



**Glasgow City Council**

**Operational Performance and Delivery Scrutiny Committee**

**Report by Chief Executive**

**Contact: Cormac Quinn Ext: 73625**

### **Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) 2024/25**

#### **Purpose of Report:**

This report provides the Committee with an overview of Glasgow's performance within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) for the 2024/2025 reporting period. It summarises the Council's comparative position across a wide suite of performance indicators and highlights areas of strong performance, alongside indicators where further analysis or improvement activity is underway or planned.

#### **Recommendations:**

The committee is asked to:

- note the contents of this report.
- consider the Local Government Benchmarking Framework and provide comment on indicators that may highlight areas of comparative interest; and
- note that the Local Government Benchmarking Framework will be reported annually to the committee following publication of updated national data.

Ward No(s):

Citywide: ✓

Local member(s) advised: Yes  No  consulted: Yes  No

## **1.0 Background**

- 1.1 This report provides a detailed overview of Glasgow's performance within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) for the 2024/25 reporting period. It sets out the Council's relative position across a comprehensive set of national performance indicators and highlights areas of robust performance and areas where further improvement work is being taken forward.
- 1.2 The LGBF is produced annually by the Improvement Service using data submitted by all 32 Scottish local authorities through their Local Financial Returns (LFR). The Framework forms part of the Council's statutory performance reporting arrangements and supports the demonstration of Best Value.
- 1.3 The LGBF provides benchmark comparisons across nine thematic areas as follows:
  - Children's Services
  - Adult Social Care
  - Culture and Leisure
  - Environmental Services
  - Corporate Services
  - Housing
  - Economic Development and Planning
  - Financial Sustainability
  - Climate Change
- 1.4 To facilitate comparisons within the LGBF, local authorities are grouped into sets of benchmarking families. These groupings reflect similar social, demographic or environmental characteristics, depending on the measure being considered.

## **2.0 The Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF)**

- 2.1 The opportunity to view full performance for each of the LGBF indicators is available from the [Improvement Service website](#).
- 2.2 The indicators themselves are derived from, and are reflective of, a range of key areas. Some indicators are reflective of cost; some also look at customer satisfaction, and some are directly relevant to our strategic commitments.
- 2.3 As the Council is not a direct provider of social housing, the indicators relating to housing management, housing conditions and housing energy efficiency are not included.

- 2.4 It should be noted that some indicators, across the full set of measures, continue to reflect residual post pandemic impacts within the 2022/23 data series.
- 2.5 No value judgement is made about a high or low ranking as this may be affected by several factors including local choices on investment priorities, population distribution, and the socio-economic composition of each local authority.
- 2.6 For consistency in Table 1 (Section 4), where a higher cost equates to comparatively lower performance, the indicator is presented within the lowest quartile regardless of local investment intentions.
- 2.7 Services continue to review all performance indicators, with particular focus on areas identified as outliers within the LGBF. The Council's Strategic Performance Group supports in-depth analysis of trends and operational factors influencing performance and coordinates follow-up improvement activity.
- 2.8 Several LGBF indicators align with Strategic Plan measures and are included within the Council's broader thematic performance reporting.
- 2.9 While the report is presented for the 2024/25 reporting period, a number of LGBF indicators are based on the most recently available validated data, which in certain cases relates to earlier financial years.

### **3.0 Performance Highlights: Highest and Lowest Quartiles**

- 3.1 A selection of the key indicators in the lowest eight nationally are listed below, with a note of some context and where appropriate; the actions being undertaken to understand and to address areas of improvement where required.

#### **Key Indicators placed in the Lowest Eight (Quartile)**

- **CHN03: Cost per pre-school education place:** Glasgow is ranked **26th nationally** with an average cost of **£13,190 per pre-school education place**. This is slightly lower than the **Family Group comparator £13,691** but remains higher than the **national average of £12,055**. The indicator (CHN03) measures the financial investment required to deliver pre-school education and reflects variations in service models, deprivation levels, staff structures, and demand pressures between councils.

