

Scrutiny committee report

Report of head of economy leisure and property

Author: Chris Webb

Tel: 01235 540358

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

Cabinet Member responsible: Elaine Ware

Tel: 01793 783026

E-mail: elaine.ware@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

To: SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 28 June 2012

2011/12 performance review of Soll Vale

RECOMMENDATION

That the committee considers Soll Vale's performance in delivering the leisure management contract for the period 2011/12 for Faringdon and Wantage leisure centres and Tilsley Park and makes any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure to enable her to make a final assessment on performance.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The report considers the performance of Soll Vale in providing the leisure management service in the Vale of White Horse at Faringdon and Wantage leisure centres and Tilsley Park for the period 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2012.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

2. The review of Soll Vale (Soll) helps ensure the Vale Council is achieving its strategic objectives in the following areas:
 - excellent delivery of key services: deliver high performing services with particular emphasis on ensuring good quality sports and leisure provision.
 - effective management of resources: reducing energy usage throughout the council's operations and continue to work in partnership with South Oxfordshire District Council to extend the sharing of services and all resources.

BACKGROUND

3. The Soll contract commenced on 1 September 2004 and ends on 31 August 2014. The total cost of the contract to the council over the ten year period is £3,819,000.

4. As well as this main contract, Soll manages the outdoor swimming pool in Abingdon under a separate contract. This contract was re-tendered in 2010 and was awarded to Soll again for a further four year period up to 31 August 2014. This review does not cover Soll's performance in managing the outdoor pool, which has a different monitoring arrangement involving Abingdon Town Council.
5. During 2011/12 there were two major changes to the Soll senior team. The previous contract manager left on 21 September 2011, with a new head of operations for the Soll group coming into post in January 2012. In June 2011, the chairman of the main Soll board stepped down with the new chairman taking up his role in July 2011.
6. Throughout 2011/12, Soll has developed the activity programme at the Vale sites and successfully increased usage in most parts of the business. Soll has continued to offer free swimming to under 8's at Faringdon and Wantage pools, maintained a very good offer for centre memberships throughout the year and has financed the refurbishment of the reception area at Wantage Leisure Centre at a cost of £15,000. The dry side activity programme at both Faringdon and Wantage leisure centres has also increased significantly. There are further plans to offer Access to Leisure scheme members significantly reduced prices or free use in the near future to encourage access for all users.
7. We monitor this contract on a monthly basis. The monitoring regime provides eight general routine inspections and four health and safety inspections annually. Each visit is unannounced and follows a detailed check list, which is completed by a monitoring officer for each visit. Areas that require immediate improvement are notified to the contractor before the officer leaves the site and a full report detailing all findings is issued to the contractor within two days of the inspection. An action plan is developed after each inspection with deadlines agreed between the Vale Council and Soll. Whilst there are always issues to deal with, there is co-operation between both organisations to achieve the desired outcomes.
8. In addition to these inspections, there are monthly formal contractor / client meetings held at one of the centres where any relevant issues are discussed. These visits also allow for ad-hoc inspections to take place. There are quarterly strategic meetings, which allow for medium to long-term issues to be discussed and planned for, although any important issues can be raised at any time and resolved should they arise.
9. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the Vale Council's objectives and targets. The Vale Council cannot deliver excellent service to its residents unless its contractors are excellent. Therefore, working jointly with contractors to review performance regularly is essential.
10. The Vale Council's process for managing contractor performance focuses on continuous improvement and action planning. The success of the performance review framework depends on contractors and the Vale Council working together to set and review realistic, jointly agreed and measurable targets.
11. The overall framework is designed to be:
 - a consistent way for the council 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

12. 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. Vale Council satisfaction as client.

13. 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 heads of service.

