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## F.1 Introduction

This sector overview provides an introduction to the Aged care services (chapter 13), Services for people with disability (chapter 14), Child protection services (chapter 15) and Youth justice services (chapter 16) chapters of this Report. It provides an overview of the community services sector, presenting both contextual information and high level performance information.

All abbreviations used in this Report are available in a complete list in volume A: Approach to performance reporting.

### Policy context

Families are the principal providers of care for children, older people and people with disability (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS)) 2010; Australian Government 2008).

Community services aim to:

* support families to fulfil their caring roles
* provide care when families are unable to
* provide interventions when a person’s needs are not able to be met within the community without special intervention.

Community services provide support to sustain and nurture the functioning of individuals, families and groups, to maximise their potential and to enhance community wellbeing (Australian Council of Social Service 2009). Although community services generally target individuals, and/or families, they can be delivered at an institutional level. Services are typically provided by government and the not‑for‑profit sector, but the for‑profit sector also has an important role (for example, as owners of aged care facilities). Community services also contribute to the development of community infrastructure to service needs (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2005).

### Sector scope

Although there is a broad understanding of the nature of community services, the sector is complex, and consistent aggregate reporting across the community services sector is not possible at this time.

Definitions of the sector vary in their scope and can change over time. Community services typically include activities that support individual and family functioning. These activities can include financial assistance and relief to people in crisis but exclude acute health care services and long-term housing assistance. Some of these interventions are included elsewhere in this Report; for example, Public hospitals (chapter 11), Mental health management (chapter 12), Housing (chapter 17) and Homelessness services (chapter 18).

The definition of community services activities in this sector overview is based on the National Classification of Community Services developed by the AIHW (2003) (box F.1). The scope of the sector overview is therefore somewhat broader than the four service‑specific chapters in this section of the Report.

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.1 Community services activities |
| Community services activities include:  *Personal and social support* — providing support for personal or social functioning in daily life. Such activities promote the development of personal skills for successful functioning as individuals, family members and members of the wider community and include: the provision of information, advice and referral; personal, social and systemic advocacy; counselling; domestic assistance; provision of services that enable people to remain in their homes; disability services and other personal assistance services.  *Support for children, families and carers* — supporting families and protecting children from abuse and neglect or harm through statutory intervention.  *Training, vocational rehabilitation and employment* — assisting people who are disadvantaged in the labour market by providing training, job search skills, help in finding work, placement and support in open employment or, where appropriate, supported employment.  *Financial and material assistance* — providing emergency or immediate financial assistance and material goods.  *Residential care and supported accommodation* — providing special purpose residential facilities, including accommodation in conjunction with other types of support, such as assistance with necessary day‑to‑day living tasks and intensive forms of care such as nursing care.  *Youth justice services* — dealing with young people and people with intellectual and psychiatric disabilities on court orders that involve correctional and rehabilitative supervision and the protection of public safety, through corrective arrangements and advice to courts and releasing authorities.a  *Service and community development and support* — providing support aimed at articulating and promoting improved social policies; promoting greater public awareness of social issues; developing and supporting community based activities, special interest and cultural groups; and developing and facilitating the delivery of quality community services. Activities include the development of public policy submissions, social planning and social action, the provision of expert advice, coordination, training, staff and volunteer development, and management support to service providers.  a This Report uses the term ‘youth justice’ to refer to detention and community‑based supervision services for young people who have committed or allegedly committed an offence while considered by law to be a juvenile (chapter 16). |
| *Source*: AIHW (2003); State and Territory governments (unpublished). |
|  |
|  |

### Profile of the community services sector

This section examines the size and scope of the community services sector and the role of government in providing community services as a whole. Detailed profiles for the services within the community services sector are reported in chapters 13, 14, 15 and 16, including the size and scope of individual service types and associated expenditure.

#### Roles and responsibilities

The Australian, State and Territory governments have major roles in the provision of community services. These roles are based on mandates to ensure basic rights and an acceptable standard of living, and a requirement to protect and support vulnerable people in society.

Local governments are also funders and providers of community services (AIHW 2005). However, community services funded solely by local government are not included in this Report.

Government involvement in community services includes:

* providing services directly to clients
* funding non‑government community service providers (which then provide services to clients)
* legislating for, and regulating, government and non‑government providers
* undertaking strategic planning, policy development and administration
* undertaking monitoring and evaluation of community services’ programs.

