## **Key Performance Indicators** (continued)

Effectiveness indicator						
Allegations as a percentage of people employed within public authorities under the Commission's jurisdiction						
<b>2015-16</b> Actual	<b>2016-17</b> Actual	<b>2017-18</b> Actual	<b>2018-19</b> Actual	<b>2019-20</b> Target	<b>2019-20</b> Actual	
2.12%	2.54%	2.60%	2.57%	2.30%	2.86%	

This indicator aims to reflect the percentage of corruption across the public sector. The indicator is determined by the number of allegations received by the Commission divided by the number of public sector employees employed across state and local government.

The 2019-20 percentage is higher than the target and 2018-19 actual result. This is largely due the higher number of allegations received in the year.

	Efficiency indicator						
Percentage of assessments completed within 28 days							
	<b>2015-16</b> Actual	<b>2016-17</b> Actual	<b>2017-18</b> Actual	<b>2018-19</b> Actual	<b>2019-20</b> Target	<b>2019-20</b> Actual	
	n/a	n/a	n/a	55%	80%	84%	

This key performance indicator was first reported in 2018-19 following a review of the key performance indicators by the Commission.

The indicator demonstrates the efficiency of the assessment function by measuring the percentage of assessments completed within 28 days.

The 2019-20 actual result is slightly better than the target. This is a significant improvement on the 2018-19 result which was impacted by fewer resources resulting from a high staff turnover during that year.

	Efficiency indicator							
Average cost of assessment								
	<b>2015-16</b> Actual	<b>2016-17</b> Actual	<b>2017-18</b> Actual	<b>2018-19</b> Actual	<b>2019-20</b> Target	<b>2019-20</b> Actual		
	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$1,028	\$1,428	\$720		

This key performance indicator was first reported in 2018-19 following a review of the key performance indicators by the Commission.

The average cost of assessment is determined by the allocation of costs divided by the number of allegations received.

The 2019-20 result is lower than the target and is related to an increase in the number of allegations received during the year and a revised costing model that more accurately calculates the cost of an assessment.

## **Key Performance Indicators** (continued)

Efficiency indicator							
Percentage (	Percentage of investigations completed within 12 months						
<b>2015-16</b> Actual	<b>2016-17</b> Actual	<b>2017-18</b> Actual	<b>2018-19</b> Actual	<b>2019-20</b> Target	<b>2019-20</b> Actual		
n/a	n/a	n/a	79%	80%	84%		

This indicator aims to demonstrate the timeliness of the investigative function by the percentage of investigations completed within a 12 month period.

The 2019-20 outcome is comparable to the target and previous year's actual result.

Efficiency indicator						
Average time (days) to complete an investigation into serious misconduct						
2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2019-20	
Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Target	Actual	
n/a	n/a	n/a	309	350	241	

This indicator reflects the average time to conduct an investigation and is only calculated when an investigation is closed. Each investigation is different and has a different degree of complexity.

The 2019-20 result is lower than the target and in part relates to six short term investigations conducted into the implementation of Commission recommendations made in previous years. The average time to complete an investigation is expected to increase in future years when the complex and lengthy investigations are closed.