Government of **Western Australia**
Mental Health Commission

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

End of Financial Year Reporting 2013-14

INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT

PERFORMANCE MONITORING & EVALUATION

MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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, September 2014

For further information please contact Helpdesk at
NGOESDC.Helpdesk@mentalhealth.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 redeveloped Non-Government Organisation Establishments Online Reporting System (NGOE reporting system) went 'live' on 1 July 2014 for reporting against the 2013-14 financial year. An evaluation was conducted in August 2014 as part of a continuous improvement process towards increasing the capacity of the system to meet its objectives and to inform future development.

Of the 74 NGOs who used the NGOE reporting system, 54 (73%) completed the evaluation. Overall, 92% of the respondents were satisfied with the system, but only 20% felt that the system did not require further improvement.

Through an examination of the issues and suggested improvement identified in the evaluation, potential enhancements have been identified that would better meet the requirements of the Commission and the system end-users. While this is not an exhaustive list, it provides guidance on what NGOs would like to see within the system.

CATEGORY	POTENTIAL CHANGE
Relevance	- Continue to work with NGOs to ensure they have a clear understanding of data definitions and information required - Improve guide for use in the Data Guides to include various scenarios
Delegation	- Simplify 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
Clarity of data requirements	- Improve the guide for use in the Data Guides - Implement a 'Help' button next to each data field that provides a pop-up box with relevant information from the Data Guides
Additional data fields	- 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)
Validation	- Continue development of system to include historical data for specific data fields as read only - Expand validation checks to reduce the likelihood of the Commission contacting the NGOs to validate data post-submission
System navigation	- Design Sections (e.g. Annual Standards) to enable navigation through the section without the need for data entry
Printing	- Print view formatted in a way that clearly summarises the report - Examine alternative download options such as PDF

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 Online Reporting System (NGOE) 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. An evaluation was conducted in February 2014 as part of a continuous improvement process towards increasing the capacity of the system to meet its objectives. Results from this evaluation[1] went towards determining system improvements for the 2013-14 end of financial year (EOFY) reporting requirements. These improvements included:

CATEGORY	IMPROVEMENT
Data requirements	- Developed functionality to cover all the reporting requirements - Improved the questions to clarify the data required - Developed functionality to assist with data entry
Printing	- 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
Email notifications	- 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
Administration site	- Developed an administration site to allow the Commission to download the data and reopen submitted reports
Support	- 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 - Provision of training to NGOs to increase understanding of data entry, delegation, and submission using the NGOE reporting system

The redeveloped system went 'live' on 1 July 2014, for the 2013-14 EOFY reporting requirements. The system:

- Enabled secure access for the Organisation Authority and/or Delegate
- Met reporting requirements specific to each NGO in accordance with MHC/NGO contract(s)

[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_evalution_results_2014.sflb.ashx

- Met 2013-14 EOFY reporting requirements, specifically:
  - Carers Recognition Act reporting requirements
  - Annual financial reporting:
    - 12-month period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014
  - Annual Activity reporting:
    - 12-month period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014
- Included documentation to assist with data entry and compliance, including:
  - Full data set specifications 2013/14
  - Data guides and reporting templates (for download and/or printing)
  - User guide
  - Links to external reference documents (e.g. the Western Australian Carers Charter)
  - Where appropriate, pre-fill data to facilitate the data entry process
- Provided the ability to view, print and/or save all data entered
- Enabled submission to the Commission on completion and review of all data entry.

Prior to both the December and June system release NGOs were given the opportunity to undertake training on the web based collection system with metropolitan NGOs offered places in nine 1-hour group sessions run over three days. Regional NGOs were offered face to face training through a visit from a Commission representative.

Participation in training for the NGOE reporting system

	Dec 2013	Jun 2014
Metropolitan	82 attendees	60 attendees
Regional	13 organisations	9 organisations

On 15 August 2014 an evaluation, hosted on Survey Monkey, was distributed to all NGOs to seek feedback on their experience with using the web based collection system. 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.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Of the 74 NGOs who used NGOE reporting system, 54 (73%) returned a completed evaluation form. This is considered to be a good representation of the system end-users, and is a considerable increase from the response rate of the previous evaluation (46%), reflecting greater engagement from the NGOs 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

Almost all of the respondents were satisfied with the NGOE reporting system. Respondents felt that the overall system was an improvement on prior data collection methodologies, and that the current system was an improvement on the previous version implemented for the December 2013 reporting requirements. The majority of respondents reported that the system was easy to use and reduced the administrative burden of reporting. This demonstrates the success of the latest developments in addressing the requirements of end-users. Most of the respondents were unsure of whether the system needs further improvement to facilitate data entry and validation, but this may be due to a lack of awareness of the potential improvements at this stage of the evaluation. Results from later stages strongly support new developments to facilitate data entry and validation.