Nationally, the cost per pre-school education place has risen significantly since 2010-11 increasing from £4840 to £12,055 in 2024/25, this has largely been driven by the expansion of funded early learning and childcare entitlement. Glasgow City Council's cost per place in 2024–25 was £13,190, a reduction from 2023–24 and below the family group average (£13,691) but

remaining above the national average. Following sharp cost growth associated with ELC expansion from 2016–17 onwards, Glasgow’s costs have stabilised since 2020–21, with modest reductions in the most recent two years.

Local variation in costs reflects factors such as Glasgow’s delivery model, higher levels of deprivation and additional support needs, workforce structures and pay, estate costs, and demographic pressures associated with operating at scale as a large urban authority.

- **C&L 01: Cost per attendance at Sport Facilities:** Glasgow ranks **30th nationally** for C&L01, with an **average cost per attendance of £6.88**. This cost is significantly above both the **Family Group comparator (£3.66)** and the **national average (£3.77)**, indicating comparatively higher expenditure per visit within Glasgow’s sports facilities. Despite this, Glasgow is not the highest-cost authority in Scotland: **Midlothian (£7.79)** and **North Ayrshire (£7.20)** both report higher costs per attendance.

Glasgow costs have continued a downward trend for the fourth successive year. This indicator includes attendances, expenditure and income related to the provision of sport and leisure facilities (including Glasgow Club) but excludes attendances by, and income from, spectators to sporting events. This inflates the cost per attendance in Glasgow in comparison to other local authorities due to the number of large venues operated by Glasgow Life where a significant number of attendees are spectators at major sporting events (Glasgow International Arena, Tollcross and Scotstoun Stadium).

- **CHN10 Adults Satisfied with Local Schools :** Glasgow is **ranked 26th nationally**, with **65.5% of adults satisfied** with local schools. This is **below the national average of 69%**: satisfaction with schools has declined both nationally and in Glasgow over the past decade, representative of a pattern in line with national post pandemic trends.

While attainment and other objective educational indicators show recovery and improvement, perceptions of local schools have been slower to improve, influenced by wider pressures on services, school environments, and community expectations. Notably, Glasgow’s own 2024–25 Education Services Stakeholder Survey reports significantly higher satisfaction (83.4%), indicating a more positive view among directly engaged service users than is captured through national perception surveys.

- **ENV3a:Net Cost of Street Cleaning per 1,000 Population:** Glasgow is **ranked 31st nationally** with a **net street-cleaning cost of £29,431 per 1,000 population**. This level of expenditure is higher than both the **national average (£17,869)** and the **Family Group comparator (£16,575)**. This

indicator reflects operational costs associated with street cleaning, which can vary between councils due to differing levels of urban density, street-use intensity, and environmental demands.

Glasgow's expenditure within this indicator reflects a range of cost pressures that are not fully captured in the headline figure and are characteristic of a large urban authority.

Higher population density and intensive street use drive increased cleansing while significant footfall linked to employment centres, transport hubs, hospitality and the night-time economy places, sustained pressure on services. In addition, the city's role as a major venue for public events and sporting fixtures generates recurrent, event-led cleansing requirements that exceed those experienced by many comparator authorities. Glasgow also delivers specialist cleansing function, including river-based services that are unique in Scotland, contributing to higher overall costs.

- **ENV03c: Street Cleanliness Score:** Glasgow is **ranked 28th nationally** with a **street cleanliness score of 86.3%**. This is below both the **national average of 91.7%** and the **Family Group comparator score of 88.9%**.

Glasgow's relative position within this indicator reflects the operational context of delivering cleansing services in a large, busy urban authority. The city experiences high volumes of daily activity across commercial districts, transport hubs and densely populated neighbourhoods which can result in streets changing condition more rapidly between cleansing cycles.

