

## Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE Supplementary Budget Estimates 2016 - 2017

#### Outcome 1 - Employment

Department of Employment Question No. EMSQ16-001064

Senator Marshall provided in writing.

#### Question

##### Annual Report - Outcome 1 Performance - Job Placements

What is the Department's view about failing to meet 9 of 19 measured targets in the Outcome 1 section of the annual performance statement?

- Why did the Department fail to meet the target for job placements over the year?
- Why did the Department fail to meet the target for proportion of job placements lasting four weeks?
- Why couldn't the Department include a pro-rata version of the data for the cost per employment outcome so there was a "cost per employment outcome" result?
- Isn't failing to even have the cost per employment outcome data available to measure the financial efficiency of the department a failure in itself?

#### Answer

**What is the Department's view about failing to meet 9 of 19 measured targets in the Outcome 1 section of the annual performance statement?**

The Department is committed to transparency and key performance indicators (KPIs) are important in explaining whether programs such as jobactive are meeting their targets. Actual performance has not matched some of the KPIs. This is because actual performance depends on factors that are often beyond the control of the department. In particular, the performance of employment programs is highly subject to economic and labour market conditions.

**Why did the Department fail to meet the target for job placements over the year? Why did the Department fail to meet the target for proportion of job placements lasting four weeks?**

The Department overestimated the proportion of job placements lasting for 4 weeks. This has subsequently been adjusted for the 2016-17 financial year. The longer term outcomes of job placements that last for 12 and 26 weeks have far exceeded the performance targets.

**Why couldn't the Department include a pro-rata version of the data for the cost per employment outcome so there was a "cost per employment outcome" result? Isn't failing to even have the cost per employment outcome data available to measure the financial efficiency of the department a failure in itself?**

The existence of seasonality in cost and job placement data, as well as the transition to jobactive, mean that partial year information is not representative.