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

- the format and function of the print view
- navigation through a report Section without the need to enter data
- the process for delegating Sections to staff
- enhanced functionality to assist data entry (e.g. historical data and comment boxes)
- in-system data definitions and guides (e.g. ‘Help’ buttons referring to relevant information from the data guides)

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	92%	6%	2%	0%
The reporting tool is an improvement on previous data collection methods	50	80%	14%	4%	2%
The reporting tool has made reporting easier and reduced the administrative burden of reporting	49	78%	12%	8%	2%
The changes implemented after the last reporting period made reporting easier	49	80%	14%	2%	4%
The reporting tool requires further improvements to reduce the burden of data reporting	49	27%	49%	20%	4%
The reporting tool is easy to use	48	85%	10%	2%	2%

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

Areas of the NGOE reporting system that the NGOs were not satisfied with. (N = 22)
The formatting of the print version of the report could be improved with more headings and a layout more conducive to easy reading for those managers who have nothing to do with the online reporting tool but are privy to the report.
Under the status of accreditation or compliance with industry quality standards, there are 4 options available. Is it possible to separate "Compliant" and "Not accredited"?
It was difficult to know what data to collect not having the reporting requirements available at the start of the contracts in July 2013, and this is why it did not reduce administrative burden during last year, but actually increased administrative burden of reporting. However, now that we know what reporting information is required it has been helpful in reducing administrative burden. In future, if any changes to reporting requirements are made, it would be helpful to know what is required well before the new reporting period commences, as we must set up databases and train staff to capture that information.
It does not cover all reporting there are still areas that require separate reporting making this process difficult. If the department knows what they require then why not cut the burden and send a single email advising all requirements and their due date 30 days before the due date.
It was difficult to print mid-way reporting unless you saved the document this was time consuming and frustrating. A print option at all stages of the reporting rather than at the end would have been good. While the email to the designated person was good, clearer titles of the section of the report/ email would have been good to highlight the area of the report as you had to open several emails to find the correct title.
It would be good if we can have previous data listed.
It doesn't allow for explanation of changes to the program in the reporting period - e.g. challenges & successes.
Some parts require a bit more explanation as to what is supposed to be being reported on. Perhaps a little line of text under each question would suffice - it is on some questions but not all of them.
Could there be a return to index button?
Sometimes it is not always clear what you need to open to get to page that needs completing. I am referring to opening up the contracts from organisation. I would also like some numbering in place; it is difficult to have conversations with colleagues around data gaps when the fields are not numbered.
Too much navigation to and from screens. Delegation was clunky - also once delegated apparently can be re-delegated without the original respondent knowing.
1. We provide 2 types of service from 14 locations; therefore it would be helpful to be able to press a button to copy the 14 locations from one service type to another, rather than having to enter them 28 times. You might even have this pre-filled from the previous report, allowing for minor updates due to staff changes, etc.; 2. When I print the report as a PDF, the Contract Summary in D. Financial Reporting shows all the figures in columns but no labels indicating what they mean; and 3. I don't get correct pagination when printing to PDF.
Printing out of the report could do with some tweaking. Possibly running a full report at the end which incorporated all the sections which were to be completed by the organisation.
I feel that rather than having an option to print the report, there should be an option to save the report electronically.
Carers Recognition Act.
As I am learning about this tool, is there a possibility to ensure when we do end of financial up the top we say for the year and then we know we also are reporting each six months?
I believe the on-line reporting tool is fine, what I would suggest is that the contracts themselves highlight fields/clause/items that will be reportable items. I wouldn't suggest another section, but just something simple like an annotation or key. For example, number of FTE involved in administrative work in the organisation is not a contract specification but is asked for in the report - is it relevant to a price-based contract? If yes, then it should be indicated that this is a data item for collection.
Print view still needs work.
There were two people in [redacted] who were given the log-in information for the tool - an executive manager who would eventually sign off on it, and the data manager. For some reason all the emails about sections having been completed or updated were sent to the data manager and not to the executive manager. It would have been helpful if either 1) we were able to nominate which of us would get the updates, or 2) we both got them (so the exec didn't miss out). It's not an earth-shattering problem, because she checked frequently anyway, but it was a bit of a niggle.

SUPPORT

There was strong support for the provision of a range of resources to assist NGOs with use of the NGOE reporting system. While Helpdesk support was reported as useful by 60% of respondents, there were a high number of respondents (38%) who did not use this service. All of those that did use Helpdesk services found it useful.