- **ENV04: Cost of Roads per Kilometre:** Glasgow is placed **25<sup>th</sup>** for this indicator which measures the average net annual cost to the council of maintaining each kilometre of the local road network. The spend per kilometre in Glasgow is £20,054 with the Family Group Average at £25,852 and the national figure £13,629. This indicator allows comparison of how much different council spend to operate and maintain roads but does not measure road quality or any other related outcomes directly.

While this indicator is comparatively high in national terms, we are satisfied that performance compares favourably within our family group peers. It is recognised that operating within a large urban city environment carries higher costs than rural settings, reflecting additional traffic management requirements and restrictions on working times across traffic sensitive routes.

- **CHN19a: School Attendance Rate (per 100 pupils): Rank 31** Glasgow is **ranked 31st nationally** with a **school attendance rate of 89.2%**. This is below both the **Family Group average of 90.2%** and the **Scottish national average of 91%**.

School attendance rates declined nationally and in Glasgow during the pandemic and, while recovery is underway, levels remain below those seen pre-COVID-19. In 2024–25, Glasgow’s overall attendance rate was 89.2%, showing a slight improvement on the previous year but remaining below both the Scotland average (91.0%) and the family group average (90.2%). The longer-term trend reflects a sharp reduction between 2018–19 and 2020–21 followed by a slower and more gradual recovery, with persistent absence continuing to suppress overall attendance. Attendance levels are influenced by a range of factors including pupil wellbeing, socio-economic pressures and post-pandemic behaviours, and Glasgow has responded through targeted initiatives such as the 2024/25 *Attendance Matters Everyday* campaign to strengthen engagement and support for families.

- **ECON01: % Unemployed people assisted into work from Council Programmes.** Glasgow is **ranked 29th nationally** with **7%** of unemployed residents supported into work. The **Scottish national average is 14.2%** and the **Family Group average is 21.9%**.

This position reflects Glasgow’s strategic focus on supporting people who are economically inactive and furthest from the labour market, many of whom face complex and multiple barriers to employment. For these individuals, progression into sustained work is often a longer-term process, and the indicator does not capture interim outcomes such as improved health, confidence, skills, or work readiness. Wider evaluation evidence shows that Glasgow’s employability provision is reaching priority groups and delivering high-impact support, particularly within communities experiencing higher levels of economic inactivity, poorer health outcomes, and entrenched socio-economic disadvantage.

- **ECON05: No of Business Gateway Start-Ups per 10,000 Population:** Glasgow is **ranked 32nd nationally** for ECON05, with **6.6 Business Gateway start-ups per 10,000 population**. The comparative **Family Group average is 12.2** and the **Scottish national average figure is 12.3**.

In absolute terms, Glasgow delivers a high volume of Business Gateway support activity relative to other authorities, despite ranking lower on population-based start-up rates. The Council’s Business Growth team has taken a deliberate strategic approach to prioritise broader, outcome-focused business support rather than focusing solely on start-up volumes. Resources are targeted towards interventions that support inclusive economic growth, productivity, and climate objectives, including ring-fenced support for social enterprises, delivery of Scotland’s largest local authority-led Green Business Support programme, and a dedicated Challenge Fund aimed at reducing barriers to entrepreneurship for under-represented groups. It should also be noted that population-based start-up measures inherently disadvantage larger

authorities such as Glasgow, meaning that start-up rates alone do not fully reflect the scale or impact of the city's business support activity.

- **CORP09: Proportion of SWF Crisis Grant Decisions within 1 day :** Glasgow is **ranked 28th nationally** with **91.8%** decisions issued within one day. National comparative data for the **Family Group average is 96.4%** and a **Scottish national average of 96%**. The indicator reflects the responsiveness of local welfare support systems in providing urgent financial assistance.

