

Performance Audit Report

Follow-up of Performance Audits

**The School Accountability and
Improvement Model**
(May 1999)

**The Management of Court Waiting
Times**
(September 1999)

State Library of New South Wales cataloguing-in publication data

New South Wales. Audit Office.

Performance audit report : follow-up of performance audits : the School Accountability and Improvement Model (May 1999) ; the Management of Court Waiting Times (September 1999).

0734721234

1. School Accountability and Improvement Model (NSW) - Auditing. 2. New South Wales. Dept of Education and Training - Auditing. 3. School improvement programs - New South Wales - Evaluation - Auditing. 4. School management and organization - New South Wales - Evaluation - Auditing. 5. Schools - New South Wales - Evaluation - Auditing. 6. Court congestion and delay - New South Wales - Auditing. 7. Court administration - New South Wales - Auditing. 8. New South Wales. Attorney-General's Dept - Auditing. I. Title: Follow-up of performance audits. II. Title: School Accountability and Improvement Model (May 1999). Management of Court Waiting Times (September 1999).

379.15809944

347.944013

© Copyright reserved by The Audit Office of New South Wales. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior consent of The Audit Office of New South Wales.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
The School Accountability and Improvement Model (May 1999)	3
The Management of Court Waiting Times (September 1999)	17
Appendices	35
Performance Audits by the Audit Office of New South Wales	39

Executive Summary

Executive Summary

The audit

Follow-up performance audits examine the extent to which accepted recommendations have been implemented. These follow-up audits provide Parliament with an assessment of any changes which may have occurred in agencies in response to an earlier performance audit report.¹

This performance audit examines two reports tabled during 1999:

- ❑ *The School Accountability and Improvement Model* (May 1999)
- ❑ *The Management of Court Waiting Times* (September 1999).

In principle, performance audits make recommendations to address an issue or problem. In reviewing progress, the audit assessed whether or not there had been a change in practice or performance.

Audit opinion

Over 96% of the audit recommendations made were accepted by the agencies. And more than half of these recommendations have been implemented.

In addition, many of the problems identified in the 1999 audits have been addressed. For over 90% of recommendations there has been some measurable change in practices or performance.

In general, the approach taken by the agencies to monitor and report on the progress of implementation could be improved. Agencies should:

- ❑ **establish arrangements, like an audit committee, to follow up on the progress of implementation of the recommendations**
- ❑ **report on the progress of the implementation of recommendations in their annual report to Parliament.**

The Audit Office has developed a checklist to assist agencies monitor and report on recommendations from performance audit reports (refer Appendix 1).

The opinion is based on the findings outlined in the following chapters.

¹ The Audit Office tabled a similar report *Follow-up of Performance Audits* in June 2001.

**The School Accountability and
Improvement Model
(May 1999)**

NSW Department of Education and Training

Audit opinion

The Audit Office found that the Department of Education and Training had implemented all but one of the recommendations from the 1999 audit.

In response to the 1999 audit, the Department made changes to enhance the quality of the school accountability and improvement process by introducing new performance assessment tools, minimum reporting standards and the school review component of the model.

Although there has been overall improvement in the quality of performance information in the latest school reports (for the 2000 school year) there are still some schools that need to present information in a more meaningful way.

The 1999 audit

The 1999 audit examined the extent to which the School Accountability and Improvement Model offered an efficient, effective and economic approach to improving school accountability and performance.

The School Accountability and Improvement Model was introduced by the Department of Education and Training in 1997. The objective was to make self-evaluation and reporting integral to the planning process in government schools.

The model comprises four components:

- the conduct of annual school self-evaluations
- annual school reporting to parents and the community
- reviews of selected schools
- systemic monitoring and reporting of all schools.²

² School self-evaluations and annual school reports were undertaken prior to the introduction of the model in 1997. The model was intended to add consistency, structure and rigour to existing practices and ensure the involvement of the community in assessments.

Findings

1999 audit findings The 1999 audit found that the model had the potential to be an effective and efficient method to improve student outcomes and school accountability and support resource allocation decisions in schools and across regions.

At the time of the 1999 audit, schools had published their first round of reports (1997) in accordance with the requirements of the model. The audit noted some improvement in the quality and content of school reports (1997, 1998) compared to previous years and subsequent improvements in accountability for school performance.

However, the 1999 audit found that the model had not yet achieved its full potential. While some of the school reports were quite good, the majority had not provided a balanced account of achievements and areas for improvement. Also, most schools had not effectively used the quantitative data provided by the Department to evaluate overall results.

The 1999 audit recommended further changes to improve the outcomes of the model, including:

- ❑ the establishment of a common set of performance indicators for schools
- ❑ the establishment of minimum standards for school report content and quality
- ❑ the implementation of the school review component of the model
- ❑ a review of the role of principals and district superintendents in managing (and accounting for) the use of resources in the school.

Changes since the 1999 audit In 1999, only 134 schools (out of 2,218 government schools) published annual school reports due to an industrial ban by the NSW Teachers Federation.³ This ban was lifted in 2000 following negotiations between the Department and the Federation.

³ NSW Department of Education and Training 1999 Annual Report p.134

2001 audit findings The Department in August 2000 released a revised reporting framework for the preparation of annual school reports.

A comparison of a sample of annual reports indicates an improvement in the quality and amount of published performance data from 1998 to 2000. School reports (2000) provide more meaningful information to parents and the community and in most cases, would assist readers to judge the performance of the school.

However, the quality and extent of performance information published in annual reports in some schools is still of concern with a need to provide a balanced account of achievements and areas for improvement.

Since the 1999 audit, the Department has established a number of working groups to further progress the model. Working groups are currently examining:

- school reviews
- website development
- additional training materials
- program evaluation support materials
- the school report style guide
- report quality
- data analysis and reporting for the new Higher School Certificate.

Status of the implementation of recommendations

The Department accepted all the 1999 audit recommendations. A summary of the status of recommendations is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Status of the implementation of recommendations		
Recommendation	Status	Changes in practice
Establishing common indicators	Implemented	Common indicators identified for school reports. While many schools are presenting information in a meaningful way, some schools have not achieved this quality of performance information.
Establishing minimum reporting standards	Implemented	Many school reports now outline outcomes and targets. However, the analysis of results is not always informative.
Support schools to implement the model	Implemented	Additional training, support and evaluation tools provided to schools. Additional CEO positions created.
Implement the school review component of the model	Implemented	The conduct of school reviews commenced in 2000.
Restructure to align administration of the model and school reporting under one executive position	Implemented	The Department was restructured. All aspects of model administration now better aligned.
Review the role of principals in managing resources	Not implemented	The authority of principals is defined by their Award conditions. Principals currently appoint casual and temporary staff and have flexibility in appointments to Head Teacher positions.
Review District Office staffing	Implemented	Review completed. Some changes occurred in work arrangements as a result.
District Superintendents to endorse school targets	Implemented	District Superintendents note school performance targets and consider these in resource planning at the district level.

More details on the implementation of each recommendation follows.

Establishing common indicators

The 1999 audit found that the school reports could be improved if schools were required to report more extensively and consistently on a common set of performance indicators.

The 1999 audit proposed a set of common indicators including measures of:

- ❑ student achievement including results against cognitive (test scores) and non-cognitive indicators (such as attendance)
- ❑ measures of school culture and work environment
- ❑ trends in student performance over time (value-added component).

Reporting student performance

The Department outlined the use of external examination data and statewide comparisons in its 2000 annual school reporting guidelines. These guidelines require schools to comment in the annual report on student performance including:

- ❑ trends in School Certificate and Higher School Certificate results over time
- ❑ progress made between standard tests (for example progress in literacy and numeracy from Year 3 to Year 5 and progress from year 5 to School Certificate)
- ❑ performance in literacy and numeracy.

