
2 Recent developments in the Report

CONTENTS

2.1 Developments in reporting	2.1
2.2 Gaps in reporting	2.10
2.3 Progress with key data issues	2.10
2.4 ‘Cross-cutting’ issues	2.29
2.5 References	2.32

2.1 Developments in reporting

This is the sixteenth Report on Government Services (RoGS) produced by the Review. This reporting is an iterative process, and the Review endeavours each year to build on developments of previous years. Since the Review published its first RoGS in 1995 (SCRCSSP 1995) there has been a general improvement in reporting.

Major enhancements to the RoGS belong in three categories:

- the inclusion of new indicators and reporting against performance indicators for the first time
- improvements to the meaningfulness and/or clarity of existing performance indicators
- improvements to the data reported against existing performance indicators, including:
 - improved comparability, timeliness and/or quality of data
 - expanded reporting for special needs groups (such as Indigenous Australians)
 - improved reporting of full costs to government.

The review of the RoGS

COAG agreed at its 7 December 2009 meeting to recommendations of the Senior Officials and Heads of Treasuries Working Group review of the RoGS. The review examined the ongoing usefulness of the RoGS to its government, non-government and community stakeholders. Developments arising from the review will be implemented over the next three editions.

The review noted:

- the central role of the RoGS in reporting comparative information on government performance
- the RoGS' original role as a tool for government had been complemented by a public accountability function
- the preponderance of submissions to the review were very supportive of the RoGS, but noted scope for improvement in the comparability, timeliness, and quality of performance data
- some submissions suggested the RoGS' scope be expanded to include government services that are not currently reported.

The review recommended that new terms of reference be prepared for the Review of Government Service Provision (subsequently endorsed by COAG 2010; www.pc.gov.au/gsp/review/tor), and set out a series of activities for the Steering Committee over the next few years:

- by the end of 2010 (in time for the 2012 RoGS), the Steering Committee, with an independent six member reference group drawn from First Ministers and Treasury officials, to review the RoGS general performance indicator framework (PIF) and individual performance indicators, to determine their consistency with the characteristics of performance indicators as defined in the IGA. An Independent Reference Group was formed in early-2010 and its three stage work program is well underway, comprising (1) a desktop review of the general PIF, (2) a conceptual review of indicators and a review of the consistency of associated measures to the IGA characteristics and (3) development of DQI for each indicator.
- during 2011, the Steering Committee to develop a set of formal criteria to determine whether the RoGS should include particular service sectors in its reporting regime — background work to inform this task is underway
- every three years (commencing at the end of 2011-12), the Steering Committee to review the operation of RoGS and report to COAG. The Steering Committee has established an annual internal reporting process to inform the three-yearly report to COAG.

Other review recommendations aimed to enhance the RoGS' accessibility. Starting with the 2012 RoGS, the publication format is to be streamlined, and the Steering Committee is investigating possible improvements to the electronic publication of the RoGS and associated data.

Improvements in reporting for the 2011 RoGS

All sections of the RoGS have been improved through implementation of the review of RoGS recommendations for action in 2010, including:

- inclusion of mini-case studies in police services and emergency management
- introduction of data quality information (DQI) for selected indicators
- extension of time series reporting in many attachment tables across most service areas.

Part B Early childhood, education and training

Preface B ('Early childhood, education and training preface') was substantially revised in the 2010 RoGS through alignment with the National Education Agreement and the National Agreement for Skills and Workforce Development. Further minor revisions have been made in the 2011 RoGS to align with changes to the National Agreements.

Chapter 3 ('Children's services') has been enhanced by:

- reporting new child care staff tenure data in Australian Government approved child care services sourced from the *National Early Childhood Education and Care Workforce Census 2010*
- improved reporting of contextual information on management type of children's services to include the additional category of non-government schools sector
- updated income levels for reporting out of pocket costs for child care
- expansion of time series data reporting in some attachment tables
- inclusion of some data quality information (DQI) documentation.

Chapter 4 ('School education') has been enhanced by:

- extending the time series for the access/equity indicator 'retention' and the efficiency indicator 'student-to-staff ratio'
- further alignment with National Education Agreement (NEA) and National Indigenous Reform Agreement (NIRA) indicators for the outcome indicators 'reading performance', 'writing performance' and 'numeracy performance'

-
- inclusion of mean scale scores and achievement bands, by Indigenous status for National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) testing
 - commencement of a time series for all NAPLAN data
 - reporting 2009 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) for the outcome indicators ‘reading performance’, ‘numeracy performance’, and ‘science literacy performance’. In PISA 2009, reading was the major assessment domain
 - reporting the outcomes of the year 6 2009 Science Literacy National Assessment Program (NAP) for the outcome indicator ‘science literacy performance’
 - reporting the outcomes of the years 6 and 10 2008 Information and Communication Technologies NAP for the outcome indicator ‘information and communication technologies performance’
 - inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Chapter 5 (‘Vocational education and training’) (VET) has been enhanced by:

- co-location of data for the Indigenous cohort of students and graduates with those for the general cohort to make comparisons easier
- reporting additional data for non-Indigenous students and graduates across various indicators
- expanded scope for ‘government funded’ activity and reporting of associated training and expenditure data
- expansion of time series in some attachment tables
- expanded time series analysis of VET participation by Indigenous status under the ‘VET participation by target group’ equity indicator
- reporting the new measure of Qualification Equivalents (by Indigenous status) under the ‘skill profile’ outcome indicator
- replacing TAFE graduates data with data for ‘government funded VET’ graduates for measures under the ‘student employment and further study outcomes’ and ‘student satisfaction with VET’ outcome indicators, to capture VET activity funded by government more comprehensively
- inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Part C Justice

Preface C (‘Justice preface’) has had no significant changes introduced in the 2011 RoGS.

Chapter 6 ('Police services') has been enhanced by:

- reporting data from all jurisdictions for the first time for the access indicator 'Indigenous staffing', enabling its status to change from incomplete to complete
- reporting 2008-09 data for the effectiveness indicator 'Crime victimisation', improving its timeliness and completeness, as the most recent previous data reported were for 2005 and were not available for some sub-categories for some jurisdictions
- reporting 2008-09 data for the effectiveness indicator 'Reporting rates', improving its timeliness and completeness, as the most recent previous data reported were for 2005 and were not available for some sub-categories for some jurisdictions
- expansion of time series data reporting in all attachment tables
- inclusion of two mini-case studies.

