



Government of **Western Australia**
Mental Health Commission

Evaluation of the Mental Health Non-Government Organisation Establishment Reporting System

2015-16

INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT

PERFORMANCE MONITORING & EVALUATION

MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Background.....	5
Results and Findings	7
Overall	7
Support.....	10
Functionality	12
Content.....	14
Review and reporting.....	15
Potential future features.....	16
Additional comments	17
Recommendations.....	18

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the members of the WA Mental Health NGO Information Development Technical Working Group whose valued contribution to the development of the web based collection instrument enabled the system go a long way to meeting the goals of both the Mental Health Commission and the mental health NGO sector.

We would also like to thank all the people who took the time to respond to the evaluation and provide such valuable feedback.

Finally, we would like to acknowledge the staff at WebSurvey who have provided outstanding work to help implement a system that met the needs of the Mental Health Commission and of the system end-users.

Mental Health Commission, April 2016

For further information please contact Helpdesk at NGOESDC.Helpdesk@mhc.wa.gov.au

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2013 the Mental Health Commission (the Commission) procured the services of WebSurvey for the development of a web based reporting system for the purposes of the State's Non-Government Organisation (NGO) data collection for contract acquittal. The system aims to:

- Improve consistency and quality of data
- Consolidate data reporting procedures
- Streamline the reporting process for NGOs
- Meet contract and future national reporting requirements

The Non-Government Organisation Establishments Online Reporting System (NGOE) went 'live' in December 2013. Evaluations were conducted in February and August 2014 to inform redevelopments to the online system. A third evaluation survey was distributed in February 2016, following the December 2015 reporting period, as part of the continuous improvement process.

Of the 76 NGOs who used the NGOE reporting system in the December 2015 reporting period, 51 (67%) completed the evaluation. Overall, feedback was very positive, with 86% of the respondents reporting they were satisfied with the system and three-quarters (76%) believing that the tool has reduced the administrative burden of reporting.

Despite the overall satisfaction with the system, only 34% felt that the system required no further improvement. After an examination of the issues and improvements suggested in the evaluation, potential enhancements have been identified that would better meet the requirements of the Commission and the system end-users.

CATEGORY	POTENTIAL ACTION
Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve the communications process for advising organisations of new data fields to be collected in future - The Commission to send out login details as well as WebSurvey to ensure all organisations receive the information
Navigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look at options for improving navigation between sections - Ensure that navigation is included in documentation and training information
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review alignment of reporting requirements with contracts - Add opportunities for organisations to provide more qualitative information - Enable capture of a 'continued improvement' response under Person Centered Recovery Practices in the National Standards for Mental Health Services Annual Self-Assessment module
Reporting burden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If consideration is made to add additional fields, consider the value of the extra information against the level of increased reporting burden - Pre-fill additional fields from previous reporting periods where possible/practical
Technical issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct additional testing prior to system going 'live' each period to identify any access and save issues - Invite some organisations to participate in User Acceptance Testing to resolve any technical issues prior to the system being distributed to all organisations
Training & documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue to offer training to all organisations at the commencement of each reporting period - Provide additional clarification in the Data Guides, particularly for calculation of Bed days and Peer Support workers
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look at including additional analysis of activity and staffing numbers, including overall numbers and distribution graphs, in the <i>In Brief</i> reports - Provide additional comment boxes and/or space for attachments within the reporting system

BACKGROUND

In 2013 the Mental Health Commission (the Commission) procured the services of WebSurvey for the development of a web-based system for the purposes of the State's Non-Government Organisation (NGO) data collection. The Non-Government Organisation Establishment (NGOE) online reporting system was developed to allow NGOs to enter data for the purposes of contract acquittal, with the aim to:

- Improve the consistency and quality of data collected;
- Consolidate data reporting procedures;
- Streamline the reporting process for NGOs; and
- Meet contractual and future national reporting requirements

The NGOE was launched on 2 December 2013 for the December 2013 reporting requirements. Two evaluations were conducted in February 2014 and August 2014 as part of a continuous improvement process towards increasing the capacity of the system to meet its objectives. Results from these evaluations^{1,2} went towards determining improvements for future reporting periods. The improvements implemented are summarised in the table on the following page.