In response, the NSW Teachers Federation advised its members that it was not necessary to provide statewide comparisons based on test data if the school chooses not to.⁴

Despite this, the Department advised that at least 80% of the annual reports (2000) for primary schools included comments on student performance using results from external examinations.

2001 audit findings

Findings from a review of a sample of school reports for 2000 from primary and high schools is consistent with the Department's advice (i.e. the majority of schools are reporting external examination results and performance trends).

Best examples were those annual reports that compared performance to state averages. For example, *50% of students were in the top 3 bands for science in the School Certificate compared to 54% statewide.*

⁴ Advice to Annual School Report Writers, *Education*, NSW Teachers Federation 2.2.01

While many schools are attempting to present information in a meaningful way, some schools have not achieved this quality of performance information.

For example, while reporting that *four students achieved results in the 91-100 percentile band in english in the Higher School Certificate*, demonstrates that some students in the school have reached a high standard of achievement, without reference to other students in the course, the reader cannot fully judge the overall achievement in the subject.

Reporting non cognitive performance

In 2000, the Department provided each school with attendance data for the past four years along with district and state averages.

2001 audit findings

All the reports reviewed in the 2001 audit included data on attendance but not all included comments where the data suggested that attendance could be an issue affecting student outcomes.

Reporting on culture and environment

The 1999 audit noted that schools are expected to pursue a broad range of outcomes to prepare students for active participation in the community and that outcomes that go beyond results in examinations should also be measured and reported on (such as citizenship, social values, school quality, culture and leadership).

At the time of the 1999 audit, there were no standard data collection tools to assist schools in measuring these other indicators (although some schools were undertaking surveys of students, staff and/or parents).

Since the 1999 audit, the Department has developed a number of evaluation instruments (SchoolMap, Quality of School Life, School Culture) for a school to measure its contribution to these outcomes.

For 2000, schools were required to evaluate one of six nominated educational management and practice areas (using the above tools or other means) and publish findings in the annual report.

2001 audit findings

All the school reports reviewed met this requirement. However, while most schools reported their findings, not all schools reported on areas for improvement.

Establishing minimum reporting standards

To overcome problems with variability in the content of school reports (in addition to reporting on common indicators discussed earlier), the 1999 audit suggested the Department establish and enforce minimum reporting standards. These standards would need to ensure that annual school reports:

- ❑ make clear and unequivocal statements that fully and accurately reflect performance
- ❑ include a statement about school and systemic objectives, linked to school and Department planning documents
- ❑ include targets against these objectives and an analysis of results against targets for the previous year.

Guidelines for schools

The 2000 annual report guidelines cover reporting progress against school improvement targets and provide guidance on developing targets (such as targets need to be specific, measurable, achievable and realistic). Enhancements to the guidelines since 1997 include a revised format for reporting performance against targets and an increased emphasis on reporting outcomes.

Schools are required to set targets for the forthcoming year based on information from the annual report and self-evaluation projects. The targets are supposed to be measurable and meaningful and the guidelines provide examples of targets such as:

- ❑ 24% increase in the number of students achieving the target
- ❑ 40% increase in the number of teachers attending course.

2001 audit findings

The review of school reports for 2000 indicated that some improvement had occurred since 1998 in that most reports have outlined outcomes and targets for 2001. However, the analysis of results against targets for the previous year was not always informative.

For example, against the objective of *improve students literacy skills*, one school reported the outcome as *students displayed more interest in reading for enjoyment*.

Supporting schools to implement the model

The 1999 audit found that limited training had been provided to principals and school self-evaluation committees before they were required to conduct self-evaluations and publish annual reports (in 1997).

The 1999 audit recommended that the Department continue to support the implementation of the model using a number of strategies.

Training and development

The Department advises that training has continued to be provided to principals and teachers in planning, data analysis and evaluation techniques. A course on reporting to parents has also been included in the statewide development program for principals in 2001-02.

In addition, District Office staff have conducted workshops for teachers and evaluation committee members on self-evaluations.

The Department has also advised that a website to further support school self-evaluations was available from May 2001.

Chief Education Officers

Chief Education Officers (CEOs) are attached to the District Office and play a major role in supporting school management. In regard to the model, CEOs provide guidance and advice to schools and school evaluation committees and are responsible for ensuring the quality of self-evaluations and annual reports.

At the time of the 1999 audit, each CEO was responsible for assisting between 65 and 80 schools. In most cases it appeared that CEOs were unable to provide the level of support required by the school (and to ensure the quality of the annual reports) and the ratio of CEOs to schools (1:76) served as a limiting factor to achieving further improvement.

2001 audit finding

The Department advises that additional CEO positions have been created and the ratio of CEOs to schools will be 1:55 from 2001.

Providing evaluation tools

Following the 1999 audit, the Department developed (and distributed) a number of evaluation tools for schools to assess student outcomes and report on these in the annual school report.

Additional assistance has been provided through the development of software to assist in analysis of data at both the school and student levels. Data support is also being reviewed to reflect the move to standards based assessment in the new Higher School Certificate and the availability of data from the new School Certificate tests in history, geography and citizenship.

Conducting school reviews

At the time of the 1999 audit, the Department had not implemented the school review component on the model and negotiations were proceeding with the NSW Teachers Federation for the implementation of school reviews in November 1999.⁵

These reviews were to be conducted in those schools where information from the self-evaluation process, annual reports or other means, indicated a need for performance improvement in student outcomes or management practices.

2001 audit findings The Department implemented the school development policy in 2000, part of which includes the conduct of school reviews.

The Department has conducted 45 reviews since January 2001 comprising:

- ❑ Education Support Team to assist the school develop a program (9)
- ❑ Program Reviews to assist the school to improve an existing school program (34)
- ❑ Management Reviews to assist the school to improve management practices (2).

The Department advises that the additional CEO positions will increase its capacity to support Education Support Team activity as well as program and management reviews.

Responsibility for the model

At the time of the 1999 audit, the arrangements for administration of the model and for school reporting were in different parts of the Department. This was considered a potential barrier to the flow of performance information across the Department and to the public.

Since 1999, the Department has been restructured bringing together school assessment and reporting functions and the administration of the model under one Deputy Director-General.

⁵ NSW Department of Education and Training *School Development Policy* 1999

Role of principals and district superintendents

Authority of principals	<p>The 1999 audit found that although principals were held to account for the performance of their schools, they did not have sufficient autonomy and control over the schools resources (staffing) to be able to affect improvement.</p>
2001 audit findings	<p>The Department advises that a principal's authority in staffing matters is defined by the conditions of the Award and there have been few changes in this regard. However, there has been a more flexible approach adopted for the allocation of Head Teacher positions to high schools, increased flexibility in the appointment of casual and temporary teachers and the introduction of an annual review process for teachers (i.e. performance reviews).</p>
District Superintendents	<p>The 1999 audit also observed that there were issues with the ability of District Office staff to provide sufficient support to their schools while at the same time addressing statewide priorities.</p> <p>The 1999 audit recommended that the Department review the role of District Superintendents in the management and utilisation of resources.</p>
2001 audit findings	<p>Following the 1999 audit, the Department conducted a review of staffing resources in District Offices. The review indicated few discretionary resources available and limited flexibility to provide additional assistance to schools.</p> <p>The Department advises that more recent changes have increased the availability of District Office staff. Firstly, it has established a Child Protection and Investigations Unit which has reduced the investigation workload in Districts. Secondly, the number of Chief Education Officer positions has been increased to 41 in Districts and 3 in head office.</p>
Providing resources to achieve school targets	<p>The 1999 report also recommended that District Superintendents endorse targets in annual school reports because of the potential impact school targets could have on district resources (and to ensure consistency in targets set by various schools within their district).</p> <p>Principals did not accept this recommendation (as they are not directly accountable to District Superintendents). Rather schools adopted the practice of targets being noted by the District Superintendent as an indicator that any resources needed to achieve a target were taken into account in district plans.</p>

Ensuring implementation

Monitoring and reporting on implementation

The Audit Office found that there were few mechanisms in place to monitor and review the implementation of recommendations in the performance audit report and there were no reports on progress to the Director-General, Department of Education and Training or the Minister.