Chapter 7 ('Court administration') has been enhanced by:

- ongoing improvements in consistency and integrity of data reported by all jurisdictions
- inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Chapter 8 ('Corrective services') is undergoing continuing development work. No significant improvements were introduced.

Part D Emergency management

Part D (Emergency management) has no preface.

Chapter 9 ('Emergency management') has been enhanced by:

- inclusion of a mini-case study
- inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Part E Health

Major improvements in reporting in the Health preface this year include:

- inclusion of the following measures to align this Report with National Healthcare Agreement (NHA) and National Indigenous Reform Agreement (NIRA) indicators
 - reporting data for the net growth in the health workforce for selected professions

-
- reporting data for the proportion of people who accessed health services by health status
 - reporting data on health risk factors, such as rates of risky alcohol consumption, smoking and obesity, for states and territories (previously only national data were reported)
 - reporting data on the incidence of selected cancers
 - reporting infant (0–1 year), child (1–4 year) and total infant and child (0–4 year) mortality (previously only infant mortality was reported)
 - reporting data for potentially avoidable deaths
 - reporting data for low birth weight babies by Indigenous status of mother
 - expansion of time series data reporting in some attachment tables.

Chapter 10 ('Public hospitals') has been enhanced by:

- inclusion of the following measures to align this Report with NHA and National Indigenous Reform Agreement (NIRA) indicators:
 - 'unplanned/unexpected readmissions within 28 days of selected surgical admissions' has replaced the 'unplanned readmission rates' indicator
 - 'healthcare associated staphylococcus aureus bacteraemia in acute care hospitals' has replaced the 'surgical site infection rates' indicator
 - an indicator for 'falls resulting in patient harm in hospitals' has been included
 - an indicator for 'intentional self harm in hospitals' has been included.
- the 'patient satisfaction' indicator now includes information previously reported on responsiveness under the output indicator 'patient satisfaction surveys'
- revisions to the definitions of two sentinel event categories to align with national definitions endorsed by Health Ministers in 2009, improving data comparability across states and territories
- better quality data for reporting on the indicator 'vaginal birth following a previous caesarean', with full coverage of births according to national definitions
- inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Chapter 11 ('Primary and community health') has been enhanced by:

- addition of the following indicators and measures to align this Report with NHA and NIRA indicators
 - an additional equity — access indicator 'developmental health checks'

-
- two additional effectiveness — access indicators ‘GP waiting times’ and ‘GP-type visits to emergency departments’
 - measures for the quality — responsiveness indicator ‘patient satisfaction’
 - an additional measure for the outcome indicator ‘child immunisation coverage’, reflecting immunisation coverage for children aged 60–63 months
 - data for the effectiveness — access indicator ‘bulk billing rates’ are reported by age for the first time
 - data reported against the effectiveness — appropriateness indicator ‘management of upper respiratory tract infections’ are improved in terms of specificity and completeness
 - inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Chapter 12 (‘Health management issues’) has been enhanced by:

- reporting data for the equity — access indicator ‘Participation rate of women from selected community groups in the BreastScreen Australia Program’, improving its timeliness, as the most recent previous data reported were for the 24 month period 2005 and 2006
- refined reporting on the effectiveness — appropriateness mental health indicator ‘services reviewed against the national standards’, by inclusion of data on additional categories relating to the achievement of standards
- reporting of an additional measure for the effectiveness — quality mental health indicator ‘collection of outcomes information’
- inclusion of the following indicator to align this Report with the NHA
 - ‘clinical mental health service use by special needs groups’, which measures access to mental health services by geographic location, Indigenous status and by the Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA)
- inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Part F Community services

Preface F (‘Community services preface’) has been substantially revised through the removal of Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) reporting from this preface. Overview material on SAAP has been relocated to section G of this Report, the new ‘Housing and homelessness’ sector summary in the 2011 Report. The preface has been enhanced by:

-
- revising the expenditure section text and data on the community services sector, improving its timeliness by two years and its coverage to a broader set of services
 - updated data and information on projections of demographics and their effects on demand for community services.

Chapter 13 ('Aged care services') has been enhanced by:

- reporting new measures for the indicator 'compliance with service standards in community care' for the Community Aged Care Packages (CACP), Extended Aged Care at Home (EACH), EACH Dementia (EACH-D) and the National Respite for Carers Program (NRCP) programs
- inclusion of the following indicators/measures to align this Report with NHA aged care indicators:
 - operational aged care places
 - selected adverse events in residential aged care
 - hospital patient days (for overnight separations only) used by patients who are waiting for residential aged care
- expansion of time series data reporting in some attachment tables, in particular five years of data are now reported for most aged care expenditure and Home and Community Care (HACC) data
- inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Chapter 14 ('Services for people with disability') has been enhanced by:

- reporting 'assistance for younger people in residential aged care' as an indicator for the first time and including additional measures in attachment tables
- reporting on inclusion of people in need of assistance with independent living (AIL) or assistance with work, education and community living (AWEC) for the indicator 'Service use by severity of disability'
- reporting WA data for the 'client and carer satisfaction' with specialist disability services indicator for the first time
- extended time series for CSTDA data in the attachment tables.
- alignment with relevant NDA indicators, including:
 - additional data disaggregations for specific age groups and sex for the access to appropriate services on the basis of relative need indicators.

Chapter 15 ('Protection and support services') has been enhanced by:

- consistent reporting of child protection activity data for the age range 0-17 years (prior to 2009-10, the rates of children subject to notifications, investigations and substantiations were calculated for children aged 0–16 years, while the rates of children on care and protection orders and in out-of-home care were calculated for children aged 0-17 years)
- six jurisdictions reporting performance data for the effectiveness indicator 'safety in out-of-home care', compared with five previously (table 15.1)
- seven jurisdictions reporting proportions of expenditure across child protection Pathway activity groups, compared with five previously (table 15.2)
- for the first time, five jurisdictions reporting experimental unit cost data for four Pathways activity groups
- for the first time, reporting a figure for the efficiency indicator 'Out-of-home care expenditure per placement night'
- where applicable, child protection, out-of-home care and intensive family support services data are reported, disaggregated by the categories 'Indigenous', 'non-Indigenous', 'unknown Indigenous status' and 'total children'
- performance data are reported for five new juvenile justice performance indicators, 'group conferencing outcomes', 'assaults in custody', 'self-harm and attempted suicide in custody', 'completion of orders', and 'centre utilisation'
- where data are available, a 10 year time series is reported for all child protection and juvenile justice indicators in attachment tables.