The report templates were shown to be less useful than other types of support. However, 34% either did not use the templates or were unsure of the usefulness, which may be a reflection of the templates becoming redundant as responses are entered directly into the online system.

The majority of comments received were positive about the resources available, and supported ongoing provision of training and Helpdesk. The most common suggestion emphasised the importance of providing clear data definitions to assist the NGOs with understanding the reporting requirements.

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	48	83%	4%	6%	6%
Assistance provided through the Helpdesk	48	60%	0%	2%	38%
User Guide	48	81%	4%	2%	13%
Data specifications document (located on the index page)	48	71%	2%	15%	13%
Data definitions in the Data Guides document	48	75%	2%	13%	10%
Report templates in the Data Guides document	47	64%	2%	17%	17%
Links to online documents (e.g. Carers Recognition Act)	48	75%	0%	13%	13%

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

Ideas NGOs have for improving supporting documents or training. (N=13)

Supporting docs and training have been excellent.
Data definitions, whilst useful, need to be more clearly defined. It leaves some of it open for interpretation. Our understanding from the data guide was changed when we asked questions during the training that was provided. If we hadn't asked the questions, the data we reported would have been different.
As previously stated, for any new reporting requirements, it would be useful to have training, consultation and feedback sessions well before the data collection period commences.
While 2 people from our agency went to the training (I was not one of them) I did not need to ask for their support as I found the online reporting easy to use.
It is good to have face to face and online training.
The flexibility with the training for the rural areas was very beneficial and greatly appreciated.
Training is brief and concise therefore useful.
Trevor and Graeme were excellent assistance, great people to work with and very patient.
Please continue seeking feedback from organisations about data definitions, and check in with organisations about whether they are applying these definitions consistently.
In the Carers Recognition Act can there be a N/A button?
I came away from the 2nd training session wondering if it really was worth the time and effort involved (travelling from and back to [redacted]), given that there was hardly any new understandings gained from it. It may have been better to email updates to NGOs.
All good.
During training would be good to bring our laptops so we can go through the various stages. Always wonder why we follow Carers Recognition Act. Maybe we should have information applicable to the different agencies.
Helpdesk were exceptionally helpful and very prompt in replying... brilliant.

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, which is supported through the comments received. This issue was also identified in the previous evaluation, and highlights improvements to the print view as a priority. Other issues identified in the comments included:

- Uncertainty around when email alerts were sent to Authorities regarding progress of delegated Sections
- Uncertainty around which Authority (Organisation or Reporting) would receive email alerts regarding progress of delegated Sections
- Uncertainty around the delegation process and the responsibility for completing a section
- Difficulties with navigation between the Index Page and Sections.

Issue with any of the following functionality

ISSUES	N[a]	YES	NO	N/A
Receiving invitation email from WebSurvey	49	4%	96%	0%
Connecting to the online reporting tool	49	6%	94%	0%
Links to external websites	49	0%	80%	20%
Links to supporting documents	49	4%	82%	14%
Delegating sections to other people in organisation	49	8%	76%	16%
Using navigation buttons e.g. Save and Next	49	12%	88%	0%
Printing or saving your data	49	16%	84%	0%
Reviewing your data	49	2%	96%	2%
Submitting your data	49	2%	92%	6%
Contacting the NGOE SDC Helpdesk through the online link	48	2%	58%	40%
Other issue (please specify below)	42	5%	40%	55%

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

Brief description of the issue (N=12)
As I mentioned previously the option to print throughout the reporting was difficult and seemed only straight forward at the end of the report. You could only print if you saved a copy and this got tedious and time consuming
Tried explorer save in file format as suggested, would be good to have an auto-convert to PDF when complete
I found it somewhat confusing as when I tried to save my responses it automatically sent a reminder notice to other delegated people that they had not completed their parts of the online reporting
Worked well
I had previously given my email as a point of contact as I am the person who submits the report. An Acting Manager had requested that they become the point of contact without notifying me, so all correspondence went to them instead of myself. If information is going to be changed perhaps an email to the original person to confirm that the changes need to be made? For example, when you change a password, you receive an email to say that this has been done.
We had to download alternative operating system in order to connect to the reporting tool. Difficult in returning to previous page and index. Printing procedure was unclear.
Using navigation buttons e.g. Save and Next; issue was generated from me in not following the process correctly. On contact with Helpdesk (Trevor) I was easy stepped through and not a problem in end result. Good learning curve.
In the event that you don't have this feature (it's possible you do and I can't remember), would you consider a button for a single user to select to indicate that they will not be delegating to anyone else in the organisation, so that the reporting tool will remove all delegation functionality and buttons, so as to avoid confusion (I confess to some confusion in navigation when inadvertently pressing a button relating to delegation).
Already described in the last section. Prints do not come out well; they are haphazard in structure with large gaps between pages.
The printed report could not respond to our printer specifications, so we let it print as was. The settings were slightly larger than an A4.
There was a glitch where we had to re-delegate - but you are aware of that and onto it. The print out needs a little work so heading make sense and it fits in a printed page - still having to cut and paste it into a word document to avoid things being cut off by page boundaries
Described on first page - issues with who received the updates about delegates' progress.