Public reporting

There was no reference to the audit in the 1999 Department of Education and Training Annual Report that followed the audit.

A progress report on the implementation of audit recommendations is included in the 2000 Annual Report.

Response from the Department of Education and Training

I refer to your letter of 31 July 2001 enclosing the segment of the Performance Audit Report relating to the Follow-up Performance Audits 2001: The School Accountability and Improvement Model.

The NSW Department of Education and Training (DET) has appreciated the opportunity to work closely with the Audit Office during both the performance and follow-up audits.

The DET accepted the eight audit recommendations arising from the 1999 audit. The DET has directed significant resources to enhance the statewide operation of the School Accountability and Improvement Directorate. I acknowledge the recognition given in your report that seven of the recommendations have been implemented by the Department. My comments in relation to each of the recommendations follow:

1. Establishing common indicators

I note the finding that this recommendation has been implemented. The School Accountability and Improvement Directorate will continue to work with schools to improve the quality of annual school reporting in terms of: meaningful student performance information; issues affecting student outcomes such as poor attendance; and areas for improvement resulting from evaluation of performance relating to the social outcomes of schooling.

2. Establishing minimum reporting standards

I note the finding that this recommendation has been implemented. Annual School Report Guidelines have been revised and schools are required to report on progress towards targets.

3. Supporting schools to implement the model

I note the finding that this recommendation has been implemented. Implementation of the school accountability and improvement model is now supported by a chief education officer in each of the 40 districts. Training and development opportunities based on modules developed by the directorate, new software for data analysis, and a website developed to assist school self-evaluation committees are now in place.

4. Implement the school review component of the model

I note the finding that this recommendation has been implemented. The capacity to support Education Support Teams, Program and Management Reviews is fully operational.

5. Restructure to align administration of the model and school reporting under one executive position

I note the finding that this recommendation has been implemented. The School Accountability and Improvement Directorate has assumed functional responsibility for assessment and reporting and reports to the Deputy Director-General (Schools).

6. Review the role of principals in managing resources

I note the finding that this recommendation has not been implemented. A principal's authority in staffing matters is defined by the conditions in the Industrial Award. Principals currently appoint casual and temporary staff and have flexibility now in the allocation of head teacher positions. Consideration will be given to expanding the principal's role in managing teaching resources in the context of the recommendations of the Review of Teacher Education.

7. Review District Office staffing

I note the finding that this recommendation has been implemented. The report recognises changes to enhance district office resourcing to schools particularly in regard to the establishment of a central Child Protection and Investigations Unit and the appointment of chief education officers in each district.

8. District Superintendents to endorse school targets

I note the finding that this recommendation has been implemented. The report acknowledges that district superintendents now note school targets and support school implementation through district plans.

Ensuring Implementation

The Audit Report acknowledges that a progress report on the implementation of audit recommendations was included in the Department's 2000 Annual Report to Parliament. The audit finds that there were few mechanisms in place to monitor and review the implementation of recommendations and there were no reports on progress to the Director-General, Department of Education and Training or the Minister.

Implementation of the recommendations was managed within the Department's corporate planning functions and through the performance management agreements of senior officers.

The Department will follow the advice of the Audit Office to monitor and report on the progress of implementation.

(signed)

Ken Boston AO

Managing Director TAFE NSW

Director-General Education and Training

Dated: 17 August 2001

The Management of Court Waiting Times (September 1999)

Attorney General's Department

Audit opinion

At the time of the 1999 audit, general agreement had been reached on the various factors which contribute to court delays and reforms were in place to reduce waiting times (the most advanced being the District Court).

Although it is too early to judge the effectiveness of the reforms, both the Supreme Court and the District Court have reported improvements in court waiting times since the 1999 audit.

The Supreme Court and the District Court have implemented most of the recommendations accepted from the 1999 audit. However, progress has not been the same in the Local Court with few changes in practices or performance.

The 1999 audit⁶

The 1999 audit focused on assessing court management practices and how well the New South Wales Supreme Court, District Court and Local Court managed factors which contributed to court waiting times.⁷

In judging the performance of the courts in reducing waiting times, the 1999 audit commented on:

- accountability and responsibility for performance
- the need for better monitoring and reporting on court waiting times
- the importance of reporting performance publicly
- the coordination of strategies to reduce waiting times.

⁶ The 1999 audit followed the preliminary performance audit report, *The Management of Courts* tabled in 1995.

⁷ Court waiting time is a measure of the time taken between the lodgement of a matter and its finalisation.

Findings

1999 audit findings The 1999 audit found that some courts could improve the management of court waiting times through better analysis, use and reporting of data. Not all findings related to all courts and in particular, the District Court had a number of improvements already in place.

Overall, the 1999 audit found that not all courts had established realistic objectives, strategic plans or had clearly defined responsibility for managing court waiting times. And, there had been limited evaluation of the reforms that had been introduced to reduce court delay.

The 1999 audit noted that judicial independence is the centrepiece of any court system and recognised the separate roles and responsibilities of the judicial and administrative components of the courts in improving court waiting times. For this reason, the 1999 audit focussed on the efficient management of court facilities as distinct from judicial process.

The 1999 audit made a number of recommendations in regard to the management of court waiting times such as:

- establishing standard time frames and targets for better identifying the causes of delays
- reporting performance against the time frames and targets
- better defining accountability where it was shared between the court committees and the Attorney General's Department
- improving the quality of strategic plans
- monitoring and reporting progress against strategic plans in reports to the public.

The 1999 audit recognised that the Attorney General's Department and the courts had taken steps to improve court waiting times. However, further improvements were possible through better management, analysis and monitoring of performance data.

Status of the implementation of recommendations

2001 follow-up audit Overall, 93% of the 1999 audit recommendations were accepted by the courts and over half of the recommendations (57%) have since been implemented.

Implementation of the remaining recommendations has commenced but, in a number of cases, the changes have yet to take effect.

Changes since the 1999 audit

In September 1999 the Supreme Court adopted a number of recommendations from its internal review of caseload monitoring and performance measurement. In addition, the Attorney General's Department released a set of model key performance indicators to provide guidance to courts on measures of performance.⁸

The Department has advised that implementation of these key performance indicators is progressing, and results will be available from October 2001.

It is too early to judge whether or not there have been any changes in overall waiting time performance following the 1999 audit. However, both the Supreme Court and the District Court have reported reductions in court waiting times for 2000.⁹

Progress of the implementation of the recommendations is reported on separately for each of the courts.

Progress in the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court is the highest court in NSW. It has unlimited civil jurisdiction and handles criminal and civil matters and appeals.

Since 1999, the number of cases commenced in the Supreme Court has remained static (33,191 in 2000 compared to 33,228 in 1999) while the number of matters finalised has increased (34,191 in 2000 compared to 31,437 in 1999).

In response to the 1999 audit, the Supreme Court accepted four recommendations relating to court waiting times. It did not accept the recommendation relating to publishing a strategic plan.

⁸ Model Key Performance Indicators for NSW Courts L.Glanfield and E.Wright February 2000

⁹ The Supreme Court Annual Review 2000 p.25; The District Court Annual Review 2000 p.26; Attorney General's Department Annual Report 1999-2000.