DIMENSION 1 – KEY PERFORMANCE TARGETS

14. 2011/12 was the first year that formal KPTs were introduced to measure Soll's performance, and established the baseline for measuring future performance. The targets were agreed at a low level due to the maturity of the contract (year seven of a ten year agreement). At the time of introducing the targets, officers agreed with the Soll contract manager that a review of the targets would take place during the year to ensure that they remained challenging yet realistic. During quarter three, officers proposed amendments to the targets as it was already apparent that several were going to be over achieved by a significant amount. These proposals were put to the Soll board in January 2012 but were declined as Soll considered that its performance would not be fully reflected in the amended figures.

15. An analysis of Soll's performance against its KPTs appears below (and in more detail in annex A of this report).

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	Increase total visits less schools	1.00%	11.4%	Excellent	5
KPT 2	Increase physical activity usage	1.00%	12.6%	Excellent	5
KPT 3	Increase U16 dry course visits	1.00%	-6.7%	Poor	1
KPT 4	Increase U16 wet course visits	1.00%	10.5 %	Excellent	5
KPT 5	Increase number of memberships sold in reporting year	1.00%	-3.6%	Poor	1
KPT 6	Reduce electricity	-3.5%	-8.8%	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)
	Reduce gas	-3.5%	-5.7%	Excellent	5
KPT 7	Increase GP referral clients	1%	16.4%	Excellent	5
KPT 8	Reduce water consumption	-3%	+1%	Poor	1
KPT 9	Increase Access to Leisure card holders	10%	19.05%	Excellent	5
KPT 10	Decrease operating cost per visit without compromising services	-2%	-13.9%	Excellent	5
Overall "average" KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average)					3.9
Overall "average" KPT performance (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)					Good

16. 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	1 – 1.4999	1.5 – 2.4999	2.5 – 3.4999	3.5 – 4.4999	4.5 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

17. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows:

KPT judgement

Previous KPT judgement for comparison

DIMENSION 2 – CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

18. Customer satisfaction has been monitored annually using a satisfaction survey in each of the three facilities. Because of the numbers of customers attending each of the centres, we asked Soll to complete at least 200 surveys each for Faringdon and Wantage leisure centres and at least 150 for Tilsley Park. For 2011/12, Soll added the questionnaire to its website for customers to complete, as well as sending the document to all members on their data base.

19. A total of 700 questionnaires were completed - 150 received from Tilsley Park, 250 from Faringdon Leisure Centre and 300 from Wantage Leisure Centre. Unfortunately,

no on-line surveys were completed by customers as this was a voluntary option which was not taken up.

- 20. An analysis of customer satisfaction performance appears in annex B of this report.
- 21. An overall satisfaction score of 4.27 or good was achieved in 2011/12, which is an improvement from 2010/11 when Soll achieved a mark of 3.9 or fair (although this was calculated using an average of all the total scores and not the overall satisfaction score as in 2011/12 - to compare results on a like for like basis, the 2010/11 score would have been 4.1).
- 22. 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

- 23. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Customer satisfaction judgement

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

DIMENSION 3 – COUNCIL SATISFACTION

- 24. The council has taken the opinions of a number of officers who have interaction with members of the Soll team at many levels. These officers have provided scores that they consider are appropriate to the performance of the contractor and these have provided the overall satisfaction score. An analysis of council satisfaction performance appears in annex C of this report.
- 25. In general, Soll has continued to provide a consistent quality of service to customers, which is demonstrated by the increasing number of visits to the centres and the low number of complaints received.
- 26. The council issued two rectification notices to Soll in this reporting year, the first in April 2011 and the second in January 2012. Both of these were issued due to the inappropriate use of advertising on the highway, which was contrary to the council's planning policies and the legislation in place governing such advertising. Following the second instance, the head of economy, leisure and property met with Soll's chairman and managing director to confirm the council's dissatisfaction with these actions and to receive Soll's assurances that the issue would not occur again. Those assurances were received and to date no further instances have occurred.
- 27. The Vale Council wanted to undertake a series of carbon reduction projects in the three facilities during 2011/12. This would have necessitated the introduction of a variation document to the main contract to secure both the council and Soll's financial and contractual position. Unfortunately, this agreement has not been achieved to date,

but it is hoped a suitable compromise on a variation document can be agreed to enable this work to go ahead.

28. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of contractors on council 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

29. The overall mark achieved by Soll for council satisfaction is 3.6 and using the scoring matrix in paragraph 28 above provides a score of fair. This is the same judgement as awarded in 2010/11 (although the actual score has increased from 3.5).

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

Council satisfaction judgement

Previous council satisfaction judgement for comparison

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

31. Taking into account the performance of the contractor against KPTs, customer satisfaction and council satisfaction, the head of economy, leisure and property has made an overall judgement of Soll's performance throughout 2011/12 as good. Whilst recognising the high importance of customer satisfaction and the increase in number of visits to the centres, the decision also needs to reflect Soll's reluctance to review its KPT targets, the delay in entering into a carbon variation agreement and the receipt of two rectification notices within a single reporting period. The committee is therefore asked its views in order for the cabinet member for leisure to make a final assessment.

Overall assessment

Previous overall assessment for comparison

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

32. Annex C of this report records strengths and areas for improvement relating to the performance of the contractor over the last year. Where performance is below expectations, the contract monitoring officer will agree an improvement plan with the contractor.
33. Officers have developed an action plan based on the findings of the customer survey and council officers' comments to address areas for improvement. The plan is attached as annex F of this report and the outcomes of this plan will be reported in 2012/13. The updated 2010/11 action plan is attached as annex E of this report.

CONTRACTORS FEEDBACK

34. 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 D of this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

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

CONCLUSION

37. The head of economy, leisure and property service has assessed Soll's performance as good for its delivery of the leisure management contract during 2011/12. The committee is asked to make any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure to enable her to make a final assessment on performance.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

38. None

Annex A – Key performance targets

KPT 1 - increase total number of visits to leisure centres less those made by schools by one per cent - achieved

This target looks at the total number of visits to all three facilities, less the number of school visits (which the three facilities have no control over). Visits increased from 352,099 in 2010/11 to 392,325 in 2011/12. All three facilities have seen growth in their usage figures, with Faringdon recording a 15.09 per cent increase, Wantage a 9.75 per cent increase and Tilsley Park a 6.24 per cent increase. The growth is due mainly to an increase in the number of memberships and numbers attending classes at Faringdon and Wantage. However, there has been a decline in casual swimming attendance.

KPT 2 - increase physical activity usage by one per cent - achieved

This target looks at the total number of customers using the facilities for sporting or active participation purposes, which increased from 333,953 visits in 2012/11 to 376,319 in 2011/12. It does not take into account spectators or people attending the sites for other social activities. Again, Faringdon has led the way with growth of 14.89 per cent. Wantage reported a 12.04 per cent increase in visits and Tilsley Park 7.56 per cent. The reason Faringdon has been able to increase user figures significantly is due to the freedom it has, compared to Wantage, in terms of its dual use agreement. Wantage effectively loses all of its facilities during the day during term time, which is not the case at Faringdon. This daytime access allows Faringdon to develop its daytime programmes with consequential increased numbers of users.

KPT 3 - increase under 16 dry course visits by one per cent – not achieved

This target looks at the total number of under 16's who enrol and participate on dry courses at all three facilities within the contract. The number of visits to these sessions fell from 8,787 in 2010/11 to 8,232 in 2011/12. Very often dry side activities are not driven in the same way as swimming courses and so by targeting this area and supporting Soll through the participation team, it is hoped that these activities will also see an increase in users. Wantage under achieved this target by 4.24 per cent and Faringdon by 15.16 per cent. This is an area that requires significant effort in 2012/13.

KPT 4 - increase under 16 wet course visits by one per cent - achieved

This target looks at the number of visits achieved through the swimming courses offered at Faringdon and Wantage. Both sites have seen an increase in numbers with Wantage reporting growth of 15.33 per cent (due to a major overhaul of its swimming programme) and Faringdon 5.07 per cent. Total visits to swim course visits increased from 41,987 in 2010/11 to 46,409 in 2011/12.