During 2024/25, the Scottish Welfare Fund experienced sustained and significant demand, receiving 50,849 applications for support, of which 78% related to Crisis Grants. Since the fund's introduction, application volumes have increased by approximately 41%, while core budget allocations have reduced by around 6%, placing continued pressure on service capacity. Although the Council approved additional funding, increasing the programme budget to £7.7 million, and the Scottish Government later provided a further £3.2 million in December 2024, the fund was required to operate at high (most compelling) priority throughout the year to remain sustainable. Operating at this threshold restricted awards to cases involving immediate and severe risk, reducing eligibility, and contributing to higher complaint levels and increased Tier 1 and Tier 2 reviews, which require more detailed consideration and longer processing times.

- **SW05: Residential Costs per Week per Resident for People Aged 65 or Over:** Glasgow is **ranked 25th nationally** with an average **weekly residential care cost of £806 per resident aged 65 or over**. This cost is slightly higher than the **Family Group average of £795** and significantly above the **Scottish national average of £725**.

Higher residential care costs for people aged 65 and over can be influenced by a combination of structural, demographic and market related figures. Glasgow has a greater prevalence of long-term conditions, including disability, dementia, and socio-economic deprivation; residents often require more intensive, specialist support; leading to higher staffing ratios and care costs.

Some elements of performance are not easily comparable, and it is important to ensure that methodology across measures are calculated consistently to accurately reflect Glasgow's performance.

### 3.2 Key indicators Ranked in the Highest Eight (Quartile)

Below are some of the key indicators in the highest eight nationally.

- **CHN6: Percentage of Pupils Living in the 20% Most Deprived Areas Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5:** In the most recent reporting year, **58% of Glasgow pupils** living in the 20% most deprived areas achieved 5 or more awards at Level 5. This performance is **5 percentage points above the Scottish National Average (SNA)** and **6 points higher than the Family Group Average (FGA)**. Glasgow ranks **4th nationally** for this measure, reflecting a strong relative performance among comparator authorities. The city has also shown year-on-year improvement, with a 3.1-point increase compared to last year.

Performance across this indicator has improved significantly both locally and nationally, reflecting sustained efforts to close poverty related attainment gaps. Glasgow's performance is above both the Scottish national average (53%) and the family group average (52%) with long term gains indicating the positive and sustained impact of targeted funding, focused school-level interventions, and a strong emphasis on equality within local education.

- **SW02: SDS Spend on Adults as a % of total adult social work spend:** This indicator calculates the cost of direct payments and managed budget spend on adults as a proportion of the total adult social work spend. Glasgow **ranks 2<sup>nd</sup>** overall at **14.2%** with comparative Family Group Average of **10.7%** and **national figure of 9.4%**.

Glasgow's ranking of 2<sup>nd</sup> nationally demonstrates a robust performance in embedding person-centred, rights-based approaches to adult social care. A high level SDS spend indicates that more individuals are enabled to exercise choice and control over how care and support is delivered to them and contributes to improved outcomes for service users.

- **CORP6a: Sickness Absence Days per Teacher**  
Glasgow ranks **2nd nationally** for teacher sickness absence (CORP6a), reflecting a strong performance for this indicator. The council also demonstrates significant improvement year-on-year, with a **12.2% reduction in teacher sickness absence** compared with the previous reporting period.
- **CORP06C Sickness Absence Days per Employee (Non-Teacher):** Glasgow is ranked 7<sup>th</sup> across all Scotland for absence having moved from 3<sup>rd</sup> in the previous year. This represents **13.1% days lost**, compared to a **14.7%** Family Group Average.
- **CHN09: % of Children Being Looked After in The Community :** Glasgow ranks **6th nationally** with **92.6% of looked-after children being supported within community settings**, compared to a **national comparator of 88.8%**. This indicator specifically measures the *balance of care* for looked-after children and reflects how effectively local authorities support children to remain in community placements rather than residential settings

- **SW7: Proportion of care services graded 'good' (4) or better in Care Inspectorate inspections:** Ranked **5<sup>th</sup>** with **89.6%** rated good or better, against a **national figure of 81.9%**. Rising from the previous years ranking of 12<sup>th</sup>, reflecting on-going progress in adult care services.
- **CHN12B: Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 1: Ranked 4<sup>th</sup>** with average total tariff score for pupils at **728 against The Family Group comparator of 650**. This indicator measures the attainment of pupils in the most deprived quintile and is a core part of the LGBF educational outcomes framework.