Table 2: Status of the implementation of recommendations in the Supreme Court		
Recommendation	Status	Changes in practice
Standard times developed to monitor the movement of cases through the court	Partially implemented	Standard time frames have been developed for the duration of criminal trials and criminal and civil appeals. Standard times are not yet in place for civil matters.
Reporting against standards and indicators for key phases	Partially implemented	Key phases identified but Court is unable to report on these.
Reporting progress against strategic plans	Implemented	Strategic direction for Court outlined in Chief Justice's annual address.
Improving accountability for court management	Implemented	Committees established involving key stakeholders to assist the planning and management of administrative matters.
Improving the quality of court plans and making plans publicly available	Not accepted	Not applicable.

Recommendation 1

The 1999 audit recommended that standard time frames be developed to monitor the movement of cases through the Court.

Establishing standard time frames

Standard times frames have been developed for the duration of proceedings for criminal trials and criminal and civil appeals. Standards are not yet in place for civil matters.

The Court advises that its database does not allow the interrogation of historic data on civil matters and therefore the development of appropriate performance standards. This matter should be addressed when the new management information system comes on line, planned for late 2002.

Reviewing standards and targets

The Court advises that its time standards for criminal matters and criminal and civil appeals are based on:

- the results of past performance
- the standards used in other New South Wales courts
- the standards used in courts in other jurisdictions (including courts in Australia, the United Kingdom and New Zealand).

The Chief Justice's Policy and Planning Committee also considered factors outside the Court's control that may impact on performance before finalising the time standards.

The Court advises that its time standards aim to be realistic and achievable but sufficiently challenging so as to improve performance.

The Court advises that 2000 was the first year it had set targets for performance and that it will continue to monitor results and adjust targets where appropriate.

Reporting adjournment rates and cases not reached

The Court has used data on the number of adjourned cases and cases not reached in its civil divisions for several years to monitor the impact of overlisting. The Court reports that criminal trials are given priority over civil trials when the Court is overlisted (only one criminal matter has not been reached in the last two years).

The Court Registry closely monitors the listing of reserve trials and, if reserve trials are not reached, ensures that they are listed (as a matter of priority) at the earliest opportunity.¹⁰

Reporting against standards

The Registry reports monthly to the Court's Policy and Planning Committee on cases (criminal and appeal matters) finalised against the time standards. The Court also reports performance against these standards in its Annual Review.

Recommendation 2

Reporting intermediate stages

The Court has identified key phases (milestones) for monitoring cases through the court process as well as total case duration times but at present is unable to report on all of these. Data for all milestones will not be available until the new management information system comes on line in 2002.

The Court monitors delays in criminal cases and other matters using indicators such as:

- bail listing delays
- time from committal to arraignment
- hearing dates for appeals (for mentions or hearings)
- reserved judgments (time from hearing to delivery of judgment).

¹⁰Reserve criminal trials refers to those cases that are included on the hearing list but are actually standby cases which will only proceed in the event that other cases listed for that day are adjourned.

Recommendation 3

Reporting progress against strategic plans

The 1999 audit recommended that the courts publish their strategic plans and standards of delivery of court services (in charters) and that achievements be reported in the Annual Review.

The Supreme Court does not prepare a strategic plan. Rather, each year the Chief Justice outlines his strategic direction for the Court, including time standards for the disposition of matters, which are adopted by the Policy and Planning Committee for monitoring and reporting purposes.¹¹

Since the 1999 audit, there have been improvements in the quality of information published in the Court's Annual Review with the 2000 edition reporting on progress against the time standards for criminal cases and civil and criminal appeals.

Recommendation 4

Improving accountability

The 1999 audit examined accountability arrangements of the courts in terms of:

- assigning accountability for the management of court processes
- the means by which courts account for their performance to the public.

Accountability for management generally involves both the judiciary and Attorney General's Department using a range of committees with general management responsibilities.

Although the Court was concerned that decisions made by committees may affect court operations and impact on judicial independence, it has established a number of committees involving key stakeholders to assist the planning and management of administrative matters. These committees include representatives from the Department in their membership.

Recommendation 5

The Court did not accept recommendation 5 (publishing strategic plans) as it was not considered appropriate to the Court's operations. Accordingly, this was not reviewed as part of the follow up audit.

¹¹For example, the strategic direction for the Supreme Court for 2001 was outlined in the address by the Honourable JJ Spigelman AC Chief Justice of New South Wales at the Opening of the Law Term Dinner for the NSW Law Society on 29 January 2001.

Overall comment Most of the recommendations accepted from the 1999 audit have been implemented by the Supreme Court and the Court has reported improvements in waiting times since the 1999 audit.

Improvements to the quality and extent of performance information in the Annual Review 2000 have also enhanced the Court's accountability to the public.

Progress in the District Court

The District Court hears most criminal matters (except murder trials) and civil matters (amounts up to \$750,000 and unlimited amounts in motor accident cases or where the parties consent). The Court also deals with appeals from the Local Court and presides over a number of tribunals.

Since 1999, there has been an increase in the number of civil matters handled by the Court (15,070 in 2000 compared to 14,621 in 1999) and a decrease in criminal matters (2,015 in 2000 compared to 2,479 in 1999).

Although many of the suggested improvements in the 1999 audit were already operating in the District Court, the Court accepted all of the recommendations and the implementation of four recommendations is complete.

Table 3: Status of the implementation of recommendations in the District Court		
Recommendation	Status	Changes in practice
Standard times developed to monitor the movement of cases through the court	Implemented	Standard times developed to monitor cases through intermediate stages and report on overall progress.
Reporting against standards and indicators for key phases	Partially implemented	Key phases identified but Court is unable to report performance for all phases.
Reporting progress against strategic plans	Implemented	Annual Review includes a report on achievements against the strategic plan.
Improving accountability for court management	Implemented	Court management committees in place.
Improving the quality of court plans and making plans publicly available	Implemented	Strategic plans are published.

Recommendation 1

Establishing standard times

The 1999 audit found that the District Court had established standards by which to measure not only overall progress of its criminal and civil cases, but also intermediate stages of its civil cases.¹² These standards are used to monitor case movement through the intermediate stages of the Court process and allow the Court to quickly identify the causes of delays and address bottlenecks.

Since the 1999 audit, the Court's Criminal and Civil Business Committees have been responsible for monitoring, reporting and advising on waiting times and ensuring the effective and efficient resolution of civil and criminal matters.

The District Court has developed standards for all intermediate stages in civil cases and some stages in criminal matters (mainly through the control of listing practices).

Reducing waiting times through better listing practices
<p>Rules for listing criminal cases are outlined in various practice notes issued by the Chief Judge of the District Court.</p> <p>For example, criminal matters committed in Sydney need to be listed within 10 days (Practice Note 48). In Sydney West, matters are listed in the District Court on the second Friday following committal (Practice Note 54).</p> <p>At the first appearance before the Court, the judge considers any issues with legal representation. If the accused is ready to enter a plea then a date will be set. If not, the judge sets a date for the formal entering of a plea within eight weeks. On the next occasion a hearing date is set unless plea negotiations have been successful.</p> <p>In any event, the target for trial date is within four months of the committal proceedings.</p>

Source: District Court 2001

Reviewing standards and targets

The District Court advises that its time standards are based on those of the American Bar Association (for civil cases) and standards used in England and Wales for its criminal jurisdictions. The Court's intention was to adopt ideal time standards based on international best practice.

The 1999 audit found that the criminal and civil standards that had been set by the Court had not been widely achieved.

