

Key performance indicators

Certification of key performance indicators for the year ended 30 June 2014

I hereby certify that the key performance indicators are based on proper records, are relevant and appropriate for assisting users to assess the Public Sector Commission's performance, and fairly represent the performance of the Commission for the financial year ended 30 June 2014.



M C Wauchope
ACCOUNTABLE AUTHORITY
8 August 2014

Overview of key performance indicators

The Commission is responsible for assisting Government through the delivery of services to achieve the broad goal of a 'greater focus on achieving results in key service delivery areas for the benefit of all Western Australians'.

To realise this goal, we provide services to public sector entities to achieve our agency-level government-desired outcome of an efficient and effective public sector that operates with integrity.

The Commission provides the following three service areas to public authorities:

1. public sector leadership
2. assistance and support
3. oversight and reporting.

Measurement of agency level outcomes

Key effectiveness indicators

The Commission's key effectiveness indicators (KEIs) measure the extent to which our activities are achieving, or are progressing towards, our agency-level outcome. To measure how we are performing against our KEIs, an annual client perception survey is issued to the chief executive officers (CEOs) and ministers of the Commission's core clients.

In 2012/13, our core clients comprised of 37 departments and 17 ministerial offices. Following internal and external stakeholder engagement, this definition was changed for the 2013/14 financial year to more accurately reflect the Commission's key stakeholders and, therefore, provide a better indication of our performance against our KEIs. Our core clients for 2013/14 capture a much larger scope of 155 clients comprising of:

- 38 departments created under section 35 of the *Public Sector Management Act 1994* (PSM Act)
- 17 ministerial offices
- 49 SES organisations (as defined under the PSM Act) specified in column 2 of Schedule 2 of the PSM Act
- 51 non-SES organisations including government boards and committees that have undertaken the Commission's good governance and ethical decision-making professional development within the financial year.

The 2013/14 client perception survey asked our core clients to rate how the advice and guidance offered by the Commission assisted them with the promotion of integrity, effectiveness and efficiency within their organisation. The survey also asked clients to rate how our assistance has helped them meet their statutory obligations under the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2003* (PID Act) and under Part IX of the *Equal Opportunity Act 1984* (EO Act).

The rating was a four-step rating from strongly agree to strongly disagree with an additional 'not applicable' option. The Commission received a 70 per cent response rate to the survey.

Outcome: An efficient and effective public sector that operates with integrity

Key effectiveness indicator	Target 2013/14	Actual 2013/14	Actual 2012/13	Actual 2011/12
The portion of core clients who indicate the Commission has delivered policy, assistance and oversight that has assisted them to enhance integrity within their agencies. ^(a)	85%	95%	98%	NA
The portion of core clients who indicate the Commission has delivered policy, assistance and oversight that has assisted them to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of their agencies. ^(b)	85%	90%	95%	NA
The portion of core clients who indicate that assistance provided by the Commission has helped them to meet their statutory obligations under the PID Act. ^(c)	75%	84%	78%	NA
The portion of core clients who indicate assistance provided by the Commission has helped them to meet their statutory obligations under Part IX of the EO Act. ^(d)	75%	78%	60%	NA

(a) This indicator measures the Commission’s capability at enhancing integrity in agencies through the minimum requirements of the principles of merit, equity, probity, integrity in official conduct, ethical codes and human resource management. Data for this measure was collected from the client perception survey.

(b) This indicator measures the Commission’s capacity at enhancing effectiveness and efficiency of public administration and management in agencies through legislative reform, the accountability framework, policies, advisory services and professional development. Data for this measure was collected from the client perception survey.

(c) This indicator measures how the Commissioner is increasing the understanding of issues related to compliance with the PID Act by public authorities through advisory services, product delivery and professional development. Data for this measure was collected from the client perception survey.

(d) This indicator measures how the Commissioner is increasing the understanding of issues related to compliance with Part IX of the EO Act by public authorities through advisory services, product delivery and professional development. Data for this measure was collected from the client perception survey.