The roles and funding arrangements for community services vary across service areas and programs:

* statutory child protection, out‑of‑home care services, intensive family support services and youth justice services are funded and delivered primarily by State and Territory governments, with some non‑government sector involvement, particularly in the delivery of out‑of‑home care services. Family support and early intervention (assessment and referral) services are funded by State and Territory governments and services are delivered primarily by non‑government organisations
* specialist disability services, excluding employment services, are funded primarily by State and Territory governments (with some Australian Government contribution) and are delivered primarily by State and Territory governments and the non‑government sector. Employment services are funded and provided primarily by the Australian Government. All governments are responsible for the cost of the NDIS. The NDIS is delivered nationally by the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) and funded by all governments
* the funding, regulation and policy oversight of aged care services are predominantly the role of the Australian Government and services are largely delivered by non‑government organisations. State, Territory and local governments do fund and deliver some aged care services. Effective regulation of non‑government agencies (through licensing, accreditation and quality assurance) enables agencies to provide services within standards, for example, the accreditation of residential aged care services.

#### Expenditure

Estimates of community services expenditure are influenced by the scope of the services to be included. The following broad estimates of community services expenditure provide context for material included in the relevant chapters of this Report.

*Australia’s welfare 2015* (AIHW 2015) analyses community services expenditure incurred by governments, non‑government organisations and individual households in providing services to assist members of the community with special needs. It reported that in   
2012‑13:

* welfare expenditure was estimated to be $136.5 billion, $93.1 billion (68 per cent) of which was in cash payments while $35.9 billion (26 per cent) was for welfare services
* of the $93.1 billion in cash payments, $40.1 billion was for older people, $28.2 billion was for families and children and $22.8 billion was for people with disability.

The following analysis relates only to expenditure on programs reported in the community services chapters of this Report: aged care services; services for people with disability; child protection services and youth justice services (each chapter includes more detailed analysis of expenditure items reported).

Total Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure on community services covered by this Report was estimated to be $28.9 billion in 2014‑15 (table F.1). This was equivalent to 1.8 per cent of GDP in that year, and 9.9 per cent of total government outlays (table F.1 and ABS 2015a).

|  |
| --- |
| Table F.1 Real government recurrent expenditure on community services (2014‑15 dollars)**a, b** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Unit | ACS | SPWD | CPS | YJS | Total | | 2010‑11 | $m | 12 922.6 | 6 582.8 | 3 313.6 | na | 22 819.0 | | 2011‑12 | $m | 13 793.5 | 7 088.0 | 3 868.6 | 663.5 | 25 413.6 | | 2012‑13 | $m | 14 469.6 | 7 359.1 | 3 996.8 | 681.7 | 26 507.1 | | 2013‑14 | $m | 15 010.0 | 7 622.8 | 4 101.9 | 684.7 | 27 419.4 | | 2014-15 | $m | 15 820.7 | 8 009.7 | 4 341.9 | 697.6 | 28 869.0 | | **Increase 2010‑11 to 2014‑15** | **%** | **22.4** | **21.7** | **31.0** | **na** | **26.5** | |
| ACS = Aged care services. SPWD = Services for people with disability. CPS = Child protection services. YJS = Youth justice services. a Totals may not add as a result of rounding. b See tables 13A.5, 14A.6, 15A.1, 16A.1 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats |
| *Source*: Australian, State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 13A.5, 14A.6, 15A.1, 16A.1 and 2A.48. |
|  |
|  |

Between 2010‑11 and 2014‑15, real government recurrent expenditure on these services increased by $6.0 billion or 26.5 per cent. The largest proportional increase in real expenditure over this period was on child protection services, which increased by 31.0 per cent. Part of this increase is explained by the addition from 2011‑12 onwards of expenditure data for family support services. The largest absolute dollar increase for a particular service between 2010‑11 and 2014‑15 was $2.9 billion for aged care services (table F.1).