KPT 5 - increase the number of annual memberships sold by one per cent – not achieved. It was agreed to reword this target to read increase total number of memberships by one per cent – not achieved

This target looks at the number of memberships sold and shows that sales of annual memberships have reduced dramatically at all facilities. This has been countered to some extent by a four per cent growth in direct debit (monthly) membership numbers. The

overall effect is a reduction of 46 memberships over the year from a total membership base of 1,256 in 2010/11 to 1,210 in 2011/12.

KPT 6 - reduce energy consumption by 3.5 per cent for gas and 3.5 per cent for electricity - achieved

This target looks at the consumption of utilities over the reporting year and compares these figures directly to the previous year's results. Electricity consumption has reduced by 8.8 per cent and gas by 5.7 per cent across the contract. Tilsley Park has made the greatest reductions with electricity reducing by 22.43 per cent and gas by 15.26 per cent. This level of savings came about due to a concerted effort by the on-site team to improve general house keeping, especially when flood lighting was turned on and off. All other facilities have made reductions primarily by reducing gas, including bringing swimming pool temperatures back to the normally accepted levels of operation.

KPT 7 - increase GP referrals by 1 per cent - achieved

This target looks at the number of people referred to the facilities by GP's and other referring practitioners, such as practice nurses and physiotherapists. There has been an increase of 12 people over the year (from 73 referrals to 85) - nine of these coming from Wantage. This is despite major priority changes for the referral scheme within the Primary Care Trust who co-ordinates the scheme and the lack of focus that it has been able to give to the scheme during the past year due to changes within its organisation. However, it is hoped that these numbers can be further increased in 2012/13.

KPT 8 - reduce water consumption by 3 per cent – not achieved

This target looks at the amount of water consumed across the three facilities within the contract in comparison to the previous year. This is one of the most difficult KPT's to achieve as there are legal standards of water quality to meet and if the number of customers increase their demand for water also increases through toilet and shower use. Overall, the contract failed to achieved this target by 4.1 per cent with Tilsley Park missing its target by 33.40 per cent, which was caused by the facility hosting more athletic events, which means more filling of the water jump on the athletics track and the hundreds of additional people these events bring to the facility and the consequences on water usage. Wantage was the only facility to reduce its water consumption by a creditable two per cent.

KPT 9 - increase the number of Access to Leisure Card holders by 10 per cent - achieved

This target looks at the number of Access to Leisure cards provided to individuals eligible to receive them across the district. The scheme has had a low profile in recent years and Soll has made a welcome contribution to raising the profile of the scheme. This has led to an increase in card holders from 15 in 2010/11 to 21 in 2011/12.

KPT 10 - decrease operating cost per visit by 2 per cent (without compromising services) - achieved

This target looks at Soll's operating costs per visit and tries to reduce those costs by either better efficiency or through increasing income. Officers try to ensure that efficiencies do not compromise the service delivered and that staff, equipment and buildings which provide the service are maintained. The contract over achieved its target by £1.78 or 12.2 per cent. Tilsley Park reported the greatest improvement of £1.15 or 26.97 per cent.