¹²Practice Note 33 and NSW District Court Annual Review 2000

Performance remains below the standard set. For example, in 2000, only 54% of civil cases were finalised within 12 months compared to the standard of 90%.¹³

The Court has made some adjustment to these standards. For example, the standard for commencement of criminal matters to committed for sentence was changed recently from 90% within 2 months to 90% within 3 months.

The Court advises that, having reduced a backlog of cases, it has a better chance of meeting the time standards in crime. In civil matters, increasing caseloads and difficulty in achieving compliance with time standards will be addressed in a forthcoming review.

The Court advises that it will continue to monitor performance in order to identify areas requiring procedural improvement.

Reporting adjournment rates and cases not reached

Since 1999, there has been a reduction of the number of criminal cases not reached.¹⁴ In addition, the Court has implemented recommendations from the *Managing Trial Court Delay* report and have improved practices in regard to:

- relisting of matters which were not reached or adjourned
- monitoring the readiness of cases to proceed to trial
- ensuring adjourned trial matters are referred to the List Judge
- monitoring the age of pending trial caseload.^{15,16}

Reporting against standards

The District Court prepares monthly reports for the Chief Judge and the Civil List Judge on performance against time standards for internal review and to inform management decisions.

Data on performance (statistical reports) form part of the Court's approach to case management.

The Court also provides data to the Attorney General's Department on a monthly basis for reporting on its key performance indicators and reports on performance in its Annual Review.

¹³NSW District Court Annual Review 2000

¹⁴The District Court reported that in Sydney, not reached cases were eliminated in 1999 and in Sydney West, not reached cases have been reduced to 2.5% in 2000. The number of not reached matters in the country has not shown a significant improvement.

¹⁵Response from the District Court to the audit recommendations March 2001

¹⁶Managing Trial Court Delay: An Analysis of Trial Case Processing in the NSW District Criminal Court NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research 2000

Recommendation 2

Reporting intermediate stages

Since 1999, the Court has reported on the commencement and duration of civil and criminal cases.

However, the Court does not have an information management system that can monitor and report on all (intermediate) stages for civil and criminal cases moving through the court system to identify causes of delays and bottlenecks.

In addition, the Court advises that the necessary data would need to be derived from various sources (including the Local Court).

The Court expects that this will be possible with the introduction of a new management information system in 2003.

Recommendation 3

Reporting progress against strategic plans

Since the 1999 audit, the Court has included in its Annual Review a report on achievements against its strategic plan. The Annual Review 2000 also includes reports on performance against the time standards for criminal and civil matters.

Recommendation 4

Improving accountability

The 1999 audit recognised that accountability for management generally involves both the judiciary and the Attorney General's Department and that in most instances, the various court committees make management decisions.

The District Court advises further improvements in clarifying the role of committees and there is now a representative from the Attorney General's Department on all Court management committees.

Recommendation 5

Publishing court plans

The 1999 audit recommended that each court prepare and publish a court plan outlining objectives, strategies, actions, targets, performance indicators, resources, and expected results. Plans should also reflect the operation of the whole of the court system and include judiciary and support functions.

At the time of the 1999 audit, the District Court had prepared and issued its 1995-1999 strategic plan. However, the 1999 audit considered that the plan could more clearly link objectives to strategies and action plans and include measures of success.

The 2000-2003 plan more clearly outlines values, primary goals and the roles and responsibilities of the various committees. More detailed strategies and targets are published in the business plans for the four main committees.

Overall comment **The 1999 audit found the District Court to be the most progressed of the three courts in having systems in place to manage court waiting times.**

The 2001 audit has found that the District Court has continued to refine its strategic and business plans and implement strategies to further improve the management of court waiting times.

Progress in the Local Court

The Local Court deals with criminal matters (those which do not require a jury) and committal hearings, juvenile matters, motor traffic prosecutions, civil actions (amounts up to \$40,000), some family law matters and coronial inquiries.

Of the three courts, the Local Court handles the highest volume of cases (nearly 300,000 in 2000) with sittings in 158 locations across the State.

The number of matters handled by the Court has increased since 1999 with the average time delay increasing by one week.^{17,18}

The Court advises that the main cause for the increase in average delay was the Olympics, during which time police officers were not available to give evidence in hearings before the Court.

As a result, a number of hearings that would normally have been held in August and September 2000 did not proceed until later in the year.

¹⁷The definition of average delay in criminal matters is the time from when the matter is first listed before the Court until the date when the matter is finalised by the Court. In civil matters the time is measured from when the parties indicate to the Court that the matter is ready to proceed to a hearing until the matter is finalised by the Court.

¹⁸Attorney General's Department Annual Report 1999-2000

Implementing the recommendations

Following the 1999 audit, the Local Court accepted all recommendations but as yet, not all changes have taken effect.

The Court advises that it is currently finalising a Strategic Plan for 2002-2005 which will incorporate many of the recommendations from the 1999 audit.

Table 4: Status of the implementation of recommendations in the Local Court		
Recommendation	Status	Changes in practice
Standard times developed to monitor the movement of cases through the court	Partially implemented	Some standards established to monitor the progress of cases.
Reporting against standards and indicators for key phases	Partially implemented	Key phases identified but the Court does not report performance against standards or targets for key phases.
Reporting progress against strategic plans	Implemented	Progress is reported in the Annual Review.
Improving accountability for court management	Implemented	The Court is currently reviewing the role of committees in the management of court processes.
Improving the quality of court plans and making plans publicly available	Partially implemented	There is no current plan available. The Court is preparing the 2002-2005 strategic plan for publication.

Recommendation 1

Establishing standard time frames

There are a number of time standards in place to monitor the progress of cases through the Court system.¹⁹ The time standards have been set for the finalisation and intermediary steps in relation to defended hearings, pleas of guilty and committal proceedings.

¹⁹Local Court Practice Note 1/95. Other practice directions set standards in relation to vacating matters listed for hearings, handling evidence and the service of briefs of evidence in summary offences.

The Court's management information system provides data on the number of matters pending, new matters, sitting times, not reached matters and part heard cases at each Court on a monthly basis. However, the system does not provide data on case adjournment rates (to monitor the impacts of overlisting).

These data, along with average sitting times and delay at each Court, are used by the Chief Magistrate to monitor workloads and allocate resources as required.

The current indicator of waiting time in Local Courts is average delay. The standards for both civil and criminal cases are being reviewed for inclusion in the Strategic Plan for 2002-2005.

The Court reports on the number of matters finalised, matters pending and trends in average delays in its Annual Review. The Court does not report performance against standards or targets for waiting times.

Recommendation 2

Reporting intermediate stages

The Court has a system in place to regulate the movement of cases through the Court system (i.e. standard time frames for case management). However, the Court does not currently have a management information system to adequately monitor and report performance.

Recommendation 3

Reporting progress against strategic plans

The 1999 and 2000 Annual Reviews have included a report on achievements against the strategic plan. The Court advises that it is in the process of reviewing its strategic plan and that progress will be reported in its Annual Review 2002.

Recommendation 4

Improving accountability

The 1999 audit recognised that the various court committees make most management decisions. In the case of the Local Court, most committees have representatives from both the judiciary and the Attorney General's Department.

The Court advises that the current strategic planning exercise is reviewing the role of committees in the management of court processes (including monitoring and advising on court waiting times) and will implement further improvements as required.

Recommendation 5

Publishing court plans

At the time of the 1999 audit, the Local Court had prepared and issued a strategic plan. However, the 1999 audit considered that the plan could be improved by more clearly linking objectives to strategies and including measures of success.

The Court advises that it is preparing a new strategic plan for 2002-2005 that will be publicly available.

Some of the strategies to deal with court delays that have been identified for the 2002-2005 plan are:

- developing uniform case management practices
- controlling and improving listing processes, including the standardisation of processes
- identifying accurate, timely and relevant information for planning, review and resource allocation
- identifying mechanisms to strengthen the partnership between the magistracy and administration.