Table F.2identifies expenditure on community services included in this Report by State and Territory governments and the Australian Government, available for reporting by State and Territory for 2014‑15. Australian, State and Territory governments spent $2130 on community services covered in this Report per person in the population (table F.2).

|  |
| --- |
| Table F.2 Government recurrent expenditure on community services, 2014‑15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Units | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust | | **Recurrent expenditure on community services** | | | | | | | | | | | | ACS | $m | 4 951.0 | 4 140.9 | 2 935.3 | 1 488.2 | 1 426.2 | 402.8 | 210.4 | 104.2 | 15 820.7 | | SPWD | $m | 2 331.2 | 1 708.1 | 1 209.5 | 870.6 | 598.5 | 167.8 | 107.1 | 88.9 | 8 009.7 | | CPS | $m | 1 550.3 | 851.7 | 860.6 | 448.3 | 321.7 | 79.5 | 51.6 | 177.3 | 4 341.0 | | YJS | $m | 218.4 | 122.7 | 1 58.5 | 102.9 | 32.5 | 17.5 | 21.6 | 23.3 | 697.6 | | **Total** | **$m** | **9 051.0** | **6 823.4** | **5 163.9** | **2 910.0** | **2 378.9** | **667.7** | **390.8** | **393.7** | **28 869.0** | | **Proportion of recurrent expenditure by service** | | | | | | | | | | | | ACS | **%** | 54.7 | 60.7 | 56.8 | 51.1 | 60.0 | 60.3 | 53.8 | 26.5 | 54.8 | | SPWD | % | 25.8 | 25.0 | 23.4 | 29.9 | 25.2 | 25.1 | 27.4 | 22.6 | 27.7 | | CPS | % | 17.1 | 12.5 | 16.7 | 15.4 | 13.5 | 11.9 | 13.2 | 45.0 | 15.0 | | YJS | % | 2.4 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 2.4 | | **Total** | **%** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | | **Recurrent expenditure on community services per person in the population**b | | | | | | | | | | | | ACS | $ | 654.4 | 703.5 | 617.9 | 576.5 | 843.2 | 781.8 | 542.8 | 426.5 | 669.6 | | SPWD | $ | 308.1 | 290.2 | 254.6 | 337.3 | 353.8 | 325.7 | 276.4 | 363.7 | 339.0 | | CPS | **$** | 914.8 | 661.0 | 764.1 | 758.8 | 893.8 | 696.5 | 596.1 | 2 791.5 | 815.3 | | YJS | $ | 301.1 | 224.4 | 326.0 | 412.5 | 205.5 | 341.7 | 623.0 | 878.5 | 306.1 | | **Total** | **$** | **2 178.4** | **1 879.0** | **1 962.6** | **2 085.1** | **2 296.3** | **2 145.8** | **2 038.4** | **4 460.2** | **2 130.0** | |
| ACS = Aged care services. SPWD = Services for people with disability. CPS = Child protection services. YJS = Youth justice services. a See tables 13A.5, 14A.6, 15A.1, 16A.1 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. b For child protection services and youth justice services, recurrent expenditure per person is calculated using population data for children 0–17 years (child protection) and 10–17 years (youth justice). |
| *Source*: Australian, State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 13A.5, 14A.6, 15A.1 and 16A.1. |
|  |
|  |

#### Size and scope

Current data on the size and scope of the community services sector are limited. The ABS Community Services Survey collected data on the number of organisations that provided community services in 2009. Almost 11 000 organisations were providing community services. These included 5809 not‑for‑profit organisations, 4638 for‑profit organisations and 520 government organisations (ABS 2010).

### Social and economic factors affecting demand for services

In general, disadvantaged members of the community live shorter lives and have higher rates of illness and disability than those whose circumstances are advantageous. For example, higher levels of education and income are associated with lower prevalence of health risk factors such as smoking and obesity and better health outcomes generally (AIHW 2010).

Disadvantage also limits the extent to which individuals and families can participate in society. Economic participation conveys financial, health and social benefits to individuals, households and families and is central to population welfare. Economic participation can be described as a person’s engagement in education and employment, and access to economic resources including income and wealth. The various aspects of economic participation are inter‑related, and are also associated with positive social and health outcomes (AIHW 2011).

##### Child protection and youth justice services

No single factor can predict whether a child will require child protection services. Factors commonly associated with child protection involvement include: early child bearing, parental alcohol and drug use, family violence, adult mental illness, social isolation, children with health, disability or behavioural problems, and families under financial stress (Bromfield and Holzer 2008; Allen Consulting Group 2003).

Similarly, no single factor can predict which children will come into contact with the justice system or be subject to youth justice supervision. A range of factors are associated with youth justice system involvement, including a young person’s lack of maturity, his or her propensity to take risks and susceptibility to peer influence, intellectual disability, mental illness, and entrenched socioeconomic disadvantage (Richards 2011).

##### Disability services

The disability policy and service delivery environment has changed significantly in recent years, notably with the introduction and staged implementation of the NDIS from 2013 to assist people who have a significant and permanent disability and who need assistance with everyday activities. Currently, assistance is provided by governments to people with disability and their carers, through specialist disability services provided under the National Disability Agreement (NDA) and through the NDIS. Unlike arrangements under the NDA, which provide funding to providers for supports based on available places in a set number of programs, the NDIS is intended to provide more choice and control to the person with disability over how and when support is provided (AIHW 2015). The NDIS is being rolled out progressively across the country and will largely replace the current provision of services provided under the NDA.

##### Aged care services

The ageing population is one of the key factors that will affect the demand for aged care services over the next 35 years. The number of people aged 65 years or over is expected to more than double, increasing from 14.9 per cent of the total population in June 2015 (table 13A.1) to 25.3 per cent by 2047 (PC 2011b). An even bigger relative increase (around four times) in the number of people aged over 85 years is anticipated. This age cohort comprises the main users of aged care services (PC 2011b).

Future challenges include increasing numbers of older people who are likely to require care (by 2050 it is estimated that 3.5 million Australians will use aged care services), expectations of care and a relative decrease in the number of informal carers (PC 2011b). The Australian Government’s aged care reform package, announced during 2012, includes a focus on increased consumer choice and control; more affordable and easier access to a full range of services; improved and expanded home care, support and residential care; better information; and more sustainable financing arrangements.

### The role of carers across Australia

Carers play a vital role in supporting people in need to remain in the community. Although some care is provided by formal providers, currently it is often undertaken informally by friends and family. Carers enable older people to remain in their homes and support people with disability and long‑term health conditions to remain in the community (ABS 2014).

The National Carer Strategy was launched by the Australian Government in August 2011 and gave effect to the *Carer Recognition Act 2010*. It forms part of the Australian Government’s National Carer Recognition Framework. The strategy aims to ensure that carers are valued and respected and that they have rights, choices, opportunities and capabilities to participate in economic, social and community life. All State and Territory governments have committed to identifying initiatives and activities that complement the strategy, or identify areas that can be worked on cooperatively. Annual Progress Reports outline the progress that has been made since the Strategy’s introduction.

In 2012, there were 2.7 million carers across Australia, around 769 800 of whom were primary carers (table FA.1). This equates to approximately 3.4 per cent of the Australian population being providers of primary care. Figure F.1presents the proportion of the Australian population who are carers, disaggregated by jurisdiction and carer type.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.1 Proportion of the Australian population who are carers, by jurisdiction, and carer type, 2012**a, b** |
| |  | | --- | | **Figure F.1 Proportion of the Australian population who are carers, by jurisdiction, and carer type, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.**  Legend to Figure F.1 Proportion of the Australian population who are carers, by jurisdiction, and carer type, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a See table FA.1 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. b Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. |
| *Source*: ABS (2013), *Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia: Summary of findings*, Cat. no. 4430.0, Canberra; table FA.1. |
|  |
|  |

Chapter 14 includes further information on carers of people with disability, including the labour force participation of primary carers and the proportion of primary carers who report a need for further assistance in their caring roles.

### Service‑sector objectives

The overarching service sector objectives in box F.2draw together the objectives from each of the specific services detailed in this Report.

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.2 Objectives of community services |
| The overarching objective of the community services’ sector is to ensure that older people, people with disability and vulnerable children are supported or assisted and have the opportunity to fully participate in the community.  The specific objectives of the services that comprise the community services sector are summarised below:   * Aged care services (chapter 13) aim to promote the wellbeing and independence of frail older people and their carers through the funding and delivery of care services that are accessible, appropriate to needs, high quality, efficient, and person‑centred. * Services for people with disability (chapter 14) aim to enhance the quality of life experienced by people with disability by assisting them to live as valued and participating members of the community. * Child protection services (chapter 15) aim to support families to care for their children and to protect children who are at risk of harm. * Youth justice services (chapter 16) aim to contribute to a reduction in the frequency and severity of youth offending, recognise the rights of victims, and promote community safety. |
| *Source*: Chapters 13, 14, 15 and 16. |
|  |
|  |

## F.2 Sector performance indicator framework

This sector overview is based on a sector performance indicator framework (figure F.2). This framework is made up of the following elements:

* Sector objectives — three sector objectives are a précis of the key objectives of the community services sector (box F.2)
* Sector‑wide indicators — sector‑wide indicators are high level indicators which cut across community services
* Service‑specific indicators — information from the service‑specific performance indicator frameworks that relate to community services.