Attainment for pupils from the most deprived backgrounds has improved substantially over the long term, both nationally and in Glasgow. While recent year-on-year variation reflects the sensitivity of tariff measures to cohort size and subject mix, performance across all SIMD groups remains above national averages, indicating sustained progress in improving equity and attainment outcomes.

- **ECON07: Proportion of People Earning Less Than the Living Wage:** Glasgow has the **4<sup>th</sup> lowest** percentage of people recorded as **earning less than the Living Wage** at **10.4%** against a **national figure of 11.3 %** and **family group average of 12.4%**.
- **CLIM02: CO2 Emissions Area Wide: Emissions Within Scope of LA Per Capita:** Glasgow **ranks 1<sup>st</sup>** in this indicator, this measure indicates the amount of carbon dioxide emission per capita in tonnes. Glasgow emission measured **2.86 against a national figure of 4.04**.
- **CORP04: The Cost per Dwelling of Collecting Council Tax: Ranked 7<sup>th</sup>** with cost per dwelling at **£4.23** against the Family Group average cost of **£6.82** and **national figure of £5.98**.
- **ECON06: Investment in Economic Development and Tourism per 1000 population:** Glasgow is **placed 8<sup>th</sup>** for this indicator with investment of **£182,041 against the national figure of £138.745**.

#### **4.0 Overview of key outlying indicators and placement within the LGBF**

- 4.1 The tables at [Appendix 1](#) summarise the indicators that fall within the top and bottom eight local authorities (representing the highest and lowest quartiles). Each indicator has been coded with its corresponding LGBF indicator to enable easy reference within the LGBF Dashboard. [Explore the data | Benchmarking](#)

#### **5.0 Scotland-wide Benchmarking Programme**

- 5.1 Glasgow continues to engage in an on-going programme of work with the Improvement Services and the Scottish Performance Network to ensure we

are making effective use of the LGBF data. Using the LGBF indicators as 'can-openers' we aim through these collaborative networks to explore the very high-level indicators to focus questions on why variations in costs, outcomes and performance are occurring across similar council areas.

5.2 The Improvement Service deliver a range of collaborative events which are attended by colleagues from across Scotland. These events are designed to support shared learning and promote a consistent approach across Local Government to emerging policy and Service demand challenges: The 2026/27 programme of events includes:

- ***Rethinking Roads and Embedding Sustainability***
- ***Leadership and Culture in Planning: Confidence and Capacity Building***
- ***Economic Development: Supporting Inward Investment***
- ***Council Tax: Prevention Before Recovery***
- ***Park and Green Spaces as Public Health Assets***

5.3 Further detail on the LGBF Programme of learning events can be found here: [LGBF Events Calendar 2026-27.pdf](#)

## **6.0 Other Benchmarking Activities**

6.1 Each Council Service is required to produce an Annual Business Plan which sets out current year priorities. The guidance around the development process for the individual service plans recognises the importance of benchmarking for achieving and demonstrating Best Value. Services are also encouraged to consider any other relevant benchmarking activity that could be undertaken out with those reflected within the LGBF structure.

6.2 The indicators identified within the highest and lowest quartiles are followed up by Services throughout the year. The Strategic Planning and Performance Working Group regularly scrutinise outliers as part of its programme of work.

## **7. Collaborative Work with the Improvement Service**

7.1 Glasgow continues to work with the Improvement Service to review a small number of Local Government Benchmarking indicators where underlying definitions, metadata, or calculation methods do not fully align with local service delivery models. This work is focused on improving consistency, transparency and comparability, particularly where variations in reported performance may reflect differences in interpretation, data capture, or methodology rather than like-for-like performance and service outcomes.

