
10A SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY ATTACHMENT

Definitions for the descriptors and indicators in this attachment are in Section 10A.3. Unsourced information has been obtained from Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments.

10A.1 Jurisdictions' comments

Commonwealth Government comments

“ The Commonwealth welcomes the second publication of information on service provision for people with a disability in this year's Report. Significant effort has gone into increasing the comparability of the data between jurisdictions. While some concerns remain, progress has been made. It is proposed that the second Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement provide for development of nationally comparable data further strengthening work in this area.

The Commonwealth notes that the scope of this chapter is limited to specialist disability services funded under the Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement and does not fully represent the jurisdiction's contribution to supporting people with a disability. In addition to providing over \$191 million for disability employment services, the Commonwealth contributes over \$306 million in transfer payments to the State and Territory Governments. Combined with funding advocacy services, national information and print disability services, the Continence Aids Assistance Scheme, the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Service, the National Relay Service and Australian Hearing Services, the total Commonwealth contribution in 1996–97 exceeded \$741 million.

It is important to note that the employment services information provided and discussed in this year's Report relates only to open employment services. In 1996–97 open employment services made up 37 per cent of service outlets, compared with 63 per cent of supported employment services. In the same period open employment services handled 58 per cent of employment clients, compared with 42 per cent by supported employment services.

Future reports will have information available on both employment service types to provide a comprehensive picture of employment services. From 1997 the Commonwealth will conduct an annual census of its funded services. The census provides information on a snapshot day basis.

It is also planned to extend the National Information Management System (NIMS) across all employment service types. It is currently used by open employment services only but will also be available to sheltered employment services in the future. NIMS provides data on an ongoing and cumulative basis. It can provide full details about the service during any specified period, in the case of this report a financial year.

”

New South Wales Government comments

“

The NSW Government finds the inclusion of disability data in this report a useful benchmarking exercise, and one which will improve further over time. However at present the data must be treated with caution.

There are inherent dangers in making comparisons across jurisdictions and while the principle of transparency is supported it is difficult to achieve in practice. For example a decision to move from partly funding organisations towards fully funding individual packages in the non-government sector will have an impact on average costs.

Another shortfall in the data is that it relies on averaging the cost to government of places provided. The wide range of individual needs of those receiving services makes averaging of costs a difficult and complex activity.

Further, the introduction of the minimum data set (MDS) has enabled certain comparisons to be made across jurisdictions, but it has also highlighted the need for better quality data on a census basis. NSW is progressively moving towards this goal. However as yet we cannot separate professional and non-accommodation type services from the overall cost in large government residential services and this impacts on average cost per place.

While we support the importance of counting rules for comparability, this should be only a small part of the total analysis. A focus on cost in the absence of measures of quality must be questioned. In this regard our continuing work on ways in which we can achieve a clearer interpretation of the NSW Disability Service Standards is crucial.

The NSW Government's development of a Disability Policy Framework will greatly improve the integration of people with disabilities into the mainstream of our society and over time reduce their reliance on the specialist disability service sector. While this initiative has been broadly welcomed by the community, it will have an adverse affect on this data. Eventually, people receiving services from the disability sector will have higher and more complex support needs and therefore higher comparative costs.

NSW will be reviewing the data from 1994–95 onwards; it is clear though that any conclusions drawn across jurisdictions on the basis of this data must remain questionable.

”

Victoria Government comments

“ Performance indicators for Disability Services were included for the first time in the 1997 Report. The Disability Services Working Group has focused on improving the comparability of indicators presented in this Chapter, rather than developing an additional suite of indicators to compare and contrast States' performance. Victoria supports this as an appropriate interim step given the status of the development of the Disability indicators.

Victoria recognises problems with data consistency and comparability across jurisdictions. The Working Group has endeavoured to ensure that the data reported in this Chapter represents an improvement on that presented in the 1997 Report.

However, any reader of the Chapter would acknowledge that:

- there is a range of other services provided to people with disabilities for which performance data is not reported; and
- the Chapter does not provide any indicators on service quality or client satisfaction.

Victoria (and the Working Group) will need to re-examine these issues with a focus on: improving data comparability across existing indicators; expanding the range of performance indicators; and reporting on indicators that ensure the 'voice' of consumers is heard in the Chapter.

Revisions to counting rules for this Report have had a significant effect on the Victorian administration costs. Victoria has moved to full cost apportionment for service outputs for the 1997–98 financial year. This has particularly impacted on the way that corporate costs are treated within the total Disability Budget. The Victorian administrative overheads now reflect this total cost approach, and administrative cost figures for 1994–95 and 1995–96 have been adjusted on the basis of 1997–98 corporate support costs.

Victoria has continued with efforts to refine service specifications, develop output indicators, and to ensure its purchasing framework is transparent. These directions will enhance the capacity of the state to provide accurate, comparative service and output data which will provide the basis for ongoing consistent reporting.

”

Queensland Government comments

“ Queensland again recognises the value of this chapter in the Report as a further small step towards nationally comparable data on disability services. However there still remains considerable reservations in relation to some of the data presented particularly in relation to comparability across states and territories. The additional information on expenditure by service type is welcomed but the major difference still remains as to what should be counted in the CSDA base.

The provision of performance indicators for accommodating and employment services only provides a limited picture of service provision for individuals. To try to indicate the extensive range of services provided to people with disabilities across the Government Sector, the Queensland Government issued in 1997–98 a Disability Budget Statement. This highlighted all estimated expenditure by Queensland Government Departments on services for people with disabilities.

The establishment of an Inter-Departmental Committee (IDC) under the chair of the Department of Premier and Cabinet will coordinate the development of a framework in relation to disability issues.

The Disability program is considering a number of reforms that will result in a more coordinated disability sector. The reforms will focus on the way both government and non-government services are funded and delivered. The reforms of output based funding, improved quality assurance mechanisms, establishing a statewide vacancy coordination system and a common client assessment system will ensure a more equitable, more effective system and provide essential data and information to aid further planning.

Queensland continues to develop and implement more appropriate service delivery models including the new Moving Ahead Program which provides support services for young school leavers with complex support needs for two years.

The publication of data on the disability service system can only strengthen accountability to clients. Further work must be undertaken to improve data collection on all service types to provide a more comprehensive picture of services to people with disabilities.”

Western Australia Government comments

“ WA supports continued efforts to develop nationally consistent performance indicators on the efficiency and effectiveness of disability services.

While acknowledging the work that has been done to improve the material presented in the 1998 Report, WA continues to have strong reservations about the validity, reliability and consistency of the data which underpin the indicators contained in the Report. Concerns have also been raised by the AIHW to the National Community Services Information Management Group.

The problems with the data place major limitations on comparisons that can be made between jurisdictions and on the interpretation of trends over time. The difficulties can be illustrated by Figure 10.6 which shows an apparent reduction in the proportion of the population using accommodation services in WA between 1995 and 1996. However, significant improvements in the accuracy of data in 1996 mean that the two years are not directly comparable.

In fact, in WA in 1996–97, 177 new accommodation places have been created with \$6.19m growth in funding as part of a five year plan which will see an additional \$40.4m for disability services, including \$14.3m for accommodation.

Improvements in the accuracy of data collected on accommodation has also affected the indicator in Figure 10.18.

