

## Accountability Reporting Guidance

Column No.	Column Title	Key Description	Colour Code
1	Reference	<p>An indicator can have multiple references allowing it to be identified for different purposes. For example indicators included in the CPA assessment are prefixed with CPA.</p> <p>Listed below are the prefixes used to identify the different indicators types.</p> <p>CPA – The indicator is included in the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA)            BV – The indicator is part of the Best Value suite of indicators            LKI – This indicator is one of Leeds Local Key Indicators            CP – This indicator supports objectives within the Corporate Plan            LAA – This indicator is part of the Local Area Agreement</p>	
4	Frequency and Measure	<p>This column identifies how frequently the performance information is collected, eg annually            This column also identifies if the data is a percentage (%), a Number (No.) or collected in days</p>	
5	Good Performance	<p>This column identifies if the performance information in columns 6,7 and 8 should increase or decrease if the service is performing well. You may also see yes or no in this column. There are a number of performance indicators where the audit commission do not specify if the results should rise or fall, for these indicators good performance is N/A.</p>	
8	Current position	<p>The blue shading identifies that data is not available. This will be for one of two reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The indicator is reported annually - this can be identified by checking the frequency column</li> <li>2. The information was not available by the reporting deadline, in which case there will be an explanation in the comments column</li> </ol>	
9	Predicted Full Year Result	Predicted full year result <b>will</b> meet target	
		Although the full year result <b>will not</b> meet target, a tolerance has been set which scores the indicator as amber	
		Predicted full year result <b>will not</b> meet target	
10	Year on Year Improvement	Improvement in performance year on year	↑
		Decline in performance year on year	↓
		No improvement or decline in performance year on year	↔
11	All England Top Quartile Based on 2005/06 Year end data	Leeds performance = Top Quartile	
	Satisfaction indicators are based on the 2006/07 quartile information	Leeds performance = Median Quartiles	
	(Will be updated for 2006/07 in January 2008)	Leeds performance = Bottom Quartile	
12	Core Cities Average (Based on 2005/06 Year End Data)	Core Cities comparisons are taken from our following benchmarking partners – Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham and Sheffield. To ensure data quality we only compare audited and verified information supplied by the Audit Commission.	
13	Core City position 1 = Top - 8 = Bottom (Based on 2005/06 Year-End data)	This column details where the 2005/06 result is ranked in the results of the 8 Core Cities, with 1= top and 8 = bottom. This is currently based on 2005/06 year-end data. We anticipate receiving the 2006/07 year end data by February 2008.	
14	Data Quality Issues – Together with projected performance, data quality issues are part of the risk assessment process that is undertaken for each performance indicator included in this report	Significant Concerns	
		Some Concerns	
		No Concerns	