Part G Housing and homelessness

Sector summary G ('Housing and homelessness sector summary') has been included for the first time and is aligned with the National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA).

Chapter 16 ('Housing') has been enhanced by:

- inclusion of new measures for the 'affordability' outcome indicator for public housing, SOMIH and community housing to align with NAHA performance reporting
- adopting the Canadian National Occupancy Standard for reporting the 'match of household to dwelling size' outcome indicator for public housing, SOMIH and community housing, to align with NAHA performance reporting
- expansion of time series data reporting in some attachment tables

-
- inclusion of some DQI documentation.

Chapter 17 ('Homelessness services') has been included for the first time and is aligned with the NAHA.

2.2 Gaps in reporting

In response to review of RoGS recommendations, an Independent Reference Group and the Steering Committee are reviewing all performance indicators in the RoGS according to the characteristics of performance indicators as defined in the IGA. This review is likely to identify further gaps in reporting.

An examination of reporting against the framework across service areas identified the following issues:

- There continues to be a paucity of information about cost-effectiveness (that is, measures of cost per outcome achieved). The lack of cost-effectiveness data partly reflects the difficulty of collecting robust quantitative information on outcomes. No cost-effectiveness indicators are reported, and only one notional indicator of cost-effectiveness has been identified (cost per life year saved in relation to breast cancer detection and management) and reporting for the indicator has not been developed.
- There are relatively few indicators of output quality compared with those for other output characteristics (effectiveness, access and appropriateness).

Identification of gaps in reporting should also take into account how well currently reported indicators measure various aspects of service provision. As noted in the 'Improvements in reporting' section (above) there remains scope to improve the appropriateness or quality of many currently reported indicators.

2.3 Progress with key data issues

The Steering Committee has identified the following ongoing data issues that affect the quality of information in the RoGS: timeliness of data; comparability of data; changes to administrative data collections; full costing of government services; and reporting of data for special needs groups.

Timeliness

As noted in chapter 1, recent data are more useful for policy decision making but there can be a trade-off between the accuracy of data and their timeliness. The Steering Committee's approach is to publish imperfect data with caveats on an annual basis wherever possible. This approach allows increased scrutiny of the data and reveals the gaps in critical information, providing the foundation for developing better data over time. Table 2.1 summarises the time periods for data included in this RoGS. The following items are of particular note:

- The most recent data on birthweights of babies for Indigenous and all mothers are for 2008.
- There is significant scope for improving the timeliness of maternity services quality data.
- 'Management of asthma' data are sourced from the ABS *National Health Survey*, which is conducted approximately every three years. The most recent data available are for 2007-08.
- 'Interval cancer rate' data for breast cancer detection and management rely on data matching and follow-up between screening periods and between screening services and medical services. Such processes take a number of years, resulting in a marked lag in reporting. The most recent data available are for 2006.
- All data for specialised mental health services are provided one year in arrears (that is, 2008-09 data for the 2011 RoGS).
- Data for users of specialist disability services are provided one year in arrears (that is, 2008-09 data for the 2011 RoGS).
- Data for the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) are provided one year in arrears (that is, 2008-09 data for the 2011 RoGS).
- For State owned and managed Indigenous housing, amenity/location and customer satisfaction most recent data available are for 2007. For community housing, data for net recurrent cost per dwelling and rent collection rate are collected one year in arrears (2008-09 data for the 2011 RoGS). Data for Indigenous community housing are also one year in arrears.

Table 2.1 Time period of reported performance results, 2011 RoGS

<i>Service area/indicator framework</i>	<i>At or earlier than 2007 or 2007-08</i>	<i>Previous year (2008 or 2008-09)</i>	<i>Current year (2009 or 2009-10)</i>
Early childhood education and training	Early childhood, education and training preface	People with or working towards selected VET qualifications by Indigenous status; Literacy and numeracy	Most government expenditure; Indigenous status: Participation in education and training; Year 12 or equivalent, or Certificate II; People with limited or no qualifications
	Children's services	Preschool services costs	Hospital separations; Family work related needs; Demand for formal care
	School education	Civics and citizenship outcomes	School expenditure; Information and communication technologies outcomes; VET in Schools participation and attainment
	VET	..	Number of VET qualifications completed (Skill profile); Employer engagement with VET; Employer satisfaction with VET
Justice	Police services	..	Victims of homicide; Land transport hospitalisations; Crime victimisation; Reporting rates; Defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding
	Court administration	..	All
	Corrective services
	Fire events	Fire deaths, Fire injuries	All others
Emergency management	Ambulance events	..	All
	Road rescue events	..	All

Table 2.1 (continued)

<i>Service area/indicator framework</i>	<i>At or earlier than 2007 or 2007-08</i>	<i>Previous year (2008 or 2008-09)</i>	<i>Current year (2009 or 2009-10)</i>
Health preface	Indigenous health workforce; proportion of people who accessed health services by health status; rates of obesity; BMI categories; daily smokers; risk of long term harm from alcohol; incidence of selected cancers; estimated life expectancies at birth	All others	..
Public hospitals	..	All others	Patient satisfaction
Maternity services	..	All others	Caesareans and Inductions for selected primiparae; Apgar scores
Primary and community health ^a	Availability of public dentists; Management of asthma; Influenza vaccination coverage for older people.	Potentially preventable hospitalisations for vaccine preventable, acute and chronic conditions; Hospitalisations for diabetes; Hospitalisations of older people for falls.	All others
Breast cancer ^b	..	Cost per separation by diagnosis related group; Mortality rate for breast cancer	All others
Mental health	..	All	..

Table 2.1 (continued)

<i>Service area/indicator framework</i>	<i>At or earlier than 2007 or 2007-08</i>	<i>Previous year (2008 or 2008-09)</i>	<i>Current year (2009 or 2009-10)</i>
Community services			
Aged care services	..	Longer care arrangements; selected adverse events in residential aged care Long term aged care in public hospitals; Complaint assessment unit costs	All others
Services for people with disability	Use of public housing	All others	Administrative efficiency ^c
Child protection and out-of-home care	All
Juvenile justice	..	Average rates of young people under juvenile justice supervision (both in detention and in the community)	All others
Public housing	..	Amenity/location; Customer satisfaction	All others
State owned and managed Indigenous housing	..	Amenity/location; Customer satisfaction	All others
Community housing	..	Net recurrent cost per dwelling; Rent collection rate; Amenity/location; Customer satisfaction	All others
Indigenous community housing	..	All	..
Commonwealth Rent Assistance	All
Supported Accommodation Assistance Program and supported accommodation assistance services	..	All others	Limited financial data
Homelessness services			

HACC = Home and Community Care. GP = general practitioner. ^a Asthma management data are from a survey conducted approximately every three years. The most recent available data are from the 2007-08 survey. ^b As data for the 'interval cancer rate' rely on data matching and follow-up between cancer screening periods and between screening services and medical services, the most recent available data are for 2006. ^c Quality assurance and client and carer satisfaction data are from jurisdiction-specific collections and reference periods vary. ... Not applicable.

