UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

University of Salford MANCHESTER

Four-Day Week Trial: South Cambridgeshire Council's Key Performance Indicator Evaluation

Dr Joshua Pink

Prof Daiga Kamerāde

Prof Brendan Burchell*

RESEARCH TEAM

To maintain independence from the research participants and policy makers, the analysis of this data was conducted by a group of researchers from the universities of Cambridge and Salford.

Joshua Pink is a Lecturer in Health Economics in the School of Health and Society at the University of Salford. He has worked as a statistician and health economist in both the public and university sectors, conducting evaluations of healthcare and policy interventions. He worked for 6 years conducting statistical and economic evaluations for the National Centre for Health and Care Excellence, producing guidance for the UK NHS and social care system.

Daiga Kamerāde is a Professor of Work and Wellbeing and a co-director of the Centre for Research on Inclusive Society at the School of Health and Society at the University of Salford. She is a highly experienced quantitative work and employment researcher. Daiga was part of the team that evaluated one of the largest four-day workweek trials in the world, conducted in the UK, contributing to the global conversation on innovative work arrangements and their implications for employee wellbeing and organisational performance.

Brendan Burchell* is a Professor in the Social Sciences and a Fellow of Magdalene College at the University of Cambridge. His main research interest is the relationship between employment and wellbeing which he has explored using both quantitative and qualitative research methods. For the past ten years he has specialised in the effects of working time reduction on performance and wellbeing. Other ongoing and recent research projects include national four-day week pilots of UK employers and the Scottish government working time reduction trials. He is the founder of the Work Time Reduction Research Network.

*Contact for questions and clarifications: bb101@cam.ac.uk

KEY FINDINGS

For the analysis not adjusting for the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic period, the following outcome measures were found to be statistically significantly different during the pilot period compared to before the pilot period:

- Outcomes that improved during the pilot period:
  - CC303: % of calls to the contact centre that are handled (answered)
  - CC305: % of complaints responded to within timescales (all SCDC)
  - FS109: Undisputed invoices paid in 30 days
  - FS113: Average number of days to process housing benefit and council tax change events
  - SH332: Emergency repairs in 24 hours
  - Planning services measure: major planning application decisions (% completed in time)
  - Planning services measure: non-major planning application decisions (% completed in time)
  - Planning services measure: non-major planning application decisions (% overturned)
- Outcomes that worsened during the pilot period:
  - FS105: % of council tax collected

For all other outcomes, no statistically significant difference could be found during the pilot period compared to before the pilot period. This does not necessarily mean there was no change – instead it means that any changes were not sufficiently large than it was possible to identify them from the general variation in the outcome over time.

For the analysis adjusting for the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic period, the following outcome measures were found to be significantly different during the pilot period compared to before the pilot period:

- Outcomes that improved during the pilot period:
  - CC303: % of calls to the contact centre that are handled (answered)
  - CC305: % of complaints responded to within timescales (all SCDC)
  - FS109: Undisputed invoices paid in 30 days
  - FS113: Average number of days to process housing benefit and council tax change events
  - FS117: % staff turnover
  - SH332: Emergency repairs in 24 hours
  - Planning services measure: major planning application decisions (% completed in time)
  - Planning services measure: major planning application decisions (% overturned)
  - Planning services measure: non-major planning application decisions (% completed in time)
  - Planning services measure: non-major planning application decisions (% overturned)
- Outcomes that worsened during the pilot period:
  - FS102: % of housing rent collected
  - FS104: % of business rates collected
  - FS105: % of council tax collected
  - AH211: average days to re-let all housing stock

For all other outcomes, no statistically significant difference could be found during the pilot period compared to before the pilot period. This does not necessarily mean there was no change – instead it means that any changes were not sufficiently large than it was possible to identify them from the general variation in the outcome over time.

As with all such analyses, it is important to note the analysis alone cannot prove it was the pilot that caused any changes identified, and it is necessary to consider other factors that may have changed over the same time period.

METHODS

Data

This report focuses on the performance of the council using Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). A separate report evaluates the impact of the trial on the employees themselves, using measures of their wellbeing, job satisfaction and other indicators.

The primary focus of this report is twofold: to show the performance of the council relative to the targets for each of the KPIs during the 15 months (January 2023-March 2024 inclusive) of the four-day week trial, and to investigate whether the performance during the 15 months of the trial was significantly different from the pre-trial data, controlling for seasonality and additionally (in separate analyses) for the exceptional COVID-19 period.

In total, data are available for 24 performance outcome measures, 19 key performance indicators and 5 planning services measures. There are several differences between the data available for different outcome measures. Some outcomes are based on monthly data, and others based on quarterly data, whilst some outcomes just cover performance for that month, and others are cumulative measures for the financial year up until that time point. The full list of outcome measures and their characteristics is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Key Performance Indicators.

Outcome description	KPI code	Time period for data	Data type
Customer contact service performance outcomes			
% of calls to the contact centre resolved first time	CC302	Monthly	Non-cumulative
% of calls to the contact centre that are handled (answered)	CC303	Monthly	Non-cumulative
% of complaints responded to within timescales (all SCDC)	CC305	Quarterly	Non-cumulative
Average call answer time (seconds)	CC307	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Financial performance			
% of housing rent collected	FS102	Monthly	Cumulative
% of business rates collected	FS104	Monthly	Cumulative
% of council tax collected	FS105	Monthly	Cumulative
Undisputed invoices paid in 30 days	FS109	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Average number of days to process new housing benefit and council tax support claims	FS112	Monthly	Non-cumulative

Average number of days to process housing benefit and council tax change events	FS113	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Staffing (staff turnover and days off sick)			
% staff turnover	FS117	Quarterly	Non-cumulative
Staff sickness days per FTE - excluding Shared Waste Service	FS125	Quarterly	Non-cumulative
Staff sickness days per FTE - Shared Waste Service only	SF786a	Quarterly	Non-cumulative
Planning service performance			
Average land charges search response days	SX025	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Major planning application decisions (% in time)	N/A – Not a KPI	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Major planning application decisions (% overturned)	N/A – Not a KPI	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Non-major planning application decisions (% in time)	N/A – Not a KPI	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Non-major planning application decisions (% overturned)	N/A – Not a KPI	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Average number of weeks for householder planning application determination	N/A – Not a KPI	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Housing services performance			
% tenant satisfaction with responsive repairs	AH204	Quarterly	Non-cumulative
Average days to re-let all housing stock	AH211	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Emergency repairs in 24 hours	SH332	Monthly	Non-cumulative
Waste management performance			
% bins collected on schedule	ES408	Monthly	Non-cumulative
% of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	ES418	Monthly	Cumulative

For most outcome measures, data are available from April 2016, and therefore time series begin at that point. However, for some variables, data were either only collected from a later time point, or the way data were collected was changed to make earlier values no

longer comparable, and for these outcomes therefore time series start from a later point. Specifically:

- KPI SF125 (staff sickness days per FTE - excluding Shared Waste Service) is only available from March 2019, as before this point the data for the Shared Waste Service were not separated out from the overall organisation.
- Data for 1 of the non-KPI planning service measures (average number of weeks for householder planning application determination) is only available from April 2018 onwards, and data for the other 4 non-KPI planning service measures is only available from January 2020 onwards.

For most outcome measures, the pilot began from 1st January 2023, and therefore comparisons of pilot to non-pilot data use this as the cut-off date. However, for some outcome measures, the pilot only began at a later time point. Specifically:

- For KPIs ES408 (% bins collected on schedule), ES418 (% of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting) and SF786a (staff sickness days per FTE - Shared Waste Service only) the relevant pilot only started on 19th September 2023, and therefore the data for September 2023 are the first included as part of the pilot in the analysis.

