

## Appendix B1

### Reasons for the Significant Difference ( i.e. > 15%) between our projected and actual performance for 2000/01

Performance Indicator	Reference	Projected Performance for 2000/01	Actual performance for 2000/01	Percentage variation between the projected and actual performance for 2000/01- i.e. $100\% \times (\text{projected} - \text{actual}) / \text{projected}$	Explanation for Significant Variation (i.e. >15%) between Projected and Actual Performance
<b>Corporate Health</b>					
Voluntary leavers as a percentage of staff in post	BV 13	9.80%	12.80%	30.6%	The projected performance calculations were made with limited information on schools based staff. When calculating the actual achievement the schools based data was complete and gave rise to a significant rise compared with the projected figure.
Early retirements (excluding ill-health retirements) as a percentage of the total workforce	BV 14	0.28%	0.21%	25.0%	The lower levels of early retirements achieved compared to projected results from a tightening up on the County Council's policy on early retirement.
Ill-health retirements as a percentage of the total workforce	BV 15	0.41%	0.54%	31.7%	The figure for actual achievement has been published incorrectly and the correct figure of 0.47% is more in line with the projected performance.
<b>Education</b>					
Percentage of 3 year olds who have access to a good quality free early years education place in the voluntary, private or maintained sectors	BV 30	15%	48.10%	220.7%	A grant for 3 year olds together with additional funds secured via successful bids meant that increased provision was made possible.
Spending per head of population on adult education through LEA provided and secured provision	BV 32	£0.40	£0.83	107.5%	This reflects additional funds secured to support adult learning.
Net Youth Service expenditure (i.e. LEA expenditure only) per head of population in the Youth Service target age range	BV 33	£23.52	£62.97	167.7%	Incorrect definition used for estimates.

## Appendix B1

### Reasons for the Significant Difference ( i.e. > 15%) between our projected and actual performance for 2000/01

Performance Indicator	Reference	Projected Performance for 2000/01	Actual performance for 2000/01	Percentage variation between the projected and actual performance for 2000/01 - i.e. $100\% * (\text{projected} - \text{actual}) / \text{projected}$	Explanation for Significant Variation (i.e. >15%) between Projected and Actual Performance
Expenditure per pupil in local authority nursery and primary schools - pupils under 5	BV 36a	£2,260	£2,954	30.7%	Incorrect definition used for estimates.
Expenditure per pupil in local authority secondary schools - pupils 16 and over	BV 36d	£3,531	£2,209	37.4%	Incorrect definition used for estimates.
Average GCSE points score of pupils in schools maintained by the authority completing Year 11	BV 37	4.6	37.6	717.4%	The projection was wrongly calculated on the basis of average score per subject as opposed to per pupil.
Percentage of statements prepared within 18 weeks including those involving other agencies	BV 43b	65%	40%	38.5%	We over estimated our performance and will be revising our future figures in light of this
Number of pupils permanently excluded during the year from schools maintained by the authority per 1,000 pupils on rolls of schools maintained by the authority:					
(a) Primary	BV 44a	0.13	0.42	223.0%	Incorrect definition used for estimates.
(b) Secondary	BV 44b	0.70	2.1	200.0%	
(c) Special schools	BV 44c	0.74	3.8	413.5%	
Percentage of half days missed due to unauthorised absence in secondary schools maintained by the authority	BV 45	0.60%	0.80%	33.3%	Whilst our truancy rates are falling the rate of reduction did not meet DfES targets. We will continue to work towards meeting those targets.
Percentage of half days missed due to unauthorised absence in primary schools maintained by the authority	BV 46	0.24%	0.38%	58.3%	We will be working on improving our projections for future years.

## Appendix B1

### Reasons for the Significant Difference ( i.e. > 15%) between our projected and actual performance for 2000/01

Performance Indicator	Reference	Projected Performance for 2000/01	Actual performance for 2000/01	Percentage variation between the projected and actual performance for 2000/01- i.e. $100\% * (\text{projected} - \text{actual}) / \text{projected}$	Explanation for Significant Variation (i.e. >15%) between Projected and Actual Performance
Percentage of schools maintained by the authority with serious weakness on 14 December 2000	BV 47	12%	4%	66.7%	The projected performance was incorrectly quoted as a percentage ( it was 12 schools not 12%).
Percentage of schools maintained by the authority subject to special measures as at the end of the autumn term.	BV 48	5%	1.8%	64.0%	Our programme of intervention has supported schools at risk which has successfully resulted in reducing the number subject to special measures by more than we originally anticipated.
Percentage of adult education hours for which students attended	BV 158	11.40	10.8	5.3%	Additional opportunities arose towards the end of the year to run extra courses which resulted in a better performance than originally anticipated
Percentage of permanently excluded pupils attending between 10 and 25 hours a week of alternative tuition	BV 159/AC-B1(ii)	70%	89.20%	27.4%	The better performance achieved compared with projected has resulted from additional funding being secured from the European Social Fund.
Percentage of permanently excluded pupils attending more than 25 hours a week of alternative tuition	BV 159/AC-B1(iii)	20%	0%	100.0%	Incorrect definition used for estimates.
Percentage of primary school classes with more than 30 pupils in years reception to two inclusive	BV 160/AC-B2(i)	9%	1.30%	85.6%	The impact of the grant for Key Stage 1 class sizes resulted in a reduction in class sizes at a faster rate than was anticipated.
<b>Social Services</b>					
Percentage of children looked after at 31 March with three or more placements during the year	BV 49	15%	9.90%	34.0%	We exceeded our expectation and have achieved a good result. However, it is a difficult indicator to predict as individual children's circumstances govern whether they move or not.
Cost of services for children 'looked after'	BV 51	£311	£565	81.7%	The method of calculation for this indicator changed from producing the projected performance figures to the achievement figures resulting in the significant variation between them.

