
5. The overall framework is designed to be:
 - a consistent way for the councils to consistently measure contractor performance, to help highlight and resolve operational issues
 - flexible enough to suit each contract, including smaller contracts which may not require all elements of the framework
 - a step towards managing risk more effectively and improving performance through action planning.

OVERVIEW OF THE REVIEW FRAMEWORK

6. The review process consists of three essential dimensions:
 1. performance measured against key performance targets (KPTs)
 2. customer satisfaction with the total service experience
 3. council satisfaction as client.
7. Each dimension is assessed and the head of service makes a judgement of classification. Contractor feedback and an assessment of strengths and areas for improvement are also included. Where some dimensions are not relevant or difficult to apply fairly to certain types of contract, the framework may be adjusted or simplified at the discretion of the head of service.
8. This contract is the first joint leisure contract and runs from 1 September 2014 until 31 August 2024. GLL provides a comprehensive programme of activities and opportunities for residents and visitors to both districts to enjoy sporting and leisure facilities. GLL operates facilities in Berinsfield, Didcot, Henley, Thame, Wallingford and Wheatley in South Oxfordshire as well as Abingdon, Wantage and Faringdon on behalf of the Vale through a management contract and service specification document.
9. The main deliverables within the contract are to:
 - provide a minimum income each year of £411,278.76 to South Oxfordshire and £1,138,136.40 to the Vale
 - increase participation in the council's leisure facilities and participation outreach programmes

- provide a varied programme of activities to cater for different age groups and preferences.

DIMENSION 1 – KEY PERFORMANCE TARGETS

10. This contract has fourteen KPTs. These KPTs were considered by a joint working group of scrutiny committee members at the time of drawing up the contract documentation and officers from the leisure and corporate strategy teams. The KPTs take into account areas of shared importance to elected members and officers in reporting on the contractor's performance. The KPTs are reported to cabinet members and senior officers on a quarterly basis so areas of success and concern can be discussed in a timely way.

11. These KPT results have been used to inform target setting for 2016/17 and will be used to develop the trend analysis that will happen as the contract progresses.

KPT ref	Description of KPT	Target	Performance	Individual KPT rating (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	KPT rating score (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
KPT 1	Increased total visits year on year	1% +	6.6%+	Excellent	5
KPT 2	Increased total activity visits year on year	1% +	7.1%+	Excellent	5
KPT 3	Increased year on year growth of inclusive membership (disabled pre-paid)	5% +	79.0%+	Excellent	5
KPT 4	Increased year on year growth of concessionary leisure card holders (pay and play)	5% +	7.1%-	Weak	2
KPT 5	Attrition (prepaid memberships only gym, swim etc. not swim school)	Below 7.5%	5.98%	Excellent	5
KPT 6	Average length of stay, direct debit members (excluding swim school)	12 Months	10.21 Months	Weak	2
KPT 7	Reduce	Under 103	40	Excellent	5

KPT ref	Description of KPT	Target	Performance	Individual KPT rating (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	KPT rating score (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
	customer complaints to Councils				
KPT 8	Percentage of bookings made on line	45%	45%	Excellent	5
KPT 9	Percentage of referrals completing Healthwise programme (GP referral)	40%	40%	Excellent	5
KPT 10	Conversion rate from Healthwise programme to Healthwise membership	25%	37%	Excellent	5
KPT 11	Decreased year on year energy usage (electricity) Kwh per visit	2% -	11% -	Excellent	5
KPT 12	Decreased year on year energy usage (gas) Kwh	2% -	23% -	Excellent	5
KPT 13	Decreased year on year energy usage (water) cubic meters per visit	2% -	59% -	Excellent	5
KPT 14	Annual user satisfaction survey	70%	79%	Excellent	5
Overall "average" KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average)					4.57
Overall "average" KPT performance (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)					Excellent

12. These targets were agreed at the start of the year using the actual achievements from the previous contracts as the baseline and took into account the actual results of the first six months of the contract in 2014/15 and also reflected anticipated trends. In order to provide an accurate comparison against past performance and to take account of the

operational and programme changes brought about by the new contract, the KPT's have been revised both up and down from the original targets.