Comparability of data

Data are generally considered to be directly comparable when definitions, counting rules and the scope of measurement are consistent (and if applicable, the sample size is large enough to be statistically reliable — explained in the statistical appendix). Performance indicator framework diagrams in each chapter are shaded to reflect indicator comparability. Table 2.2 summarises the proportions of performance indicators in each service area (1) with comparable data and (2) with data reported, both comparable and not directly comparable. Of the 23 service area performance indicator frameworks, 15 have at least 50 per cent of indicators reported on a comparable basis.

Table 2.2 does not capture the details of improvements in performance reporting, for example:

- merging of some indicators, where several measures are streamlined under a single indicator, involving no reduction in reporting
- splitting of some indicators, as indicators and measures develop
- changing the scope of some indicators over time, where original indicators have been replaced by more meaningful indicators.

Further, information in table 2.2 is based only on indicators with data reported, so it does not reflect conceptual developments relating to the identification of indicators, the development of definitions for indicators and their measures, and the associated data collection and counting rule developments. Current examples of these types of developments are described in section 2.1.

Table 2.2 Comparability of indicators, 2011 RoGS^{a, b}

<i>Service area indicator framework (year first reported)</i>	<i>Indicators reported on a comparable basis</i>			<i>Change in all indicators (no.)</i>	
	<i>no.</i>	<i>% of all reported</i>	<i>Change since last year no.</i>	<i>Since last year</i>	<i>Between first reported–2011</i>
<i>Early childhood, education and training</i>					
Children's services (1997)	14	66.7	–	–	+14
School education (1995)	11	64.7	–	–	+10
Vocational education and training (1995)	10	83.3	-1	-2	+2
<i>Justice</i>					
Police services (1995)	16	76.2	–	–	+6
Court administration (1995)	3	50.0	–	–	+3
Corrective services (1995)	10	90.9	–	–	-3
<i>Emergency management</i>					
Fire events (1998)	2	20.0	–	–	+10
Ambulance events (1998)	1	11.1	–	–	+10
Road rescue events (2004)	2	66.7	+2	–	+2
<i>Health</i>					
Public hospitals (1995)	8	50.0	+2	+1	+2
Maternity services (2001)	4	40.0	+1	–	+5
Primary and community health (1999)	27	96.4	+4	+5	+23
Breast cancer detection/management (1998)	7	63.6	–	–	+11
Mental health management (1999)	9	75.0	+4	+1	+6
<i>Community services</i>					
Aged care services (1997)	16	88.9	+2	+2	+10
Services for people with a disability (1997)	8	57.1	+1	+1	+3
Child protection and out-of-home care (1995)	4	33.3	–	-6	–
Juvenile justice (2009)	4	36.4	+2	+5	+11
<i>Housing and homelessness</i>					
Public housing (1995)	10	100.0	-1	-1	-3
State owned and managed Indigenous housing (2002)	10	100.0	-1	-1	–
Mainstream community housing (1997)	2	22.2	–	-1	+9
Indigenous community housing (2008)	2	28.6	-2	–	–
Commonwealth Rent Assistance (1999)	9	90.0	–	–	+10
Supported Accommodation and Assistance Program (1995)	12	80.0	–	-1	+11

^a Changes can reflect merging of some indicators and splitting of others, as indicators and measures develop. Data do not capture changes in indicators over time, or replacement of indicators with more meaningful indicators. ^b Information is based only on indicators with data reported and does not reflect many conceptual developments. ... Not applicable. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: SCRCSSP (1995–2002); SCRGSP (2003–2010a, 2011).

Changes to administrative data collections

The discontinuation of data sets and the establishment of new data sets have implications for performance reporting by the Review. Time series comparisons, scope, comparability and accuracy of data can be affected.

Review requirements are not necessarily a priority in the development of national minimum data sets (NMDS) or other types of information infrastructure. There can be, for example, a significant delay between the first data collection period and the public release of data from a new data set, and implementation problems can affect data quality for several years. For the purposes of the Review, this can mean that reporting scope and data quality are diminished for some time until the new data sets are fully operational.

Juvenile justice

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) has developed a NMDS for juvenile justice. The sixth report of the juvenile justice NMDS covers the period 2008-09 and is anticipated to be released in 2011.

The Australasian Juvenile Justice Administrators, in consultation with the Review has developed a performance reporting framework, included in and since the 2009 RoGS. This year, data were reported for the seven indicators under development since last year and remaining indicators and indicator boxes were included, for which data collections are under development.

SAAP and supported accommodation assistance services

A new source for financial SAAP and supported accommodation assistance services data has been adopted this year. Financial data were previously provided by the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA), as jurisdictions were required to report upon SAAP expenditure pursuant to the SAAP V agreement. The NAHA does not require such reporting and consequently, FaHCSIA is now unable to provide these data. State and Territory governments now provide these data from their administrative systems.

Although the SAAP concluded on 31 December 2008, the support services provided to homeless people continued. An interim collection (for non-financial data) will provide data on specialist homelessness services funded under the NAHA until the Homelessness National Minimum Data Set (HNMDS) is operational (anticipated by 1 July 2011). Reported SAAP/homelessness data currently lag by one year (that is,

data for 2008-09 were provided for the 2011 Report) and a high priority item for development is to improve the timeliness of these data.

Costing of services

In addition to the Review objective that funding of, or costs for, service delivery be measured and reported on a comparable basis, a further objective of the Review is that efficiency estimates reflect the full costs to government. The Review has identified three priority areas for improving the comparability of unit costs, and developed appropriate guidelines in each case:

- including superannuation on an accrual basis (SCRCSSP 1998a)
- accounting for differences in the treatment of payroll tax (SCRCSSP 1999a)
- including the full range of capital costs (SCRCSSP 2001).