On 11 February 2016 a third evaluation, hosted on Survey Monkey, was distributed to all NGOs to seek feedback on their experience with using the web-based collection system after the December 2015 reporting period. This report summarises the results from the evaluation survey and the comments provided by NGOs. The results of this evaluation are intended to inform continuous improvement and assist with planning future development of the system towards further achievement of the objectives.

It should be noted that due to the nature of data reporting requirements for contract acquittal, any changes will be prioritised according to the importance of the change identified and the deadline for which the data is next required.

¹ Mental Health Commission. (2014). *Mental Health Non-Government Organisation Establishment 2013/14 Web Based Data Collection: Feedback and Evaluation Results*. Perth: Government of Western Australia: http://www.mentalhealth.wa.gov.au/Libraries/pdf_docs/NGOE_SDC_Web_Based_Collection_System_evaluation_results_2014.sflb.ashx

² Mental Health Commission. (2014). *Evaluation of the Mental Health Non-Government Organisation Establishment Reporting System: End of Financial Year Reporting 2013-14*. Perth: Government of Western Australia: http://mentalhealth.wa.gov.au/Libraries/pdf_docs/Evaluation_of_the_online_reporting_system_for_Non-Government_Organisations_Results_and_feedback_from_the_2013_14_financial_year_reporting_period.sflb.ashx

Improvements implemented in the NGOE reporting system from previous evaluations

CATEGORY	IMPROVEMENT
Data requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developed functionality to cover all the reporting requirements - Improved the questions to clarify the data required - Developed functionality to assist with data entry - Add field at the bottom of each page to enable NGOs to provide comment on data - Separate 'not compliant' and 'not applicable' responses in the Carers Recognition Act to allow accurate response - Ensure input for data fields are appropriate to the information being reported (e.g. Average Beds can be reported to two decimal places)
Printing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Print view made available by a read only view on login after submission, and by having the print view option available on the Index page - Improved the look and format of the print view - Included a 'Print' button on print view to improve the print function - Included the option to save the Print View as a pdf document
Email notifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Automatic email notification sent when a delegated Section had been completed - Automatic email confirmation sent when the completed report had been submitted to the Commission - Simplified the delegation process and allow Authorities to enter their own messages to delegates - Nominate which Authority receives notifications regarding progress on delegated sections - Clarify and simplify instructions in Delegation emails
System navigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design sections (e.g. Annual Standards) to enable navigation through the section without the need for data entry
Validation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Included historical data for specific data fields as read only - Expanded validation checks to reduce the likelihood of the Commission contacting the NGOs to validate data post-submission
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved the Data Guides and User Guide to reflect the implemented changes and clarify the reporting and submission process - Improved the Data Guides by including various scenarios/examples - Implemented a 'Help' button next to each data field that provides a pop-up box with relevant information from the Data Guides - Provision of training to NGOs to increase understanding of data entry, delegation, and submission using the NGOE reporting system

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Of the 76 NGOs who used NGOE reporting system in the December 2015 reporting period, 51 (67%) returned a completed evaluation form. One respondent also provided comments via email³. This is considered to be a good representation of the system end-users. This is slightly lower than the response rate of the previous evaluation in 2014 (73%), but significantly higher than the evaluation in 2013 (46%⁴). The continuing high response rate reflects the NGOs ongoing engagement towards the system and reporting standards.

The following provides an analysis of the responses to each question within the evaluation form. Organisation names and any other identifiers have been removed from the text fields to ensure confidentiality.

OVERALL

The majority (86%) of the respondents were satisfied with the NGOE reporting system. This was only slightly lower than the satisfaction level reported in the previous evaluation (92%). Over three quarters (76%) of respondents reported that the system has made reporting easier and reduced the administrative burden of reporting, which was also comparable to the proportion reported previously (78%). This demonstrates that respondents continue to be satisfied with the changes made.

Only 20% of respondents reported that the reporting tool requires further improvements, slightly lower than the proportion in 2014 (27%). However, a high proportion (42%) reported that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the need for improvements, but this may be due to a lack of awareness of the potential improvements that may be available. Approximately one third (34%) of respondents disagreed that the reporting tool required further improvements, higher than the proportion in the previous evaluation (20%). These responses suggest that minimal changes be made to the system in the future.

To what extent NGOs agree with the statements regarding the NGOE reporting system.