More broadly, it is important to note that differences in effectiveness and efficiency indicators between jurisdictions may also reflect a complex range of factors including differences in the nature and composition of services falling within the Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement, differences in the composition of client groups and support needs, differences in the level of service provision by the non-government sector and differences in the availability of services which are substitutable for accommodation.

In WA, accommodation services are complemented by a strong individual and family support program, and a pro-active approach to improving access to mainstream services and facilities provided by State and Local Government and the private sector. These impact on the demand for and cost of accommodation services and on the characteristics of clients receiving accommodation support.

The process of deriving nationally consistent performance indicators for disability services is in its early stages. The establishment of an agreed conceptual framework has been a significant advance. The challenge for the future will be to improve the quality and consistency of the data and our understanding of the factors which underlie and explain the indicators.”

South Australia Government comments

“

South Australia supports the continuing efforts of the Industry Commission and other states and territories to provide consistent data reflecting the efficiency and effectiveness of disability services at a national level. While the data contained in this publication is a clear improvement on the 1997 Report, its inherent quality and scope demonstrates a need for caution in its application. The process of determining a full range of sound indicators, developing appropriate and consistent definitions and collecting data require further development before the data can be used in an unqualified way.

This task will require substantial effort particularly in overcoming the impact of the different policy, structural and service delivery programs that exist between the jurisdictions. For example, in the absence of institutional accommodation options in the NT, there was a reliance on SA institutions to provide such forms of accommodation until NT clients were repatriated in the mid 1990's. This historical context clearly underpins the current differences in the respective levels and costs of service provision and accordingly needs to be recognised in interpreting data.

As reported in the 1997 Report, the SA disability sector is in the process of a major structural reform of the service system. This involves the introduction of a new approach designed to achieve an equitable and coordinated process for assessing the support needs of consumers, developing support plans based upon individual needs, identifying service inputs and client outcomes and attaching resources to these plans.

As part of this reform, a comprehensive information system is being developed. This system will be capable of capturing appropriate client characteristic information, service provision and outcomes at both the individual and aggregate level. The system will assist in improving knowledge of the relationship between unit costs and complexity of activity limitation. The capacity to integrate information on client status, inputs, service outputs and client outcomes will do much to overcome the deficits of the current data collection approaches. Accordingly, the introduction of this system will greatly improve the consistency and quality of SA's contribution to subsequent national collections.

”

Tasmania Government comments

“ This is the second year that service provision for people with a disability has been included in the Report on Government Service Provision. Some of the difficulties in obtaining comparable data and the parameters of the application of that data across jurisdictions have been addressed or are in the process of being addressed. The resulting increased quality and reliability of the data, particularly the efficiency indicators, has enabled comparisons and evaluations to be based on more consistent and coherent information.

In Tasmania, the Department of Community and Health Services has undergone a major Review which has resulted in a restructure on a statewide model. For Disability Services this has entailed a more streamlined management and accountability framework which should result in increased consistency of service delivery levels and standards of service provision.

Tasmania is also progressing the closure of the major institution for people with intellectual disability, Willow Court Centre. A strategic plan has been endorsed which will see the relocation of all remaining clients to community-based accommodation options by the year 1999. The relocation and closure will represent a major achievement in our efforts to ensure that all clients are accommodated in the least restrictive community-based options.

The emphasis in community-based service delivery will be on a significant shift, through current Service Agreements with service providers, from measuring inputs, throughputs and outputs and translating these into reliable measures of service quality and quality of life improvements for clients. In this context we are acutely aware of the current lack of quantitative information available for indicators in this area and note the possibility for further work being undertaken, such as a client satisfaction survey, on a national level.

If reliable quantitative indicators can be developed the emphasis for measuring service effectiveness will shift from cost, price or general activity or output measures to standards, quality and satisfaction of clients. In Tasmania this proposed shift of emphasis will be part of a broader focus in disability services on ensuring that service provision is responsive to actual client need and results in an actual improvement in the quality of life experienced by the client group.

”

Australian Capital Territory Government comments

“ The ACT is unique in a number of aspects in contrast to other states and territories. Given the size of the ACT, its largely urban population and the need to provide a comprehensive range of services at a comparatively low volume, economies of scale are difficult to achieve.

It is important to note that the development of indicators for the provision of service to people with disabilities is still at an early stage and therefore comparisons across jurisdictions should be interpreted with caution. While the ACT did not participate in the 1996 Commonwealth State Disability Agreement Minimum Data Collection it is expected, that in terms of the characteristics of users of services, there would have been little change from the previous year.

In relation to the data on Commonwealth funded employment services included in the chapter it is of concern to the ACT the only data relating to open employment services has been reported on. As this amounts to only one third of all employment services it fails to give a true picture in each jurisdiction.

ACT funded services for people with disabilities have been undergoing significant reform and redevelopment over the past twelve months. This process has focussed on improving the quality of services through a stronger client commitment, individual planning, improved complaints processes and the development of new policies and procedures to guide service delivery. In addition there have been significant efficiency gains through the implementation of better management and industrial relations practices. This process of reform will continue.

One impact of these reforms is the significant reduction in the cost of providing community-based accommodation that has taken place over the past three years.

The reform process also will be driven by the implementation of service purchasing arrangements and the introduction, over time, of contestability between service providers and an increased focus on individualised funding arrangements.”

Northern Territory Government comments

“ The NT acknowledges that the section on services for people with disabilities provides better and more comprehensive data than the last Report.

However, the NT contends the comprehensiveness of data from both ABS Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers and CSDA Minimum Data Set snapshot, the two main source of data in the report. The NT is of the view that both these sources understate the level of Aboriginal disability in the NT.

Due to small sample size of the NT component of the ABS Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers (1993), the prevalence of disability estimated in the report is subject to high standard errors. It is essential that any data of this type must be standardised in age, sex and social composition.

As for the CSDA, most of the services in the NT are urban based and although data shows a relatively higher proportion of Aboriginal clients, it misses the majority of Indigenous people with disabilities who life in remote communities where there are no disability services.

In conclusion, the NT Government welcomes the Commission's efforts in improving the contents of this report and will continue to cooperatively contribute towards the development of a comprehensive national reporting for disability services.

The picture is still incomplete as services provided by individual jurisdictions such as equipment, rehabilitation and transport are not covered. ”

10A.2 All jurisdictions' data

10A.2.1 Descriptors

Table 10A.1: Severity of handicap by jurisdiction, 1993 ('000)

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT^a</i>	<i>NT^{a,b}</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Moderate to no handicap ^c	769.4	639.8	450.3	242.7	235.1	65.6	36.1	16.6	2 455.7
Severe handicap	98.9	74.0	59.4	28.6	23.6	8.7	5.6	2.5	301.1
Profound handicap	147.3	104.2	72.5	33.8	42.1	13.0	5.4	1.6	419.9
Total population aged 5 to 64 years	4 863.2	3 613.2	2 604.2	1 401.7	1 171.2	379.3	257.6	148.8	14 441.6

a Estimates for jurisdictions with smaller populations should be interpreted with caution because of small sample sizes.

b Data from the NT did not include remote areas.

c 'Moderate to no handicap' included moderate handicap, mild handicap, disability with no handicap and handicap status undetermined.