### **7.2 *Indicators under review***

A limited number of indicators remain under review, these include:

- **Business Gateway Start Ups per 10,000 population:** Glasgow has consistently ranked poorly within this indicator, however alternative data sets available from the Office of National Statistics (not currently used by LGBF) indicate a higher rating for Glasgow.
- **Claimant Count as a % of working age population & as a % of 16-24 population :** This is a benefits-based indicator that is influenced by welfare rules and population structure; Glasgow’s younger population and higher deprivation can inflate rates. Caution should be used when using this indicator in isolation when reviewing Local Authority performance.
- **Cost of Planning per application:** A fuller understanding of what figures are used to calculate the cost per planning application is required to ensure that accurate direct staff costs are attributed rather than cumulative cost centre figures.
- **Cost per Pupil (Primary and Secondary Education):** Further details required on data sets related to actual pupil roll/census information and calculations relative to published LFR figures.
- **Adults Satisfied with Local Schools :** Glasgow is ranked 26th nationally, with 65.5% of adults satisfied with local schools. This is below the national average of 69%. Locally available datasets such as, Glasgow’s own 2024–25 Education Services Stakeholder Survey reports significantly higher satisfaction (83.4%). It is therefore appropriate to review the datasets used for analysis and ensure robust comparators.
- **Home Care costs per hour for people aged 65 or over:** These figures should be interpreted with caution, as councils may apply different service models and cost inclusions. To ensure comparability, the indicators are aligned to the Local Financial Return methodology, however some local cost pressures may not be fully reflected.
- **% of adults supported at home who agree that their service and support has had an impact on their quality of life:** Locally available figures and data intelligence would suggest higher satisfaction ratings. Further work to review the most appropriate data sets could potentially improve reliability of this measure.

7.3 The aim of this work, which will be co-ordinated by the Performance Officer Group, is to improve confidence in the published indicators by ensuring consistency and a fair reflection of local activity, while maintaining robust benchmarking across Councils.

## 8. Policy and Resource Implications

### Resource Implications:

*Financial:* None

*Legal:* None

*Personnel:* None

*Procurement:* None

**Council Strategic Plan:** Reduce Poverty and Inequality in Our Communities., Increase Opportunity and Prosperity for all our citizens, Fight the climate emergency in a just transition to net zero , enable staff to deliver essential services in a sustainable, innovative, and efficient way.

**Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:**

*Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2025 to 2029? Please specify.* Yes, by highlighting benchmarked areas of Equality work the report seeks to assist in increasing people's knowledge about Equality and Fairness which supports the Equality Outcomes.

*What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?* No EQIA required as the report is a comparative one; based on local authority data from 2024/25, and no policy decisions are initiated in this report.

*Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio-economic disadvantage:* Yes, by highlighting areas of work the report seeks to assist in increasing people's knowledge about Fairness and impact of policy/planning on socio-economic outcomes.

**Climate Impacts:**

*Does the proposal support any climate Plan actions? Please specify:* No significant climate impacts identified at this point, however this report seeks to review benchmarking indicators aligned to the Council's climate and net zero objective.

*What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?* LGBF data will be used Services to review performance

*Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?* As above

**Privacy and Data  
Protection impacts:**

Data collated with be handled in accordance with  
the General Data Protection Regulation

## **9. Recommendations**

9.1 The committee is asked to:

- note the contents of this report.
- consider the Local Government Benchmarking Framework and provide comment on indicators that may highlight areas of comparative interest; and
- note that the Local Government Benchmarking Framework will be reported annually to the committee following publication of updated national data.