	N ^(a)	AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE
Overall, I am satisfied with the online reporting tool	50	86%	8%	6%	0%
The reporting tool has made reporting easier and reduced the administrative burden of reporting	50	76%	12%	10%	2%
The reporting tool requires further improvements to reduce the burden of data reporting	50	20%	42%	34%	4%
The reporting tool is easy to use	49	82%	14%	4%	0%

(a) Respondents were not required to reply to all questions

³ As this respondent did not answer the survey questions, they are not included in the quantitative results presented in the tables; however their feedback has been included in the comments tables.

⁴ The first evaluation was conducted using a paper-based, rather than web-based survey, which may have contributed to the lower response rate.

From the comments, NGOs would like to see improvements to:

- Navigation through the various sections to the report
- Greater clarification on how to calculate some data fields, for example bed days and peer support workers
- the format and function of the print view
- navigation through a report Section without the need to enter data
- the relevance of some questions to particular organisations.

Areas of the NGOE reporting system that the NGOs were not satisfied with. (N = 20)

Communications

There were additional questions which we weren't expecting and therefore had to go through 6 months' worth of data to extract the answers of these questions.

The new output reporting to the sector development & representation. As we were not advised a year in advance of the new template creation, extrapolating this data from our records increased reporting hours.

Navigation

At times felt cumbersome moving between sections.

I would prefer to access just down one layer and in one of sections I have to go into another layer. I believe it is section 8. Also different part of the reporting has the same heading e.g. Organisation which is confusing.

Navigation between program reports could be made easier

Relevance

Some of the generic questions didn't fit our service. So there were some answers as close as we could get when there were only check boxes.

Some of the data doesn't fit our work, in term of # contact hours with clients etc. therefore some of the report feels a bit tokenistic. Our program is population-wide so it's difficult to convey the reach and impact with the questions asked. To ensure the MHC is aware of our impact, we provided a more detailed written report to our contract manager.

The current report does not have the capacity to show target populations that are required by funding.

As an agency we need to therefore keep a second copy or record of clients, instances, type of support etc. it has made reporting laborious and is not time efficient.

As we are funded as a group service all the references to individual contracts and outcomes are difficult for us to provide or do not apply to our service.

Rating against National Standards- Although we perceive our program enhances recovery we have no quantifiable data to support this. We are seeking funding to research this. These standards relate to ongoing individual assessment which our service does not carry out, although some of these standards apply to us they do not in their entirety.

Service improvement action plans- This section needs to include a section that can be applied to a service like ours.

Reporting burden

The reporting requirements are just starting to feel burdensome.

organisation details: option to include information 'only if changed' as requirements, in most instances, will not change within a year.

Repetitive in areas

Technical issues

We have access problems which we will try to resolve the next time the window is open.

Training & documentation

We only supply "Face-to-face counselling" and no allowance is made for the hours of administration, promotion etc. that the program requires for implementation

When you are going to submit the data if you haven't completed all fields it doesn't activate the submit button but it doesn't indicate what are the fields pending to complete.

Thanks

I am having difficulties in how to calculate bed days

It is not dissatisfaction at all but we'd appreciate further clarification. We are asked to provide the FTE figure for peer support workers. Over the last few years of reporting via this portal we have not reported FTE of our peer support workers (Youth Consultants as we call them or young people with the lived experience of having a parent with mental illness) as they have been budgeted for under Federal contracts or from internal means. It would be ideal to have clarification around how to report this more accurately in the future and that it is consistent with how other organisations are also reporting.

Miscellaneous

Personally I feel it might be an idea to allow export of data with justification into the system but would be difficult to accommodate many various systems.

The Reporting Tool malfunctioned in some way that meant the Report did not show all of the information that had been entered when it was initially viewed by the contract manager. The issue was related to the Reporting Tool and was identified and remedied very quickly (within two business days)

SUPPORT

There was strong support for the provision of a range of resources to assist NGOs with use of the NGOE reporting system. The inclusion of Historical data in the online system had the highest usefulness rating (86%), following by assistance provided through the NGOE Helpdesk (76%).

Training offered by the Commission was shown to be less useful than other types of support. However, 42% of respondents either did not utilise training or were not sure, which may be a reflection of the lower uptake of training in recent reporting periods as organisations become more familiar with the reporting requirements. This was also supported through the comments provided.