Sources: ABS Cat. No 4430.0; ABS Cat. No 3201.0

Table 10A.2: Area of handicap by jurisdiction, 1993 ('000)^a

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA^b</i>	<i>SA^b</i>	<i>Tas^b</i>	<i>ACT^b</i>	<i>NT^{b,c}</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Self-care handicap	312.1	247.9	173.7	98.6	106.2	30.2	15.7	5.2	989.5
Mobility handicap	602.1	470.8	315.4	167.0	185.3	50.9	24.3	11.6	1 827.5
Communication handicap	160.9	133.7	77.6	42.0	43.3	12.9	6.7	2.1	479.1
Schooling handicap	49.2	37.0	29.5	19.7	15.3	4.3	3.9	0.5	159.4
Employment handicap	472.0	375.6	283.1	141.4	150.5	46.1	19.9	9.3	1 497.9
Persons aged less than five years with a handicap	17.0	14.7	10.6	6.2	4.4	2.0	0.9	0.6	56.4
Total population aged 5 to 64 years	4 863.2	3 613.2	2 604.2	1 401.7	1 171.2	379.3	257.6	148.8	14 441.6

a The total may be less than the sum of the components as persons may have more than one area of handicap.

b Estimates for jurisdictions with smaller populations should be interpreted with caution because of small sample sizes.

c Data from the NT did not include remote areas.

Sources: ABS Cat. No 4430.0; ABS Cat. No 3201.0

Table 10A.3: People with a disability: living arrangements by type of impairment, 1993 (per cent)^a

<i>Impairment type</i>	<i>Living with relatives in a household</i>	<i>Living alone in a household</i>	<i>Living with people other than relatives in a household</i>	<i>Living in an establishment^b</i>
Sensory ^c	85.8	9.1	5.1	na
Intellectual only ^d	90.2	4.6	3.7	1.5
Physical only ^e	82.3	12.1	5.3	0.3
Psychological only ^f	82.3	12.3	4.4	1.0
Sensory and physical	79.8	17.5	2.6	0.1
Psychological and physical	78.8	14.3	4.4	2.5
Other dual impairments	73.5	15.7	4.2	6.6
Three or more impairments	62.5	16.3	8.3	12.9
Other ^g	91.0	5.4	3.5	0.1

a People with a disability under age 60 years.

b An 'establishment' is defined as hospitals, nursing homes, hostels, retirement villages and other 'homes'.

c 'Sensory' referred to loss of sight or hearing.

d 'Intellectual' covered 'slow learning or understanding'.

e 'Physical' included incomplete use of limbs, restrictions in physical activity, difficulty with gripping, brain damage or a deformity where the person did not indicate another type of impairment.

f 'Psychological' included nervous or emotional conditions, treatment for mental illness and fits or loss of consciousness.

g 'Other' included other conditions and those with a speech loss only.

Source: ABS Cat. No 4433.0

Table 10A.4: People with a disability: main provider of help by activity assisted, 1993 (per cent)

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Informal help^a</i>	<i>Formal help^b</i>	<i>No provider of assistance</i>
Self-care	85.3	8.9	5.8
Mobility	85.3	4.9	9.7
Verbal communication	69.9	6.9	23.2
Health care	50.4	42.1	7.6
Home help	65.8	19.3	14.9
Home maintenance	69.9	22.8	7.3
Meal preparation	78.4	9.2	12.5
Personal affairs	88.3	5.0	6.8
Transport	84.4	8.6	6.9

a 'Informal help' includes help from relatives, partners, friends or neighbours.

b 'Formal help' includes help from home care/home help/council handyperson, community/home nursing, privately arranged help/commercially provided service, meals on wheels (only for help with meal preparation), voluntary community assistance scheme, physiotherapy, chiropody, podiatry, speech therapy (only verbal communication handicap) and other formal help.

Source: ABS Cat. No 4430.0

Table 10A.5: Clients of government and non-government CSDA services by type of service, 1996 (number)^a

	NSW	Vic	Qld ^b	WA ^c	SA	Tas	ACT ^d	NT	Aust ^d
<i>People using state and territory government funded or provided CSDA services</i>									
Accommodation support									
Government	2 891	3 557	962	1 126	727	116	na	0	9 379
Non-government	2 976	2 284	2 035	1 096	1 221	504	na	143	10 259
Organisation not stated	0	0	0	1	0	0	na	0	1
Community support									
Government	1 996	971	1 423	5 997	551	95	na	6	11 039
Non-government	1 324	2 119	398	6 848	792	137	na	26	11 644
Organisation not stated	0	0	5	9	0	0	na	0	6
Community access									
Government	1 295	393	69	589	70	165	na	0	2 581
Non-government	1 594	4 030	1 136	1 468	288	341	na	50	8 907
Organisation not stated	0	0	0	1	0	0	na	0	1
Respite									
Government	240	163	175	464	4	35	na	0	1 081
Non-government	279	239	236	1 182	66	39	na	38	2 079
Organisation not stated	0	0	0	0	0	0	na	0	0
Other/not stated									
Government	0	16	0	0	0	0	na	0	16
Non-government	0	0	0	0	0	0	na	0	0
Organisation not stated	0	46	0	159	0	0	na	0	205
<i>People using Commonwealth Government funded or provided CSDA services</i>									
Employment services ^e									
Government	0	73	148	0	0	0	0	0	221
Non-government	4 176	5 025	3 417	1 901	658	270	49	88	15 584
Organisation not stated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

na not available

a An individual may have been counted more than once if more than one services type was accessed on the day of the survey. Data excluded psychiatric services.

b Data on the 'Intellectual Disability Service' services funded by Queensland were collected over a fortnightly period.

c Data for recipients of CSDA services funded by WA cover the 12 month period 1996-97 and have been adjusted for multiple use of services.

d 1996 CSDA minimum data set excluded ACT data.

e Included only open employment services. A small number of Commonwealth funded services are auspiced by State, Territory and Local Governments.

Source: Black *et al* 1997

Table 10A.6: Nominal Government expenditure under the CSDA by service type, 1994–95, 1995–96 and 1996–97 (\$'000)^a

	Cwth	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Accommodation Support										
1994–95	2 051 ^b	na	209 854	79 434 ^c	79 423	na	30 435	na	na	na
1995–96	181 ^b	na	251 384	91 645 ^c	83 791	87 140	31 305	na	na	na
1996–97	0	303 378 ^c	264 330	97 556 ^c	93 578	87 398	35 211	15 987	5 946	903 383
Community Support										
1994–95	11 003	na	33 140	17 810 ^d	2 575	na	3 443	na	na	na
1995–96	11 656	na	47 165	19 479 ^d	2 551	16 325	4 534	na	na	na
1996–97	11 610	54 402	51 329	23 198 ^d	3 583	20 275	4 453	1 801	1 697	172 348
Community Access										
1994–95	549	na	54 159	8 327 ^d	8 237	na	3 344	na	na	na
1995–96	147	na	52 418	11 363 ^d	8 976	6 284	5 914	na	na	na
1996–97	355	45 461	65 922	13 681 ^d	10 723	5 786	5 964	898	1 480	150 270
Respite Services										
1994–95	0	na	6 286	9 741 ^c	10 759 ^e	na	1 831	na	na	na
1995–96	0	na	19 237	11 484 ^c	11 181 ^e	4 858	2 772	na	na	na
1996–97	0	21 566	19 070	14 240 ^c	13 978 ^e	4 556	3 209	1 759	929	79 308
Employment Services										
1994–95	172 993	na	0	0	0	na	0	na	na	172 993
1995–96	181 563	na	0	0	0	0	0	na	na	181 563
1996–97	191 054	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	191 064

(cont.)