## Appendix B1

### Reasons for the Significant Difference ( i.e. > 15%) between our projected and actual performance for 2000/01

Performance Indicator	Reference	Projected Performance for 2000/01	Actual performance for 2000/01	Percentage variation between the projected and actual performance for 2000/01- i.e. $100\% * (\text{projected} - \text{actual}) / \text{projected}$	Explanation for Significant Variation (i.e. >15%) between Projected and Actual Performance
Cost of intensive social care for adults	BV 52	£325	£421	29.5%	The method of calculation for this indicator changed from producing the projected performance figures to the achievement figures resulting in the significant variation between them.
Older people aged 65 and over helped to live at home	BV 54	40	54.7	36.8%	This result was better than we anticipated and reflects an increase in investment last year.
Percentage of adult clients receiving a review	BV 55	60%	32%	46.7%	This was our first year of measurement and we overestimated our performance. The top band for this PI starts at 60% and we acknowledge we have a recording problem with this PI which we are working to resolve.
Number of assessments of service users aged 65 and over per head of population aged 65 and over	BV 59	126	0.04	100.0%	This was a new indicator for the year and the projection we set were unrealistically high.
Users/carers who said that matters relating to race, culture or religion were noted	BV 60	45%	55.90%	24.2%	The figure for actual achievement has been published incorrectly and the correct figure of 44% is more in line with the projected performance.
Expenditure on children in need (and not 'looked after') as a proportion of expenditure on all childrens services	BV 61	30%	22%	26.7%	The method of calculation for this indicator changed from producing the projected performance figures to the achievement figures resulting in the significant variation between them.
<b>Environment</b>					
Total tonnage of household waste arisings:percentage recycled includes composted rate	BV 82a	6.50%	7.50%	15.4%	The projected performance based on 3rd quarter due to a time delay in contractors systems for provision of information. The systems have now been developed to ensure current information is available.

## Appendix B1

### Reasons for the Significant Difference ( i.e. > 15%) between our projected and actual performance for 2000/01

Performance Indicator	Reference	Projected Performance for 2000/01	Actual performance for 2000/01	Percentage variation between the projected and actual performance for 2000/01- i.e. $100\% * (\text{projected} - \text{actual}) / \text{projected}$	Explanation for Significant Variation (i.e. >15%) between Projected and Actual Performance
Cost of highways maintenance per 100 Km travelled by a vehicle on principal roads.	BV 93	£0.23	£0.19	17.4%	The projection was made based on rolling year-end expenditure forecast December 2000 outturn. Subsequent operational decisions to reallocate approx. £600,000 led to the deviation away from the projected figures.
Number of days temporary traffic controls or road closures on traffic sensitive roads caused by local authority road works per km of traffic sensitive road	BV 100	0.44	0.61	38.6%	As this indicator was new for 2000-01 no previous-years information was available on which to gauge annual trends. Results from quarterly monitoring showed no consistent pattern as collection systems were being established. The year-end projection was therefore based on the last known level of performance. It is anticipated that a seasonal increase, due to deterioration in road condition caused by of adverse weather is a contributing factor in the deviation.
Percentage of applications determined within 8 weeks	BV 109 (amended for 2002/03)	22%	17%	22.7%	A mistake was made in the calculation of 3rd quarter monitoring returns with which the projected performance was based. This was rectified in the calculation of the final out-turn.
<b>Cultural and Related services</b>					
Cost per visit to public libraries	BV 115	£1.70	£2.34	37.6%	Expenditure was reported net of income when forecasts were made. DTLR definition revised to gross cost for out-turn figures.
Spend per head of population on cultural and recreational facilities and activities	BV 116	£10.97	£13.01	18.6%	Expenditure was reported net of income when forecasts were made. DTLR definition revised to gross cost for out-turn figures. Expenditure increased due to a one off contribution to the building costs of the History Centre.

**Appendix B1**

**Reasons for the  
Significant Difference ( i.e. > 15%) between our projected and actual performance for 2000/01**

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Projected Performance for 2000/01</b>	<b>Actual performance for 2000/01</b>	<b>Percentage variation between the projected and actual performance for 2000/01 - i.e. <math>100\% * (\text{projected} - \text{actual}) / \text{projected}</math></b>	<b>Explanation for Significant Variation (i.e. &gt;15%) between Projected and Actual Performance</b>
<b>Community Safety</b>					
The percentage of racial incidents that resulted in further action	BV 175 (new previously AC-A2b)	100%	13.80%	86.2%	An error was made in calculating the figure for actual achievement.
The number of domestic violence refuge places per 10,000 population which are provided or supported by the authority	BV 176 (new previously A3 AC)	2.13	0.56	73.7%	Methodology was incorrect for deriving 2000/01 projected performance. A revised methodology was used to derive the actual achievement figure, hence the variation between the two.