The majority of comments received were positive about the resources available, and supported ongoing provision of training should further changes be made. Two comments also expressed a desire to have the reporting requirements more closely linked with their contracted arrangements.

Indication of how useful the following were for completion of your reporting.

TYPE OF SUPPORT	N ^(a)	USEFUL	NOT USEFUL	NOT SURE	NOT USED
Training offered by the Commission	50	54%	4%	10%	32%
Assistance provided through the NGOE Helpdesk	50	76%	0%	0%	24%
User Guide	50	72%	2%	6%	20%
Data specifications document (located on the index page of the reporting tool)	50	62%	0%	16%	22%
Data Guides	50	62%	2%	12%	24%
Help buttons (specific data element definitions)	49	69%	2%	6%	22%
Links to online documents (e.g. Carers Recognition Act)	50	60%	2%	6%	32%
Historical data	50	86%	0%	4%	10%

(a) Respondents were not required to reply to all questions

Ideas NGOs have for improving supporting documents or training (N=14)

Relevance

There are a lot of references that don't apply to our contract so I can see the need for them to be there for others. As such I would be reluctant to suggest changes only from my perspective.

If the reports can reflect contract targets. As an agency we can then have confidence that the reports are accurate. The portal is easy to use, the reports are not useful.

Reporting burden

more user friendly

Training & documentation

perhaps repeats and refresher courses.
this would assist new staff.

Development of a generic data collection form to utilise throughout the reporting period for all MHC support workers linking to the required data requirements.

The preparation of the information in the format required to feed "the number" in to the online reporting system is very complex, and no doubt this will be calculated in a different way by each organisation involved.

We have also been asked for a more "qualitative" style of report by our Contract Manager, which obviously is not supplied by this online reporting tool.

Ongoing training regarding any changes is appreciated.

Other than the initial training at the commencement of this 'new reporting format' no other training has been required. Having the availability to contact the helpdesk is sufficient for me to manage our organisation.

Historical data highly useful and overall the set of guides and tools are excellent. The Sector Development and Representation data definitions were not well explained- i.e. scope of events.

I have found the more I complete the online surveys, the easier they get to navigate.
No issues at all this time around!

Ensuring that supporting documents are always up to date / updated regularly
Ensuring that training is provided if and when changes are made to the reporting tool

Miscellaneous

Helpdesk are very good at assisting and supportive.

Makes reporting easy, thank you.

Space for variance comment was useful but required more discussion.

FUNCTIONALITY

The majority of NGOs did not encounter issues when using the NGOE reporting system. Of those that did, the main issue encountered related to printing or saving the data (14%), which is supported through the comments received. This issue was also identified in previous evaluations, and highlights the need for improvements to system testing to resolve these issues prior to the system going 'live' each reporting period. Other issues identified in the comments included:

- Not receiving the email invitations from WebSurvey
- Uncertainty with navigating the review and submission process

Issue with any of the following functionality

ISSUES	N ^(a)	YES	NO	N/A
Receiving invitation email from WebSurvey	49	4%	94%	2%
Connecting to the online reporting tool	49	4%	96%	0%
Links to external websites	49	0%	78%	22%
Links to supporting documents	49	0%	82%	18%
Delegating sections to other people in organisation	49	6%	82%	12%
Using navigation buttons e.g. Save and Next	49	10%	90%	0%
Printing or saving your data	49	14%	86%	0%
Reviewing your data	49	6%	94%	0%
Submitting your data	49	6%	94%	0%
Contacting the NGOE Helpdesk	49	0%	76%	24%
Other issue (please specify)	35	0%	51%	49%

(a) Respondents were not required to reply to all questions

Brief description of the issue (N=12)

Communications

Our organisation has two people who should receive the invitation: we both received notice that we would be receiving the passwords etc., but neither of us got them till we contacted the help desk.

the email went to my junk mail

I had difficulties with delegating a section of the report, although it noted I had delegated the section, the staff member never received emails. I have used this report for 2 years and this is the only time this has happened.

The delegation would not reliably send emails to the delegate for input.

Navigation

problem or confusion with submitting, along with the review and submit process. MHC helpdesk was available, friendly, helpful and supportive.