Table 10A.6: Nominal Government expenditure under the CSDA by service type, 1994–95, 1995–96 and 1996–97 (\$'000) (cont.)

	<i>Cwth</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Other Support Services										
1994–95	9 225	na	12 980	409	765	na	44	na	na	na
1995–96	8 917	na	14 004	993	890	896	70	na	na	na
1996–97	4 896	2 856	9 178	1 473	836	1 002	65	21	12	20 339
Other										
1994–95	6 112	na	9 165	0	12 331	na	297	na	na	na
1995–96	4 747	na	13 976	0	13 449	5 672	451	na	na	na
1996–97	5 794	14 437	11 621	0	16 517	5 936	515	44	0	54 863
Administration expenditure										
1994–95	16 436	20 770	45 801	18 966	8 794	2 545	7 634	765	395	122 104
1995–96	16 972	na	42 438	27 375	9 575	3 361	8 029	1 032	407	na
1996–97	18 074	28 895	45 275	26 962	10 805	3 578	9 297	1 384	579	144 849
Total expenditure on CSDA services										
1994–95	218 370	326 371	371 385	134 685	122 884	124 009	47 781	16 200	9 998	1 371 681
1995–96	224 183	395 397	440 622	162 340	130 411	127 466	52 761	18 200	10 413	1 561 792
1996–97	231 783	456 404	466 725	177 110	150 021	131 587	58 562	20 175	10 643	1 703 010

na not available

a Related only to services for which a jurisdiction had a direct responsibility.

b Accommodation expenditure in 1994–95 and 1995–96 related to services which have since been transferred from the Commonwealth to State and Territory Governments.

c 'Respite' was separated from 'accommodation support' based on the approximate proportion of time spent on respite in each departmental area office.

d Residential Program Officers were not separately costed by the department. Therefore, 'community access' was overstated and 'community support' was understated by the same amount (considered to be an insignificant amount).

e Expenditure identified also included 'family support' as costs in relation to 'respite' were unable to be separated.

Table 10A.7: Real Government expenditure under the CSDA by service type, 1994–95, 1995–96 and 1996–97 (in 1996–97 dollars '000)

	Cwth	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Accommodation Support										
1994–95	2 147 ^a	na	219 742	83 177 ^b	83 166	na	31 869	na	na	na
1995–96	184 ^a	na	255 731	93 230 ^b	85 240	88 647	31 846	na	na	na
1996–97	0	303 378 ^b	264 330	97 556 ^b	93 578	87 398	35 211	15 987	5 946	905 745
Community Support										
1994–95	11 522	na	34 702	18 649 ^c	2 697	na	3 606	na	na	na
1995–96	11 857	na	47 981	19 816 ^c	2 595	16 608	4 613	na	na	na
1996–97	11 610	54 402	51 329	23 198 ^c	3 583	20 275	4 453	1 801	1 697	169 990
Community Access										
1994–95	575	na	56 711	8 719 ^c	8 625	na	3 501	na	na	na
1995–96	150	na	53 325	11 560 ^c	9 131	6 392	6 017	na	na	na
1996–97	355	45 461	65 922	13 681 ^c	10 723	5 786	5 964	898	1 480	150 270
Respite Services										
1994–95	0	na	6 582	10 200 ^b	11 266 ^d	na	1 917	na	na	na
1995–96	0	na	19 570	11 683 ^b	11 374 ^d	4 942	2 820	na	na	na
1996–97	0	21 566	19 070	14 240 ^b	13 978 ^d	4 556	3 209	1 759	929	79 308
Employment Services										
1994–95	181 145	na	0	0	0	na	0	na	na	na
1995–96	184 703	na	0	0	0	0	0	na	na	na
1996–97	191 054	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	191 064

(cont.)

Table 10A.7: Real Government expenditure under the CSDA by service type, 1994–95, 1995–96 and 1996–97 (in 1996–97 dollars '000) (cont.)

	<i>Cwth</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Other Support Services										
1994–95	9 660	na	13 591	428	801	na	46	na	na	na
1995–96	9 071	na	14 246	1 010	905	912	71	na	na	na
1996–97	4 896	2 856	11 621	1 473	836	1 002	65	21	12	20 339
Other										
1994–95	6 400	na	9 597	0	12 912	na	311	na	na	na
1995–96	4 829	na	14 218	0	13 681	5 770	459	na	na	na
1996–97	5 794	14 437	7 704	0	16 517	5 936	515	44	0	54 863
Administration expenditure										
1994–95	17 211	21 749	47 959	19 859	9 208	2 665	7 993	801	413	127 858
1995–96	17 266	na	43 171	27 849	9 741	3 419	8 168	1 050	414	na
1996–97	18 074	28 896	45 275	26 962	10 805	3 578	9 297	1 384	579	144 849
Total expenditure on CSDA services										
1994–95	228 659	341 750	388 885	141 032	128 674	129 852	50 032	16 963	10 469	1 436 315
1995–96	228 059	402 235	448 242	165 148	132 666	129 671	53 673	18 515	10 593	1 588 803
1996–97	231 782	456 404	466 725	177 110	150 021	131 587	58 562	20 175	10 643	1 703 010

na not available

For notes refer to Table 10A.6.

10A.2.2 Effectiveness

Outcomes

Table 10A.8: Accommodation clients receiving community-based care or support, 1995 and 1996 (per cent)^a

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i> ^b	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i> ^c	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>Proportion receiving community-based care or support</i>									
1995	51.3	64.2	79.6	60.3	42.7	54.4	92.0	100.0	57.4
1996	54.0	77.0	77.1	66.0	46.5	54.4	na	100.0	61.9

na not available

a 'Community-based care or support' included group homes, attendant care, outreach/other 'in-home'/drop-in support, alternative family placement and other accommodation. An individual may have been counted more than once if more than one services type was accessed on the 'snapshot' day. Data excluded psychiatric services.

b Data for recipients of CSDA services funded by WA cover a 12 month period and have been adjusted for multiple use of services.

c 1996 CSDA minimum data set excluded ACT data.

Sources: Black *et al* 1997; Madden *et al* 1997

Table 10A.9: Employment rates for people with a disability and the total population, 1993 (per cent)^a

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i> ^b	<i>Tas</i> ^b	<i>ACT</i> ^b	<i>NT</i> ^b	<i>Aust</i>
<i>Employment rate</i>									
People with a disability aged 15 to 64	82.5	82.1	78.7	84.9	83.4	82.8	91.4	82.8	82.2
General population aged 15 to 64	89.5	87.8	89.5	91.0	90.0	86.8	93.1	92.3	89.3

a There were differences between the two surveys (ABS survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers; ABS Labour Force Survey, Australia) in the sample size, the scope of the rules applied and the complexity of the questions used to determine labour force status.

b Estimates for smaller jurisdictions should be interpreted with caution because of small sample sizes.

Sources: ABS Cat. No 4430.0; ABS Cat. No 6203.0

Quality

No comparable data.