Other issues influence the comparability of cost estimates. Where possible, the Review has sought to ensure consistency in:

- accounting for the goods and services tax (GST)
- reporting accrued benefits to employees (such as recreation and long service leave)
- apportioning applicable departmental overhead costs
- reporting non-government sourced revenue.

Reforms to treasury and finance department accounting guidelines in most jurisdictions require government agencies to adopt accrual accounting in their financial reporting frameworks. Accrual accounting is based on the principle that the agency recognises revenue and expenses when they are earned and incurred, respectively. Cash accounting, in contrast, recognises revenue and expenses when they are collected and paid, respectively. The majority of agencies and jurisdictions have adopted accrual accounting. Table 2.3 provides an overview of the Review's progress in reporting on an accrual basis, meeting the principle of reporting full cost to government (incorporating depreciation and the user cost of capital) and adjusting for differences in superannuation and payroll tax.

Table 2.3 Progress of unit cost comparability, 2011 RoGS

Service area/indicator framework	Accounting regime ^a	Full cost to government — element included			
		Depreciation	User cost of capital	Superannuation on accrual basis	Payroll tax consistent
<i>Early childhood, education and training</i>					
Children's services	Accrual	✓	x	✓	x
School education	Accrual	✓	✓	✓	✓
VET	Accrual	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Justice</i>					
Police services	Accrual	✓	✓	✓	✓
Court administration	Accrual	✓	x	✓	✓
Corrective services	Accrual	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Emergency management</i>					
Fire events	Accrual	✓	✓	x	✓
Ambulance events	Accrual	✓	✓	x	✓
<i>Health</i>					
Public hospitals	Accrual	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maternity services	Accrual	✓	x	✓	✓
Primary and community health ^b	Accrual
Breast cancer	Accrual	x	x	x	x
Mental health	Accrual	x	x	✓	x
<i>Community services</i>					
Aged care services ^b	Accrual	✓
Services for people with disability	Accrual	✓	x	✓	✓
Child protection and out-of-home care ^b	Accrual	✓	x	✓	x
Juvenile justice services
<i>Housing and homelessness</i>					
Public housing	Accrual	✓	✓	✓	✓
State owned and managed Indigenous housing	Accrual	✓	✓	✓	✓
Community housing	Transition	✓	..	✓	✓
Indigenous community housing	Accrual	✓	✓	✓	✓
Commonwealth Rent Assistance ^c	Cash
Supported Accommodation Assistance Program ^b	Accrual

✓ = Most jurisdictions include this item or report it separately, or include it on an accrual basis. x = Most jurisdictions do not include or report this item, or do not include it on an accrual basis. ^a Accrual: most jurisdictions reported in accrual terms for the data in the 2011 RoGS. Transition: most jurisdictions have not reported on either a pure cash or accrual basis. ^b Costs comprise mostly Australian Government transfer payments to private service providers or households. ^c Costs comprise mostly Australian Government transfers to individuals as part of their social security or family assistance payments. There is no separate appropriation for the Rent Assistance component of these payments and reported expenditure is based on a cash accounting regime. .. Not applicable.

Source: Chapters 3–17.

The Steering Committee's preference is to remove payroll tax from reported cost figures, where feasible, so cost differences between jurisdictions are not caused by differences in jurisdictions' payroll tax policies. In some chapters, however, it has not been possible to separately identify payroll tax, so a hypothetical amount is included in cost estimates for exempt services.

Capital costs

Under accrual accounting, the focus is on the capital used (or consumed) in a particular year, rather than on the cash expenditure incurred in its purchase (for example, the purchase costs of a new building). Capital costs comprise two distinct elements:

- depreciation — defined as the annual consumption of non-current physical assets used in delivering government services
- the user cost of capital — the opportunity cost of funds tied up in the capital used to deliver services (that is, the return that could be generated if the funds were employed in their next best use), calculated as 8 per cent of the value of physical, non-current assets.

To improve the comparability of unit costs, the Steering Committee decided that both depreciation and the user cost of capital should be included in unit cost calculations (with the user cost of capital for land to be reported separately). The Steering Committee also agreed that the user cost of capital rate should be applied to all non-current physical assets, less any capital charges and interest on borrowings already reported by the agency (to avoid double counting). The rate applied for the user cost of capital is based on a weighted average of rates nominated by jurisdictions (currently 8 per cent).

Differences in asset measurement techniques can have a major impact on reported capital costs (SCRGSP 2001). However, the differences created by these asset measurement effects are generally relatively small in the context of total unit costs because capital costs represent a relatively small proportion of total cost (except for housing). In housing, where the potential for asset measurement techniques to influence total unit costs is greater, the adoption under the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement (replaced by the NAHA from 1 January 2009) of a uniform accounting framework has largely prevented this from occurring. The adoption of national uniform accounting standards across all service areas would be a desirable outcome for the Review.

Other costing issues

Other costing issues include accounting for the GST, the apportionment of costs shared across services (mainly overhead departmental costs) and the treatment of non-government sourced revenue.

- Government agencies are treated in the same manner as other businesses for GST. That is, government agencies are not exempt from GST on their purchases, and can claim input tax credits for the GST paid on inputs. Data reported in this RoGS are net of GST paid and input tax credits received unless otherwise specified. The GST appears to have little quantifiable impact on the performance indicators in this RoGS.
- Full apportionment of departmental overheads is consistent with the concept of full cost recovery. The practice of apportioning overhead costs varies across the services in the RoGS.
- For non-government sourced revenue, some services deduct such revenue from their estimates of unit costs where it is relatively small (for example, in police services and court administration). The costs reported are therefore an estimate of net cost to government. However, where revenue from non-government sources is significant (such as with public hospitals, fire services and ambulance services), it is necessary to report both the gross cost and the net cost to government to obtain an adequate understanding of efficiency.

Reporting for special needs groups

Some chapters of the RoGS focus on the performance of agencies in providing services to specific groups in society — for example, the chapters on aged care services, services to people with disability and children’s services. Across the RoGS, the Review also seeks to report on the performance of agencies providing services for three identified special needs groups: Indigenous people; people living in communities outside the capital cities (that is, people living in other metropolitan areas, or rural and remote communities); and people from a non-English speaking background. There is a paucity of data on outcomes for these groups.

Indigenous Australians

In May 1997, the (then) Prime Minister asked the Review to give particular attention to the performance of mainstream services in meeting the needs of Indigenous Australians. Table 2.4 provides an indication of which service areas report at least one data item on Indigenous Australians.

