Comments on draft report

We would welcome the key findings section containing a summary of the performance of the council relative to the targets for each of the KPIs during the 15 months of the four-day week trial (at present the key findings only relate to half of the analysis, focussing only on the current summary of the performance during the trial relative to the pre-trial data).

Planning service measure 'Average number of weeks for householder planning application determination' appears to be missing from the key findings lists where we anticipate it would feature on the list of improved measures.

We request that you analyse the year end figures (only) for the KPIs FS104 (percentage of business rates collected) and FS105 (percentage of council tax collected) as our performance is judged on year end.

P.3 – typo? Should read 'sufficiently large that' rather than 'sufficiently large than'.

We realise you have used the short titles we included when we sent data over, but:

- FS109 title should probably change to % of undisputed invoices paid within 30 days (doesn't currently state % in report).
- FS113 should state 'average number of days to process housing benefit and council tax support change events' (*support* currently missing)
- SH332 should state '% of emergency housing repairs in 24 hours'

P.8 – typo – 'Theses' under Analysis 2 – Time series.

At various points the report refers to the 4DW 'trial' but in relation to the regression analyses (including explanation within method section), it is referred to the 'pilot'. Very minor, but consistency of language is ideal (we are using 'trial').

P.28 – typo – 'Ac can be seen'

P.74 – fig 46 – the Y axis goes up to 101%

In the regression analysis tables could any statistically significant results be highlighted in to make a bit more visually obvious where this occurs?

On p.15 the commentary under table 6 says that Nov and Dec outcomes were better than outcomes in Aprils. Later in the document (e.g. at p.21) it switches to comparing significant monthly variations to ‘the reference outcome’. My suggestion is that it might help readers who aren’t used to this language if it continued to refer to ‘Aprils’ as being the reference outcome throughout the doc, either as is the case at p.15 or maybe in brackets after ‘the referenced outcome’.