Access

Table 10A.10: Proportion of the estimated potential population using accommodation support services, 1995 and 1996 (per cent)^a

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i> ^b	<i>WA</i> ^c	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i> ^d	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i> ^d
1995	4.4	6.0	4.4	6.0	6.8	6.7	3.9	2.3	5.2
1996	4.5	6.2	4.2	5.8	6.3	6.1	na	3.0	5.1

na not available

a An individual may be counted more than once if more than one services type was accessed on the 'snapshot' day. Data excluded psychiatric services. Data was adjusted to account for the assumption of differing disability rates amongst the indigenous population across jurisdictions.

b Data on the 'Intellectual Disability Service' services funded by Queensland were collected over a fortnightly period.

c Data for recipients of CSDA services funded by WA cover a 12 month period and have been adjusted for multiple use of services.

d 1996 CSDA minimum data set excludes ACT data.

Sources: Black *et al* 1997; Madden *et al* 1997

Table 10A.11: Proportion of the estimated potential population using open employment services, 1996 (per cent)^a

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
1996	6.2	10.2	9.3	9.2	4.1	5.3	1.2	3.4	7.7

a Included only open employment services. An individual may have been counted more than once if more than one service type was accessed on the 'snapshot' day. Data excluded psychiatric services. Data were adjusted to account for the assumption of differing disability rates amongst the indigenous population across jurisdictions.

Source: Black *et al* 1997

Table 10A.12: Users of accommodation services by handicap status, 1996^a

	<i>Units</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld^b</i>	<i>WA^c</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT^d</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust^d</i>
Moderate to no handicap	No	260	179	389	145	83	43	na	7	1 106
% of all handicap	%	4.5	3.9	13.1	6.7	4.3	7.0	na	4.9	6.0
Severe handicap	No	2 102	1 918	1 163	983	847	252	na	53	7 318
% of all handicap	%	36.0	41.3	39.1	45.7	43.6	40.7	na	37.1	40.0
Profound handicap	No	3 482	2 545	1 422	1 022	1 013	324	na	83	9 891
% of all handicap	%	59.6	54.8	47.8	47.5	52.1	52.3	na	58.0	54.0
All handicap	No	5 844	4 642	2 974	2 150	1 943	619	na	143	18 315

na not available

a An individual may be counted more than once if more than one services type was accessed on the 'snapshot' day. Data excludes psychiatric services. Data was adjusted to account for the assumption of differing disability rates amongst the indigenous population across jurisdictions.

b 'Intellectual Disability Service' services funded by Queensland cover a fortnightly period.

c Data for recipients of CSDA services funded by WA cover a 12 month period and have been adjusted for multiple use of services.

d 1996 CSDA minimum data set excluded ACT data.

Source: Black *et al* 1997

Table 10A.13: Users of open employment services by handicap status, 1996^a

	<i>Units</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Moderate to no handicap	No	2 040	1 800	1 124	396	135	210	0	43	5 748
% of all handicap	%	48.9	35.3	31.5	20.8	20.5	77.8	0.0	48.9	36.4
Severe handicap	No	1 895	2 767	1 818	1 211	485	41	21	44	8 282
% of all handicap	%	45.4	54.3	51.0	63.7	73.7	15.2	42.9	50.0	52.4
Profound handicap	No	241	531	623	294	38	19	28	1	1 775
% of all handicap	%	5.8	10.4	17.5	15.5	5.8	7.0	57.1	1.1	11.2
All handicap	No	4 176	5 098	3 565	1 901	658	270	49	88	15 805

a Included only open employment services. An individual may have been counted more than once if more than one service type was accessed on the 'snapshot' day. Data excluded psychiatric services. Data were adjusted to account for the assumption of differing disability rates amongst the indigenous population across jurisdictions.

Source: Black *et al* 1997

Table 10A.14: Proportion of people from special needs groups and all people using accommodation support services, 1996^a

	<i>Units</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld^b</i>	<i>WA^c</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT^d</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Proportion of indigenous people using accommodation support services	per 1000 indigenous population	1.19	0.91	0.79	1.73	1.45	0.42	na	1.29	1.13
Proportion of the general population using accommodation support services	per 1000 total Australian population ^e	1.07	1.14	0.46	1.17	1.53	1.45	na	0.81	1.01
Proportion of culturally and linguistically diverse people using accommodation support services	per 1000 culturally and linguistically diverse population	0.16	0.18	0.15	0.48	0.38	0.77	na	0.49	0.21
Proportion of the general population using accommodation support services	per 1000 total Australian population ^f	1.15	1.24	0.65	1.44	1.62	1.58	na	0.84	1.13

na not available

a An individual may have been counted more than once if more than one services type was accessed on the 'snapshot' day. Data excluded psychiatric services.

b 'Intellectual Disability Service' services funded by Queensland cover a fortnightly period.

c Data for recipients of CSDA services funded by WA cover a 12 month period and have been adjusted for multiple use of services.

d 1996 CSDA minimum data set excluded ACT data.

e For the purpose of comparing use by the general population with use by indigenous people, the general users excluded recipients whose indigenous origin was 'not known' or 'not stated'.

f For the purpose of comparing use by the general population with use by culturally or linguistically diverse people, the general users excluded recipients whose cultural or linguistic origin was 'not known' or 'not stated'.

Source: Black *et al* 1997

Table 10A.15: Proportion of people from special needs groups and all people using open employment services, 1996^a

	<i>Units</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Proportion of indigenous people using open employment services	per 1000 indigenous population	1.23	4.80	2.49	1.94	0.73	0.48	na	0.31	1.69
Proportion of the general population using open employment services	per 1000 total Australian population ^b	0.89	1.52	1.53	1.53	0.68	0.70	0.22	0.69	1.19
Proportion of culturally and linguistically diverse people using open employment services	per 1000 culturally and linguistically diverse population	0.31	0.66	0.45	0.50	0.21	0.15	na	0.77	0.44
Proportion of the general population using open employment services	per 1000 total Australian population ^c	1.03	1.78	1.66	1.61	0.72	0.93	0.24	0.71	1.34

na not available

a Included only open employment services. An individual may have been counted more than once if more than one services type was accessed on the 'snapshot' day. Data excluded psychiatric services.

b For the purpose of comparing use by the general population with use by indigenous people, the general users excluded recipients whose indigenous origin was 'not known' or 'not stated'.

c For the purpose of comparing use by the general population with use by culturally or linguistically diverse people, the general users excluded recipients whose cultural or linguistic origin was 'not known' or 'not stated'.

Source: Black *et al* 1997

10A.2.3 Efficiency

Table 10A.16: Nominal Government costs/contributions per place, 1994–95, 1995–96 and 1996–97 (\$)

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT^h</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>Cost per government institutional/large residential place</i>									
1994–95	61 889 ^a	40 735	50 192 ^{b,c}	57 003 ^f	68 732	101 351	51 007	0	55 987
1995–96	64 243 ^a	43 163	50 343 ^{b,c}	56 791 ^f	67 456	90 330	39 245	0	57 398
1996–97	65 284 ^a	46 327	53 468 ^{b,c}	67 014 ^f	69 076	91 144	51 686	0	60 775
<i>Cost per government community accommodation and care place</i>									
1994–95	60 449	47 339	42 112 ^c	37 251 ^f	52 074	50 125	84 636	0	50 238
1995–96	62 816	53 143	56 154 ^c	37 804 ^f	53 559	67 533	80 060	0	55 276
1996–97	56 160	52 746	61 645 ^c	43 405 ^f	61 988	72 864	66 017	0	54 819
<i>Government contribution per non-government institutional/large residential place</i>									
1994–95	28 596	32 407	9 277 ^d	19 567 ^{f,g}	22 578	19 855	0	0	23 705
1995–96	31 724	33 464	11 845 ^d	20 491 ^{f,g}	24 327	21 720	0	0	25 848
1996–97	26 336	27 318	11 707 ^d	21 061 ^{f,g}	29 141	23 925	0	0	23 686
<i>Government contribution per non-government community accommodation and care place</i>									
1994–95	39 662	26 787	10 262 ^{d,e}	43 059 ^{f,g}	31 397	45 435	13 192	53 619	29 113
1995–96	38 068	28 330	11 150 ^{d,e}	41 615 ^{f,g}	32 967	49 669	13 939	54 392	31 138
1996–97	42 428	30 352	13 955 ^{d,e}	26 754 ^{f,g}	33 134	55 713	18 433	46 001	32 998

a NSW was unable to separate out professional and other non-accommodation services provided within the institutional environment.