Some council KPIs are not included at all in the analysis, and the above table. The KPIs excluded and the reasons for these exclusions are:

- Eight KPIs were only introduced in the 2022/23 or 2023/24 financial year, and therefore it is not possible to compare them to sufficient historical pre-pilot data. These are:
  - AH215 (% successful homeless preventions as a proportion of all homeless cases closed)
  - AH230 (Number of households with children leaving bed and breakfast accommodation after longer than six weeks)
  - AH245 (% of SCDC homes with active HHRS Category 1 or 2 damp and mould cases)
  - CC314 (% of public hybrid meetings run without issues causing downtime exceeding five minutes) and
  - ES430 (% of fly tips cleared within 10 working days)
  - ES412 (kgs of black bin waste per household)
  - ES414 (kgs of total waste per household)
  - PN519 (Average time to determine validated householder planning applications) – this outcome is included as a planning service measure, but was not a KPI until 2022/23 so did not have target or intervention thresholds, and therefore is not analysed as a KPI.
- Four KPIs are reported as average two-year performance, rather than for each month, and therefore the pre- and post-pilot periods cannot be separated in the way necessary for analysis. These are PN510 (% of major applications determined within 13 weeks or agreed timeline), PN511 (% of non-major applications determined within eight weeks or agreed timeline), PN512 (% of appeals against

major planning permissions refusal allowed) and PN513 (% of appeals against non-major planning permission refusal allowed). These KPIs cover the same data as the four non-KPI planning service measures that are included.

Analysis

Up to 4 analyses were conducted for each outcome measure. Not all analyses were applicable to all outcome measures because of the differences between the data described above. Where an analysis is not conducted for a particular outcome, the reason for that exclusion is described in the results section for the relevant outcome.

Analysis 1 – KPI status
For each KPI, the council has defined target and intervention thresholds for the KPI. For each KPI, target, intervention and actual values are presented for each month or quarter (as applicable to the outcome measure), and are colour coded as follows:
- Green – The target value for the KPI is achieved.
- Amber – The target value for the KPI is not achieved, but the KPI is not worse than the threshold specified for intervention.
- Red – The target value for the KPI is not achieved, and the KPI has reached the threshold specified for intervention.

Analysis 2 – Time series
Graphical representations are provided of the historical data over time, both before and during the pilot period. These go from the earliest available data up until the end of March 2024. Theses graphs present data for each time point it was collected (either monthly or quarterly) and are presented as line graphs for data representing just that time period, and bar charts for data presenting cumulative values for that financial year.

Additionally, graphs showing comparisons of year-on-year averages are also presented. That is, the monthly or quarterly data are summarised into a single value for the whole years, and these are presented. This value is the average of the 12 monthly (or 4 quarterly) values for data representing individual time periods, and the value at the end of the financial year for data presenting cumulative values over financial years.

Analysis 3 – regression analysis to estimate impact of pilot introduction
A linear regression analysis was conducted to estimate the impact of the introduction of the pilot on the outcome, adjusting for any potential seasonality in the outcome (whether performance varies over the course of the financial year). Thus, the two predictors for the outcome measure included in the regression are the month (or quarter) the data was collected in, and whether the data were collected before or during the pilot period.

When looking at the results of the regression analyses, the value in the "pilot" row indicates how much lower (if the regression coefficient is negative) or higher (if the

regression coefficient is positive) the outcome was during the pilot period, compared to before the pilot period.

All changes are reported as absolute rather than relative differences. For example, if an outcome is 50% at baseline and the report mentions a 10% decrease in the outcome, this is a change from 50% to 40%, not a change from 50% to 45%.

Analysis 4 – regression analysis to estimate impact of pilot introduction, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19
Analysis 3 does not explicitly account for the impact of COVID-19 on services, as it includes comparing current data against data collected during the COVID-19 pandemic, when it may be expected that performance on some outcomes would be different.

Therefore, a second linear regression analysis was done, including time of year and the timing of the pilot as above, but also including a variable for whether the pandemic was ongoing or not. In the absence of a clear definition for the start and end of the pandemic, the period when some form of lockdown restrictions was in operation was used as a proxy for this, and therefore April 2020 to July 2021 was used as the relevant period.

In the same way analysis 3 may underestimate the impact of COVID-19, it is likely that analysis 4 will overestimate the impact during the specific period defined as the COVID-19 period for analysis. There are likely to be residual effects of the pandemic that persist beyond the end of formal lockdown restrictions, and this is not taken into account in the analysis.

When looking at the results of the regression analyses, the values in the "pilot" and "COVID-19 period" rows indicated how much lower (if the regression coefficient is negative) or higher (if the regression coefficient is positive) the outcome was during the pilot or COVID-19 periods respectively, compared to outside those periods. As in analysis 3, all changes are reported as absolute rather than relative differences.

RESULTS

Customer contact service performance outcomes

CC302: % of calls to the contact centre resolved first time

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 2. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	81.04	80	70
Feb-23	77.78	80	70
Mar-23	78.76	80	70
Apr-23	79.45	80	70
May-23	78.12	80	70
Jun-23	80.34	80	70
Jul-23	80.79	80	70
Aug-23	81.93	80	70
Sep-23	79.82	80	70
Oct-23	76.86	80	70
Nov-23	68.93	80	70
Dec-23	76.59	80	70
Jan-24	80.16	80	70
Feb-24	79.46	80	70
Mar-24	83.71	80	70

Over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 month (November 2023) where the KPI registered as worse than the intervention level, 8 months where the target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 6 months where the target was met (Table 2).

- Analysis 2 – Time series

According to Figures 1 and 2, there has been fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure over time, with the worst performing year being 2021/22.

Figure 1. % of calls to the contact centre resolved first time (monthly)

Figure 2. % of calls to the contact centre resolved first time (YoY)

Table 3. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	80.68	77.33, 84.03
May	-0.12	-4.84, 4.59
June	-0.87	-5.58, 3.85
July	-1.71	-6.43, 3.00
August	-0.49	-5.21, 4.22
September	-3.68	-8.39, 1.04
October	-3.14	-7.86, 1.57
November	-4.65	-9.36, 0.07
December	-1.62	-6.34, 3.09
January	-1.79	-6.51, 2.94
February	-0.77	-5.50, 3.96
March	0.80	-3.93, 5.53
Pilot	-0.45	-3.13, 2.24
†April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis in Table 3 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by month or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of month-by-month variation.

Table 4. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	80.95	77.51, 84.39
May	-0.12	-4.85, 4.61
June	-0.87	-5.60, 3.86
July	-1.71	-6.44, 3.02
August	-0.61	-5.36, 4.13
September	-3.80	-8.54, 0.94
October	-3.27	-8.01, 1.48
November	-4.77	-9.51, -0.03*
December	-1.75	-6.49, 3.00
January	-1.88	-6.63, 2.86
February	-0.87	-5.62, 3.88
March	0.70	-4.05, 5.45
Pilot	-0.63	-3.37, 2.10
COVID-19 period	-0.98	-3.65, 1.69
†April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis in Table 4 only found one significant result, which is that outcomes in Novembers appear to be worse than the reference outcome. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than both the impact of COVID-19, and the level of month-by-month variation.

CC303: % of calls to the contact centre that are handled (answered)

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 5. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	91.02	90	80
Feb-23	91.61	90	80
Mar-23	88.01	90	80
Apr-23	91.88	90	80
May-23	94.73	90	80
Jun-23	90.67	90	80
Jul-23	88.55	90	80
Aug-23	90.37	90	80
Sep-23	94.96	90	80
Oct-23	96.20	90	80
Nov-23	94.99	90	80
Dec-23	97.44	90	80
Jan-24	96.27	90	80
Feb-24	96.13	90	80
Mar-24	94.90	90	80

As can be seen in Table 5, over the period of the pilot, there have been 2 months (March 2023 and July 2023) where the KPI target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 13 months where the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

According to Figures 3 and 4, there has been fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure over time, with the worst performing year being 2016/17.

Figure 3. % of calls to the contact centre that are handled/answered (monthly)


Legend: Actual, Target

Figure 4. % of calls to the contact centre that are handled/answered (YoY)

Legend: Actual, Target

Table 6. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	82.26	76.75, 87.77
May	2.26	-5.50, 10.01
June	3.41	-4.35, 11.70
July	1.47	-6.28, 9.23
August	1.56	-6.19, 9.31
September	2.65	-5.10, 10.41
October	6.01	-1.74, 13.76
November	7.81	0.06, 15.56*
December	10.26	2.51, 18.01*
January	3.93	-3.85, 11.70
February	5.22	-2.55, 12.99
March	1.00	-6.79, 8.77
Pilot	7.21	2.80, 11.62*
†April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis presented in Table 6 found that outcomes in Novembers and Decembers were significantly better than outcomes in Aprils, and that there was a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. The percentage of calls that were handled was approximately 7% higher during the pilot, compared to before.

Table 7. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	82.30	76.63, 87.98
May	2.26	-5.54, 10.06
June	3.41	-4.39, 11.21
July	1.47	-6.33, 9.27
August	1.54	-6.28, 9.36
September	2.63	-5.19, 10.45
October	5.99	-1.83, 13.81
November	7.79	-0.03, 15.61
December	10.24	2.42, 18.06*
January	3.91	-3.92, 11.74
February	5.21	-2.63, 13.04
March	0.99	-6.85, 8.82
Pilot	7.18	2.66, 11.69*
COVID-19 period	-0.17	-4.57, 4.24
†April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 7, the analysis found that outcomes in Decembers were significantly better than outcomes in Aprils, and that there was a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. The percentage of calls that were handled was approximately 7% higher during the pilot, compared to before.

CC305: % of complaints responded to within timescales (all SCDC)

Reported as non-cumulative quarterly data, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 8. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Q4, 22/23	89.74	80	70
Q1, 23/24	85.54	80	70
Q2, 23/24	85.11	80	70
Q3, 23/24	83.15	80	70
Q4, 23/24	88.54	80	70

According to Table 8, over the period of the pilot, the KPI was met for all quarters.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 5 and 6, there has been fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure over time, with the two most recent financial years (2022/23 and 2023/24) showing the best levels of performance.

Figure 5. % of formal complaints resolved within timescale (quarterly)


Figure 6. % of formal complaints resolved within timescale (YoY)

Table 9. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	68.88	61.62, 76.15
Quarter 2	-2.16	-12.28, 7.96
Quarter 3	-0.44	-10.56, 9.68
Quarter 4	6.60	-3.59, 16.80
Pilot	15.41	5.45, 25.38*
[†]Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis in Table 9 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by quarter of the year but did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. The percentage of formal complaints that were resolved within the correct timescale was approximately 15% higher during the pilot, compared to before.

Table 10. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	69.58	62.14, 77.02
Quarter 2	-1.57	-11.81, 8.66
Quarter 3	-0.44	-10.59, 9.72
Quarter 4	6.71	-3.52, 16.95
Pilot	14.55	4.38, 24.72*
COVID-19 period	-4.71	-14.88, 5.46
[†]Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis in Table 10 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by quarter of the year, or during the COVID-19 period. However, it did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. The percentage of formal complaints that were resolved within the correct timescale was approximately 15% higher during the pilot, compared to before.

CC307: Average call answer time (seconds)

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with lower values representing better performance.

Table 11. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	139	100	180
Feb-23	141	100	180
Mar-23	178	100	180
Apr-23	128	100	180
May-23	133	100	180
Jun-23	157	100	180
Jul-23	184	100	180
Aug-23	163	100	180
Sep-23	78	100	180
Oct-23	70	100	180
Nov-23	87	100	180
Dec-23	30	100	180
Jan-24	51	100	180
Feb-24	55	100	180
Mar-24	80	100	180

As can be seen in Table 11, over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 month (July 2023) where the KPI registered as worse than the intervention level, 7 months where the target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 7 months when the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As Figures 7 and 8 indicate, there has been major fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure over time, with the worst performing years being 2016/17 and 2019/20.

Figure 7. Average call answer time (seconds) (monthly)


Figure 8. Average call answer time (seconds) (YoY)

Table 12. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	214.14	144.01, 284.57
May	-38.10	-136.78, 60.59
June	-40.50	-139.18, 58.18
July	-25.67	-124.35, 73.01
August	-21.74	-120.43, 76.94
September	-38.39	-137.07, 60.29
October	-79.37	-178.05, 19.32
November	-99.28	-197.96, -0.60*
December	-139.15	-237.83, -40.47*
January	-57.38	-156.31, 41.54
February	-67.68	-166.61, 31.24
March	-12.69	-111.62, 86.23
Pilot	-52.03	-108.13, 4.08

[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level

The analysis presented in Table 12 found two significant results, which are that outcomes in Novembers and Decembers appear to be better than the reference outcome. There is no evidence of a statistically significant impact from the introduction of the pilot.

Table 13. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	205.69	134.00, 277.38
May	-38.10	-136.67, 60.48
June	-40.50	-139.07, 58.07
July	-25.67	-124.24, 72.90
August	-17.89	-116.70, 80.83
September	-34.54	-133.35, 64.28
October	-75.51	-174.32, 23.31
November	-95.42	-194.24, 3.39
December	-135.30	-234.11, -36.48*
January	-54.27	-153.25, 44.71
February	-64.57	-163.55, 34.41
March	-9.58	-108.56, 89.40
Pilot	-46.11	-103.16, 10.94
COVID-19 period	30.85	-24.81, 86.51

[†]April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level

According to Table 13, the analysis only found 1 significant result, which is that outcomes in Decembers appear to be better than the reference outcome. There is no evidence of a statistically significant impact from either the COVID-19 period, or the introduction of the pilot.

Financial performance

FS102: % of housing rent collected

Reported as cumulative monthly data based on the total expected to be collected by the end of financial year, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 14. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	97.66	97.3	95.35
Feb-23	97.79	97.9	95.94
Mar-23	97.96	98	96
Apr-23	82.99	82.6	80.95
May-23	89.64	89.5	87.71
Jun-23	93.22	92.8	90.94
Jul-23	94.78	95.4	93.49
Aug-23	95.83	96	94.08
Sep-23	96.29	97.1	95.16
Oct-23	96.69	97.2	95.26
Nov-23	97.09	97.3	95.35
Dec-23	97.01	97.7	95.75
Jan-24	97.69	97.3	95.35
Feb-24	97.92	97.9	95.94
Mar-24	97.92	98	96

Table 14 indicates that over the period of the pilot, there were 9 months where the target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 6 months when the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

The within year pattern is relatively consistent over time (see Figures 9 and 10). However, the end of year rent collection percentage was below the target at the end of 2020/21 and has not met the target level at the end of subsequent financial years.

Data for this KPI are not available for December 2020.

Figure 9. % of housing rent collected (monthly)

Figure 10. % of housing rent collected at end of financial year (YoY)

Table 15. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	83.23	82.37, 84.10
May	7.35	6.13, 8.56*
June	10.45	9.234, 11.67*
July	11.99	10.77, 13.20*
August	12.78	11.56, 13.99*
September	13.45	12.24, 14.67*
October	14.00	12.79, 15.21*
November	14.31	13.09, 15.52*
December	14.44	13.19, 15.70*
January	14.76	13.55, 15.98*
February	14.97	13.76, 16.19*
March	15.10	13.88, 16.31*
Pilot	-0.43	-1.12, 0.26
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As would be expected from an outcome that is measured cumulatively over the financial year, there is a clear pattern of increases month by month over the financial year (see Table 15). There is no evidence of a significant impact of the pilot on the outcome.

Table 16. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	83.69	82.93, 84.45
May	7.35	6.30, 8.39*
June	10.45	9.41, 11.50*
July	11.99	10.94, 13.03*
August	12.57	11.52, 13.61*
September	13.24	12.20, 14.29*
October	13.79	12.74, 14.84*
November	14.10	13.05, 15.14*
December	14.03	12.94, 15.12*
January	14.59	13.54, 15.64*
February	14.80	13.75, 15.85*
March	14.93	13.88, 15.97*
Pilot	-0.74	-1.34, -0.13*
COVID-19 period	-1.67	-2.28, -1.06*
[†]April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 16, as would be expected from an outcome that is measured cumulatively over the financial year, there is a clear pattern of increases month by month over the financial year. There is evidence of a significant worsening of the outcome both during COVID-19 and the pilot period, with the percentage of housing rent collected 1.7 percentage points lower than the long-term average during the COVID-19 period, and 0.7 percentage points lower than the long-term average during the pilot.

FS104: % of business rates collected

Reported as cumulative monthly data based on the total expected to be collected by the end of financial year, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 17. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	93.8	95.5	93.59
Feb-23	97.7	98.4	96.43
Mar-23	98.2	99.1	97
Apr-23	13.1	13	12.74
May-23	22.0	22.69	22.24
Jun-23	32.3	31.73	31.1
Jul-23	42.1	40.98	40.16
Aug-23	51.7	50.2	49.2
Sep-23	64.8	59.78	58.58
Oct-23	69.0	68.66	67.29
Nov-23	77.5	77.85	76.29
Dec-23	84.6	86.3	84.57
Jan-24	93.1	95.5	93.59
Feb-24	95.7	98.4	96.43
Mar-24	98.9	99.1	97

Over the period of the pilot, there has been 3 months (May 2023, January 2024 and February 2024) where the KPI registered as worse than the intervention level, 6 months where the target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 6 months when the target was met (Table 17).

- Analysis 2 – Time series

According to Figures 11 and 12, there has been fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure over time, with the worst performing years being 2020/21 and 2022/23.

Figure 11. % of business rates collected (monthly)

Legend: Actual (blue), Target (orange)

Figure 12. % of business rates collected (YoY)

Legend: Actual (blue), Target (orange)

Table 18. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	13.53	12.63, 14.44
May	9.38	8.10, 10.65*
June	19.24	17.96, 20.51*
July	28.16	26.89, 29.44*
August	37.59	36.31, 38.86*
September	47.19	45.91, 48.46*
October	55.33	54.05, 56.60*
November	64.05	62.78, 65.32*
December	72.55	71.28, 73.82*
January	81.31	80.03, 82.59*
February	84.16	82.88, 85.44*
March	85.54	84.26, 86.82*
Pilot	-0.27	-0.99, 0.46
†April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As would be expected from an outcome that is measured cumulatively over the financial year, we can see it Table 18 that there is a clear pattern of increases month by month over the financial year. There is no evidence of a significant impact of the pilot on the outcome.

Table 19. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	14.04	13.27, 14.81
May	9.38	8.31, 10.44*
June	19.24	18.18, 20.30*
July	28.16	27.10, 29.22*
August	37.36	36.29, 38.42*
September	46.96	45.89, 48.02*
October	55.09	54.03, 56.16*
November	63.82	62.76, 64.88*
December	72.32	71.26, 73.38*
January	81.12	80.06, 82.19*
February	83.97	82.91, 85.04*
March	85.35	84.29, 86.42*
Pilot	-0.62	-1.24, -0.01*
COVID-19 period	-1.85	-2.45, -1.25*
†April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 19, as would be expected from an outcome that is measured cumulatively over the financial year, there is a clear pattern of increases month by month over the financial year. There is evidence of a significant worsening of the outcome both during COVID-19 and the pilot period, with the percentage of business rates collected 1.9 percentage points lower than the long-term average during the COVID-19 period, and 0.6 percentage points lower than the long-term average during the pilot.

FS105: % of council tax collected

Reported as cumulative monthly data based on the total expected to be collected by the end of financial year, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 20. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	95.4	97.8	95.84
Feb-23	98.2	98.6	96.63
Mar-23	99.2	99.1	97.1
Apr-23	11.0	11	10.78
May-23	20.7	21	20.58
Jun-23	30.1	30	29.4
Jul-23	39.4	39.76	38.96
Aug-23	49.2	48.96	47.98
Sep-23	58.5	58.56	57.39
Oct-23	67.4	67.76	66.4
Nov-23	76.7	77.06	75.52
Dec-23	85.8	86.16	84.44
Jan-24	95.1	95.26	93.35
Feb-24	97.5	97.93	95.97
Mar-24	99.3	99.1	97.11

Ac can be seen in Table 20, over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 month (January 2023) where the KPI registered as worse than the intervention level, 9 months where the target was not met but KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 5 months when the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

According to Figures 13 and 14, with the exception of one financial year (2020/21), the performance on this KPI has been consistently above the target level at the end of each financial year.


Figure 13. % of council tax collected (monthly)

Figure 14. % of council tax collected (YoY)

Table 21. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	14.36	13.39, 15.34
May	9.39	8.02, 10.76*
June	18.59	17.22, 19.96*
July	27.85	26348, 29.22*
August	37.10	35.73, 38.47*
September	46.48	45.10, 47.85*
October	55.41	54.04, 56.78*
November	64.63	63.25, 66.00*
December	73.65	72.28, 75.02*
January	83.07	81.70, 84.45*
February	84.64	83.26, 86.01*
March	85.42	84.05, 86.80*
Pilot	-2.08	-2.86, -1.30*
†April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As would be expected from an outcome that is measured cumulatively over the financial year, there is a clear pattern in Table 21 of increases month by month over the financial year. There is evidence of a significant worsening of the outcome during the pilot period,

with the percentage of council tax collected 2.1 percentage points lower than the long-term average during the pilot.

Table 22. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	14.58	13.60, 15.56
May	9.39	8.04, 10.73*
June	18.59	17.25, 19.94*
July	27.85	26.51, 29.19*
August	37.00	35.65, 38.35*
September	46.37	45.03, 47.72*
October	55.31	53.96, 56.66*
November	64.52	63.18, 56.87*
December	73.55	72.20, 74.90*
January	82.99	81.65, 84.34*
February	84.55	83.20, 85.90*
March	85.34	83.99, 86.69*
Pilot	-2.24	-3.01, -1.46*
COVID-19 period	-0.81	-1.57, -0.05*
[†]April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As would be expected from an outcome that is measured cumulatively over the financial year, in Table 22 there is a clear pattern of increases month by month over the financial year. There is evidence of a significant worsening of the outcome both during COVID-19 and the pilot period, with the percentage of council tax collected 0.8 percentage points lower than the long-term average during the COVID-19 period, and 2.2 percentage points lower than the long-term average during the pilot.

FS109: % of undisputed invoices paid in 30 days

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 23. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	98.74	98.5	96.5
Feb-23	98.93	98.5	96.5
Mar-23	98.42	98.5	96.5
Apr-23	99.56	98.5	96.5
May-23	98.86	98.5	96.5
Jun-23	99.56	98.5	96.5
Jul-23	99.20	98.5	96.5
Aug-23	98.64	98.5	96.5
Sep-23	98.55	98.5	96.5
Oct-23	98.97	98.5	96.5
Nov-23	98.96	98.5	96.5
Dec-23	99.50	98.5	96.5
Jan-24	99.04	98.5	96.5
Feb-24	99.17	98.5	96.5
Mar-24	99.93	98.5	96.5

As indicated by Table 23, over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 month (March 2023) where the KPI target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 14 months where the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

According to Figure 15 and 16, in 2018/19 and earlier, this KPI was consistently below the target value, whilst since 2019/20 the KPI has consistently been met on average across the financial year.

Figure 15. % of undisputed invoices paid in 30 days (monthly)

Figure 16. % of undisputed invoices paid in 30 days (YoY)

Table 24. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	98.01	96.64, 99.37
May	-0.02	-1.93, 1.90
June	-0.67	-2.58, 1.25
July	-0.31	-2.22, 1.61
August	-0.33	-2.24, 1.59
September	-0.07	-1.99, 1.85
October	-0.57	-2.48, 1.35
November	-0.65	-2.57, 1.27
December	-0.41	-2.33, 1.51
January	-1.36	-3.28, 0.57
February	-1.19	-3.11, 0.73
March	-0.16	-2.08, 1.76
Pilot	1.62	0.53, 2.71*
†April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 24, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year but did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. The percentage of undisputed invoices that were paid in 30 days was approximately 1.6% higher during the pilot, compared to before.

Table 25. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	97.60	96.26, 98.94
May	-0.02	-1.86, 1.82
June	-0.67	-2.51, 1.17
July	-0.31	-2.15, 1.53
August	-0.14	-1.98, 1.70
September	0.12	-1.73, 1.96
October	-0.38	-2.22, 1.46
November	-0.46	-2.31, 1.38
December	-0.22	-2.07, 1.62
January	-1.20	-3.05, 0.64
February	-1.04	-2.89, 0.81
March	-0.01	-1.85, 1.84
Pilot	1.91	0.84, 2.97*
COVID-19 period	1.49	0.45. 2.53*
†April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis presented in Table 25 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year but did find significant improvements in both the COVID-19 and pilot periods compared to before the pilot was introduced. The percentage of undisputed invoices that were paid in 30 days was approximately 1.5% higher COVID-19 period compared to the long-term average, and 1.9% higher during the pilot, compared to the long-term average.

FS112: Average number of days to process new housing benefit and council tax support claims

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with lower values representing better performance.

Table 26. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	6	15	20
Feb-23	10	15	20
Mar-23	14	15	20
Apr-23	19	15	20
May-23	14	15	20
Jun-23	9	15	20
Jul-23	9	15	20
Aug-23	13	15	20
Sep-23	12	15	20
Oct-23	13	15	20
Nov-23	10	15	20
Dec-23	11	15	20
Jan-24	10	15	20
Feb-24	10	15	20
Mar-24	12	15	20

According to Table 26, over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 month (April 2023) where the KPI target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 14 months where the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figure 17 and 18, this KPI has been consistently met or exceeded on average over the years where data are available.

Figure 17. Average number of days to process new HB/CTS claims (monthly)

Figure 18. Average number of days to process new HB/CTS claims (YoY)

Table 27. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	15.84	12.79, 18.89
May	-1.88	-6.16, 2.41
June	-2.38	-6.66, 1.91
July	-2.25	-6.54, 2.04
August	-2.38	-6.66, 1.91
September	-3.13	-7.41, 1.16
October	-6.88	-11.16, -2.59*
November	-7.00	-11.29, -2.71*
December	-6.25	-10.54, -1.96*
January	-4.41	-8.71, -0.11*
February	-4.78	-9.08, -0.48*
March	-2.03	-6.33, 2.27
Pilot	-0.74	-3.18, 1.70
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis presented in Table 27, found five significant results, which are that outcomes from October-February appear to be better than the reference outcome. There is no evidence of a statistically significant impact from the introduction of the pilot.

Table 28. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	15.77	12.63, 18.91
May	-1.88	-6.19, 2.44
June	-2.38	-6.69, 1.94
July	-2.25	-6.56, 2.06
August	-2.34	-6.67, 1.98
September	-3.09	-7.42, 1.23
October	-6.84	-11.17, -2.52*
November	-6.97	-11.29, -2.64*
December	-6.22	-10.54, -1.89*
January	-4.38	-8.71, -0.05*
February	-4.76	-9.09, -0.42*
March	-2.01	-6.34, 2.33
Pilot	-0.69	-3.18, 1.81
COVID-19 period	0.27	-2.17, 2.71
[†]April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

In Table 28, the analysis found five significant results, which are that outcomes from October-February appear to be better than the reference outcome. There is no evidence of a statistically significant impact from either the COVID-19 period or the introduction of the pilot.

FS113: Average number of days to process housing benefit and council tax change events

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with lower values representing better performance.

Table 29. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	4	10	15
Feb-23	3	10	15
Mar-23	6	10	15
Apr-23	7	10	15
May-23	6	10	15
Jun-23	6	10	15
Jul-23	5	10	15
Aug-23	4	10	15
Sep-23	4	10	15
Oct-23	7	10	15
Nov-23	4	10	15
Dec-23	3	10	15
Jan-24	5	10	15
Feb-24	4	10	15
Mar-24	5	10	15

As can be seen in Table 29, over the period of the pilot, the KPI was met for all quarters.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As indicated by Figures 19 and 20, this KPI has been consistently met or exceeded on average over the years where data are available.


Figure 19. Average number of days to process HB/CTS change events (monthly)

Figure 20. Average number of days to process HB/CTS change events (YoY)

Table 30. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	10.54	8.84, 12.24
May	-0.75	-3.14, 1.64
June	-1.38	-3.77, 1.01
July	-1.50	-3.89, 0.89
August	-1.13	-3.52, 1.27
September	-1.50	-3.89, 0.89
October	-2.63	-5.02, -0.23*
November	-3.75	-6.14, -1.36*
December	-4.25	-6.64, -1.86*
January	-1.71	-4.11, 0.68
February	-4.96	-7.36, -2.57*
March	-2.71	-5.11, -0.32*
Pilot	-3.29	-4.65, -1.93*

[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level

As can be seen in Table 30, the analysis found six significant results, which are that outcomes from October, November, December, February and March appear to be better than the reference outcome, and there is a statistically significant improvement in the pilot period. There is an approximately 3.3 day reduction in the number of days to process a housing benefit or council tax change during the pilot, compared to before.

Table 31. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	10.44	8.69, 12.19
May	-0.75	-3.15, 1.65
June	-1.38	-3.78, 1.03
July	-1.38	-3.90, 0.90
August	-1.08	-3.49, 1.33
September	-1.46	-3.87, 0.95
October	-2.58	-4.99, -0.17*
November	-3.71	-6.12, 1.30*
December	-4.21	-6.62, -1.80*
January	-1.68	-4.09, 0.73
February	-4.93	-7.34, -2.52*
March	-2.68	-5.09, -0.26*
Pilot	-3.23	-4.62, -1.84*
COVID-19 period	0.34	-1.01, 1.70

[†]April, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level

According to Table 31, the analysis found six significant results, which are that outcomes from October, November, December, February and March appear to be better than the reference outcome, and there is a statistically significant improvement in the pilot period. There is an approximately 3.2 day reduction in the number of days to process a housing benefit or council tax change during the pilot, compared to before.

Staffing (staff turnover and days off sick)

FS117: % staff turnover

Reported as non-cumulative quarterly data, with lower values representing better performance.

Table 32. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Q4, 22/23	1.66	3.25	4
Q1, 23/24	2.27	3.25	4
Q2, 23/24	1.90	3.25	4
Q3, 23/24	2.04	3.25	4
Q4, 23/24	1.87	3.25	4

As can be seen in Table 32, over the period of the pilot, the KPI was met for all quarters.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As indicated by Figure 21 and 22, this KPI has been generally met over the years for which data are available, but voluntary staff turnover was slightly worse than the target in 2016/17 and 2021/22.

Figure 21. Staff turnover (non-cumulative) (monthly)



Figure 22. Staff turnover (non-cumulative) (YoY)

Table 33. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	3.02	2.36, 3.68
Quarter 2	0.22	-0.70, 1.13
Quarter 3	-0.62	-1.54, 0.29
Quarter 4	-0.30	-1.22, 0.62
Pilot	-0.87	-1.77, 0.03
[†]Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis presented in Table 33 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by quarter or from when the pilot was started.

Table 34. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	3.14	2.50, 3.78
Quarter 2	0.32	-0.56, 1.20
Quarter 3	-0.62	-1.50, 0.26
Quarter 4	-0.28	-1.16, 0.60
Pilot	-1.02	-1.90, -0.14*
COVID-19 period	-0.81	-1.68, 0.07
[†]Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis in Table 34 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by quarter of the year, or during the COVID-19 period. However, it did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. Staff turnover was approximately 1 percentage point lower during the pilot, compared to before.

FS125: Staff sickness days per FTE - excluding Shared Waste Service

Reported as non-cumulative quarterly data, with lower values representing better performance.

Table 35. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Q4, 22/23	1.64	1.75	2.5
Q1, 23/24	1.18	1.75	2.5
Q2, 23/24	1.70	1.75	2.5
Q3, 23/24	1.67	1.75	2.5
Q4, 23/24	1.94	1.75	2.5

Over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 quarter (January-March 2024) where the KPI target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 4 quarters when the target was met (see Table 35).

- Analysis 2 – Time series

According to Figure 23 and 24, this KPI has generally been met over time, but staff sickness was above the target level in 2019/20, and in September-December 2021.


Figure 23. Staff sickness days per FTE excluding SWS (non-cumulative) (monthly)

Figure 24. Staff sickness days per FTE excluding SWS (non-cumulative) (YoY)

Table 36. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	1.30	0.92, 1.69
Quarter 2	0.29	-0.24, 0.83
Quarter 3	0.45	-0.08, 0.98
Quarter 4	0.39	-0.15, 0.93
Pilot	0.02	-0.43, 0.46
[†]Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis in Table 36 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by quarter or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of quarter-by-quarter variation.

Table 37. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	1.45	1.12, 1.77
Quarter 2	0.40	-0.03, 0.84
Quarter 3	0.45	0.02, 0.88*
Quarter 4	0.43	-0.00, 0.86
Pilot	-0.17	-0.54, 0.21
COVID-19 period	-0.55	-0.92, -0.17*
[†]Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis in Table 37 found that staff sickness in quarter 3 of the financial year was higher on average than the reference category, and that staff sickness during the COVID-19 period was lower than outside of it. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than both the impact of COVID-19, and the level of quarter-by-quarter variation.

SF786a: Staff sickness days per FTE - Shared Waste Service only

Reported as non-cumulative quarterly data, with lower values representing better performance.

Table 38. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Q3, 23/24	2.66	3	3.5
Q4, 23/24	3.39	3	3.5

According to Table 38, over the period of the pilot, there have been 1 quarter where the KPI target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 1 quarter when the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 25 and 26, this KPI has only been met in 1 year for which data was available – 2020/21. Staff sickness has been above the target level in all other years.

Figure 25. Staff sickness days per FTE - SWS (non-cumulative) (monthly)


Figure 26. Staff sickness days per FTE - SWS (non-cumulative) (YoY)

Table 39. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	3.98	3.20, 4.75
Quarter 2	-0.05	-1.15, 1.05
Quarter 3	0.26	-0.86, 1.37
Quarter 4	-0.10	-1.12, 1.02
Pilot	-1.03	-2.69, 0.63
†Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis presented in Table 39 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by quarter or from when the pilot was started.

Table 40. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	4.07	3.30, 4.84
Quarter 2	0.04	-1.04, 1.13
Quarter 3	0.27	-0.83, 1.37
Quarter 4	-0.08	-1.18, 1.01
Pilot	-1.13	-2.77, 0.50
COVID-19 period	-0.75	-1.81, 0.32
†Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis presented in Table 40 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by quarter, during the COVID-19 period, or from when the pilot was started.

Planning service performance

SX025: Average land charges search response days

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with lower values representing better performance.

Table 41. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	11.73	12	15
Feb-23	9.31	12	15
Mar-23	8.73	12	15
Apr-23	10.29	10	12
May-23	7.34	10	12
Jun-23	10.59	10	12
Jul-23	11.42	10	12
Aug-23	11.29	10	12
Sep-23	14.32	10	12
Oct-23	8.50	10	12
Nov-23	9.01	10	12
Dec-23	7.66	10	12
Jan-24	8.04	10	12
Feb-24	4.41	10	12
Mar-24	4.45	10	12

Table 41 suggests that over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 month (September 2023) where the KPI registered as worse than the intervention level, 4 months where the target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 10 months where the target was met.

Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 27 and 28, there has been fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure over time, with the worst performing years being 2016/17 and 2021/22.

Figure 27. Average land charges search response days (monthly)

Figure 28. Average land charges search response days (YoY)

Table 42. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	8.85	4.48, 13.22
May	-0.05	-6.20, 6.10
June	1.12	-5.03, 7.27
July	1.46	-4.69, 7.61
August	2.19	-3.96, 8.34
September	1.92	-4.23, 8.07
October	1.19	-4.96, 7.34
November	-0.24	-6.39, 8.91
December	-0.59	-6.73, 5.56
January	-0.21	-6.37, 5.96
February	-0.92	-7.08, 5.25
March	-1.09	-7.26, 5.07
Pilot	0.12	-3.38, 3.61
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

The analysis in Table 42 found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by month or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of month-by-month variation.

Table 43. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	7.83	3.46, 12.21
May	-0.05	-6.07, 5.97
June	1.12	-4.90, 7.14
July	1.46	-4.55, 7.48
August	2.66	-3.37, 8.69
September	2.39	-3.64, 8.42
October	1.65	-4.38, 7.68
November	0.23	-5.80, 6.26
December	-0.12	-6.15, 5.91
January	0.17	-5.87, 6.21
February	-0.54	-6.58, 5.50
March	-0.72	-6.76, 5.32
Pilot	0.83	-2.65, 4.31
COVID-19 period	3.73	0.33, 7.13*
[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 43, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of month-by-month variation. However, there was a significant increase in response times during the COVID-19 period, compared to outside of it.

Planning services measure: major planning application decisions (% completed in time)

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with higher values representing better performance.

- Analysis 1 – KPI status

Not applicable as this outcome is not a KPI, and therefore there is no target threshold for it.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 29 and 30, there is considerably variation in the monthly outcomes, because of the relatively small numbers of decisions made per month. However, the yearly average shows a consistent outcome from 2020-23, with a considerable improvement in 2023/24.


Figure 29. Major planning application decisions (% in time)

Figure 30. Major planning application decisions (% in time) - YoY

Table 44. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	58.22	37.54, 78.90
May	1.11	-27.79, 30.01
June	7.03	-21.87, 35.93
July	18.89	-10.02, 47.78
August	16.05	-12.85, 44.95
September	14.73	-14.17, 43.63
October	11.53	-17.37, 40.42
November	5.40	-23.50, 34.30
December	0.67	-28.23, 29.57
January	0.29	-27.19, 27.77
February	-4.79	-32.27, 22.70
March	-1.07	-28.55, 26.41
Pilot	15.47	2.76, 28.17*
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis		
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 44, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year but did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. Approximately 15% more major planning application decisions were completed within the correct timescale during the pilot, compared to before.

Table 45. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	48.14	27.13, 69.14
May	1.11	-25.97, 28.19
June	7.03	-20.05, 34.11
July	18.88	-8.20, 45.96
August	20.20	-7.09, 47.48
September	18.88	-8.41, 46.16
October	15.67	-11.61, 42.96
November	9.55	-17.74, 36.84
December	4.82	-22.47, 32.10
January	4.20	-21.75, 30.14
February	-0.88	-26.82, 25.07
March	2.84	-23.11, 28.78
Pilot	22.60	9.38, 35.81*
COVID-19 period	16.59	3.25, 29.94*
[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 45, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year but did find a significant improvement both during the COVID-19 period and in the pilot period. Approximately 17% more major planning application decisions were completed within the correct timescale during the COVID-19 period, compared to outside it, and approximately 23% more major planning application decisions were completed within the correct timescale during the pilot, compared to before.

Planning services measure: major planning application decisions (% overturned)

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with lower values representing better performance.

- Analysis 1 – KPI status

Not applicable as this outcome is not a KPI, and therefore there is no target threshold for it.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 31 and 32, proportions of major planning decisions overturned are consistently low, but are highest in 2021/22.

Figure 31. Major planning application decisions (% overturned)

Figure 32. Major planning application decisions (% overturned) - YoY

Table 46. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	4.12	-1.71, 9.96
May	-3.57	-11.72, 4.57
June	-1.30	-9.45, 6.85
July	-1.30	-9.45, 6.85
August	0.00	-8.15, 8.15
September	-3.57	-11.72, 4.58
October	1.98	-6.17, 10.13
November	2.06	-6.09, 10.21
December	-3.57	-11.72, 4.58
January	-1.02	-8.77, 6.73
February	-3.24	-10.99, 4.51
March	0.09	-7.66, 7.84
Pilot	-2.21	-5.79, 1.37
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis		
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 46, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by month or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of month-by-month variation.

Table 47. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	6.49	0.41, 12.57
May	-3.57	-11.41, 4.26
June	-1.30	-9.13, 6.64
July	-1.30	-9.13, 6.64
August	-0.97	-8.87, 6.92
September	-4.55	-12.44, 3.35
October	1.01	-6.89, 8.90
November	1.09	-6.81, 8.98
December	-4.55	-12.44, 3.35
January	-1.94	-9.44, 5.57
February	-4.16	-11.66, 3.35
March	-0.82	-8.33, 6.68
Pilot	-3.89	-7.71, -0.06*
COVID-19 period	-3.90	-7.76, -0.04*
[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis		
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 47, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year but did find a significant improvement both during the COVID-19 period and in the pilot period. Approximately 4% fewer major planning application decisions were overturned during the COVID-19 period, compared to outside it, and approximately 4% fewer major planning application decisions were overturned during the pilot, compared to before.

Planning services measure: non-major planning application decisions (% completed in time)

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with higher values representing better performance.

- Analysis 1 – KPI status

Not applicable as this outcome is not a KPI, and therefore there is no target threshold for it.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 33 and 34, the higher number of non-major planning applications (compared to major planning applications) means there is less monthly volatility in the outcomes, with a fairly consistent percentage being completed on time across different years.


Figure 33. Non-major planning application decisions (% in time)

Figure 34. Non-major planning application decisions (% in time) - YoY

Table 48. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	70.38	62.60, 78.16
May	-2.58	-13.44, 8.29
June	6.10	-4.77, 16.97
July	4.70	-6.17, 15.56
August	6.57	-4.30, 17.44
September	0.42	-10.45, 11.28
October	1.50	-9.37, 12.36
November	4.99	-5.88, 15.85
December	5.50	-5.37, 16.37
January	0.41	-9.92, 10.75
February	-4.17	-14.50, 6.17
March	-2.49	-12.82, 7.85
Pilot	13.05	8.27, 17.82*
†April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 48, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year but did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. Approximately 13% more non-major planning application decisions were completed within the correct timescale during the pilot, compared to before.

Table 49. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	65.25	57.93, 72.56
May	-2.58	-12.00, 6.85
June	6.10	-3.33, 15.53
July	4.70	-4.73, 14.12
August	8.68	-0.82, 18.18
September	2.53	-6.97, 12.03
October	3.61	-5.89, 13.11
November	7.10	-2.40, 16.60
December	7.61	-1.89, 17.11
January	2.40	-6.63, 11.43
February	-2.18	-11.21, 6.85
March	-0.50	-9.53, 8.53
Pilot	16.68	12.08, 21.28*
COVID-19 period	8.45	3.80, 13.09*
[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis		
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 49, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year but did find a significant improvement both during the COVID-19 period and in the pilot period. Approximately 8% more non-major planning application decisions were completed within the correct timescale during the COVID-19 period, compared to outside it, and approximately 17% more non-major planning application decisions were completed within the correct timescale during the pilot, compared to before.

Planning services measure: non-major planning application decisions (% overturned)

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with lower values representing better performance.

- Analysis 1 – KPI status

Not applicable as this outcome is not a KPI, and therefore there is no target threshold for it.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 35 and 36, there has been fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure over time, with the best performing year being 2023/24.

Figure 35. Non-major planning application decisions (% overturned)

Figure 36. Non-major planning application decisions (% overturned) - YoY

Table 50. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	0.65	0.00, 1.30
May	0.35	-0.56, 1.26
June	0.07	-0.84, 0.98
July	-0.04	-0.95, 0.87
August	-0.12	-1.03, 0.78
September	-0.34	-1.25, 0.56
October	0.25	0.25, 1.16
November	0.27	-0.64, 1.18
December	0.08	-0.83, 0.99
January	0.48	-0.39, 1.34
February	0.30	-0.56, 1.17
March	0.04	-0.82, 0.91
Pilot	-0.51	-0.91, -0.11*

[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level

According to Table 50, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month, but there was statistically significant evidence of a small reduction in the % of non-major planning application decisions that were overturned during the pilot period, compared to before the pilot.

Table 51. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	0.75	0.03, 1.46
May	0.35	-0.57, 1.26
June	0.07	-0.85, 0.98
July	-0.04	-0.96, 0.78
August	-0.16	-1.09, 0.76
September	-0.38	-1.31, 0.54
October	0.21	-0.71, 1.14
November	0.23	-0.69, 1.16
December	0.05	-0.88, 0.97
January	0.44	-0.44, 1.32
February	0.27	-0.61, 1.15
March	0.00	-0.87, 0.88
Pilot	-0.58	-1.02, -0.13*
COVID-19 period	-0.15	-0.61, 0.30

[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis
*Result is statistically significant at the 95% level

As can be seen in Table 51, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month or during the COVID-19 period, but there was statistically significant evidence of a small reduction in the % of non-major planning application decisions that were overturned during the pilot period, compared to before the pilot.

Planning services measure: average number of weeks for householder planning application determination

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with lower values representing better performance.

- Analysis 1 – KPI status

Not applicable as this outcome is not a KPI, and therefore there is no target threshold for it.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 37 and 38, the best performing years on this measure were 2018/19 and 2023/24.


Figure 37. Average number of weeks for householder planning application determination

Figure 38. Average number of weeks for householder planning application determination (YoY)

Table 52. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	11.19	9.67, 12.70
May	0.93	-1.20, 3.06
June	0.68	-1.45, 2.81
July	0.26	-1.86, 2.39
August	1.12	-1.01, 3.25
September	0.65	-1.48, 2.78
October	0.71	-1.42, 2.84
November	-0.34	-2.47, 1.79
December	1.15	-0.98, 3.27
January	-0.26	-2.40, 1.88
February	1.20	-0.94, 3.33
March	0.68	-1.45, 2.82
Pilot	-1.87	-2.96, -0.78*
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 52, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month, but there was statistically significant evidence of a reduction of approximately 1.9 weeks in the average number of weeks for householder planning application determination during the pilot period, compared to before the pilot.

Table 53. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	10.67	9.17, 12.17
May	0.93	-1.10, 2.97

June	0.68	-1.35, 2.71
July	0.26	-1.77, 2.30
August	1.35	-0.69, 3.39
September	0.88	-1.16, 2.92
October	0.94	-1.10, 2.98
November	-0.12	-2.16, 1.93
December	1.37	-0.67, 3.41
January	-0.10	-2.14, 1.95
February	1.36	-0.68, 3.41
March	0.85	-1.20, 2.89
Pilot	-1.49	-2.57, -0.41*
COVID-19 period	1.37	0.31, 2.42*
[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 53, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month, but there was statistically significant evidence of an increase of approximately 1.4 weeks in the average number of weeks for householder planning application determination during the COVID-19 period, compared to outside that period, and a reduction of approximately 1.5 weeks in the average number of weeks for householder planning application determination during the pilot period, compared to before the pilot.

Housing services performance

AH204: % tenant satisfaction with responsive repairs

Reported as non-cumulative quarterly data, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 54. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Q4, 22/23	92	97	92
Q1, 23/24	96	97	92
Q2, 23/24	93	97	92
Q3, 23/24	93	97	92
Q4, 23/24	91	97	92

According to Table 54, over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 quarter (January-March 2024) where the KPI registered as worse than the intervention level, and 4 quarters where the target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 39 and 40, this KPI fell below the target in 2020/21, and has still not recovered to the target level.


Figure 39. % of satisfaction with repairs (monthly)

Figure 40. % of satisfaction with repairs (YoY)

Table 55. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	95.43	91.62, 99.24
Quarter 2	-2.42	-7.73, 2.89
Quarter 3	-2.81	-8.11, 2.50
Quarter 4	-1.48	-6.83, 3.87
Pilot	-0.74	-5.96, 4.49
†Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 55, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by month or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of month-by-month variation.

Table 56. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

• Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	96.91	94.27, 99.55
Quarter 2	-1.16	-4.80, 2.47
Quarter 3	-2.81	-6.41, 0.80
Quarter 4	-1.25	-4.89, 2.39
Pilot	-2.56	-6.17, 1.05
COVID-19 period	-10.04	-13.66, -6.43
†Quarter 1 of the financial year, outside of both the COVID-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 56, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by quarter or from when the pilot was started. However, there was a significant decrease in tenant satisfaction with responsive repairs during the COVID-19 period, compared to outside of it.

AH211: Average days to re-let all housing stock

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with lower values representing better performance.

Table 57. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	25	17	25
Feb-23	27	17	25
Mar-23	25	17	25
Apr-23	38	17	25
May-23	33	17	25
Jun-23	22	17	25
Jul-23	30	17	25
Aug-23	26	17	25
Sep-23	29	17	25
Oct-23	24	17	25
Nov-23	39	17	25
Dec-23	30	17	25
Jan-24	30	17	25
Feb-24	33	17	25
Mar-24	30	17	25

As can be seen in Table 57, over the period of the pilot, there have been 11 months where the KPI registered as worse than the intervention level, and 4 months where the target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figure 41 and 42, this KPI rose to considerably above the target in 2020/21 and has still not recovered to the target level.

Figure 41. Average days to re-let all housing stock (monthly)

Figure 42. Average days to re-let all housing stock (YoY)

Table 58. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	30.50	15.75, 45.25
May	4.00	-16.76, 24.76
June	4.56	-16.20, 25.32
July	0.19	-20.57, 20.95
August	0.75	-20.01, 21.51
September	3.13	-17.63, 23.88
October	-4.00	-24.76, 16.76
November	-3.19	-23.95, 17.57
December	-2.88	-23.63, 17.88
January	2.88	-17.94, 23.69
February	-1.62	-22.44, 19.19
March	-3.25	-24.06, 17.56
Pilot	-1.01	-12.81, 10.80
†April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 58, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by month or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of month-by-month variation.

Table 59. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept†	18.71	9.62, 27.80
May	4.00	-8.50, 16.50
June	4.56	-7.94, 17.06
July	0.19	-12.31, 12.69
August	6.13	-6.40, 18.66
September	8.50	-4.03, 21.03
October	1.38	-11.15, 13.91
November	2.19	-10.34, 14.72
December	2.50	-10.03, 15.03
January	7.22	-5.33, 19.77
February	2.72	-9.83, 15.27
March	1.10	-11.45, 13.65
Pilot	7.25	0.02, 14.49*
COVID-19 period	43.02	35.96, 50.08*
†April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 59, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year. There is evidence of a significant worsening of the outcome both during COVID-19 and the pilot period, with the average number of days to relet housing stock increasing by 43.0 days during the COVID-19 period, compared to the long-term average, increased by 7.3 days during the pilot period, compared to the long-term average.

SH332: Emergency repairs in 24 hours

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 60. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Jan-23	100	100	98
Feb-23	100	100	98
Mar-23	100	100	98
Apr-23	100	100	98
May-23	100	100	98
Jun-23	100	100	98
Jul-23	100	100	98
Aug-23	100	100	98
Sep-23	100	100	98
Oct-23	100	100	98
Nov-23	100	100	98
Dec-23	100	100	98
Jan-24	100	100	98
Feb-24	100	100	98
Mar-24	100	100	98

According to Table 60, over the period of the pilot, the KPI was met for all months.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 43 and 44, there was fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure between 2016 and 2021, but from 2022-24 the KPI has been consistently met.

Figure 43. % of emergency repairs in 24 hours (monthly)

Figure 44. % of emergency repairs in 24 hours (YoY)

Table 61. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	97.56	95.77, 99.35
May	-0.04	-2.56, 2.47
June	-0.78	-3.29, 1.74
July	-2.07	-4.58, 0.45
August	0.11	-2.41, 2.63
September	-0.56	-3.08, 1.95
October	-1.76	-4.28, 0.76
November	-0.17	-2.68, 2.35
December	-0.73	-3.24, 1.79
January	-0.40	-2.93, 2.12
February	-0.19	-2.71, 2.34
March	-0.09	-2.61, 2.44
Pilot	2.93	1.50, 4.36*
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 61, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year but did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. Approximately 2.9% more emergency repairs were completed within 24 hours during the pilot, compared to before.

Table 62. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	97.89	96.08, 99.70
May	-0.04	-2.53, 2.45
June	-0.78	-3.26, 1.71
July	-2.07	-4.56, 0.42
August	-0.04	-2.54, 2.45
September	-0.71	-3.21, 1.78
October	-1.91	-4.40, 0.58
November	-0.32	-2.81, 2.18
December	-0.88	-3.37, 1.62
January	-0.52	-3.02, 1.97
February	-0.31	-2.81, 2.19
March	-0.21	-2.71, 2.29
Pilot	2.70	1.26, 4.14*
COVID-19 period	-1.21	-2.62, 0.19
[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 62, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects by month of the year or during the COVID-19 period but did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. Approximately 2.7% more emergency repairs were completed within 24 hours during the pilot, compared to before.

Waste management performance

ES408: % bins collected on schedule

Reported as non-cumulative monthly data, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 63. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Sep-23	99.79	99.7	99.25
Oct-23	99.72	99.7	99.25
Nov-23	99.79	99.7	99.25
Dec-23	99.81	99.7	99.25
Jan-24	99.69	99.7	99.25
Feb-24	99.89	99.7	99.25
Mar-24	99.86	99.7	99.25

As can be seen in Table 63, over the period of the pilot, there has been 1 month (January 2024) where the KPI target was not met but the KPI was not worse than the intervention level, and 6 months when the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 45 and 46, from 2017 onwards, the outcome has been consistently above the target level over time.

Figure 45. % of bins collected on schedule (monthly)

Figure 46. % of bins collected on schedule (YoY - data for September-March)

Table 64. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	99.62	99.34, 99.90
May	0.07	-0.33, 0.46
June	-0.01	-0.41, 0.38
July	0.13	-0.26, 0.52
August	0.14	-0.26, 0.53
September	0.15	-0.24, 0.55
October	0.13	-0.27, 0.52
November	0.13	-0.26, 0.53
December	0.19	-0.21, 0.59
January	0.11	-0.28, 0.51
February	0.18	-0.21, 0.58
March	-0.21	-0.60, 0.19
Pilot	0.08	-0.24, 0.40
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 64, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by month or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of month-by-month variation.

Table 65. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	99.58	99.29, 99.86
May	0.07	-0.32, 0.46
June	-0.01	-0.41, 0.38
July	0.13	-0.26, 0.52
August	0.15	-0.24, 0.55
September	0.17	-0.22, 0.57
October	0.14	-0.25, 0.54
November	0.15	-0.25, 0.54
December	0.21	-0.19, 0.60
January	0.13	-0.26, 0.53
February	0.20	-0.19, 0.60
March	-0.19	-0.59, 0.20
Pilot	0.10	-0.22, 0.42
COVID-19 period	0.16	-0.06, 0.38
[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 65, the analysis found no evidence of any statistically significant effects, either by month, during the COVID-19 period, or from when the pilot was started. The impact of the introduction of the pilot appears to be minimal, and smaller than the level of month-by-month variation.

ES418: % of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting

Reported as cumulative data, based on the proportion sent from the start of the relevant financial year up to the point of measurement, with higher values representing better performance.

Table 66. Analysis 1 – KPI status

KPIs	Actual	Target	Intervention
Sep-23	53.68	52	48
Oct-23	52.78	52	48
Nov-23	52.38	52	48
Dec-23	51.76	52	48
Jan-24	50.73	52	48
Feb-24	49.98	52	48
Mar-24	50.00	52	48

According to Table 66, over the period of the pilot, there has been 4 months (December 2023-March 2024) where the KPI target was not met but the intervention level was not reached, and 3 months where the target was met.

- Analysis 2 – Time series

As can be seen in Figures 47 and 48, there has been fluctuation in the performance on this outcome measure over time, with the worst performing year being 2022/23.

Data for this KPI are not available for January or February 2017.

Figure 47: % of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting (monthly)

Figure 48: % of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting (YoY - data for September-March)

Table 67. Analysis 3 – Regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	49.82	48.14, 51.50
May	3.12	0.74, 5.50*
June	3.87	1.49, 6.24*
July	3.40	1.02, 5.78*
August	3.43	1.05, 5.81*
September	3.43	1.04, 5.82*
October	3.09	0.69, 5.48*
November	2.89	0.49, 5.28*
December	1.88	-0.51, 4.28
January	1.15	-1.33, 3.63
February	0.54	-1.94, 3.02
March	0.73	-1.66, 3.13
Pilot	-0.16	-2.09, 1.77
[†]April, outside of the pilot period, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

As can be seen in Table 67, the analysis found seven significant results, which are that outcomes from May-November appear to be better than the reference outcome. There is no evidence of a statistically significant impact from the introduction of the pilot.

Table 68. Analysis 4 – Regression analysis, adjusting for the impact of COVID-19

Variable	Regression coefficient	95% confidence interval
Intercept[†]	50.28	48.64, 51.93
May	3.12	0.84, 5.40*
June	3.87	1.59, 6.14*
July	3.40	1.13, 5.68*
August	3.20	0.91, 5.48*
September	3.23	0.94, 5.52*
October	2.89	0.59, 5.18*
November	2.69	0.39, 4.98*
December	1.69	-0.61, 3.98
January	0.99	-1.38, 3.37
February	0.38	-1.99, 2.76
March	0.54	-1.76, 2.83
Pilot	-0.44	-2.30, 1.42
COVID-19 period	-1.86	-3.13, -0.59*
[†]April, outside of both the COVD-19 and pilot periods, is used as the reference category in the analysis *Result is statistically significant at the 95% level		

According to Table 68, the analysis found eight significant results, which are that outcomes from May-November appear to be better than the reference outcome, and the outcomes during the COVID-19 period are worse than the outcomes outside that period. There is no evidence of a statistically significant impact from the introduction of the pilot.

How to cite this report:
Pink, J., Kamerāde, D., Burchell, B. (2024). Four-Day Week Trial: South Cambridgeshire Council' s Key Performance Indicator Evaluation. Research Report. University of Salford/University of Cambridge.