This sector overview provides an overview of relevant performance information. Chapters 13, 14, 15 and 16 and their associated attachment tables provide more detailed information.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.2 Community services performance indicator framework |
| |  | | --- | | Figure F.2 Community services performance indicator framework  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
|  |
|  |

### Sector‑wide indicators

This section includes high level indicators of community services outcomes. Many factors are likely to influence these outcomes — not solely the performance of government services. However, these outcomes inform the development of appropriate policies and the delivery of government services.

Data Quality Information (DQI) is included where available for performance indicators in this Report. The purpose of DQI is to provide structured and consistent information about quality aspects of data used to report on performance indicators, in addition to material in the chapter or sector overview and attachment tables. All DQI for the 2016 Report can be found at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016.

#### Wellbeing of older people

‘Wellbeing of older people’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to promote the wellbeing and independence of older people (box F.3).

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.3 Wellbeing of older people |
| ‘Wellbeing of older people’ is defined as overall life satisfaction of older people and is measured by the proportion of people aged 65 years or over who were at least satisfied with their lives.  A high proportion of people who are at least satisfied with their lives is desirable.  Data are no longer available for reporting against this indicator. 2010 data and data quality information can be found in the 2015 Report. The Steering Committee will consider the priority of this indicator and whether alternative measures and/or data should be further developed for this Report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Independence of older people

‘Independence of older people’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to promote the wellbeing and independence of older people (box F.4).

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.4 Independence of older people |
| ‘Independence of older people’ is defined as participation in the community by older people and is measured by the proportion of people living in households aged 65 or over, who participated in social or community activities away from home in the past three months.  A high proportion of people aged 65 years or over who participated in social or community activities is desirable.  Data for this measure include 95 per cent confidence intervals (in the form of error bars in figures and percentages in tables).  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions for 2012 * complete (subject to caveats) for the current reporting period. All required 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions   The SDAC does not include people living in discrete Indigenous communities and very remote areas, which affects the comparability of the NT results.  Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2012, among people aged 65 years or over living in households, the proportion who participated in social or community activities away from home in the past 3 months was 93.2 per cent (figure F.3).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.3 Proportion of people living in households aged 65 years or over, who participated in social or community activities away from home in the past three months, 2012**a** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure F.3 Proportion of people living in households aged 65 years or over, who participated in social or community activities away from home in the past three months, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a See box F.4 and table FA.2 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: ABS (unpublished) Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers (SDAC) 2012; table FA.2. |
|  |
|  |

#### Quality of life of people with disability

‘Quality of life of people with disability’ is an indicator of governments’ objective for people with disability to have an enhanced quality of life and participate as valued members of the community (box F.5).

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.5 Quality of life of people with disability |
| ‘Quality of life of people with disability’ is defined as overall life satisfaction of people with disability, and is measured by the number of people with disability who were at least mostly satisfied with their lives, divided by the total number of people with a mild, moderate, severe or profound disability who provided a response.  A high proportion of people with disability who were at least mostly satisfied with their lives is desirable.  Overall life satisfaction is a summary subjective indicator of wellbeing. A number of circumstances may influence overall life satisfaction, such as health, education, employment, income, personality, family and social connections, civil and human rights, levels of trust and altruism, and opportunities for democratic participation (Diener 1984; Stutzer and Frey 2010).  Data are no longer available for reporting against this indicator. 2010 data and data quality information can be found in the 2015 Report. The Steering Committee will consider the priority of this indicator and whether alternative measures and/or data should be further developed for this Report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Participation of people with disability and their carers in the community