Table 2.4 Reporting of at least one data item on Indigenous Australians, 2011 RoGS

<i>Service area/indicator framework</i>	<i>Descriptive</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Outputs</i>		
			<i>Equity</i>	<i>Effectiveness</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>
<i>Early childhood, education and training</i>					
Early childhood, education and training preface	✓	✓	✓	x	x
Children's services	x	x	✓	x	x
School education	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
VET	x	✓	✓	✓	x
<i>Justice</i>					
Justice preface	x	x	x	x	x
Police services	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
Court administration	x	x	x	x	x
Corrective services	✓	x	x	✓	x
<i>Emergency management</i>					
Fire events	x	x	x	x	x
Ambulance events	x	x	x	x	x
Road rescue events	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Health</i>					
Health preface	✓	✓	x	x	x
Public hospitals	✓	x	x	✓	x
Maternity services	x	✓	x	x	x
Primary and community health	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
Breast cancer	x	x	✓	x	x
Mental health	✓	✓	✓	x	x
<i>Community services</i>					
Community services preface	x	x	x	x	x
Aged care services	✓	x	✓	✓	x
Services for people with disability	✓	x	✓	✓	x
Child protection and out-of-home care	✓	x	x	✓	x
Juvenile justice services	✓	x	x	✓	x
<i>Housing and homelessness</i>					
Public housing	✓	✓	x	x	x
State owned and managed Indigenous housing	✓	✓	✓	x	✓
Community housing	✓	x	x	x	x
Indigenous community housing	✓	✓	x	✓	✓
Commonwealth Rent Assistance	x	✓	✓	x	x
Supported Accommodation Assistance Program	x	✓	✓	✓	x

Source: Chapters 3–17.

Since 2003, the Steering Committee has compiled all of the RoGS information on Indigenous Australians into a separate Indigenous compendium. The most recent compendium (of data from the 2010 RoGS) was released in April 2010 (SCRGSP 2010b). A compendium of Indigenous data from this RoGS will be released by mid-2011.

Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators report

In April 2002, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) commissioned the Steering Committee to produce a regular report on key indicators of Indigenous disadvantage. The terms of reference for this report was updated in March 2009 and the new terms of reference for the Review, endorsed by COAG in 2010, encompasses the *Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators* (OID) report. Four editions of the OID report have been published (SCRGSP 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009b). The fifth edition of the *Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage* (OID) report is anticipated to be released in mid-2011.

Indigenous Expenditure Report

In December 2007, COAG committed to reporting on expenditure on services to Indigenous Australians. In October 2008, Treasury requested the Secretariat for the Review to provide secretariat services to the Indigenous Expenditure Report Steering Committee, an arrangement endorsed by COAG in 2009.

The first data report, which is planned for public release in early 2011, notes that identifying the share of government expenditure that relates to Indigenous people is a complex exercise, and the quality of reporting is likely to improve across subsequent reports. Developments in the Indigenous Expenditure Report have the potential to improve expenditure reporting in the RoGS.

Data collection issues relating to Indigenous Australians

National work on improving Indigenous identification is ongoing. The robustness of Indigenous identification cuts across jurisdictions' collections and a joint ABS and AIHW paper on national Indigenous identification is planned for publication in 2011.

Many administrative data collections do not have accurate or complete identification of the Indigenous status of their clients. In some instances, the method and level of identification of Indigenous people appear to vary across jurisdictions. Further, while many surveys now include an Indigenous identifier, many do not

include a sufficiently large sample to provide reliable results for the Indigenous population.

The ABS and AIHW undertake important roles in improving data for the Indigenous population, including:

- an ongoing program to improve the identification of Indigenous status of clients in Australian, State and Territory governments' administrative systems. Priority is being given to the improvement of births and deaths statistics in all states and territories, as well as data for hospital separations, community services, education, housing and crime and justice
- work with other agencies to develop and support national Indigenous information plans, Indigenous performance indicators and Indigenous taskforces on a number of topics
- improving Indigenous enumeration in the five-yearly Census of Population and Housing, including data for small geographic areas
- an established cycle of Indigenous-specific surveys as part of the ABS Household Survey Program to provide Indigenous statistics on a three-yearly basis and an annual series of Indigenous labour force estimates.

The Ministerial Council on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs (MCATSIA) commissioned work to identify methodological issues in Indigenous data collections, outline how these are being addressed and identify any remaining gaps. The findings are presented in *Population and Diversity: Policy Implications of Emerging Indigenous Demographic Trends*, released in mid-2006 by the Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR) (Taylor 2006). In mid-2007, MCATSIA commissioned further work on Indigenous population statistics from the CAEPR constructed around four projects:

- detailed regional analysis of change in Indigenous social indicators
- assessment of social and spatial mobility among Indigenous people in metropolitan areas
- development of conceptual and methodological approaches to the measurement of short term mobility
- case-study analyses of multiple disadvantage in select city neighbourhoods and regional centres.

Working Papers related to these projects are co-badged with MCATSIA and released as part of the CAEPR Working Paper Series (CAEPR 2008).

In December 2007, COAG established a Working Group on Indigenous Reform (WGIR) to support the achievement of COAG's Indigenous targets. It is chaired by

the Hon Jenny Macklin MP, Australian Government Minister for Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and comprises senior officials from each jurisdiction. The WGIR has developed a Closing the Gaps framework and the Steering Committee is committed to aligning relevant indicators in this RoGS with the WGIR framework.

The Coordinator-General for Remote Indigenous Services (CGRIS) provides a 6 monthly report to the Minister for Families Community Services and Indigenous Affairs. The first report was noted at COAG on 7 December 2009. COAG decided that the WGIR will provide a progress report to COAG on recommendations in the CGRS report. The first WGIR progress report was noted by COAG at its April 2010 meeting. COAG also committed to continuing its monitoring of progress of the National Partnership on Remote Service Delivery (COAG 2010).

The Review will draw on these initiatives in future RoGS.

People living in rural and remote areas

The Steering Committee selectively reports on the performance of governments in delivering services to people in communities outside the capital cities. Table 2.5 indicates which service sectors are reporting at least one data item on services delivered to people in rural and remote areas.