The 2013/14 effectiveness indicators show that the Commission is meeting its projected targets across all areas. The difference between the first two actual indicators for 2012/13 and 2013/14 can be attributed to the much larger scope of our core clients that were issued the survey for the 2013/14 financial year.

Key efficiency indicators

Key efficiency indicators provide a measure of the cost of inputs required to achieve outcomes. In all instances, the Commission’s indicators include all direct costs associated with the particular service and a share of the corporate and executive support costs allocated to each service in accordance with the number of staff employed—full-time equivalent (FTE).

Exceptions to this are the value of grants paid during the year and the cost of redeployees from other agencies, which are excluded because it is considered they are not a cost of delivering services.

Service 1 – Public sector leadership

This service is responsible for the identification and development of legislative changes, policy and strategic initiatives that position the public sector to meet future challenges.

Service 1 – Public sector leadership	Target 2013/14	Actual 2013/14	Actual 2012/13	Actual 2011/12
Average cost per hour addressing legislative and policy development	\$108	\$116	\$94	NA
With the implementation of a revised outcome-based management framework in 2012/13, there is no comparative data for 2011/12 actuals.				

The actual average cost for supporting authorities through legislative and policy development in 2013/14 is higher than budgeted due to internal structural changes within the Commission that included the transference of the workforce planning function and the Director of Equal Opportunity in Public Employment to this service area.

Service 2 – Assistance and support

This service builds the capacity and develops the public sector workforce by providing advice, assistance and professional development to public authorities.

Service 2 – Assistance and support	Target 2013/14	Actual 2013/14	Actual 2012/13	Actual 2011/12
Average cost per hour of assistance and support provided	\$126	\$112	\$101	NA
Average cost per workforce and diversity program, product or training hour	\$116	\$146	\$103	NA
Average cost per public administration, standards and integrity program, product or training hour	\$115	\$105	\$85	NA
Average cost per leadership development product, program and training hour	\$109	\$162	\$112	NA
With the implementation of a revised outcome-based management framework in 2012/13, there is no comparative data for 2011/12 actuals.				

The actual average cost for assisting and supporting authorities in 2013/14 is lower than budgeted due to the Commission functioning with reduced FTE levels, associated operating costs attributed to the whole of sector recruitment freeze and our commitment to reducing the leave liability during this financial year.

Our actual average cost for assisting and supporting authorities with workforce and diversity programs in 2013/14 is higher than budgeted due to the introduction of a range of new workforce initiatives and training programs, developed through a series of tender processes and delivered at no cost to participants across the sector.

Our actual average cost for assisting and supporting authorities to sustain standards of ethics and integrity in 2013/14 is lower than budgeted due to the Commission functioning with reduced FTE levels, associated operating costs attributed to the whole of sector recruitment freeze and our commitment to reducing leave liability of our staff during this financial year.

The actual average cost for assisting and supporting authorities with leadership and professional development in 2013/14 is higher than budgeted due to the introduction of the Centre for Public Sector Excellence and a change in the divisional structure to support the Centre, including change in salary of the divisional head. Further increase is attributed to the associated development opportunities provided to directors general, CEOs, members of the senior executive service and high potential employees across the sector.

Service 3 – Oversight and reporting

This service provides independent oversight to monitor and report to Parliament and ministers on compliance with the PSM Act and the PID Act.

Service 3 – Oversight and reporting	Target 2013/14	Actual 2013/14	Actual 2012/13	Actual 2011/12
Average cost per hour of performance and oversight activity	\$92	\$95	\$74	NA
Percentage of oversight actions completed within target timeframes	90%	91%	83%	NA
With the implementation of a revised outcome-based management framework in 2012/13, there is no comparative data for 2011/12 actuals.				

The percentage of oversight actions completed within the targeted timeframes can be attributed to a new case management system and attention to timeliness in acquitting cases.