

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Wording
Date: 20 May 2024 15:42:29
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

[REDACTED]

As promised, responses to these more specific points:

Comments on accuracy of your statement:

“It is important to note that during the trial period both business rates and council tax performance improved (the percentage of collected did increase) – but compared to the long term average the rates were lower.”

I confess I’m not sure I find this all that convincing. First of all, anything cumulative is always going to go up, and even if FS102 is not cumulative it is still an outcome with a clear trend over improvements through the financial year every year, so I don’t think it is surprising it happened during they =pilot as well.

In more general terms, if we are talking about comparing what you might see on the graphs to the regression results, they are definitely looking at different things. The way I would describe the regression is always that it is looking at outcomes through the whole pilot period compared to the long-term average (or the long-term average adjusted for COVID-19, as appropriate). It is of course possible that separately from that an outcome might improve as the pilot is going on, but I would be nervous about making too much of that. Mostly, that is because there is a lot of month by month variation in these outcomes anyway, so it is really hard to be sure it is a genuine trend, not just random variation (in a way the regression tries to adjust for, so we are more confident about for those results).

If there are places you want to talk about both, I would suggest keeping the two points of interpretation separate, and phrasing different so they don’t get inappropriately compared. For example, you could say:

- Outcome X was found to be significantly worse during the pilot period compared to the long-term average.
- The time series appear to show a trend towards improved performance as the pilot goes on.

If that was your interpretation, that would seem reasonable – just need to make clear one is a statistical finding, and one just a feeling from looking at a data series.

On your second, point, We haven’t added in any further interpretation of the time series, nor do I think it would be that appropriate. If I were presenting this data my approach would be to prevent people as much as possible trying to interpret those graphs (human nature is very susceptible to overinterpreting those types of visualisations) and focus on the more analytical results. Not up to me of course how you choose to make use of what we present, but that was why we don’t focus too much time on them.

I appreciate that is a lot of words, so very happy to discuss if that would be easier than doing things via email,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@scams.gov.uk>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2024 3:07 PM

To: [REDACTED]@salford.ac.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@cam.ac.uk>

Subject: Wording

Hi [REDACTED]

I have a question! I'm trying to interpret the draft analysis for my draft report and I have drafted the following statement:

Of those areas which saw poorer performance during the trial period than the longer term average, 3 measures (council tax, business rates and housing rent collected) are affected nationwide by the economic climate and impacts of cost of living. It is important to note that during the trial period both business rates and council tax performance improved (the percentage of collected did increase) – but compared to the long term average the rates were lower.

I think this is accurate, but it did make me ponder the wording in the introduction of your draft report (Summary of regression results section) For the analysis not adjusting for the impact of the COVID-19 period, the following outcome measures were found to be significantly different during the pilot period compared to before the pilot period: where you refer to 'Outcomes that worsened during the pilot period' and list the measures:

- o FS102: % of housing rent collected
- o FS104: % of business rates collected
- o FS105: % of council tax collected
- o AH211: Average days to re-let all housing stock

And my understanding is that for any of the measures (better, same or 'worse') it's the performance during the pilot relative to previous years, and so it's entirely possible that the "better" measures actually did worse *during the progression of the 15 months*, as shown by the time series, and that some that did 'worse' *actually improved* over the course of the pilot.

So my first question is, do you think my statement is factually correct?

And second question is, in your final analysis are you looking at interpreting the results as currently in the draft (ie commenting on the regression analysis but not the time series) or are you combining the interpretation as I am starting to?

Sorry this comes late in the process, I'm picking this up as I'm trying to explain it to others!

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Data Quality Lead

Pronouns: she/her – please feel free to tell me your pronouns



South Cambridgeshire Hall | Cambourne Business Park | Cambourne | Cambridge |
CB23 6EA



www.scamb.gov.uk | [facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [X](#)

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived