From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: Anne Ainsworth; [redacted]
Subject: RE: SCDC Data
Date: 15 May 2024 14:32:46
Attachments: image004.png
image012.png
image013.png
image014.png
image018.png

Hello [redacted]

Just coming back to you on the dates for likely media interest:
First online publication of the report as an appendix to our Employment and Staffing Committee is planned for 5th June (the meeting is 13th).
It is then intended to go to our Cabinet (meeting 25th June), Cambridge City Council strategy meeting 1st July and our full Council 18th July.

I'll get other answers together with our collated comments back to you later today or tomorrow morning.
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

[redacted]
www.scambs.gov.uk | facebook | Instagram | LinkedIn | X

From: [redacted]@cam.ac.uk>
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2024 12:11 PM
To: [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>; [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted] scambs.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>
Subject: RE: SCDC Data

Dear [redacted] Cc [redacted]

Two things:-

1. We noted in the data that there was a marked change in the time-series for CC307 (Average call answer time (seconds)) between Aug 23 and Sept 23, when the figures approximately halved after that month. We wondered whether there was an obvious explanation for that change, such as an increase in staffing or a change in the call-handling system?
2. It would be useful if you could inform us when you think it likely that there might be media interest in these figures, for instance when the report(s) go online or when they are discussed at a council meeting, so that we can instruct our universities where to route any enquiries that might come our way.

Looking forward to hearing your feedback,

Best Wishes,

[redacted]

[redacted] [redacted]

[redacted] University of Cambridge.
https://research.sociology.cam.ac.uk/profile/prof-brendan-burchell

www.wtr-rn.com

From: [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2024 11:12 AM
To: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]@cam.ac.uk>
Subject: RE: SCDC Data

Hi [redacted]

I'm afraid there's been a slight correction to one of the KPI results used for the draft 4DW report. This is for FS117 - % staff turnover.

Essentially this KPI covers voluntary leavers only. It's been explained to me that there was an instance where someone was incorrectly categorised on the system as a voluntary leaver, when this in fact wasn't the case.

This means the result for Q4 should actually be 1.87, rather than the 2.02 included within the draft report.

Apologies for this. I wanted to let you know as early as possible, rather than to wait for [redacted]s return. I'm actually on leave for the rest of the week, so after today, please continue to liaise with [redacted].

Many thanks

[redacted]

[redacted] | Senior Policy and Performance Officer

South Cambridgeshire Hall | Cambourne Business Park | Cambourne | Cambridge | CB23 6EA
[redacted]
www.scambs.gov.uk | facebook | Instagram | LinkedIn | X

Pronouns: Him/he – please feel free to tell me your pronouns.

From: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 1:35 PM
To: [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>; [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]cam.ac.uk>
Subject: RE: SCDC Data

Super; thanks. I think that covers everything I need to know,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Sent: Friday, May 3, 2024 6:14 PM
To: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]scambs.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]cam.ac.uk>
Subject: RE: SCDC Data

Hi [redacted]

Sorry for the delay, always need to the speak to the teams who own the data to confirm! Answers for you in red:

- From look at the dataset, there seems no reason you could look at the 2 percentages (% in time and % overturned), but I know that isn't what was done previously (assuming this is the same dataset). Any reason why we shouldn't follow that approach, and if there is do you have any preference what we look at instead? No reason not to analyse both percentages, we would welcome that.
- Are you happy we just use the combined GCSP dataset, or is there a reason for us to look at the 2 subsets separately? The work is all completed by a single service, so in terms of what we deliver it's one data set (we just have to report to separately to central government as officially the councils are two planning authorities). It can be helpful for us to look at the split as some decision making is by elected members through the planning committee (relevant to non-delegated decisions), and generally for our interest! Again, happy with what you decide, and our planning team are happy to discuss that for your reporting if that helps.
- Was the previous dataset you sent through for this final, or are we expecting any updates for this one? This is the final data set.
- The Cambridge report talks about a change in the way the data were collected/categorised in April 2022? Does that mean we should ignore the data from before that point, or was the change small enough we can still include it? We think this refers to when the classification of the type of application changed from major / minor / other
  to major / minor
  and we have already ensured the data was amalgamated into the new categories so it can be compared.

Let me know if you have any other queries,

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

[redacted]
www.scambs.gov.uk | facebook | Instagram | LinkedIn | X

From: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2024 5:53 PM
To: [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>; [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]@cam.ac.uk>
Subject: RE: SCDC Data

[redacted]

So, I think the only additional questions I have are around what you would like us to do with the non-KPI planning dataset:

- From look at the dataset, there seems no reason you could look at the 2 percentages (% in time and % overturned), but I know that isn't what was done previously (assuming this is the same dataset). Any reason why we shouldn't follow that approach, and if there is do you have any preference what we look at instead?
- Are you happy we just use the combined GCSP dataset, or is there a reason for us to look at the 2 subsets separately?
-

Was the previous dataset you sent through for this final, or are we expecting any updates for this one?
- The Cambridge report talks about a change in the way the data were collected/categorised in April 2022? Does that mean we should ignore the data from before that point, or was the change small enough we can still include it?

I hope that all makes sense. Let me know if anything doesn't,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2024 11:39 AM
To: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]cam.ac.uk>
Subject: RE: SCDC Data

Hello [redacted]

Thanks for your email; we've popped answers below in blue after each query (one outstanding) and I'm happy to chat if this helps further.
Kind regards

[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

[redacted]
www.scambs.gov.uk | facebook | Instagram | LinkedIn | X

From: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2024 3:29 PM
To: [redacted]scambs.gov.uk>; [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>; [redacted]@cam.ac.uk>
Subject: RE: SCDC Data

[redacted]

Thanks for sending that through. I've been through the KPI dataset, and all makes sense. I just have a few very minor points to clarify (I think I know the answer to most, but better to ask rather than assume). Happy to discuss if that would help with any of them, but hopefully they are sufficiently minor I won't need to take up your time in that way.

Questions/clarifications to make sure my understanding is correct:
- I assume the dates in the "period" column all correspond to the end date of a measurement period. Thus, for example, data listed as 29/02/2024 covers the period from 01/02/2024-29/02/2024 **– Yes this is correct.**
- All the data series should go back to March 2016, except for FS125, which only goes back to March 2019 –**All except FS125 are shown since 2016 with the first performance result for FS125 being June 2019 which cover the period 1st April to 30th June 2019.**
- The pilot started in January 2023 for all KPIs, except for the three new ones you have added in (ES418, ES408 and SF76a) where is started in September 2023 – **Correct, the waste trial commenced on 19th September 2023.**
- There are three blank entries in the actual data column – are those unavailable or can we complete those data?:
  - FS102 – December 2020 – **There was not a result recorded for this month, as it was not possible to obtain a performance result due to the transfer of the 'rents' system to a new operating system called 'Orchard'**
  - ES418 – February 2017 **– We have this comment for both the January and February results that are**

missing– 'Performance data not yet available due to resources needed to deliver significant bin day change project' we have asked a data analyst to check back in their historical notes to see if these were added at a later date so will come back to you with this information.

  - ES418 – January 2017 – **(see above)**
- For FS104, the target for March 2021 is listed as 98.4, whilst every other March is 99.1 (February is usually 98.4). Is that an error and should the target there also be 99.1? – **Yes looking back this appears to be an error and should read the same as all other March targets pre 2021 so 99.0 would be the correct target. The target was changed to 99.1 for March 2022 onwards**

I think that is everything on the KPIs – I will be back in touch if I have any separate questions on the planning datasets.

Thanks,

[redacted]

University of Salford

[redacted]

From: [redacted]@cam.ac.uk>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2024 1:04 PM
To: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>
Subject: FW: SCDC Data

Dear [redacted]

See attached.

Best Wishes,

[redacted]

[redacted] University of Cambridge.
[redacted]

www.wtr-rn.com

From: [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2024 11:57 AM
To: [redacted]@cam.ac.uk>; [redacted]@salford.ac.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@scambs.gov.uk>
Subject: SCDC Data

Hello [redacted]

Please find attached two files:

- KPI data – this is as provided last week with the addition of KPI SX025 – average land charges search response days
- Planning data sets (major and non-major planning application decisions) – these are up to date to 19/03/24

We are asking all data owners to ensure year-end data is submitted as quickly as possible after the end of March to complete the set for analysis, and we will provide this as soon as we can.

I know Anne will be in touch on your questions and I am happy to schedule a call at any time to assist – just let me know.

Kind regards

[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

[redacted]
www.scambs.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

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

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