Table 2.5 Reporting of at least one data item on rural and remote communities, 2011 RoGS

Service area/indicator framework	Descriptive	Outcomes	Outputs		
			Equity	Effectiveness	Efficiency
<i>Early childhood, education and training</i>					
Early childhood, education and training preface	x	x	✓	x	x
Children's services	x	x	✓	✓	x
School education	✓	✓	x	x	x
VET	x	✓	✓	x	x
<i>Justice</i>					
Justice preface	x	x	x	x	x
Police services	x	x	x	x	x
Court administration	x	x	x	x	x
Corrective services	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Emergency management</i>					
Fire events	x	x	x	✓	x
Ambulance events	x	x	x	x	x
Road rescue events	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Health</i>					
Health preface	✓	x	x	x	x
Public hospitals	✓	x	x	✓	x
Maternity services	x	x	x	x	x
Primary and community health	x	✓	✓	✓	x
Breast cancer	x	x	✓	x	x
Mental health	x	✓	✓	x	x
<i>Community services</i>					
Community services preface	x	x	x	x	x
Aged care services	✓	x	✓	✓	x
Services for people with disability	x	x	✓	✓	x
Child protection and out-of-home care	x	x	x	x	x
Juvenile justice services	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Housing</i>					
Public housing	✓	x	x	x	x
State owned and managed Indigenous housing	✓	x	x	x	x
Community housing	✓	x	x	x	x
Indigenous community housing	x	x	x	x	x
Commonwealth Rent Assistance	x	x	✓	x	x
Supported Accommodation Assistance Program	x	x	x	x	x

Source: Chapters 3–17.

Where geographic location is used to identify groups with special needs, data are usually disaggregated according to a geographic classification system, either:

- the Rural, Remote and Metropolitan Areas (RRMA) classification system developed in 1994 by the Department of Primary Industries and Energy, and the then Department of Human Services and Health (now Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing), or a variant of RRMA, or
- the Australian Bureau of Statistics' (ABS 2009) Australian Standard Geographical Classification of remoteness areas based on the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA) developed by Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care and the National Key Centre For Social Applications of Geographic Information Systems.

Reporting data on rural and remote communities is complicated by the number of classification systems that exist. The chapters on children's services, VET, emergency management, aged care services, disability services and housing use the ABS Australian Standard Geographical Classification of remoteness areas.

A number of other services (public hospitals, primary and community health and protection and support services) use the Rural, Remote and Metropolitan Areas (RRMA) classification or a variant (DPIE and DSHS 1994). The chapter on school education uses its own system developed for education ministers, known as the Geographic Location Classification, which draws on the RRMA classification and ABS's Accessibility and Remoteness Index of Australia (Jones 2000).

People from a non-English speaking background

A number of chapters in the RoGS include data on the performance of governments in providing services to people from a non-English speaking background. Table 2.6 indicates which services have reported at least one performance indicator for all jurisdictions.

Reporting data on people from a non-English speaking background is complicated by the number of classification systems that exist. Various chapters of the RoGS use different classification systems based on: people speaking a language other than English at home (reported for children's services, VET, and breast cancer detection and management); people with a language background other than English (reported for school education); and people born in a non-English speaking country (reported for aged care services, services for people with disability and SAAP, within protection and support services). In addition, some services report data using the cultural and language diversity classification (see for example, SAAP and aged care).

Table 2.6 Reporting of at least one data item on people from a non-English speaking background, 2011 RoGS

Service area/indicator framework	Descriptive	Outcomes	Outputs		
			Equity	Effectiveness	Efficiency
<i>Early childhood, education and training</i>					
Early childhood, education and training preface	x	✓	x	x	x
Children's services	x	x	✓	x	x
School education	✓	✓	x	x	x
VET	x	✓	✓	x	x
<i>Justice</i>					
Justice preface	x	x	x	x	x
Police services	x	x	x	x	x
Court administration	x	x	x	x	x
Corrective services	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Emergency management</i>					
Fire events	x	x	x	x	x
Ambulance events	x	x	x	x	x
Road rescue events	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Health</i>					
Health preface	x	x	x	x	x
Public hospitals	x	x	x	x	x
Maternity services	x	x	x	x	x
Primary and community health	x	x	x	x	x
Breast cancer	x	x	✓	x	x
Mental health	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Community services</i>					
Community services preface	x	x	x	x	x
Aged care services	x	x	✓	x	x
Services for people with disability	x	x	✓	✓	x
Child protection and out-of-home care	x	x	x	x	x
Juvenile justice services	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Housing</i>					
Public housing	x	x	x	x	x
State owned and managed Indigenous housing	x	x	x	x	x
Community housing	x	x	x	x	x
Indigenous community housing	x	x	x	x	x
Commonwealth Rent Assistance	x	x	x	x	x
Supported Accommodation Assistance Program	x	x	✓	✓	x

Source: Chapters 3–17.

2.4 ‘Cross-cutting’ issues

There is growing emphasis on the management of policy issues that cover more than one service-sector, service area or ministerial portfolio — for example, government policies aimed at specific client groups such as older people, females, children, Indigenous Australians, people in rural and remote areas and people from non-English speaking backgrounds. Improving the management of these issues can contribute to more effective and efficient service provision. Greater efficiency can come from more clearly defined priorities and from the elimination of duplicated or inconsistent programs. Improved outcomes can also result from a more holistic and client centred approach to service delivery.

Cross-cutting issues arise in several areas of the RoGS. The frameworks in chapter 12 (‘Health management issues’) are one means of reporting outcomes for a range of different services working in combination. The ultimate aim of chapter 12 is to report on the performance of primary, secondary and tertiary health services in improving outcomes for people with breast cancer or mental illness. The frameworks and the scope of services reported are evolving over time. The mental health management section, for example, currently focuses on the performance of specialised mental health services, but people with a mental illness also access: primary and community health services (such as general practitioners, and drug and alcohol services) (chapter 11), for example, general practitioners often refer people to specialist health and health-related services, and the quality of their links with these services and of their referral practices can influence the appropriateness of services received by clients; aged care services (chapter 13); services for people with disability (chapter 14); public housing (chapter 16); and, some people with a mental illness also enter corrective services (chapter 8).

