



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	2012-13 Actual	2013-14 Target	2013-14 Actual	Variance
Where the Ombudsman made recommendations to improve practices or procedures, percentage of recommendations accepted by agencies	100%	100%	100%	Nil
Number of improvements to practices or procedures as a result of Ombudsman action	72	100	152	+52

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 2013-14, there were 199 remedies provided by public authorities to assist the individual who made a complaint to the Ombudsman.

Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

For the fifth consecutive year, public authorities have accepted every recommendation made by the Ombudsman, matching the 2012-13 actual result and meeting the 2013-14 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 2013-14, more than tripled since 2009-10. 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.

Key Efficiency Indicators

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

Key Efficiency Indicators	2012-13 Actual	2013-14 Target	2013-14 Actual	Variance from Target
Percentage of allegations finalised within 3 months	83%	85%	98%	+13%
Percentage of allegations finalised within 12 months	99%	100%	100%	Nil
Percentage of allegations on hand at 30 June less than three months old	94%	85%	98%	+13%
Percentage of allegations on hand at 30 June less than 12 months old	96%	100%	100%	Nil
Average cost per finalised allegation	\$1,821	\$1,825	\$1,858	+\$33
Average cost per finalised notification of death	\$12,281	\$12,325	\$18,407	+\$6,082



Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

The timeliness and efficiency of complaint handling has substantially improved over the past five years due to a major complaint handling improvement program introduced in 2007-08. An initial focus of the program was the elimination of aged complaints. Building on the program, the Office developed and commenced a new organisational structure and processes in 2011-12 to promote and support early resolution of complaints. As a result of the program, the Office has reduced the average age of complaints from 173 days on 30 June 2007 to 23 days on 30 June 2014 while over the same period significantly reducing the average cost of finalised allegations from \$2,941 in 2007-08 to \$1,858 in 2013-14. These improvements are in the context of a significant increase in the number of complaints across all sectors that occurred in 2009-10.

In 2013-14, substantially improved complaint handling has resulted in the following actual results compared to budget targets.

- The percentage of allegations finalised within three months (98%) is the highest figure in the past five years, very significantly improving on the 2012-13 actual result (83%), and significantly exceeding the 2013-14 Target (85%). The 2014-15 Target has been adjusted accordingly to 95%.
- The percentage of allegations finalised within 12 months (100%) has exceeded the 2012-13 actual result and matched the 2013-14 Target.
- The percentage of allegations on hand at 30 June less than three months old (98%) has improved from the 2012-13 actual result (94%) and has significantly bettered the 2013-14 Target (85%). The 2014-15 Target has been adjusted accordingly to 90%.
- The percentage of allegations on hand at 30 June less than 12 months old (100%) has improved from the 2012-13 actual result (96%) and met the 2013-14 Target (100%). Pleasingly, the Office has achieved, and has been able to maintain, not having any complaints on hand over 12 months.

Since the commencement of the complaint handling improvement program in 2007-08, the average cost per finalised allegation has reduced by a total of 37% from \$2,941 in 2007-08 to \$1,858 in 2013-14. The average cost per finalised allegation in 2013-14 is comparable to the 2012-13 actual result (\$1,821) and the 2013-14 Target (\$1,825).

The Ombudsman reviews certain child deaths and family and domestic violence fatalities. This involves:

- Reviewing the circumstances in which and why child deaths and family and domestic violence fatalities occur;
- Identifying patterns and trends that arise from reviews of child deaths and family and domestic violence fatalities; and
- Making recommendations to public authorities about ways to prevent or reduce child deaths and family and domestic violence fatalities.

The average cost per finalised notification of death exceeded the 2012-13 actual result and the 2013-14 Target, reflecting the staffing required for:

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

Summary of Financial Performance

The majority of expenses for the Office (70%) relate to staffing costs. The remainder is primarily for accommodation, communications and office equipment.

Financial Performance	2013-14 Target ('000s)	2013-14 Actual ('000s)	Variance ('000s)
Total cost of services (sourced from Statement of Comprehensive Income)	\$10,625	\$10,551	-\$74
Income other than income from State Government (sourced from Statement of Comprehensive Income)	\$2,462	\$2,506	+\$44
Net cost of services (sourced from Statement of Comprehensive Income)	\$8,163	\$8,045	-\$118
Total equity (sourced from Statement of Financial Position)	\$1,881	\$1,531	-\$350
Net increase in cash held (sourced from Statement of Cash Flows)	\$19	-\$65	-\$84
Staff Numbers	Number	Number	Number
Full time equivalent (FTE) staff level at 30 June 2014	70	63	-7



Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

There was no significant variation between the actual results and the budget target for the Office's total cost of services or net cost of services.

For both, the small decrease in the actual result compared to the budget target was mainly due to the deferral of the commencement, from 2013-14 to 2014-15, of the function to scrutinise and report on the Criminal Penalty Infringement Notices scheme. This was partially offset by a one-off voluntary separation payment, higher depreciation of the fit-out of office accommodation provided as services free of charge through the Department of Finance (Building Management and Works) and amortisation of the finance system, that was commissioned in early 2013 to support the financial operations of the Office, following the decommissioning of the Office of Shared Services.

For total equity, the decrease in the actual result compared to the budget target was primarily due to a reduction in cash due to a one-off voluntary separation payment, using cash on hand, and a reduction in the net value of assets because depreciation and amortisation exceeded the value of additional assets purchased.

For cash held, the decrease in the actual result compared to the budget target was primarily due to a one-off voluntary separation payment.

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