## Appendix 1

Highest Ranked Quartile 2024-25							
		Current	Previous			Current	Previous
CHN06	% Pupils Living in the 20% Most Deprived Areas Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5	4	4	CORP06a	Sickness Absence Days per Teacher	2	4
CHN07	% Pupils Living in the 20% Most Deprived Areas Gaining 5+ Awards at Level 6	6	4	CORP6b	Sickness Absence Days per Employee (Non-Teacher)	7	3
CHN09	% of Children Being Looked After in The Community	6 <b>(2023-24)</b>	6 (2022-23)	SW02	Self-Directed Support (Direct Payments + Managed Personalised Budgets) Spend on Adults as % of Total Adult Social Work Spend	2	3
CHN12b	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 1	4	3	SW07	Proportion of Care Services Graded 'Good' (4) or Better in Care Inspectorate Inspections	5	12
CHN12c	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 2	3	4	ENV4d	Percentage of C Class Roads Considered for Maintenance Treatment	6	6
CHN12d	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 3	8	11	ECON04	Proportion of Procurement Spent on Local Enterprises	5	6
CHN12f	Average Total Tariff SIMD Quintile 5	6	6	ECON06	Investment in Economic Development & Tourism per 1,000 Population	8	4
CHN23	Proportion of LAC with More Than 1 Placement in the Last Year	1 <b>(2023-24)</b>	3 (2022-23)	ECON07	Proportion of People Earning Less Than the Living Wage	4	2
CORP3b	% the Highest Paid 5% of Employees Who are Women	5	5	CLIM01	CO2 Emissions Area Wide Per Capita	4 <b>(2023-24)</b>	7 (2022-23)
CORP3c	The Gender Pay Gap	7	23	CLIM02	CO2 Emissions Area Wide: Emissions Within Scope of LA Per Capita	1 <b>(2023-24)</b>	2 (2022-23)

Highest Ranked Quartile 2024-25							
		Current	Previous			Current	Previous
CORP04	The Cost per Dwelling of Collecting Council Tax	7	4				

Lowest Ranked Quartile 2024-25							
		Current	Previous			Current	Previous
CHN3	Cost per Pre-School Education Place	26	20	C&L01	Cost per Attendance at Sports Facilities	30	31
CHN08a	The Gross Cost of "Children Looked After" in Residential Based Services per Child per Week	30 (23/24)	31 (22/23)	ENV1a	Net Cost per Waste Collection per Premises	30	21
CHN10	% of Adults Satisfied with Local Schools	26	28	ENV3a	Net Cost of Street Cleaning per 1,000 Population	31	31
CHN13a	% of P1, P4 and P7 Pupils Combined Achieving Expected CFE Level in Literacy	31	32	ENV03c	Street Cleanliness Score	28	30
CH13b	% P1, P4 and P7 Pupils Combined Achieving Expected CFE Level in Numeracy	29	31	ENV04a	Cost of Roads per Kilometre	25	26
CHN14a	Literacy Attainment Gap (P1,4,7 Combined)	25	15	ENV04b	Percentage of A Class Roads Considered for Maintenance Treatment	28	26
CHN14b	Numeracy Attainment Gap (P1,4,7 Combined)	25	17	ENV06	Portion of Total Household Waste Arising that is Recycled	30	30
CHN19a	School Attendance Rate (per 100 pupils)	31	29	ECON01	% Unemployed People Assisted into Work from Council Programmes	29	29

Lowest Ranked Quartile 2024-25							
		Current	Previous			Current	Previous
CHN21	% Participation for 16-19 Year Olds	28	25	ECON05	No. of Business Gateway Start-Ups per 10,000 Population	32	31
CORP01	Support Services as a % of Total Gross Expenditure	30	28	ECON12a	Claimant Count as a % of Working Age Population	32	32
CORP07	% Income Due from Council Tax Received by the End of the Year	29	28	FINSUS01	Total Useable Reserves as a % of Council Annual Budgeted Revenue	31	31
CORP09	Proportion of SWF Crisis Grant Decisions Within 1 Day	28	31	FINSUS02	Uncommitted General Fund Balance as a % of Council Annual Budgeted Net Revenue	28	28
SW05	Residential Costs per Week per Resident for People Aged 65 or Over	25	26	FINSUS3	Ratio of Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream	25	23
SW08	Number of Days People Spend in Hospital When They are Ready to be Discharged, per 1,000 Population (75+)	25	22	FINSUS5	Actual Outrun as a Percentage of Budgeted Expenditure	29	19