- 13. Performance against the targets has been very positive and it is good to note that performance is significantly improved since the previous year. GLL has achieved an excellent rating against 12 of the 14 targets. Some of these were particularly pleasing for example, the savings in utility consumption achieved. GLL introduced a comprehensive housekeeping process into the centres which it was anticipated would produce some savings but not to the level realised.
- 14. GLL needs to carry out some further work on the reports delivered by its management reporting system (Legend). It appears that the number of visits reported by Legend may not accurately reflect the actual number of customers. This inaccuracy means that GLL are not getting full credit for the increased visits achieved in relation to in KPT's 1 and 2. In addition accurate data makes for better decision making. Since being introduced almost three years ago, officers have repeatedly raised this point with GLL in order that their achievements in attracting more users are properly reflected.
- 15. The reason KPT's 4 and 6 have not been achieved is primarily because we are still in the early days of the contract. The concessionary leisure card (KPT 4) was only introduced to the Vale facilities in 2015 and it will take a while for uptake to reach anticipated levels. Uptake of the card has already increased in 2016 and this will be reflected in the 2016/17 KPTs.
- 16. The average length of stay for members (KPT 6) also reflects that the Vale facilities joined GLL in September 2014 and therefore the absolute maximum stay that could have been achieved between that date and the end of the reporting year could have been 19 months. Experience tells us that membership numbers change very quickly however we are now seeing that the length of stay is growing as customers experience improving facilities, new equipment and GLL's management of the service and this will be reflected in the 2016/17 KPTs.
- 17. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of contractors on customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

- 18. These results generate a score of 4.57 which results in an overall judgement for the KPT dimension of Excellent.
- 19. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows:

KPT judgement Excellent

Previous KPT judgement for comparison N/A

DIMENSION 2 – CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

20. GLL carried out and collated customer satisfaction surveys during 2015/16. Details of the questions asked are attached as annex A of this report.
21. The sample size for this survey was 945. This is a very small sample for the number of visitors attending the facilities across both South Oxfordshire and the Vale. Going forwards, GLL must properly resource this piece of work.
22. GLL also undertakes its own annual satisfaction survey. In order to maximise the usefulness of both surveys, GLL will reschedule the timing of its survey to provide us with customer feedback at six monthly intervals. The information from both surveys will be included in future reports.
23. GLL has achieved an overall customer satisfaction score of 4.16. The weaker areas of service identified by this process form part of the action plan for the year ahead included in Annex B.
24. In addition to the customer satisfaction surveys, we monitor customer comments received by each facility and those received directly by the council. In terms of the feedback received we raise any negative comments that could have significant service or safety implications with GLL to ensure that appropriate action is taken. We also compliment the positive comments which are received especially when it relates to a named member of the GLL team. In annex A there is a breakdown of the number and type of comments received.
25. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, the following is a guide to the assessment of GLL on customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

26. The overall score achieved by GLL for customer satisfaction is 4.16, which delivers a judgement of Good. As this is the first judgement under this new contract there is no previous comparison to compare against. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Customer satisfaction judgement **Good**

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison N/A

DIMENSION 3 – COUNCIL SATISFACTION

27. Three officers associated with the contract have commented on the council's satisfaction with the delivery of the contract during 2015/16 – these can be seen in annex C. These are the:
- facilities development (leisure) officer who deals primarily with the management of the leisure facilities

- leisure manager and
- partnership development officer who deals with the specialist participation element of the contract.

28. Having taken over the operation of all the facilities on the 1 September 2014 the immediate transition went very well. The only issue related to membership details and prices charged which were easily and quickly dealt with by GLL. The primary cause of these issues arose from the inaccurate, confusing or missing data from previous contractors given to GLL on the transfer of the contracts.
29. After the initial two weeks the support team from GLL was removed leaving the normal centre teams to continue the transition. This worked very well.
30. We had a watching brief during this time, offering support where requested by the GLL team whilst maintaining a very low key monitoring role. During the first three months monitoring slowly increased in the Vale sites which were new to GLL whilst normal monitoring was maintained in South which GLL had run since 2009.
31. Despite the challenges of operating 12 complex and multi-disciplined facilities, GLL has continued to support a range of charitable initiatives during the year, these included Swimathon, Sport Relief hosting a GLL evening to present awards to athletes living in south and vale sponsored by the GLL sports foundation, inter partnership pickleball and badminton championships.
32. Carbon reduction schemes within the partnership have taken a while to progress, however at the end of the reporting year we are in a position to have major works undertaken in both partnerships which will save money and carbon. These projects along with improved housekeeping at the facilities are already, and we expect will continue to, produce reductions in the consumption of all utilities. The major projects will include new air handling units at the White Horse and Henley centres, new lights in the sports halls at Faringdon and Wantage centres and new lights in the pool at Faringdon.
33. We do have a concern about the high level of staff turnover across the contract. Duty managers, lifeguards, swimming instructors and café staff have a high turnover at Thame, White Horse and Didcot Wave, meaning the remaining staff are under pressure to continue to deliver high standards with reduced resources. GLL appears to have difficulty recruiting suitable candidates to certain posts. We have met with GLL colleagues to share our concerns and a plan is now in place to help managers overcome the problem.
34. GLL's community team have worked in partnership to deliver some outreach programmes but the staffing levels and a lack of suitably qualified coaches has resulted in courses being cancelled. This is an area that needs to be addressed in the future.
35. GLL works with the participation team to deliver projects such as GO Active, Active Women and Sportivate. To support these projects the councils asked GLL to demonstrate the Social Return on Investment. This needs further work to suit our needs and the participation team are working with GLL to achieve that.
36. The school holiday activities programme is now being run by GLL on behalf of the councils. The play scheme style activities have worked well and had a good