When printing final report the data entered adapts to the system requirements such as percentages and comparisons. To obtain just the entered data, and the original format printing must be done throughout the report. It would be of benefit to be able to print both the original and final data on completion for records.

Technical issues

There were times we had completed the section but when we tried to save it it advised that it wasn't saved.

Difficult to find the print icon.

In reviewing our data in section 10 "Family and Carer Support", I noticed calculation errors in the Validation Summary pertaining to "Cost per service hour" for both "This Period" and "Last Year" for all 3 areas.

On a couple of occasions data was entered but then not saved, even though it was carefully saved. Had to keep reviewing that data was saved.

Saved data to move on but upon return it was lost. This happened twice and was lost. Helpdesk responded to investigate but without luck.

We have problems saving and returning to index, we have to exit the data tool and re-login in order to move to the next section. Contract sections were not accessible at all on some computers. this has been an ongoing issues since the tool was introduces. we are attempting to solve it at the next reporting window

Miscellaneous

Didn't print whole report.

CONTENT

Of the 50 respondents to the question 'Did you encounter difficulty understanding what the questions were asking?' 86% did not encounter any difficulties. This is a small improvement from the previous evaluation (84%), demonstrating the continuing familiarity that NGOs have gained with using the system.

The majority of respondents who encountered issues with the questions reported using the Data Guides and/or Help buttons to assist. This was consistent with those who did not have difficulty responding to the question but still reporting using the supports available.

Difficulty responding to the questions within the data collection instrument

N ^(a)	YES	NO
50	14%	86%

(a) Respondents were not required to reply to all questions

Supports used to assist with understanding the questions

TYPE OF SUPPORT	N ^(a)	YES
Help buttons	15	60%
Data Guides	15	60%
NGOE Helpdesk	11	44%
Contract Manager	6	24%
Other (please specify)	2	8%

(a) Some respondents answered this question even if they reported 'No' to the previous question

Other (please specify) (N=2)

We have an excel spreadsheet we populate to prepare for reporting.

It wasn't difficulty in understanding the questions, but we did seek clarification from our contract manager on our unique service and how we should respond.

REVIEW AND REPORTING

Print View

In this evaluation additional questions were asked regarding the usefulness of the Print View that respondents are able to access to review their responses and save a copy for their records after submission. Respondents overwhelmingly found the Print View a useful resource, with only a small proportion reporting that it was not used.

Indicate how useful you found the Print View for the following

	N ^(a)	USEFUL	NOT USEFUL	NOT SURE	NOT USED
Keeping a record of your submitted report	49	96%	0%	0%	4%
Reviewing your responses	49	88%	0%	0%	12%
Comparing your response to previous periods	49	90%	0%	0%	10%

(a) Respondents were not required to reply to all questions

In-Brief reports

The Commission has published two summary reports - *Western Australian Non-Government Organisation – Establishment – In Brief* – utilising data from the 2013-14 and 2014-15 reporting periods.^{5,6} The objective of these reports is to describe the activity and characteristics of the services delivered by the non-government sector in Western Australia, which can be utilised by NGOs to better understand how their service performs in comparison across each service type within the sector.

Almost two thirds (65%) of respondents reported that they found the information in the *In-Brief* reports useful, however a further 29% reported that they were not sure, suggesting that some respondents may not yet be familiar with the reports and their uses.

Do you find the information provided in the In Brief reports useful?

N ^(a)	YES	NO	NOT SURE
49	65%	6%	29%

Suggestions for any additional information you would like to see within the In Brief reports (N=3)

There are no opportunities for outcomes reporting.

Perhaps you could add distribution graphs across bands of data be it FTE and various averages for client numbers, contacts, contact hours, funding per service hours, etc.

For peer support workers, total number of peer support workers in the sector as well as a per organisation average as this is helpful for monitoring workforce growth.