CONTENT

Of the 51 respondents to the question 'Did you encounter difficulty understanding what the questions were asking?', 84% did not encounter any difficulties. This is a considerable improvement from the December 2013 reporting system (65%), demonstrating the success of the revised questions to provide clarity around what was required, and the familiarity that NGOs have gained with using the system.

Respondents who encountered issues with the questions reported using the Data Guides to assist. Two of the respondents reported that the Data Guides did not provide sufficient clarification. The main issues identified related to:

- Lack of clarity in the data definitions, which left some degree of interpretation
- Uncertainty around how to report information against the data definition
- Lack of understanding around technical terms.

Difficulty responding to the questions within the data collection instrument

N[(a)]	YES	NO
51	16%	84%

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

Utilisation of the Data Guides to assist with understanding

N[(a)]	YES	NO
7	100%	0%

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

Sufficient clarification provided in the Data Guides

N[(a)]	YES	NO
4	50%	50%

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

Briefly describe the problem. (N=4)

Data definitions, whilst useful, need to be more clearly defined. It leaves some of it open for interpretation. Our understanding from the data guide was changed when we asked questions during the training that was provided. If we hadn't asked the questions, the data we reported would have been different e.g. for Personalised Support linked to Housing.
Can't remember the question; it was in the early part of the reporting tool.
There was one occasion where the definition confused me a bit, but that was just because we closed beds and I didn't realise how this was to be captured, as a leave day or not at all. I now know for next time.
More the terminology of questions, but the user guide helped, or I would ask someone from our Finance department.

POTENTIAL FUTURE FEATURES

While there was support for all of the additional features, the level of support varied. Of particular note and supported by the additional comments, were to:

- Include a text field against activity data fields to enable comments
- Include a 'Help' button next to data elements that opens a pop-up box with relevant data definitions
- Include historical data for reference during data entry
- Improve the format of the print view (as supported by comments throughout)
- Include the Disability Access and Inclusion Plan

Less support was evident for the following functionality, however it should be noted that there was a higher level of uncertainty with each of these when compared to other suggested features:

- Ability to generate standard reports for service type benchmarking
- Improved data validation checks at point of entry
- Ability to capture catchment area/service coverage
- Ability to add text to the delegation email to clarify the purpose of the delegation

The only feature which lacked support was the ability to limit final submission of data to the Organisation Authority only – however, the high level of uncertainty with this feature indicated that respondents may have been unsure of what this would entail. Currently, the final step of the submission process requests authorisation from the Organisation Authority, therefore accountability is emphasised within the system and the process for sign-off is left to the organisations without limiting the submission function to a single login.

Indication your organisation would find the following features useful in future years.

FEATURES/IMPROVEMENTS	N[(a)]	USEFUL	NOT USEFUL	NOT SURE
Ability to add a text message to the email sent to the delegate to improve delegation process.	49	59%	20%	20%
Limit final submission of data to the Organisation Authority only (the Reporting Authority will not be able to submit)	48	33%	25%	42%
Previous financial year data included within the tool for validation purposes	47	85%	2%	13%
Improved data checks and validation at point of entry to reduce queries after submission	49	67%	4%	29%
Inclusion of a text box against activity data to enable NGOs to comment on data and any variances in numbers across time.	49	88%	2%	10%
Include ability to capture catchment area/coverage of service – not just location of service	49	61%	8%	31%
Include a 'Help' button next to data elements that open a pop-up box with the relevant data definitions and guides	49	88%	2%	10%
Ability to generate reports for service type benchmarking and business case development	49	69%	6%	24%
Improve the format of the print view	49	71%	4%	24%