attendance across most centres. Further work is required on the sports specific activities and a better working relationship with local clubs would help to address this. Marketing of activities could also be improved. This is a common theme within the participation and facility element of the contract.

37. The participation team worked with GLL to deliver its annual swimming offer in May and June 2015. The campaign was a success with over 1,000 people registering for the offer across South Oxfordshire and the Vale. If all GLL staff had been aware of the campaigns it would have been even better and this is learning for future campaigns.
38. In April 2016, a new world record was set for playing continuous doubles tennis by a group from the tennis coaching team at the White Horse Leisure and Tennis Centre. In addition the team raised £13,000 in sponsorship for Sports Relief which brought the total figure raised by GLL in South and Vale to £31,626.
39. The partnership promoted the Club Games for older customers competing on behalf of both councils, as well as hosting an awards evening for aspiring athletes who receive funding support from the Greenwich Sports Foundation.
40. The partnership also delivered joint elections for both councils at the White Horse Leisure and Tennis Centre which dealt with many logistical issues in a professional and helpful manner.
41. The Chairmen of both councils attended official openings of newly refurbished gyms at Park, Henley, Faringdon and Wantage Leisure Centres as well as presenting awards at Triathlons at Faringdon and Wantage.
42. Also during 2015/16, the council's audit team reviewed the contract and GLL's performance. There were no high risk recommendations and overall a satisfactory outcome was awarded. We and GLL are addressing the recommendations made.
43. During the first year of the contract repairs and maintenance issues were raised by the client team along with some concerns identified during monthly inspections.

Most of these concerns have now been addressed by GLL undertaking the following actions:

- introducing regional and partnership maintenance officers
 - introducing a computerised building management system which allows the client team to oversee the works ordered and undertaken by GLL on the facilities
 - engaging with more local contractors to give an improved response time and accountable performance
 - improving monitoring procedures to increase the performance of their centres.
44. We have worked closely with GLL to implement these changes and the benefits of improved maintenance, monitoring scores and information flow, have already been realised.
 45. During the 2015/16 reporting period Thame swimming pool was closed for major refurbishment works. This involved many nights of testing and unsocial working hours as well as dealing with customer queries and the operational consequences of the

closure. The Thame team, as well as the partnership manager should be complimented on their diligence and support over this period and continued efforts to resolve this important project.

46. Based on GLL's performance, an overall council satisfaction rating of 3.5 has been achieved.

47. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of contractors on customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

48. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on council satisfaction as follows:

Council satisfaction judgement **Fair**

Previous council satisfaction judgement for comparison N/A

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

49. Taking into account the performance of the contractor against KPTs, customer satisfaction and council satisfaction, the head of service has made an overall judgement as follows.

Overall assessment **Good**

Previous overall assessment for comparison N/A

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

50. Annex D of this report records strengths and areas for improvement relating to the performance of the contractor over the last year. We have worked with GLL to develop an action plan to address areas for improvement. The plan is attached as annex B and will be delivered in 2016/2017.

CONTRACTOR'S FEEDBACK

51. A key feature of the process for reviewing the performance of contractors is that the council provides them with an opportunity to give their feedback on the assessment, including suggestions for improvements to council processes. This is included in annex E attached to this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

52. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

53. There are no legal implications arising from this report.

CONCLUSION

54. The head of Corporate Strategy has assessed GLL's performance as "**Good**" for its delivery of the leisure management contract during 2015/16. The committee is asked to make any recommendations to the cabinet members for leisure, to enable them to make a final assessment on GLL's performance.