Other references in this RoGS to cross-cutting issues include:

- workforce participation and the availability of child care services, VET in schools and non-linear education and training pathways are briefly discussed in the ‘Early childhood, education and training preface’
- mortality rates and life expectancy (reported in the ‘Health preface’) are influenced by education, public health, housing, primary and community health, and hospital services (as well as external factors)
- potentially preventable hospitalisations (chapter 11) — are influenced by primary and community health services
- the proportion of general practitioners with links to specialised mental health services (chapter 12) — general practitioners often refer people to specialist health and health-related services, and the quality of their links with these

services and of their referral practices can influence the appropriateness of services received by clients

- long term aged care in public hospitals (chapter 13)
- younger people with disability in residential aged care facilities (chapter 14)
- community services pathways and Home and Community Care (HACC) across the community services sector ('Community services preface')
- rates of return to prison and community corrections (reported in the 'Justice preface') are influenced by the activities of police, courts and corrective services (as well as other factors)
- changes in education outcomes over time for children on custody or guardianship orders (chapter 15), compared to changes in education outcomes over time for all children (the latter also reported in school education, chapter 4)
- the contributions of many services to child protection services (discussed primarily in chapter 15). Police services investigate serious allegations of child abuse and neglect, courts decide whether a child will be placed on an order, education and child care services provide services for these children, and health services support the assessment of child protection matters and deliver therapeutic, counselling and other services
- close links between SAAP and supported accommodation assistance services (chapter 17) and other forms of housing assistance reported in the Housing chapter (chapter 16), particularly housing funded under the Crisis Accommodation Program.

Counter-terrorism

A number of service areas included in this RoGS contribute to government initiatives to improve security throughout Australia. In particular, emergency services, police and public hospitals are key services involved in the inter-jurisdictional National Counter Terrorism Plan.¹ While performance data in

¹ A National Counter Terrorism Committee with officials from the Australian, State and Territory governments has developed a National Counter Terrorism Plan. All governments have responsibilities under the Plan to prevent acts of terrorism or, if such acts occur, to manage their consequences in Australia (Attorney-General's Department 2009). The Counter-Terrorism White Paper 2010, *Securing Australia – Protecting our Community*, sets out Australia's counter-terrorism objectives and the means by which the Government will pursue them and provides that in relation to global counter-terrorism, Australia is committed to all United Nations counter-terrorism agreements. The White Paper reflects a number of improvements to Australia's approach to counter-terrorism and brings together for the first time, in a comprehensive manner, Australia's response to terrorism both domestically and internationally (DPM&C 2010).

this RoGS do not explicitly include the details of these government activities, such activities need to be kept in mind when interpreting performance results — for example:

- counter-terrorism activities might have led to an increase in government expenditure, but the outputs or outcomes (for example, increased security patrols, emergency planning or improved security) may not show up in the data in the chapters. In this case, performance results for efficiency indicators might suggest a decrease in value for money
- counter-terrorism requirements might have been accommodated by an increase in productivity rather than an increase in expenditure, but if the additional outputs or outcomes are not recorded in the chapters, then performance results will not reflect the improvement in productivity.

The agencies with the primary responsibilities for counter-terrorism (such as the defence forces, the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation and the relevant coordinating bodies) are not within scope for this RoGS, so comprehensive reporting of counter-terrorism is not included.

2.5 References

- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) 2009, *Australian Standard Geographical Classification*, Cat. no. 1216.0, Canberra.
- 2009, *Childhood Education and Care, Australia*, Cat. no. 4402.0, Canberra.
- , *National Information Development Plan for Crime and Justice Statistics 2005*, Cat. no. 4520.0, Canberra.
- Attorney-General's Department 2009, *Counter-terrorism committees*, www.ag.gov.au/www/agd/agd.nsf/Page/Nationalsecurity_Counter-terrorism_Counter-terrorismcommittees, Australian Government (accessed 17 November 2009).
- CAEPR (Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research) 2008, *MCATSLA Indigenous Population Project*, www.anu.edu.au/caepr/projects/mcatsia.php, Australian National University (accessed 19 November 2009).
- COAG (Council of Australian Governments) 2008, *COAG Communiqué 29 November 2008*, www.coag.gov.au/coag_meeting_outcomes/2008-11-29/index.cfm, Australian Government (accessed 19 November 2009).
- 2010, *COAG Communiqué 20 April 2010*, www.coag.gov.au/coag_meeting_outcomes/2010-04-19/docs/communique_20_April_2010.rtf, Australian Government (accessed 21 July 2010).
- DPM&C (Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet) 2010, *Counter-Terrorism White Paper Securing Australia Protecting Our Community*, Australian Government, www.dpmc.gov.au/publications/counter_terrorism/docs/counter-terrorism_white_paper.pdf (accessed 21 July 2010).
- DPIE and DSHS (Department of Primary Industries and Energy and Department of Human Services and Health) 1994, *Rural, Remote and Metropolitan Areas Classification*, 1991 Census edition, Australian Government Publishing Service (AGPS), Canberra.
- Equal and Donovan Research 2000, *National Satisfaction Survey of Clients of Disability Services*, Report prepared for the Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision and the National Disability Administrators, Productivity Commission, Canberra.
- Jones, R. G. 2000, *Development of a common definition of, and approach to collection on, the geographic location of students to be used for nationally comparable reporting of outcomes of schooling*, report prepared for the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs National Education Performance Monitoring Taskforce, Carlton, Victoria.

SCRCSSP (Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision) 2002 (and previous issues), *Report on Government Service Provision 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 1997a, *Data Envelopment Analysis: A Technique for Measuring the Efficiency of Government Service Delivery*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 1997b, *Reforms in Government Service Provision 1997*, AGPS, Canberra.

— 1998a, *Superannuation in the Costing of Government Services*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 1998b, *Implementing Reforms in Government Services 1998*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 1999a, *Payroll Tax in the Costing of Government Services*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 1999b, *Linking Inputs and Outputs: Activity Measurement by Police Services*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 2001, *Asset Measurement in the Costing of Government Services*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 2003, *Efficiency Measures for Child Protection and Support Pathways, Reforms in Government Service Provision*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

SCRGSP (Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision) 2010a (and previous issues), *Report on Government Service Provision 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 2010b, *Report on Government Services 2010: Indigenous Compendium*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 2009 (and previous issues), *Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators 2003, 2005, 2007*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

— 2005, *Review of patient satisfaction and experience surveys conducted for public hospitals in Australia*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

Taylor, J. 2006, *Population and Diversity: Policy Implications of Emerging Indigenous Demographic Trends*, Discussion paper no. 283/2006, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Australian National University, Canberra.

Working Group on Indigenous Reform 2010, *Progress Status Report addressing the recommendations of the first six monthly report of the Coordinator-General for Remote Indigenous Services*, www.coag.gov.au/coag_meeting_outcomes/2010-04-19/docs/WGIR_progress_status_report.pdf (accessed 21 July 2010).