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

Comments or suggestions for developing the instrument in future (N=10)
Similar to the Carer's Recognition, perhaps it would be helpful to include Disability Access and Inclusion Plan in the reporting tool.
Add the Disability Access and Inclusion Plan.
All great ideas. I especially like the data from the previous year and the adding of a text box against activity.
Disability Access and Inclusion Plan.
Collation of "Local" and "Regional" data sets in reports for (de-identified) feedback for service planning
I think it is quite good, it is quite straight forward and nothing is ever perfect. It is definitely workable
It would be useful if data from the previous 6-12 months could be included within the tool so, as Coordinator I could see at a glance any significant changes in data and review these against variables such as staffing, changes in organisational policy and procedure etc. This would also make it easier to comment on/account for significant discrepancies in the data if/as they occur.
Will the Disability Access and Inclusion Plan be a module in the future? The ability to submit negative figures in the financial module.
Under financials, Long term liabilities for staff need to be identified as carried over funds.
Definitely previous financial year’s data to be included for validation purposes.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Generally the comments were very supportive of the NGOE reporting system and potential improvements, and confirmed that the objectives were being met. The reported ease-of-use demonstrates that the system is an improvement on previous collection methodologies and that the NGOs have gained familiarity with this process.

Further comments (N=19)
Thank you for all your work in the initial and ongoing development of this tool.
As this was my first time reporting to anyone, I found it so easy to use and I really liked the fact that if you did need help the Helpdesk was very prompt.
We found some of the financial information to be inaccurate and made amendments accordingly.
I have been compiling a MHC report for the last 5 years and found this the easiest report to do. Thank you.
I think that this reporting period was easier. Some of this may have been that we were more aware of what we had to do. I certainly think that it is less time consuming than the previous method.
It's good and easy to use.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback and the suggestions for improvements next time will be really appreciated.
I am very happy with the tool overall. It has significantly reduced the administrative workload of frontline counselling staff as I no longer have to delegate sections of the report for extended narrative content. The improvements at the last reporting period were also helpful, and indicated that the Commission is responsive to feedback provided both in survey and face-to-face meetings. Thankyou for your support!
The online reporting tool has been a huge improvement on previous systems. The ability to review annually can only improve the system further.
Feel that the overall tool is a vast improvement on the old process - hard copy, and makes work easier in the reporting back to MHC.
I believe the online reporting tool to be a vast improvement on the previous reporting method. The tool over time I think will continue to develop to meet growing demands on the sector in terms of information being captured and wide variety of outcomes being reported on. The ability to attach additional information or to be able to provide additional information through the use of 'comments' boxes etc. has also helped to increase the level of detail that can be provided at the time of reporting. This allows for any discrepancies or queries to be raised and dealt with very quickly after the reporting period which is very helpful as the information is still recent and changes can be made in practices if needed to bring about more desirable reporting outcomes.
Find reporting less onerous, easy to delegate aspects, Helpdesk returned call straight away, no complaints.
I don't have any further suggestions - I found it very user-friendly and easy to use. Definitely considerably less onerous than other forms of reporting.
Comments already placed under relevant sections. Overall the admin burden has reduced by 80 percent and we are happy with the introduction of the online reporting system.
Thanks Trevor and your team. I believe you will continue to give us options that will make the reporting process bliss.
1) As discussed with Trevor it would be good to have a directive of how to represent the FTE/hours of staff paid (most likely) under Federal contracts but who lend capacity to the State-funded contract. Currently we represent them as volunteers but that has largely been as a matter of consistency for us. It would be reassuring to know that all contracted services were reporting it the same way which might benefit benchmarking. 2) I was expecting that all reporting components would be online. I was surprised to see that the DAIP was not included this time in the online tool- but thought no more about it. A recent contact from our MHC contract manager was required to request it as it hadn't been submitted on the basis of my assumption and no specific reference to it on the online tool. If it's possible to have a prompt or clearer statement about what other (off-line) components are required it would be 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. 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 for improvements are apparent from the responses and are categorised 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, some may not be able to be implemented in the next release for the 31 December 2014 reporting period. However, these will remain on the list of improvements for the 30 June 2015 reporting period. Changes will be prioritised according to reporting deadlines and requirements for contract acquittal, and supporting documentation (e.g. User Guide) will be reviewed to reflect the changes made to the system.

CATEGORY	POTENTIAL CHANGE
Relevance	- Continue to work with NGOs to ensure they have a clear understanding of data definitions and information required - Improve guide for use in the Data Guides to include various scenarios
Delegation	- Simplify 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
Clarity of data requirements	- Improve the guide for use in the Data Guides - Implement a 'Help' button next to each data field that provides a pop-up box with relevant information from the Data Guides
Additional data fields	- 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)
Validation	- Continue development of system to include historical data for specific data fields as read only - Expand validation checks to reduce the likelihood of the Commission contacting the NGOs to validate data post-submission
System navigation	- Design Sections (e.g. Annual Standards) to enable navigation through the section without the need for data entry
Printing	- Print view formatted in a way that clearly summarises the report - Examine alternative download options such as PDF