Overall comment

The implementation of recommendations arising from the 1999 audit has not progressed at the same rate in the Local Court as in the other courts. While it is understood that work is underway on improving strategic planning and identifying time standards, as yet the implementation of some recommendations is incomplete and there are few changes in practices or performance.

Ensuring implementation

Monitoring and reporting on implementation

In response to a request from the Audit Office following the 1999 audit, the Attorney General's Department provided a report on the acceptance and implementation of recommendations for each of the three courts.

Progress on implementation of some audit recommendations is discussed in the six monthly meetings of the Civil and Criminal Justice Forums.

Progress is also reported to the Attorney General and the Premier through six monthly progress reports on the implementation of the Department's Strategic Framework for Court Services 2000-2004.

Public reporting

There was no reference to the audit in the Attorney General's Department Annual Report 1999-2000 that followed the audit.

Response from the Attorney General's Department

Thank you for the opportunity to formally comment on the Follow Up Performance Audit relating to the Performance Audit report on the Management of Court Waiting Times (September 1999).

The New South Wales Attorney General's Department is committed to the effective and efficient delivery of court services in partnership with the judiciary and magistracy.

*A significant improvement in our accountability has been achieved by the implementation of standardised **key performance indicators** (KPIs) based on time standards set by the Courts. Monthly reporting against the KPI's also provides court administrators with an important tool for managing improvements in court waiting times. Using a limited number of statistics directed at measuring key aspects of performance by courts, the KPIs provide a simple, clear and comprehensive picture of how the Courts are performing.*

*The key performance indicators are an integral part of the Department's new **courts administration system**. A customised software package for NSW Courts is expected to be ready for implementation in the Supreme Court in the second half of 2002 and in the District and Local Courts in 2003.*

Among other benefits, the system will provide milestone management and reporting for court cases and vastly improved case management and statistical information and reporting facilities, allowing the courts and the Department to identify reasons for delays, and to plan and manage more effectively the workload and resources of the courts.

The Audit Office has recognised the considerable achievements made by both the Department and the Courts in improving the management of court performance. The 1999 report acknowledged that the Department and the Courts had taken many positive steps to improve court waiting times, and the follow up report notes that further improvements have refined and improved management strategies and enhanced the Courts' accountability to the public.

*As noted in the review, the **Supreme Court** and the **District Court** have implemented most of the recommendations accepted from the 1999 audit.*

As a result of delay reduction strategies adopted over the last few years, both the Supreme and District Courts are making significant improvements in court waiting times. Recent figures compiled in relation to criminal trials by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research show substantial reductions in the time elapsed between committal for trial and trial finalisation in the Supreme and District Courts during the 2 year period from 1 April 1999 to 30 March 2001.

The median time for Supreme Court trial cases where the accused is on bail fell from 21 months in the year ending March 2000 to 14 months in the year ending March 2001 (ie a decrease of 33 per cent). Where the accused is held on remand, the time fell from 14.5 months to 11 months (ie a decrease of 14 per cent).

In the NSW District Criminal Court, the median time for finalising trial cases where the accused is on bail has fallen from 14 months to 10.3 months (ie a drop of 26 per cent). Where the accused is in custody the median time is 6.5 months. In the civil area, the District Court is undertaking a major review of the civil case management practice note in order to more effectively manage the court's expanding civil caseload.

*In relation to the **Local Court**, the Report has, due to its timing, not reflected significant developments recently announced by the Chief Magistrate. The Local Court has now finalised its Strategic Plan for 2002 - 2005 incorporating many of the recommendations raised in the 1999 audit. The plan incorporates time standards for the completion of civil and criminal matters which will soon be adopted, providing clear objectives and measurable outcomes that will allow the work of the Court to be objectively reviewed and evaluated on an ongoing basis.*

New practice notes, detailing case management procedures in both criminal and civil matters, and a guide to best practice standards for magistrates are adopted as part of the Plan. These have the potential to assist in the achievement of the time standards, and equally importantly, to improve the Local Court's uniformity and consistency of court and case management procedures throughout its 158 locations.

The Plan will be reviewed annually by the Chief Magistrate and progress under the Plan will be reported in the Local Court Annual Review. Internally, monthly reports will be provided detailing performance against the time standards.

The Department is committed to ongoing improvement in the management of court waiting times and to reducing court waiting times to meet the time standards.

I would like to thank the Audit Office for its continuing interest in and support for improvement in the management of court waiting times and for the consultative and cooperative manner in which the follow up performance audit was conducted.

(Signed)

*Laurie Glanfield
Director General*

Dated: 21 August 2001

Appendices

Appendix 1 A guide for monitoring and reporting on performance audit recommendations

Following a performance audit, agencies should:

- ✓ Assign responsibility for the implementation of recommendations accepted to a single person or branch
- ✓ Develop an action plan which includes a timetable for implementation and clearly outlines roles and responsibilities for the implementation of each recommendation accepted
- ✓ Include in the plan mechanisms to monitor and report on results against key indicators where they have been identified in the audit
- ✓ Allocate sufficient resources to implement the plan and set realistic and achievable timeframes and targets
- ✓ Have the plan endorsed by the CEO and where appropriate, the Board and the Minister
- ✓ Incorporate the plan in other planning documents such as the corporate plan, business plans or performance agreements
- ✓ Nominate or establish a committee to monitor and report on progress (some agencies use their audit committee or risk management committee to do this)
- ✓ Provide regular reports on the progress of implementation of the recommendations to the CEO and where appropriate, the Board and the Minister
- ✓ Raise staff awareness of the outcomes of the performance audit and invite feedback on how best to implement the recommendations
- ✓ Regularly review and monitor the plan and make amendments, where necessary, to maintain relevance and appropriateness
- ✓ Report progress and actions taken to address issues raised in the performance audit in the annual report (reporting progress each year until implementation is complete).

Appendix 2 **The audit**

Objective Follow-up performance audits examine the extent to which accepted recommendations have been implemented by agencies. Follow-up audits provide Parliament with an assessment of any changes which may have occurred in agencies in response to an earlier performance audit report.

Scope The following reports were covered by the audit:

- ❑ *The School Accountability and Improvement Model* (May 1999)
- ❑ *The Management of Court Waiting Times* (September 1999).

Criteria The following criteria were used to judge changes in practice or performance:

- ❑ the agency has assessed the impact of the recommendations, has determined the course of action, and has implemented accepted recommendations
- ❑ the implementation plan is monitored and reported upon (eg, through the Audit Committee or other monitoring mechanisms)
- ❑ the agency has reported the progress of implementation of accepted recommendations in subsequent agency Annual Reports.

Cost of the audit The cost of the audit was \$98,364. This figure includes the estimated cost of printing the report (\$5,000).

Acknowledgment

The Audit Office gratefully acknowledges the cooperation and assistance provided by representatives of the Attorney General's Department and the Department of Education and Training.

Performance Audits by the Audit Office of New South Wales

Performance Auditing

What are performance audits?

Performance audits are reviews designed to determine how efficiently and effectively an agency is carrying out its functions.

Performance audits may review a government program, all or part of a government agency or consider particular issues which affect the whole public sector.

Where appropriate, performance audits make recommendations for improvements relating to those functions.

Why do we conduct performance audits?

Performance audits provide independent assurance to Parliament and the public that government funds are being spent efficiently and effectively, and in accordance with the law.

They seek to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of government agencies and ensure that the community receives value for money from government services.

Performance audits also assist the accountability process by holding agencies accountable for their performance.

What is the legislative basis for Performance Audits?

The legislative basis for performance audits is contained within the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1983, Division 2A*, (the Act) which differentiates such work from the Office's financial statements audit function.