Annex B – Customer satisfaction

Customer Survey Results SOLL VALE			
	2010/11	2011/12	Variance
Ease of Getting through on Telephones	4.1	4.26	0.16
Activity available at convenient times	4.1	4.23	0.13
Ease of booking	4.1	4.23	0.13
Ease of parking	3.6	3.14	-0.46
Waiting time at reception	4.0	4.16	0.16
Activity charge	3.7	4.08	0.38
Range of activities available	4.0	4.27	0.27
Ease of contacting the centre with issues	3.8	4.25	0.45
If any issues, how well were they dealt with	3.9	4.26	0.36
QUALITY OF FACILITIES / SERVICES			
Quality of equipment	3.9	4.05	0.15
Water quality in the swimming pool	3.8	4.26	0.46
Water temperature in the swimming pool	4.0	3.99	-0.01
Quality of food and drink	3.7	3.79	0.09
Quality of brochures / leaflets/websites	3.8	4.08	0.28
Availability of information	4.2	4.14	-0.06
Quality of information on notice boards	3.9	4.12	0.22
Quality of flooring in sports hall/activity area	3.9	4.19	0.29
Quality of lighting in sports hall/ activity area	4.2	4.24	0.04
Quality of artificial turf pitches	Not Asked	3.73	0
CLEANLINESS			
Cleanliness of changing rooms	3.7	4.10	0.4
Cleanliness of activity space	3.8	4.15	0.35
Cleanliness of cafeteria area	3.9	3.91	0.01
Quality of litter removal	Not Asked	4.50	0
Overall impression on cleanliness of centre	3.8	4.21	0.41
CAFETERIA / FOOD & DRINK			
Range of food and drink	3.3	3.67	0.37
Quality of food and drink	3.5	3.77	0.27
Value for money of food and drink	3.5	3.64	0.14
STAFF			
Helpfulness of reception staff	4.3	4.59	0.29
Helpfulness of other staff	4.1	4.60	0.50
Standard of coaching / instruction	4.1	4.58	0.48
Availability of staff	3.9	4.63	0.73
Visibility of staff including uniform	4.0	4.62	0.62
VALUE FOR MONEY			
Value for money of activities	3.8	4.16	0.36
Overall satisfaction with your visit today	4.1	4.27	0.17
Average Score	3.9	4.14	0.24

In summary, there were an additional 237 comments made across the contract, of which 64 related to car parking issues, and 35 related to fitness classes. The priority areas from the survey comments form part of the action plan for 2012/13, which can be

found in annex F of this report. The comments concerning car parking at Wantage cannot be tackled without significant investment and forward planning; however, in the short term, Soll has negotiated with King Alfred's Academy to use its car parks on certain evenings to reduce parking difficulties and to re-schedule classes so that demand on car parking peaks is minimised.

Annex C - Council satisfaction

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. Questions can be left blank if not relevant to a contract or contractor.

Contractor / supplier / partner name

From (date) To

SERVICE DELIVERY

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

* These spaces are deliberately left blank for the addition of any performance criteria which are specific to this particular contract / service.

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

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

IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION

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

KEY DOCUMENTS

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

1. Annual business plan (Yes / No)

Yes

2. Updated business continuity plan (Yes / No)

Yes

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths

Contract manager and site managers are easy to deal with.

Positive in procuring contractors to achieve joint project work

Changes were required to the management team at Wantage Leisure Centre, which were recognised and dealt with positively and quickly

Improvements with health and safety files, especially asbestos and legionella management plans, were identified, which were resolved quickly and satisfactorily

Robust performance figures

Willing to work on new and joint projects e.g. Monkey Mayhem

Supports county-wide projects e.g. Go Active and Active Women

Very accommodating on shared holiday programme activities

Soll was awarded an Inspire Mark for providing free swimming to under 14's across the district. It is hoped that this will assist in continuing an Olympic sporting legacy and involvement in sport for youngsters through to their adolescent and older years.

During 2011/12 Soll invested £15,000 to improve the reception area at Wantage Leisure Centre. These works included the redecoration of the whole area, new flooring, LED lighting, an improved hot drinks offer and new soft furnishings. Customers have welcomed this improvement and are making significantly more use of the area as a result.