ANNEX A – CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

	Overall Score	
1	Ease of getting through on telephone	4.26
2	Activity available at convenient times	4.33
3	Ease of booking and paying at reception	4.32
4	Ease of parking	4.04
5	Waiting time at reception	4.18
6	Activity charge	4.27
7	Range of activities available	4.25
8	Ease of contacting the centre with issues	4.25
9	How well were issues dealt with	4.16
10	Ease of booking and paying on line	4.15
11	Use of fast track pods where available	3.86
12	Quality of equipment	4.19
13	Water quality in the swimming pool	4.03
14	Water temperature in the swimming pool	3.96
15	Quality of food and drink	3.86
16	Quality of information / leaflets/websites	4.05
17	Availability of information in general	4.13
18	Quality of information on notice boards	4.11
19	Quality of flooring in sports hall/activity area	4.07
20	Quality of lighting in sports hall/activity area	4.17
21	Quality of artificial turf pitches	3.95
22	Cleanliness of changing rooms	4.03
23	Cleanliness of activity space	4.13
24	Cleanliness of cafeteria area	3.96
25	Litter removal inside and outside the centre	4.25
26	Overall impression on cleanliness of centre	4.19
27	Range of food and drink	3.79
28	Quality of food and drink	3.92
29	Value for money of food and drink	4.04
30	Reliability of vending services	3.90
31	Range of clothing and equipment for sale	3.89
32	Prices of clothing and equipment	4.13
33	Helpfulness of reception staff	4.53
34	Helpfulness of other staff	4.51
35	Standard of coaching / instruction	4.49
36	Availability of staff	4.33
37	Visibility of staff including uniform	4.47
38	Value for money of activities	4.39
39	Overall satisfaction with your visit today	4.46

40	Would you recommend this service to an associate?	4.49
Average Score	4.16	

The average score reached in 2015/16 was 4.16 across the contract, which is a significant improvement on last year and reflects the effort put in by GLL to improve services. The GLL team should be commended for their efforts and we will continue to work with the centre managers and partnership management to maintain and improve this score.

Customer comments are also monitored. The volume of comments received during the reporting year is detailed below and broken down by complaint and compliment.

Type of complaint	Year total 2015/16	Type of compliment	Year total 2015/16
Cleaning	43	Cleaning	13
Equipment/environment	39	Equipment/environment	9
Staff	44	Staff	71
Communication / On line	53		0
Repairs and Maintenance	76	Repairs and Maintenance	7
Classes	168	Classes	13
Membership	79	Membership	2
Miscellaneous	89	Miscellaneous	56
Total	611	Total	171

Feedback received directly by the council's

Type of Complaint	Year total 2015/16	Type of compliment	Year total 2015/16
Cleaning	8	Cleaning	1
Swimming Lessons	5	Swimming Lessons	
Food/vending	1	Food/Vending	
Staffing	3	Staffing	2
Repairs and Maintenance	3	Repairs and Maintenance	
Campsite	2	Campsite	
Information	3	Information	
Bookings/Members	15	Bookings/Members	
Total	40	Total	3

There was only one comment received across the contract relating to equalities and diversity during 2015/16 and that related to a male customer requesting male only swimming sessions which was responded to but no action required.

KEY DOCUMENTS

If required, has the contractor provided the council with annual updates of the following documents?

1. Updated equalities information (Yes)
2. Updated utility information (Yes)
3. Updated concept evolution information (Yes)

Annex B – Action plan for 2016/17

Action	Owner	Due date
Improve customer satisfaction response size for future consultation processes	GLL	Summer Survey 2016 Winter Spring Survey 2017
Enter into a vending contract that will provide a much improved service to customers	GLL	Quarter 3 2016
Improve dry side toilet facilities at Didcot Wave	GLL/SODC	June 2016
Improve training and awareness for on-site staff to recognise items needing repair or maintenance	GLL	Ongoing
Update Gym equipment at Thame	GLL	2016/17
Improve staffing levels and focus on customer service, rather than sales	GLL	Ongoing
Improve squash courts across the estate	GLL	2016/17
Improve sports hall floor at Park Leisure centre	GLL	2016/17
Improve disabled changing at White Horse Centre	VWHDC	September 2016
Improve telephone answering at White Horse centre	GLL	2016/17
Improve Car Parking at Faringdon Centre	GLL/VWHDC	2016/17
Improve Car Parking at Thame centre	GLL/SODC	2016/17
Improve Car Parking at Wantage Leisure Centre	GLL/VWHDC	2016/17

Annex C – Council Satisfaction for 2015/16

This assessment allows the council (as a client) to record its own satisfaction with aspects of a contractor’s performance which lie outside Key Performance Targets and customer satisfaction. Each officer with direct knowledge and who frequently interacts with the contractor should complete this form. Some questions can be left blank if the officer does not have direct knowledge of that particular question.

