

Introduction

This supplement contains three categories of information:

- (a) performance on best value performance indicators and selected other national indicators;
- (b) explanations for all those indicators for which we did not meet our targets in 2005/06;
- (c) performance on those indicators that make up the basket of performance indicators in the Council's Public Service Agreement (PSA) cost-effectiveness target.

(a) Performance indicator tables

The tables shown in this section exhibit the performance indicators (PIs) we are using to help us to monitor whether our objectives are being achieved. Many indicators, just like activities, relate to more than one objective. But each indicator has been assigned to just one corporate objective. It is hoped that this approach simplifies the presentation and makes it easier to follow. The performance indicator information provides only part of the picture of our performance.

The tables of indicators show:

- our actual performance in 2004/05 compared with the targets for performance that we set at the start of that year, and compared with the actual performance of other councils where the information is available;
- the targets for 2005/06 that we set on indicators in last year's Best Value Performance Plan, alongside our actual performance in meeting them;
- targets for performance in 2006/07, 2007/08 and 2008/09 wherever possible.

Comparisons with other authorities

The comparisons of performance against other authorities shown in the tables are based on Leicestershire's statistical 'nearest neighbours', i.e., those authorities that are similar with regard to a range of socio-economic factors. Some socio-economic factors are more relevant to some services than to others, so the same approach can lead to slightly different groups of authorities for different services.

For Social Services, the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) has included Leicestershire in a group of 16 comparator authorities. For Education, the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) has included Leicestershire in a group of 11 authorities. For all other services we have included Leicestershire in a group of 13 authorities which are most similar, as identified by the 'nearest neighbours' analysis provided by the Institute of Public Finance. The lists of these authorities are shown overleaf.

Comparator Groups

Education (OFSTED)	Social Services (CSCI)	All Other Services
Cheshire	Bedfordshire	Bedfordshire
Derbyshire	Cambridgeshire	Cambridgeshire
East Riding of Yorkshire	Cheshire	Cheshire
East Sussex	Derbyshire	Derbyshire
Essex		
	Gloucestershire	Gloucestershire
	Hampshire	Hampshire
Leicestershire	Leicestershire	Leicestershire
	Northamptonshire	Northamptonshire
Nottinghamshire	Nottinghamshire	Nottinghamshire
	Oxfordshire	
	Shropshire	
Staffordshire	Staffordshire	Staffordshire
	Suffolk	
Warwickshire	Warwickshire	Warwickshire
West Sussex		
	Wiltshire	Wiltshire
Worcestershire	Worcestershire	Worcestershire

The information on the performance of the relevant comparator group shows the average (median) performance of the group and the performance of the best-scoring 25% of authorities in the group. For some indicators, it is better to achieve a high score, e.g., the proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 or above in the Key Stage 2 mathematics test (BV40). In these cases, the score shown under 'best 25%' is higher than the average and is that of the authority ranked the 75th percentile (i.e., the authority that is three-quarters of the way up the table if authorities' scores are ranked with the highest at the top). For some indicators, it is better to achieve a low score, e.g., the number of vehicle crimes per 1,000 population (BV128). In these cases, the score shown under 'best 25%' is lower than the average and is that of the authority ranked the 25th percentile (i.e., the authority that is one-quarter of the way up the table if authorities' scores are ranked with the highest at the top).

We compare ourselves annually against the best 25% and set targets to reach the best 25% within 3 years (if we are not already there), wherever this is appropriate. It should be noted that best-25% performance is a moving target, as local authority performance generally improves year on year.

Changes of definition

There are some cases in which the definition of an indicator has changed from one year to the next. In such cases, the change is identified by an asterisk and a note explaining that the inter-year comparison is not strictly like-for-like. This diminishes the value of the performance information presented; but the Government and the Audit Commission make the changes to definitions, so this is beyond our control.