Performance audits are not entitled to question the merits of policy objectives of the Government.

Who conducts performance audits?

Performance audits are conducted by specialist performance auditors who are drawn from a wide range of professional disciplines.

How do we choose our topics?

Topics for a performance audits are chosen from a variety of sources including:

- ❑ our own research on emerging issues
- ❑ suggestions from Parliamentarians, agency Chief Executive Officers (CEO) and members of the public
- ❑ complaints about waste of public money
- ❑ referrals from Parliament.

Each potential audit topic is considered and evaluated in terms of possible benefits including cost savings, impact and improvements in public administration.

If you wish to find out what performance audits are currently in progress just visit our website at www.audit@nsw.gov.au.

The Audit Office has no jurisdiction over local government and cannot review issues relating to council activities.

How do we conduct performance audits?

Performance audits are conducted in compliance with relevant Australian standards for performance auditing and our procedures are certified under international quality standard ISO 9001.

Our policy is to conduct these audits on a "no surprise" basis.

Operational managers, and where necessary executive officers, are informed of the progress with the audit on a continuous basis.

What are the phases in performance auditing?

Performance audits have three key phases: planning, fieldwork and report writing.

During the planning phase, the audit team will develop audit criteria and define the audit field work.

At the completion of field work an exit interview is held with agency management to discuss all significant matters arising out of the audit. The basis for the exit interview is generally a draft performance audit report.

The exit interview serves to ensure that facts presented in the report are accurate and that recommendations are appropriate. Following the exit interview, a formal draft report is provided to the CEO for comment. The relevant Minister is also provided with a copy of the draft report. The final report, which is tabled in Parliament, includes any comment made by the CEO on the conclusion and the recommendations of the audit.

Depending on the scope of an audit, performance audits can take from several months to a year to complete.

Copies of our performance audit reports can be obtained from our website or by contacting our publications unit.

How do we measure an agency's performance?

During the planning stage of an audit the team develops the audit criteria. These are standards of performance against which an agency is assessed. Criteria may be based on government targets or benchmarks, comparative data, published guidelines, agencies corporate objectives or examples of best practice.

Performance audits look at:

- processes
- results
- costs
- due process and accountability.

Do we check to see if recommendations have been implemented?

Every few years we conduct a follow-up audit of past performance audit reports. These follow-up audits look at the extent to which recommendations have been implemented and whether problems have been addressed.

The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) may also conduct reviews or hold inquiries into matters raised in performance audit reports.

Agencies are also required to report actions taken against each recommendation in their annual report.

To assist agencies to monitor and report on the implementation of recommendations, the Audit Office has prepared a Guide for that purpose. The Guide is on the Internet and located at

<http://www.audit.nsw.gov.au/guides-bp/bpglist.htm>

Who audits the auditors?

Our performance audits are subject to internal and external quality reviews against relevant Australian and international standards.

The PAC is also responsible for overseeing the activities of the Audit Office and conducts reviews of our operations every three years.

Who pays for performance audits?

No fee is charged for performance audits. Our performance audit services are funded by the NSW Parliament and from internal sources.

For further information contact:

The Audit Office of New South Wales

Location	Postal Address
Level 11 234 Sussex Street SYDNEY 2000 Australia	GPO Box 12 SYDNEY NSW 2001 Australia

Telephone	(02) 9285 0155
Facsimile	(02) 9285 0060
Internet	http://www.audit.nsw.gov.au
e-mail	mail@audit.nsw.gov.au

Office Hours	9.00am - 5.00pm Monday to Friday
--------------	-------------------------------------

Tom Jambrich
Assistant Auditor-General
Performance Audit Branch
(02) 9285 0051

Performance Audit Reports

No.	Agency or Issue Examined	Title of Performance Audit Report or Publication	Date Tabled in Parliament or Published
1	Department of Housing	<i>Public Housing Construction: Selected Management Matters</i>	5 December 1991
2	Police Service, Department of Corrective Services, Ambulance Service, Fire Brigades and Others	<i>Training and Development for the State's Disciplined Services: Stream 1 - Training Facilities</i>	24 September 1992
3	Public Servant Housing	<i>Rental and Management Aspects of Public Servant Housing</i>	28 September 1992
4	Police Service	<i>Air Travel Arrangements</i>	8 December 1992
5	Fraud Control	<i>Fraud Control Strategies</i>	15 June 1993
6	HomeFund Program	<i>The Special Audit of the HomeFund Program</i>	17 September 1993
7	State Rail Authority	<i>Countrylink: A Review of Costs, Fare Levels, Concession Fares and CSO Arrangements</i>	10 December 1993
8	Ambulance Service, Fire Brigades	<i>Training and Development for the State's Disciplined Services: Stream 2 - Skills Maintenance Training</i>	13 December 1993
9*	Fraud Control	<i>Fraud Control: Developing an Effective Strategy (Better Practice Guide jointly published with the Office of Public Management, Premier's Department)</i>	30 March 1994
10	Aboriginal Land Council	<i>Statutory Investments and Business Enterprises</i>	31 August 1994
11	Aboriginal Land Claims	<i>Aboriginal Land Claims</i>	31 August 1994
12	Children's Services	<i>Preschool and Long Day Care</i>	10 October 1994
13	Roads and Traffic Authority	<i>Private Participation in the Provision of Public Infrastructure (Accounting Treatments; Sydney Harbour Tunnel; M4 Tollway; M5 Tollway)</i>	17 October 1994
14	Sydney Olympics 2000	<i>Review of Estimates</i>	18 November 1994
15	State Bank	<i>Special Audit Report: Proposed Sale of the State Bank of New South Wales</i>	13 January 1995
16	Roads and Traffic Authority	<i>The M2 Motorway</i>	31 January 1995
17	Department of Courts Administration	<i>Management of the Courts: A Preliminary Report</i>	5 April 1995
18*	Joint Operations in the Education Sector	<i>A Review of Establishment, Management and Effectiveness Issues (including a Guide to Better Practice)</i>	13 September 1995
19	Department of School Education	<i>Effective Utilisation of School Facilities</i>	29 September 1995

No.	Agency or Issue Examined	Title of Performance Audit Report or Publication	Date Tabled in Parliament or Published
20	Luna Park	<i>Luna Park</i>	12 October 1995
21	Government Advertising	<i>Government Advertising</i>	23 November 1995
22	Performance Auditing In NSW	<i>Implementation of Recommendations; and Improving Follow-Up Mechanisms</i>	6 December 1995
23*	Ethnic Affairs Commission	<i>Administration of Grants (including a Guide To Better Practice)</i>	7 December 1995
24	Department of Health	<i>Same Day Admissions</i>	12 December 1995
25	Environment Protection Authority	<i>Management and Regulation of Contaminated Sites: A Preliminary Report</i>	18 December 1995
26	State Rail Authority of NSW	<i>Internal Control</i>	14 May 1996
27	Building Services Corporation	<i>Inquiry into Outstanding Grievances</i>	9 August 1996
28	Newcastle Port Corporation	<i>Protected Disclosure</i>	19 September 1996
29*	Ambulance Service of New South Wales	<i>Charging and Revenue Collection (including a Guide to Better Practice in Debtors Administration)</i>	26 September 1996
30	Department of Public Works and Services	<i>Sale of the State Office Block</i>	17 October 1996
31	State Rail Authority	<i>Tangara Contract Finalisation</i>	19 November 1996
32	NSW Fire Brigades	<i>Fire Prevention</i>	5 December 1996
33	State Rail	<i>Accountability and Internal Review Arrangements at State Rail</i>	19 December 1996
34*	Corporate Credit Cards	<i>The Corporate Credit Card (including Guidelines for the Internal Control of the Corporate Credit Card)</i>	23 January 1997
35	NSW Health Department	<i>Medical Specialists: Rights of Private Practice Arrangements</i>	12 March 1997
36	NSW Agriculture	<i>Review of NSW Agriculture</i>	27 March 1997
37	Redundancy Arrangements	<i>Redundancy Arrangements</i>	17 April 1997
38	NSW Health Department	<i>Immunisation in New South Wales</i>	12 June 1997
39	Corporate Governance	<i>Corporate Governance Volume 1 : In Principle Volume 2 : In Practice</i>	17 June 1997
40	Department of Community Services and Ageing and Disability Department	<i>Large Residential Centres for People with a Disability in New South Wales</i>	26 June 1997
41	The Law Society Council of NSW, the Bar Council, the Legal Services Commissioner	<i>A Review of Activities Funded by the Statutory Interest Account</i>	30 June 1997
42	Roads and Traffic Authority	<i>Review of Eastern Distributor</i>	31 July 1997
43	Department of Public Works and Services	<i>1999-2000 Millennium Date Rollover: Preparedness of the NSW Public Sector</i>	8 December 1997

