Council requests for changes to Balanced Scorecard from February 2020 Workshop	
1. Insert arrows setting out direction of travel	Accepted: This will be included in the final version for Council in May 2020.
2. Include five-year targets against strategy	This will not be included as quarterly progress against the strategy will be reported on separately and to increase the reporting period would deflect from the purpose of the Scorecard.
3. RAG ratings should change from %s to Intolerable, At Risk and On Track	Accepted: new format is Not on track, At Risk, and On Track
4. Include targets for CEO and SMT performance	Accepted: the targets will be integrated into appropriate performance management measures.
5. Require spend on projects measure	The overall finance measure includes spend on projects, there will also be separate financial reporting against projects in the finance report.
6. Registration should include measures for new registrants and those who are renewing	Accepted : a measure for new registrants has now been included
7. Finance - 2%, measure on reserves rather than 5% within the budget policy	Partially accepted: we have changed to remove specific percentages and instead state that we should be working within our budget and reserves policy respectively (i.e. zero variance).
8. People- request a measure related to investment in people	Accepted: a training measure has now been included.
9. FTP set out the measure for each quarter, if 78 weeks is not achievable come back with a new target	Accepted: the measure would be considered at risk if off track from quarter to quarter, rather than until achieved in full. Although 78 weeks has been retained, this will include cases resolved by Case Examiners, not just those going all the way through to a hearing.
10. Education- targets on specific issue each year which should be risked based	Partially accepted: this is a possibility for the future but as we have not yet specific education priorities for the sector, we are unable to report progress against them. In the interim the measure included are the most effective with the data we currently collect.
11. Education measure on operational business being on track	The nature of our education operational work does not lend itself to this kind of reporting. The measures we have chosen are measures of our impact, on the speed with which conditions are addressed and the quality of provision.
12. Customer and stakeholder- measure of CET overall and what are our priorities	To report on this measure in isolation would be too granular for this level of reporting.
13. Measure GOC quality of approving CET. Focus on the change we are trying to achieve	Accepted: the quality of the CET as experienced by stakeholders is a measure of the quality of GOC's approval process. Although an imperfect measure, trends should still be useful.
14. Include Efficiency programme measure on benefit realisation	Accepted: there is now an efficiency measure.
15. Measure against time, cost and quality – more transparent around our time cost and quality	Partially accepted: there are a range of measures addressing time, cost and quality. Further measures will be reported when indicators fall within amber or red.

Reminder that the Balanced Scorecard is an assurance tool for Council to receive a high-level report on progress against strategy on a quarterly basis

SMT detailed response as to the basis of the final indicators

FtP Performance and Customer Measures
Timeliness Measures
In FtP we have slightly amended our outward facing business plan and balanced scorecard objective to read as something more relevant and meaningful for our external partners. The 78 week closed case median is a standalone objective only relevant to a single point in time. It does not show readers the direction of travel or translate easily into more achievable operational milestones.

The objective also currently only measures the end to end output – the age profile of closed cases that have gone before a Fitness to Practise committee. These account for less than 20% of all investigations opened by the GOC and therefore we have sought to introduce a measure that includes resolutions by case examiners as well as the FtPC while maintaining an internal focus on the overarching objective we have previously reported to the PSA. This ensures that there is a focus on all stages of the FtP process.

Last year, including all final case examiner decisions, 64% of investigated concerns were resolved within 78 weeks. At present 59% of open cases are currently less than 68 weeks old (68 weeks to allow for a realistic 10 weeks to go through the final stages of the investigation process). We anticipate improving this over the next 12 months as the front end improvements take effect but are mindful of the continued push on our legacy cases – therefore we are setting ourselves a stretch objective to 67% of all concerns being resolved within 78 weeks.

Although our published objective will alter this year in line with the above, we remain committed to achieving the 78-week end-to-end median by March 2021

EDUCATION Performance and Customer Measures
Education timeliness in meeting conditions
This is a measure of our approved qualification providers' ability to meet conditions resulting from our Education quality assurance activity, including routine and periodic quality assurance and outcomes of activities such as a serious concerns review. The measure relies on our Education Visitor Panels recommending realistic, measurable conditions which can be resolved in a timely manner by providers; and providers' willingness and capacity to take action to meet conditions within the set timeframe.

Education quality of CET provision
This is a measure of our CET providers' ability to deliver good quality CET which meets Registrants' needs and contributes to their professional development, as reported by Registrants to the CET provider at the end of a CET session. The measure relies on our registrants making objective assessment of the quality of CET provision they have engaged with, and reporting that measure accurately to the CET provider.

REGISTRATION Performance and Customer Measures
Registration quality & accuracy
The GOC classifies registration data errors into three categories depending on the level of seriousness.
• Tier 1 errors are the most serious and are reserved for errors where the applicant should not have been put on to the register
• Tier 2 errors indicate that although the registrant was appropriately registered, the public register contains incorrect or misleading information
• Tier 3 errors relate to instances where the registrant was appropriately registered, and the public register is correct but other information submitted by the applicant was not correctly recorded on the GOC's database.
For registration errors to be reported as inaccurate for the purposes of the Balanced Scorecard, errors need to fall into Tier 1.