Areas for improvement	Dealing with maintenance issues in good time and minimising disruption to customers
	Continue to ensure agreed timescales are met
	When ideas are tabled, bring them forward as detailed plans more quickly, otherwise they remain just good ideas
	Data needs to be checked for accuracy before being issued to the council
	When the council procures works in facilities, communication with contractors must go through the council in terms of amending those works

Soll's contract manager for this contract left in autumn 2011 and has subsequently been replaced with a head of operations for the Soll group. This role may have a reduced input to the council's contract and much of the client facing work of the former contract manager appears to have been allocated to a new post of deputy contract manager who also manages Tilsley Park and Abbey Meadows outdoor pool. There are obvious potential work load and delivery issues arising from this change, which the client team are reviewing. These changes are still bedding in at the moment and the client team will raise any issues with the Soll senior management team should anything of concern arise.

Annex D - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

"We note the report from the District Council. As a local charitable company we are very pleased with our involvement in the delivery of the leisure services and thank the officers for their support over the year which has enabled the company to continuously improve these services."

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

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

Feedback provided by

Date

Annex E – progress of 2010/11 action plan

Action	Owner	Due date	Date completed	Contract monitoring office comments
Wantage and Faringdon centre car parks are too small for the current usage and are restricted in terms of expansion. Soll will try to programme its class activities to stagger demand on the car parks and where possible ensure staff park off-site or use other forms of transport to arrive at work.	Soll	On going	On going	Soll has undertaken these actions and secured use of King Alfred's car parking for evening use.
Duty managers have been placed on the front of reception to support the reception teams, so there are a minimum of two people at reception desks to speed customers through.	Soll	May 2011	May 2011	This has happened to the extent where no comments have been made in this year's survey.
Soll management team is constantly reviewing prices against the local market place and in conjunction with the client team sets prices that offer the best value within commercial limitations	Soll	On going	On going	Soll prices are generally some of the best value in the market place due to extensive local competition.
New coffee machines were installed as receptions were re-configured. At Tilsley Park new menus were put in place and were reviewed throughout the year.	Soll	April 2011	April 2011	
Soll and the council to discuss the replacement of the carpet elements of the pitches, which are now 16 years old.	Soll/client	2011/12	Autumn 2012	The council allocated funding in its capital programme for carrying out these works
Improve the overall facility provision in Wantage. Officers are considering the future provision requirements for the area in terms of impending new housing development, which will be brought to elected members in the future	Vale of White Horse District Council	To be agreed		These processes are on-going and will involve all appropriate parties at the appropriate time
To enhance the lighting levels and to minimise the carbon footprints of the centres, projects are being evaluated to put in alternative lighting schemes, which will reduce energy usage and utility bills	Soll/client	2011/12		Agreement is required on the contract variation document to allow works to go ahead
Introduce new cleaning rota's as well as improve training for sports assistants	Soll	April	April 2011	Improvements in cleaning have

		2011		been evidenced overall. Some issues have arisen as is expected during the year but overall cleaning is better.
--	--	------	--	--

Annex F – 2011/12 proposed action plan to improve performance

Action	Owner	Due date
Supply more healthy food options	Soll	1 September 2012
Improve supervision of cleaning at Faringdon pool	Soll	1 July 2012
Improve the speed with which repairs and maintenance are undertaken	Soll	1 July 2012
Increase/improve dance studio space at both Wantage and Faringdon centres	Soll / Vale of White Horse District Council	Wantage Complete June 2012
Increase number and type of classes to accommodate demand and industry trends	Soll	1 September 2012
Improve the preventative maintenance and servicing of gym equipment at Faringdon leisure centre	Soll	1 July 2012
Investigate the purchasing of new body pump equipment	Soll	1 September 2012
Replace astro turf pitches at Tilsley Park	Vale of White Horse District Council	Autumn 2012
Provide detailed plans for service delivery ideas within agreed timescales to allow improvements to take place	Soll	1 August 2012
Improve checking and accuracy of data before sending to the client team	Soll	1 June 2012
Working with the client team to ensure works ordered are those which are delivered on site	Soll / Vale of White Horse District Council	1 June 2012
Improve the overall facility provision in Wantage. Officers are considering the future provision requirements for the area in terms of impending new housing development, which will be brought to elected members in the future	Vale of White Horse District Council	To be agreed