The numbers indicated in the following table are the total number of responses received for each question

Contractor GLL

From (date) 1 April 2015 To 31 March 2016

SERVICE DELIVERY

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
1 Understanding of the client's needs		1	2		
2 Response time			2	1	
3 Delivers to time			3		
4 Delivers to budget	2	1			
5 Efficiency of invoicing		1	2		
6 Approach to health & safety		3			

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
9 Easy to deal with	2	1			
10 Communications / keeping the client informed			2	1	
11 Quality of written documentation			3		
12 Compliance with council’s corporate identity		3			
13 Listening		3			
14 Quality of relationship	2	1			

IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
15 Offers suggestions beyond the scope of work			2	1	
16 Degree of innovation			3		
17 Goes the extra mile		1	2		
18 Supports the council's sustainability objectives		3			
19 Supports the council's equality objectives		3			
20 Degree of partnership working		3			

The following table is a summary of council satisfaction based on the completed questionnaires

Rating	Votes	Score equivalent	Total
very satisfied	6	X 5	30
satisfied	24	X 4	96
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	21	X 3	63
dissatisfied	3	X 2	6
very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	54		189

The overall council satisfaction is calculated as follows: $189 \div 54 = 3.5$ (refers to point 46 in the report)

ANNEX D - STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths

Centre managers and partnership managers are approachable and willing to help

Monitoring scores have improved towards the end of the year after considerable input from the client team

General managers are quick to respond to queries or issues when highlighted

Works well in partnership at a senior level providing updates on contract issues

Teams work well to deliver joint projects including major works

Areas for improvement

The GLL bid team need to inform and work much closer with their delivery team to ensure they are appraised of the needs of the contract

Improve training and induction processes of duty managers to improve delivery at the sites

Maintain staffing levels in order to provide the required service to customers

Too many items of maintenance being missed by site teams, which the client team observe which has improved towards the later part of the year

Improve the number of customers completing the annual customer satisfaction surveys to better reflect the numbers of users.

Annex E - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

GLL is pleased how the partnership has developed with the Councils and that the step change in service/performance in the first full year has been recognised; especially through the customer feedback. However, it is recognised there is always room for further improvement.

Dimension 1 – KPT's

GLL is delighted with the “excellent” score against the KPTs set in conjunction with the Councils. In many instances, for example KPT 1 and 2, the outcomes are well above UK averages. This also demonstrates that our shared vision with Council's Participation Team is being achieved:

“To offer opportunities that enhance the physical, mental, creative, and social well being of all members of the community who choose to get involved – encouraging everyone to take part”

KPT 4 - GLL has recently introduced a Pay & Play card in the Vale which will entitle regular users to 30% discount and up to 50% for those receiving concessions. This will undoubtedly improve the score in future reporting years

KPT 6 – Average Length of Stay was a difficult target to set at the start of contract as Vale members did not have any length of stay as part of their membership history. GLL are confident this target can be met in future reporting years and are committed to continuous improvement with numerous measures already underway to achieve further development in 2016/2017.

Dimension 2 – Customer Satisfaction

GLL is satisfied with the overall score of “good” with the average of 4.16 just 0.14 off an excellent rating. There is still a significant amount of investment taking place in the centres and to score good with a majority of this still to be completed GLL is confident in achieving Excellence at the following Scrutiny Report.

It must be recognised that GLL also conducted an Annual User Survey at the leisure centres at the same time as the Councils' Customer Survey. This clash may have resulted in fewer customers completing the Councils' paper survey. This electronic survey had (1,161 surveys completed). Therefore GLL has arranged that its electronic Annual User Survey takes place later in the year from 2017.

Dimension 3 – Council Satisfaction

GLL is aware of the staffing issues that were in some cases inherited at the start of contract and these have mostly been addressed; turnover comparisons have reduced by over 50%.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

Re point 32. GLL are keen to record that the mobilisation into South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse was smooth transition and was recognised as this. Although with a change in contractor there was the risk of losing staff throughout a period of time. Turnover now has significantly reduced by 50%, and GLL are operating key programmes in the partnership to reduce this further (Apprentices, Supervisor Academy and Trainee Management schemes)

WHAT COULD / SHOULD THE COUNCIL DO DIFFERENTLY TO ENABLE THE CONTRACTOR TO DELIVER THE SERVICE MORE EFFICIENTLY / EFFECTIVELY / ECONOMICALLY?

GLL is keen to utilise the latest technology and innovation to improve the service and “offer” to customers. We would welcome support from officers for a number of pilots/trials as the leisure industry can be a fast-moving one.

However, GLL do recognise the tremendous support, particularly from senior managers, that has been provided to-date and are keen to build further on this through the contract.

Feedback provided by

Ben Whaymand, Partnership Manager GLL
--

Date

13 th September 2016
