

Disability Employment Services – Technical Advisory Group

Minutes of meeting held on Wednesday, 4 November 2009, 9.15am – 4.00pm

Present: Tony Waslin (Chair), Robyn McKenzie, David Thompson, Sally Sinclair, Bec Jackson, Peter Tanner, Jason Mckey, Jenny Kitchen, Greg Hall, Stuart Reidy-Croft, Carl Princehorn, Annette Williams, Nikki Brouwers, Annette Gill, Nic Bolto, Greg Barton, Pauline Disseldorp, Paul Cain (from noon via Livemeet), Kristin Lumley, Joe Dwyer, Alex Kerr, Raymond Lubansky, Cedric Seveque, Alison Durbin, Andy Weiss (Access Economics), Heather Byrne (Probity), John Manthey.

Apologies: Rosemary Wallage, Viv Gugger, Lucy Macali.

Welcome

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.
2. The Chair tabled the minutes for meeting 1 (27th October 2009) of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and the content of the minutes were accepted by the TAG.

Probity

3. The Probity Advisor briefed new TAG members about probity considerations for the meeting and for the operation of the Group. Deed polls were completed and signed by the new members of the group.

Recommendations of the Industry Reference Group

4. Alison Durbin presented the recommendations of the Industry Reference Group (IRG), including the use of a comparative performance mechanism, performance ratings bandwidths and the key performance indicators (apart from KPI 2.8 Ongoing Support which was deferred until noon) and their associated weightings for each Program.
5. Several members of the TAG asked if providers could be given comparative performance data broken down by individual characteristics such as disability type. The Department responded that producing star ratings on the basis of individual characteristics would not be possible, but the TAG would have the opportunity to outline their reporting requirements at a later stage.
6. The TAG discussed whether it was appropriate to have a rolling performance period or whether performance should be based on all performance data since the beginning of the contract. The Chair indicated this would be an issue for consideration at future meetings, noting that the current duration of the deed was relevant.
7. Joe Dwyer presented the IRG recommendations regarding KPI 2.8 (Ongoing Support) later in the meeting, and the reasons why the IRG recommended not including wages and hours as performance measures. This included a discussion on the impact of different labour markets, pay rates, jobs and industries, that sometimes people needed to change employment to better reflect their personal circumstances and the need to streamline administration.
8. The Group discussed the issues surrounding a wages and hours measure. It was agreed the Department would investigate what wages and hours data was to be collected, and how it could be made available to providers and relevant groups. However, it was noted this reporting was expected to occur outside the performance rating methodology, but within the

overall monitoring framework. The Chair indicated that the quality of employment assistance would be addressed through KPI 3 (Quality).

#	Action Item	Responsible	Due Date	Status
1	Investigate how wages and hours data could still be collected outside the performance rating methodology and made available.	Department	Next face to face meeting.	New

9. The TAG discussed the weighting of KPI 2.8 in Program B. It was requested that the Department present more data to the TAG regarding the effect on star ratings of weighting by caseload and whether there are any unintended consequences for providers who have a high ongoing support caseload.

#	Action Item	Responsible	Due Date	Status
2	Present Ongoing Support data to the TAG.	Department	Next face to face meeting	New

Overview of Regression Methodology

10. John Manthey presented an overview of the Job Services Australia star ratings methodology. He explained the six step process of how star ratings are calculated for JSA. It was requested that John Manthey's presentation on star ratings be made available to providers, as part a performance ratings framework education campaign.
11. The Chair indicated that future meetings would discuss provider's reporting needs, the education campaign for providers and the independent variables to be included in the DES regression models.

Key Performance Indicators - measurement definitions

12. TAG members were provided with a draft copy of the DES Performance Measure Definitions. There was a wide ranging discussion of the draft measurement definitions used for the performance measures. The TAG has agreed to the performance measurement definitions for KPIs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7. The remainder of the KPIs will be discussed in future meetings.
13. The Chair indicated the Department would outline how transition clients will be incorporated into the performance model.

#	Action Item	Responsible	Due Date	Status
3	Measurement definitions will be updated to provide information around transition clients.	Department	Next face to face meeting	New

Other Business

14. The Department suggested that the next meeting of the TAG would occur on Monday 9 November 2009 through a LiveMeet. This meeting will continue the discussion of measurement definitions and consider the independent variables to be used in the regression model (as well as any additional variables to be tested).
15. Subject to availability of TAG members, a face to face meeting is scheduled for 25 November 2009 in Melbourne.