b Government provided institutional accommodation in Queensland included four large residentials administered by Queensland Health which are linked to the CSDA funding base. The numbers of places in these residentials are based on the number of permanent beds, excluding the beds allocated for respite.

c The number of places in Queensland government provided institutional accommodation reflected the number of *people* in this type of accommodation at 30 June in each year. The number of places in government provided community accommodation reflected the number of *beds* in this type of accommodation at 30 June in each year.

d The Queensland Disability Program did not collect details of receipts from client contributions charged by non-government organisations. Previous years data were updated to account for miscoding.

e For service providers in Queensland that did not respond to the 1995–96 CSDA minimum data set collection places data were based on 1994–95 and 1996–97 minimum data set values. An estimated 38 additional non-government provided community places were included for 1996–97 to account for institutional reform packages funded after the 1996 minimum data set collection date.

f Improvements in the data collection process in WA has allowed the number of individuals provided with accommodation placements for 1995–96 and 1996–97 to be reported. Bed numbers were used for 1994–95 places data as the number of individuals placed in was less accurate. Improved data quality and realignment of some non-government services across programs explain in part changes in the places data over time.

g Expenditure on non-government provided accommodation in 1996–97, reflects adjustments made following a review to improve costing at program and output level in WA. Places which were jointly funded by the government agency and the non-government service provider were unable to be separated.

h The NT Government did not provide institutional or large residential accommodation care and support.

Table 10A.17: Real Government costs/contributions per place, 1994–95, 1995–96 and 1996–97 (in 1996–97 dollars)

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>Cost per government institutional/large residential place</i>									
1994–95	64 805 ^a	42 655	52 557 ^{b,c}	59 689 ^f	71 971	106 126	53 410	0	58 625
1995–96	65 354 ^a	43 910	51 214 ^{b,c}	57 773 ^f	68 623	91 892	39 924	0	58 391
1996–97	65 284 ^a	46 327	53 468 ^{b,c}	67 014 ^f	69 076	91 144	51 686	0	60 775
<i>Cost per government community accommodation and care place</i>									
1994–95	63 298	49 570	44 096 ^c	39 006 ^f	54 528	52 487	88 624	0	52 605
1995–96	63 902	54 063	57 125 ^c	38 458 ^f	54 485	68 701	81 445	0	56 232
1996–97	56 160	52 746	61 645 ^c	43 405 ^f	61 988	72 864	66 017	0	54 819
<i>Government contribution per non-government institutional/large residential place</i>									
1994–95	29 943	33 934	9 715 ^d	20 489 ^{f,g}	23 642	20 791	0	0	24 822
1995–96	32 273	34 043	12 050 ^d	20 845 ^{f,g}	24 748	22 095	0	0	26 295
1996–97	26 336	27 318	11 707 ^d	21 061 ^{f,g}	29 141	23 925	0	0	23 686
<i>Government contribution per non-government community accommodation and care place</i>									
1994–95	41 531	28 049	10 746 ^{d,e}	45 088 ^{f,g}	32 877	47 576	13 814	56 146	30 484
1995–96	38 726	28 820	11 343 ^{d,e}	42 335 ^{f,g}	33 537	50 528	14 180	55 333	31 677
1996–97	42 428	30 352	13 955 ^{d,e}	26 754 ^{f,g}	33 134	55 713	18 433	46 001	32 998

For notes refer to Table 10A.16.

Table 10A.18: Administration expenditure as a proportion of total expenditure, 1994–95, 1995–96 and 1996–97 (per cent)

	<i>Cwlth^a</i>	<i>NSW^b</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT^c</i>	<i>All juris.^b</i>
1994–95	7.5	6.4	12.3	14.1	7.2	2.1	16.0	4.7	3.9	8.9
1995–96	7.6	na	9.6	16.9	7.3	2.6	15.2	5.7	3.9	9.4
1996–97	7.8	6.3	9.7	15.2	7.2	2.7	15.9	6.9	5.4	8.5

a The 1996–97 Commonwealth figure included a one-off expense of \$320 000 for voluntary redundancy packages. A component of the Department's Corporate Services budget has been apportioned to the Disability Programs Division's administrative costs using a proportion of the total portfolio budget. This calculation may be distorted as the portfolio budget includes significant expenditure on items such as Medicare, the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme and transfers to the states and territories.

b Due to a restructure in NSW in 1995–96 administration costs for that year were unable to be determined.

c The NT grants funded organisations were advanced the first quarter 1996–97 payments in 1995–96. Therefore, expenditure for 1996–97 did not include the full years funding to organisations. CSDA SSP funded grants were advanced the first quarter payments in 1996–97 for the 1997–98 financial year. Therefore expenditure for 1996–97 included the first quarter allocation for 1997–98.

10A.3 Definitions and explanatory notes

Table 10A.19 Definition of descriptors

<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Total people with a disability (ABS)	<p>The definition of disability adopted by this Report is: “in the context of health experience a disability is any restriction or lack (resulting from an impairment) of ability to perform an activity in the manner or within the range considered normal for a human being (ABS 1993a).”</p> <p>In an attempt to operationalise this definition so as to estimate the total number of people with a disability the ABS defined a person with a disability as one who experiences one or more of the following limitations, restrictions or impairments which had lasted, or were likely to last, for a period of 6 months or more: loss of sight (even when wearing glasses or contact lenses); loss of hearing; speech difficulties in native languages; blackouts fits or loss of consciousness; slowness at learning or understanding; incomplete use of arms or fingers; difficulty gripping or holding small objects; incomplete use of feet or legs; treatment of nerves or an emotional condition; restriction in physical activities or in doing physical work; disfigurement or deformity; long-term effects of head injury, stroke or any other brain damage; a mental illness requiring help or supervision; treatment or medication for a long term condition or ailment and still restricted; and any other long term condition resulting in a restriction.</p>
People with a handicap (ABS)	<p>Handicap is a term used by the ABS Survey of Disability Aging and Carers as a proxy for the level of support needed by respondents with a disability. For the purposes of the survey a handicap is defined as a limitation to perform certain tasks associated with daily living. The limitation must be due to a disability and in relation to one or more of the following areas: self care; mobility; verbal communication; schooling; or employment. Persons aged less than 5 years with one or more disabilities were all regarded as having a handicap but were not classified by area or severity of handicap. This was due to difficulties inherent in determining whether the needs of children aged less than 5 years were a function of their age or their disability.</p>
People with a disability but no handicap (ABS)	<p>Persons with a disability but not identified as having a handicap in responding to the ABS Survey of Disability Aging and Carers stated that they had one of the broad limitations, restrictions or impairments as given for disability, but then stated that they were not restricted in any of the specific tasks given to identify persons with a handicap.</p>

(cont.)

