



# Summary of Performance

## Key Effectiveness Indicators

The Ombudsman aims to improve decision making and administrative practices in public authorities as a result of complaints handled by the Office, reviews of certain child deaths and family and domestic violence fatalities and own motion investigations. Improvements may occur through actions identified and implemented by agencies as a result of the Ombudsman's investigations and reviews, or as a result of the Ombudsman making specific recommendations and suggestions that are practical and effective. Key effectiveness indicators are the percentage of these recommendations and suggestions accepted by public authorities and the number of improvements that occur as a result of Ombudsman action.

Key Effectiveness Indicators	2013-14 Actual	2014-15 Target	2014-15 Actual	Variance
Where the Ombudsman made recommendations to improve practices or procedures, the percentage of recommendations accepted by agencies	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	Nil
Number of improvements to practices or procedures as a result of Ombudsman action	152	100	<b>99</b>	-1

Another important role of the Ombudsman is to enable remedies to be provided to people who make complaints to the Office where service delivery by a public authority may have been inadequate. The remedies may include reconsideration of decisions, more timely decisions or action, financial remedies, better explanations and apologies. In 2014-15, there were 211 remedies provided by public authorities to assist the individual who made a complaint to the Ombudsman.

## Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

Public authorities have accepted every recommendation made by the Ombudsman, matching the actual results of the past four years and meeting the 2014-15 target.

In 2007-08, the Office commenced a program to ensure that its work increasingly contributed to improvements to public administration. Consistent with this program, the number of improvements to practices and procedures of public authorities as a result of Ombudsman action has, in 2014-15, almost doubled since 2010-11. There may, however, be fluctuations from year to year, related to the number and nature of complaints and reviews finalised by the Office in any given year. In 2014-15 the actual result is comparable to the 2014-15 target.

## Key Efficiency Indicators

The key efficiency indicators relate to timeliness of complaint handling, the cost per finalised allegation about public authorities, the cost per finalised notification of child deaths and family and domestic violence fatalities and the cost to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of *The Criminal Code*.

Key Efficiency Indicators	2013-14 Actual	2014-15 Target	2014-15 Actual	Variance from Target
Percentage of allegations finalised within three months	98%	95%	98%	+3%
Percentage of allegations finalised within 12 months	100%	100%	100%	Nil
Percentage of allegations on hand at 30 June less than three months old	98%	90%	96%	+6%
Percentage of allegations on hand at 30 June less than 12 months old	100%	100%	100%	Nil
Average cost per finalised allegation	\$1,858	\$1,820	\$1,857	+\$37
Average cost per finalised notification of death	\$18,407	\$12,325	\$18,983	+\$6,658
Cost to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of <i>The Criminal Code</i>	N/A*	\$723,000	\$413,586	-\$309,414

\*As 2014-15 is the first year of the function, there is no comparable data in 2013-14.

## Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

The 2014-15 actual results for each of the key efficiency indicators relating to allegations on hand and allegations finalised matched or exceeded the 2014-15 target. Overall, all 2014-15 actual results represented significant improvement in the efficiency of complaint resolution over the last five years.

The average cost per finalised allegation in 2014-15 is comparable to the 2013-14 actual result (\$1,858) and the 2014-15 target (\$1,820). Since 2007-08, the efficiency of complaint resolution has improved significantly with the average cost per finalised allegation reduced by a total of 37% from \$2,941 in 2007-08 to \$1,857 in 2014-15.

The average cost per finalised notification of death (\$18,983) is consistent with the 2013-14 actual result (\$18,407) and exceeds the 2014-15 target (\$12,235), reflecting the staffing required for:

- The investigation of complex reviews undertaken in 2014-15; and
- The commencement in 2012-13, and development during 2013-14 and 2014-15, of an important new initiative to review family and domestic violence fatalities.

The 2015-16 target has been adjusted to \$18,950 accordingly.



The cost to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of *The Criminal Code* (\$413,586) is lower than the 2014-15 target (\$723,000) due to the change in the commencement of the function to March 2015.

For further details, see the [Key Performance Indicator section](#).

## Summary of Financial Performance

The majority of expenses for the Office (73%) relate to staffing costs. The remainder is primarily for accommodation, communications and office equipment.

Financial Performance	2013-14 Actual	2014-15 Target ('000s)	2014-15 Actual ('000s)	Variance ('000s)
Total cost of services (sourced from <a href="#">Statement of Comprehensive Income</a> )	\$10,551	\$11,218	\$10,331	-\$887
Income other than income from State Government (sourced from <a href="#">Statement of Comprehensive Income</a> )	\$2,506	\$2,560	\$2,463	-\$97
Net cost of services (sourced from <a href="#">Statement of Comprehensive Income</a> )	\$8,045	\$8,658	\$7,867	-\$791
Total equity (sourced from <a href="#">Statement of Financial Position</a> )	\$1,531	\$1,628	\$2,303	+\$675
Net increase in cash held (sourced from <a href="#">Statement of Cash Flows</a> )	(\$65)	\$20	\$873	+\$853
Staff Numbers	Number	Number	Number	Number
Full time equivalent (FTE) staff level at 30 June 2015	63	70	60	-10

## Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

The variation between the 2014-15 actual results and the target for the Office's total cost of services and net cost of services is primarily due to the cost to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of *The Criminal Code* being lower than the 2014-15 target, due to the change in the commencement of the function to March 2015 and temporary vacancies arising from staff movements during the year. There were no significant variations between the actual results for 2014-15 and 2013-14.

For total equity and cash held, the increase in the actual result compared to the target is primarily due to lower than expected payments due to the change in the commencement of the function to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of *The Criminal Code* to March 2015, expenses incurred during 2014-15 but paid in 2015-16, and temporary vacancies arising from staff movements during the year.

For further details see [Note 27 'Explanatory Statement' in the Financial Statements section](#).