⁵ Mental Health Commission (2015). *Western Australia Mental Health Non-Government Organisation Establishment – In-Brief 2013-14*. Perth: Government of Western Australia:
http://mentalhealth.wa.gov.au/Libraries/pdf_docs/Western_Australian_Non-Government_Organisation_Establishment_In_Brief_2013-14_2.sflb.ashx

⁶ Mental Health Commission (2016). *Western Australia Mental Health Non-Government Organisation Establishment – In-Brief 2014-15*. Perth: Government of Western Australia:
http://mentalhealth.wa.gov.au/Libraries/pdf_docs/V1_0_WA_NGOE_In_Brief_Report_2014-15_FINAL_20160208v2.sflb.ashx

POTENTIAL FUTURE FEATURES

In this evaluation, respondents were asked an open ended question as to suggestions for potential future features that they would like to see incorporated into the online system. The majority of comments expressed an interest in being able to report more qualitative information relating to their service.

Comments or suggestions for developing the instrument in future (N=6)

Relevance

Perhaps more "qualitative" feedback such as barriers, challenges and innovation that has worked for marginalised groups in our community, successes etc.

Also useful would be a directory of services in our community

I would like to see an area that allows an organisation to report on outcomes within the service, areas to share positive news, lessons learned in the last 12 months

in the Person Centred Recovery Practises, can there be another category to choose from i.e. better than 'needs improvement' but below 'yes', possibly 'improved on last year'

Miscellaneous

More answer boxes for specific comments when the check box selection doesn't apply.

To provide space for written report instead of (comment Window)

At the moment I cannot think of additional information I do like the report that breaks down cost of service based on the information provided and how this compares to the national/state average.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Generally additional comments were very supportive of the NGOE reporting system and advised that the tool was easy to use. One comment requested that amount of information requested be simplified to reduce reporting burden and another commented that minimal changes were preferred to make the system easier to use over time.

Further comments (N=6)

Please trim some reporting 'bloat' as it's just starting to feel onerous to complete. Please consider the level of compliance-type requirements you require organisations to respond to, as too much can detract from truly serving individuals in our community and can trigger unrealistic feelings of inadequacy. The partner relationship between the MHC and NGOs should nurture and cultivate effective, person-centred community-based services.

Overall it is quite simple to use - keeping changes to a minimum would be good as our organisation only uses it every 6 months. Limited changes make it easier to use each time.

And thanks for requesting feedback on how the system is working.

I found the reporting system to be clear and easy to use, the training provided was useful and easy to follow.

efficient and well organised, thank you.

I am happy with the tool. I find it easy to use and effective.

easy to use and MHC helpdesk always helpful.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission's move to a web-based reporting system has been met with a positive response from the NGOs. While it is evident that the objectives of the NGOE reporting system are well on the way to being met, there is considerable support for improvements towards further achievement of the objectives, and to ensure that user requirements are satisfied to facilitate the growing demands for information. However it is also evident that the needs for additional information need to be balanced against the level of reporting burden placed on organisations. This is particularly important to ensure that the reporting process is streamlined and to maintain the productive partnership that has been established with the NGOs.

Some themes from the comments provided are apparent and these themes have been highlighted below. These will form the basis for the changes to be considered by the Commission for the NGOE reporting system. While all of these categories are considered important, due to resources and timing, changes will be prioritised according to reporting deadlines and requirements for contract acquittal. Supporting documentation (e.g. User Guide) will be reviewed to reflect the changes made to the system as required.

CATEGORY	POTENTIAL ACTION
Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve the communications process for advising organisations of new data fields to be collected in future - The Commission to send out login details as well as WebSurvey to ensure all organisations receive the information
Navigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look at options for improving navigation between sections - Ensure that navigation is included in documentation and training information
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review alignment of reporting requirements with contracts - Add opportunities for organisations to provide more qualitative information - Enable capture of a 'continued improvement' response under Person Centered Recovery Practices in the National Standards for Mental Health Services Annual Self-Assessment module
Reporting burden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If consideration is made to add additional fields, consider the value of the extra information against the level of increased reporting burden - Pre-fill additional fields from previous reporting periods where possible/practical
Technical issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct additional testing prior to system going 'live' each period to identify any access and save issues - Invite some organisations to participate in User Acceptance Testing to resolve any technical issues prior to the system being distributed to all organisations
Training & documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue to offer training to all organisations at the commencement of each reporting period - Provide additional clarification in the Data Guides, particularly for calculation of Bed days and Peer Support workers
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look at including additional analysis of activity and staffing numbers, including overall numbers and distribution graphs, in the <i>In Brief</i> reports - Provide additional comment boxes and/or space for attachments within the reporting system