Table 10A.19 Definition of descriptors (cont.)

<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>Definition</i>
People with a profound handicap (ABS)	The level of severity of a person's handicap was determined based on the person's ability to perform tasks relevant to the areas of self-care, mobility, and verbal communication and on the amount and type of help required. Where a person experiences difficulty in more than one of the above areas it is the area with the highest level of severity that determines the overall level of handicap. People with a profound handicap are those people with a disability who always require help or supervision in one or more of the three categories mentioned above.
People with a severe handicap (ABS)	Those people with a disability who sometimes required help or supervision with tasks relevant to the areas of self-care, mobility, and verbal communication.
People with a moderate handicap (ABS)	Those people with a disability who did not require help or supervision with tasks relevant to the areas of self-care, mobility, and verbal communication but who had difficulty performing one or more of these tasks.
People with a mild handicap (ABS)	Those people with a disability who did not require help or supervision with tasks relevant to the areas of self-care, mobility, and verbal communication but the person uses an aid, or has a mild mobility handicap or can not easily pick up an object from the floor.
Total principal carers (ABS)	A principal carer is a person aged 15 years or more providing the most informal care for the activities of self-care, mobility or verbal communication. Principal carers are chosen (by the recipient) from the main carers nominated for the activities for the activities of self-care, mobility or verbal communication. A recipient can identify only carer as the principle carer. Recipients include people with a disability and older people
CSDA MDS	The CSDA minimum data set, which specifies data items and their definitions to be collected from all services funded or provided under the Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement. These data items were agreed and developed by all jurisdictions, working in cooperation with the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, which collates and published national data from the collection.
People using CSDA accommodation services	People on the snapshot day agreed to as part of the CSDA MDS (except for WA where the numbers on an average day were used) using one or more services corresponding to the following CSDA MDS services types: 1.01 institutions; 1.02 hostel accommodation; 1.03 group houses; 1.04 attendant care; 1.05 outreach support/other in-home support/drop-in support; and 1.06 other accommodation.

(cont.)

Table 10A.19 Definition of descriptors (cont.)

<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>Definition</i>
People using CSDA community support services	People on the snapshot day (except for WA where the numbers on an average day were used) using one or more services corresponding to the following CSDA MDS services types: 2.1 advocacy; 2.2 information/referral; 2.3 early childhood intervention; 2.4 recreation/holiday programs; 2.5 therapy (PT OT ST); 2.6 family/individual case practice/management; 2.7 behaviour intervention/specialist intervention; 2.8 counselling: individual/family/group; 2.9 brokerage/direct funding; 2.10 mutual support/self help groups; 2.11 print disability; 2.12 resource teams/regional teams; and 2.13 other community support is used.
People using CSDA community access services	People on the snapshot day (except for WA where the numbers on an average day were used) using one or more services corresponding to the following CSDA MDS services types: 3.1 continuing education/independent living training/adult training centre; 3.2 post school options/social and community support/community access; 3.3 other community access and day programs.
People using CSDA respite services	People on the snapshot day (except for WA where the numbers on an average day were used) using one or more services corresponding to the following CSDA MDS services types: 4.1 own home respite; 4.2 centre based/respite house; 4.3 host family respite/peer support; and 4.4 other respite/flexible respite/combination.
Other CSDA /not stated	People on the snapshot day (except for WA where the numbers on an average day were used) using one or more services corresponding to the following CSDA MDS services types: 6.1 service evaluation-training; 6.2 peak bodies; 6.3 research and development; and 6.4 other.
People using CSDA Employment services	People on the snapshot day using one or more services corresponding to the following CSDA MDS service types: 5.1 competitive employment training and placement, 5.2 individual supported job, 5.3 sheltered employment, 5.4 supported employment, 5.5 employment support — state and territory government funded no job placement component, and 5.6 other employment.
Open employment services and supported employment services	An open employment service is an organisation that provides services to enable people with a disability to find, compete for, train for and keep employment in the open labour market. The remaining employment services — supported employment services — differ from open labour market services in that they employ people with a disability in sheltered working environments and provide continuing support.

(cont.)

Table 10A.19 Definition of descriptors (cont.)

<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Total Government Expenditure	Represents all government expenditure on disability services by the central coordinating unit and the umbrella department including expenditure on both programs and administration, direct expenditures and grants to government service providers, and government grants to non-government service providers. Excluded from total expenditure are provider funded contributions towards disability services. HACC, psychiatric and housing were also excluded from total disability expenditure. Therapy expenditure was excluded where possible.
Government expenditure per person	Total expenditure by a state or territory divided by the population aged between 5 and 64 years.
Real expenditure	Actual expenditure adjusted for changes in prices. Adjustments are made using the GDP(E) price deflator, and expressed in terms of final year prices.

Table 10A.20 Definition of performance indicators

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Proportion receiving community care or support	The numerator for this indicator is calculated using MDS service types 1.03 group houses, 1.04 attendant care, 1.05 outreach support/other in-home support/drop-in support and 1.06 other accommodation. The denominator is derived from MDS categories 1.01 to 1.06 and therefore in addition to those categories discussed above includes 1.01 institutions and 1.02 hostel accommodation. Services for people with a psychiatric disability have been excluded. The performance indicator is calculated as the numerator divided by the denominator, multiplied by 100.
Participation rate for people with a disability	Total number of people with a disability in the labour force (where the labour force includes all people who are employed or unemployed), divided by the total number of people with a disability aged 15 years and over. An employed person is a person aged 15 years or more, who in his or her main job during the enumeration period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • worked one hour or more for pay, profit, commission or payment in kind in a job, business, or on a farm (includes employees, employers and self-employed persons); • worked one hour or more without pay in a family business or on a farm (excluding persons undertaking other unpaid voluntary work); or • were employers, employees, or self-employed persons or unpaid family helpers who had a job, business or farm, but were not at work. Unemployed persons are those aged 15 years or more who were not employed during the enumeration period, but were looking for work.
Participation rate for the total population	Total number of people aged 15 years or more in the labour force (where the labour force includes all people who are employed or unemployed), divided by the total number of people aged 15 years and over.
Proportion of people with a disability employed	Total number of people with a disability who are in the labour force and employed divided by the total number of people with a disability in the labour force.
Proportion of the total population employed	Total number of people aged 15 to 64 years who are in the labour force and employed divided by the total number of people aged 15 to 64 years in the labour force.
Proportion of people with a disability unemployed	Total number of people with a disability who are in the labour force but unemployed divided by the total number of people with a disability in the labour force.
Proportion the total population unemployed	Total number of people aged 15 to 64 years who are in the labour force but unemployed divided by the total number of people aged 15 to 64 years in the labour force.

(cont.)

Table 10A.20 Definition of performance indicators (cont.)