No.	Agency or Issue Examined	Title of Performance Audit Report or Publication	Date Tabled in Parliament or Published
44	Sydney Showground, Moore Park Trust	<i>Lease to Fox Studios Australia</i>	8 December 1997
45	Department of Public Works and Services	<i>Government Office Accommodation</i>	11 December 1997
46	Department of Housing	<i>Redevelopment Proposal for East Fairfield (Villawood) Estate</i>	29 January 1998
47	NSW Police Service	<i>Police Response to Calls for Assistance</i>	10 March 1998
48	Fraud Control	<i>Status Report on the Implementation of Fraud Control Strategies</i>	25 March 1998
49*	Corporate Governance	<i>On Board: guide to better practice for public sector governing and advisory boards (jointly published with Premier's Department)</i>	7 April 1998
50	Casino Surveillance	<i>Casino Surveillance as undertaken by the Director of Casino Surveillance and the Casino Control Authority</i>	10 June 1998
51	Office of State Revenue	<i>The Levying and Collection of Land Tax</i>	5 August 1998
52	NSW Public Sector	<i>Management of Sickness Absence NSW Public Sector Volume 1: Executive Briefing Volume 2: The Survey - Detailed Findings</i>	27 August 1998
53	NSW Police Service	<i>Police Response to Fraud</i>	14 October 1998
54	Hospital Emergency Departments	<i>Planning Statewide Services</i>	21 October 1998
55	NSW Public Sector	<i>Follow-up of Performance Audits: 1995 - 1997</i>	17 November 1998
56	NSW Health	<i>Management of Research: Infrastructure Grants Program - A Case Study</i>	25 November 1998
57	Rural Fire Service	<i>The Coordination of Bushfire Fighting Activities</i>	2 December 1998
58	Walsh Bay	<i>Review of Walsh Bay</i>	17 December 1998
59	NSW Senior Executive Service	<i>Professionalism and Integrity Volume One: Summary and Research Report Volume Two: Literature Review and Survey Findings</i>	17 December 1998
60	Department of State and Regional Development	<i>Provision of Industry Assistance</i>	21 December 1998
61	The Treasury	<i>Sale of the TAB</i>	23 December 1998
62	The Sydney 2000 Olympic and Paralympic Games	<i>Review of Estimates</i>	14 January 1999
63	Department of Education and Training	<i>The School Accountability and Improvement Model</i>	12 May 1999

No.	Agency or Issue Examined	Title of Performance Audit Report or Publication	Date Tabled in Parliament or Published
64*	Key Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Government-wide Framework</i> • <i>Defining and Measuring Performance (Better practice Principles)</i> • <i>Legal Aid Commission Case Study</i> 	31 August 1999
65	Attorney General's Department	<i>Management of Court Waiting Times</i>	3 September 1999
66	Office of the Protective Commissioner Office of the Public Guardian	<i>Complaints and Review Processes</i>	28 September 1999
67	University of Western Sydney	<i>Administrative Arrangements</i>	17 November 1999
68	NSW Police Service	<i>Enforcement of Street Parking</i>	24 November 1999
69	Roads and Traffic Authority of NSW	<i>Planning for Road Maintenance</i>	1 December 1999
70	NSW Police Service	<i>Staff Rostering, Tasking and Allocation</i>	31 January 2000
71*	Academics' Paid Outside Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Administrative Procedures</i> ▪ <i>Protection of Intellectual Property</i> ▪ <i>Minimum Standard Checklists</i> ▪ <i>Better Practice Examples</i> 	7 February 2000
72	Hospital Emergency Departments	<i>Delivering Services to Patients</i>	15 March 2000
73	Department of Education and Training	<i>Using computers in schools for teaching and learning</i>	7 June 2000
74	Ageing and Disability Department	<i>Group Homes for people with disabilities in NSW</i>	27 June 2000
75	NSW Department of Transport	<i>Management of Road Passenger Transport Regulation</i>	6 September 2000
76	Judging Performance from Annual Reports	<i>Review of eight Agencies' Annual Reports</i>	29 November 2000
77*	Reporting Performance	<i>Better Practice Guide A guide to preparing performance information for annual reports</i>	29 November 2000
78	State Rail Authority (CityRail) State Transit Authority	<i>Fare Evasion on Public Transport</i>	6 December 2000
79	TAFE NSW	<i>Review of Administration</i>	6 February 2001
80	Ambulance Service of New South Wales	<i>Readiness to respond</i>	7 March 2001
81	Department of Housing	<i>Maintenance of Public Housing</i>	11 April 2001
82	Environment Protection Authority	<i>Controlling and Reducing Pollution from Industry</i>	18 April 2001
83	Department of Corrective Services	<i>NSW Correctional Industries</i>	13 June 2001

No.	Agency or Issue Examined	Title of Performance Audit Report or Publication	Date Tabled in Parliament or Published
84	Follow-up of Performance Audits	<i>Police Response to Calls for Assistance The Levying and Collection of Land Tax Coordination of Bushfire Fighting Activities</i>	20 June 2001
85*	Internal Financial Reporting	<i>Internal Financial Reporting including a Better Practice Guide</i>	27 June 2001
86	Follow-up of Performance Audits	<i>The School Accountability and Improvement Model (May 1999) The Management of Court Waiting Times (September 1999)</i>	September 2001

* Better Practice Guides

Performance Audits on our website

A list of performance audits tabled or published since March 1997, as well as those currently in progress, can be found on our website www.audit.nsw.gov.au



THE AUDIT OFFICE MISSION

Assisting Parliament
improve the
accountability and
performance of
the State

For further information please contact:

The Audit Office of New South Wales

Street Address

Level 11
234 Sussex Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000
Australia

Postal Address

GPO Box 12
SYDNEY NSW 2001
Australia

Telephone (02) 9285 0155
Facsimile (02) 9285 0100
Internet <http://www.audit.nsw.gov.au>
e-mail mail@audit.nsw.gov.au

Office Hours: 9.00am - 5.00pm Monday to Friday

Contact Officer: Jane Tebbatt
Principal Performance Auditor
+612 9285 0074

To purchase this Report please contact:

The NSW Government Information Service

Retail Shops

Sydney CBD

Ground Floor
Goodsell Building
Chifley Square
Cnr Elizabeth & Hunter Sts
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Parramatta CBD

Ground Floor
Ferguson Centre
130 George Street
PARRAMATTA NSW 2150

Telephone and Facsimile Orders

Telephone

Callers from Sydney metropolitan area 9743 7200
Callers from other locations within NSW 1800 46 3955
Callers from interstate (02) 9743 7200

Facsimile (02) 9743 7124