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Potential population/labour force	<p>The ABS concept of 'severe or profound' handicap, relating as it does to the need for assistance with everyday activities of self-care, mobility and verbal communication, has been argued to be the most relevant population figure for disability services. However, the relatively high standard errors in the prevalence rates for smaller jurisdictions, as well as the need to adjust for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population, made it necessary to prepare special estimates of the 'potential population' for disability services. These estimates, prepared by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW), were used in the performance indicators when population data was needed in the denominator.</p> <p>Briefly, the national age-sex specific rates of severe and profound handicap were applied to the 1995 age and sex structure of each jurisdiction to give an 'expected current estimate' of people with a severe or profound handicap, aged under 65 years, in that jurisdiction. People of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin were given a weighting of 2 in these estimates, in recognition of their greater prevalence rates of disability, and their relatively greater representation in CSDA services.</p> <p>The denominator for employment services was restricted to people aged 15–64 years and was further scaled to adjust for the overall labour force participation rate of the population.</p> <p>The 'potential population' is not an estimate of the population needing disability support services, but provides a consistent scale of each jurisdictions population which <i>might</i> require these services.</p>
Proportion of potential population using accommodation services	<p>The denominator for this performance indicator is the expected number of Australians aged under 65 with severe or profound handicap in 1995 adjusted to reflect the greater prevalence and severity of handicaps experienced by people from an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander background. The numerator comes from the 1995 CSDA MDS categories 1.01 to 1.06. Services for people with a psychiatric disability have been excluded. The performance indicator is calculated as the numerator divided by the denominator, multiplied by 100.</p>
Proportion of potential labour force using employment services	<p>The denominator for this indicator is the expected number of Australians aged 15 to 64 years with severe or profound handicap in 1995 adjusted for the greater prevalence and severity of disability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations, multiplied by the labour force participation rate for each state and territory as at June 1995 (ABS Cat. No 6203.0). The numerator comes from the CSDA MDS service types 5.01 competitive employment training and placement 5.02 individual supported job, 5.03 sheltered employment, 5.04 supported employment, 5.5 employment support — state and territory funded no job placement component and 5.06 other employment and represent the number of people receiving employment services funded by the Commonwealth under the CSDA. The performance indicator is calculated as the numerator divided by the denominator, multiplied by 100.</p>

(cont.)

Table 10A.20 Definition of performance indicators (cont.)

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Users of accommodation services with a severe, profound, or moderate to no handicap	The denominator for this indicator was calculated by using service types 1.01 to 1.06 of the 1995 CSDA MDS (excluding services identified as psychiatric services). In calculating the numerator severity of handicap is derived from the 1995 MDS data item 'level of support needed — activities of daily living' (support a). This item uses the same areas of need as the ABS for determining handicap: self care, mobility and verbal communication. Moderate to no handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 1'. Severe handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 2 or 3'. Profound handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 4'. All handicap excludes responses from the MDS with level of 'support a' not known (76 people). Data for WA are from the 1996 MDS collection. For all other jurisdictions the 1995 MDS was used.
Users of employment services with a severe, profound, or moderate to no handicap	The data for this indicator is derived from service types 5.01 to 5.06 of the 1995 CSDA MDS. In calculating the numerator severity of handicap is derived from the 1995 MDS data item 'level of support needed — activities of daily living' (support a). This item uses the same areas of need as the ABS for determining handicap namely: self care, mobility and verbal communication. Moderate to no handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 1'. Severe handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 2 or 3'. Profound handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 4'. All handicap excludes responses from the MDS with level of 'support a' not known (8 people).
Proportion of people from an indigenous background using accommodation services, 1995–96, (per 1000 indigenous population)	The numerator for this indicator is indigenous people using accommodation services and is derived from accommodation type 1 services from the CSDA MDS (excluding services identified as services for people with a psychiatric disability). The denominator is the indigenous population under 65 years of age in 1991. The performance indicator is calculated as the numerator divided by the denominator, multiplied by 100. Data for WA are from the 1996 MDS collection. For all other jurisdictions the 1995 MDS was used.
Proportion of people from an indigenous background using employment services, 1995–96, (per 1000 indigenous population)	The numerator for this indicator is indigenous people using employment services (from the 1995 MDS), the denominator is indigenous population aged 15–64 years in 1991. The performance indicator is calculated as the numerator divided by the denominator, multiplied by 1000.

(cont.)

Table 10A.20 Definition of performance indicators (cont.)

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Proportion of people from a culturally and linguistically diverse background using accommodation services, by state and territory and Australia, 1995–96, (per 1000 culturally and linguistically diverse population)	The numerator for this indicator is persons from a culturally and linguistically diverse background using accommodation services with the data being derived from the 1995 MDS accommodation service type 1 (excluding services identified as services for people with a psychiatric disability). The denominator is the culturally and linguistically diverse population less than 65 in 1991 (from ABS expanded profile, Cat. No 2722.0). The performance indicator is calculated as the numerator divided by the denominator, multiplied by 1000. Data for WA are from the 1996 MDS collection. For all other jurisdictions the 1995 MDS was used.
Proportion of people from a culturally and linguistically diverse background using employment services, by state and territory and Australia, 1995–96, (per 1000 culturally and linguistically diverse population)	The numerator for this indicator is Persons from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds using employment services with data being drawn from the 1995 MDS. The denominator is the culturally and linguistically diverse population aged 15–64 years in 1991 (from ABS expanded profile, Cat. No 2722.0). The performance indicator is calculated as the numerator divided by the denominator, multiplied by 1000.
Cost per government institutional/large residential place	The numerator for this indicator is government expenditure on government provided institutional/large residential accommodation and care (1995 MDS categories 1.01 and 1.02 who have 6 or more clients). The denominator is the average number of places of this type available over the financial year. The indicator is calculated by dividing the numerator by the denominator.
Cost per government community accommodation and care place	The numerator for this indicator is government expenditure on government provided community accommodation and care as defined by 1995 MDS category 1.03 and who have less than 6 clients. The denominator is the average number of places of this type available over the financial year. The indicator is calculated by dividing the numerator by the denominator.
Government contribution per non-government institutional/large residential place	The numerator for this indicator is government contributions to non-government provided institutional/large residential accommodation and care (1995 MDS categories 1.01 and 1.02, and who have 6 clients or more). Government per place contributions to non-government providers represent only a proportion of the total cost of providing a place with this proportion varying between jurisdictions. The denominator is the average number of places of this type available over the financial year. The indicator is calculated by dividing the numerator by the denominator.

(cont.)

Table 10A.20 Definition of performance indicators (cont.)

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Government contribution per non-government community accommodation and care place	<p>The numerator for this indicator is government expenditure on government provided community accommodation and care as defined by 1995 MDS category 1.03 and who have less than 6 clients. Government contributions to non-government providers per place represent only a proportion of the total cost of providing a place with this proportion varying between jurisdictions. The denominator is the average number of places of this type available over the financial year. The indicator is calculated by dividing the numerator by the denominator.</p>
Administration expenditure as a proportion of total expenditure	<p>The numerator is equal to expenditure by jurisdictions on administering the system as a whole. This includes the regional disability program administration, regional administration, the central program policy branch administration, the disability program administration and the disability program share of corporate administration costs under the umbrella department. It does not include administration expenditure on individual services.</p> <p>The denominator is equal to total government expenditure on providing and funding services for people with a disability and includes expenditure on both programs and administration, direct expenditures and grants to government service providers, and government grants to non-government service providers.</p> <p>Excluded from total expenditure are provider funded contributions towards disability services. HACC, psychiatric and housing were excluded from total disability expenditure. Therapy expenditure was excluded where possible.</p>