‘Participation of people with disability and their carers in the community’ is an indicator of governments’ objective for people with disability and their carers to participate as valued members of the community and have an enhanced quality of life (box F.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.6 Participation of people with disability and their carers in the community |
| ‘Participation of people with disability and their carers in the community’ is defined as social and community participation of people with disability and their carers and is measured by:   * the proportion of people with disability and their carers who participated in social or community activities (away from home or at home) in the past 3 months * the proportion of primary carers of people with disability who participated in social or community activities (away from home or at home) and without the care recipient in the past 3 months.   A high proportion of people with disability and their carers who participated in social or community activities is desirable.  Data for the indicator include 95 per cent confidence intervals (in the form of error bars in figures and percentages in tables).  Data are not available for reporting against the first measure. Data reported for the second measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions for 2012 but a break in series means that data for 2009 and earlier years are not comparable to data for 2012 * complete (subject to caveats) for the current reporting period. All required 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions   The SDAC does not include people living in discrete Indigenous communities and very remote areas, which affects the comparability of the NT results.  Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2012, 72.1 per cent of primary carers participated in social or community activities away from home and without the recipient of care in the past three months (figure F.4) and 39.0 per cent of primary carers participated in social or community activities at home and without the recipient of care in the past three months (table FA.3).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.4 Proportion of primary carers who participated in social or community activities away from home in the last three months, 2012**a** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure F.4 Proportion of primary carers who participated in social or community activities away from home in the last three months, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a See box F.6 and table FA.3 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: ABS (2013) SDAC 2012; table FA.3. |
|  |
|  |

#### Jobless families with children as a proportion of all families

‘Jobless families with children as a proportion of all families’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure positive family environments for Australia’s children and young people (box F.7).

A reduction in the number of jobless families is important, as there are many costs to the country of family joblessness, including:

* the direct costs of lost national output and supporting families who are not participating in the workforce
* the indirect costs of reduced labour market attachment of children from jobless families, poorer health outcomes, and reduced income and overall wellbeing arising from joblessness (Australian Government 2011).

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.7 Jobless families with children |
| ‘Jobless families with children’ is defined as the number of families without jobs who have children as a proportion of all families. Family is defined as two or more people, one of whom is at least 15 years of age, who are related by blood, marriage (registered or de facto), adoption, step or fostering, and who are usually resident in the same household. The basis of a family is formed by identifying the presence of a couple relationship, lone parent‑child relationship or other blood relationship. Some households will, therefore, contain more than one family (ABS 2015b).  Jobless families with children is reported for three measures:   * jobless families as a proportion of all families * jobless families with dependants (including children aged under 15 years) as a proportion of all families with dependants (including children aged under 15 years) * jobless families with children aged under 15 years as a proportion of all families with children aged under 15 years.   A low or decreasing number of jobless families as a proportion of all families is desirable.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) for 2012 * complete (subject to caveats) for the current reporting period.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, almost 1 in 5 families were jobless as at 30 June 2012, whilst for families with dependents or children under 15 years this was around 1 in 10 (table FA.4).

#### Improving child development

‘Improving child development’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure that Australia’s children and young people are safe and well (box F.8).

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.8 Improving child development |
| ‘Improving child development’ is defined as the proportion of children who are developmentally vulnerable on one or more Australian Early Development Census (AEDC) domains.  A low or decreasing proportion of children who are developmentally vulnerable on one or more AEDC domains is desirable.  The AEDC is a population measure of young children’s development as they enter school and therefore reports on early childhood development across the whole community. Every three years, teachers complete a checklist for children in their first year of full‑time school which measures five key areas, or domains, of early childhood development: physical health and wellbeing; social competence; emotional maturity; language and cognitive skills; communication skills and general knowledge.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete (subject to caveats) for the current reporting period. All required 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2012, 22.0 per cent of children were developmentally vulnerable on one or more AEDC domain/s, while 10.8 per cent of children were developmentally vulnerable on two or more AEDC domains (figure F.5).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.5 Proportion of children who are developmentally vulnerable, 2012**a** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure F.5 Proportion of children who are developmentally vulnerable, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a See box F.8 and table FA.5 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: Centre for Community Child Health and Telethon Institute for Child Health Research (2013), *A Snapshot of Early Childhood Development in Australia ― AEDC National Report 2012*; table FA.5. |
|  |
|  |

### Service‑specific performance indicator frameworks

This section summarises information from the service‑specific indicator frameworks in chapters 13, 14, 15 and 16.

Each performance indicator framework provides comprehensive information on the equity, effectiveness and efficiency of specific government services.

Additional information is available in each chapter and associated attachment tables to assist the interpretation of these results.

#### Aged care services

The performance indicator framework for aged care services is presented in figure F.6. An overview of the aged care performance indicator results are presented in table F.3.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.6 Aged care services performance indicator framework |
| |  | | --- | | Figure F.6 Aged care services performance indicator framework   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table F.3 Performance indicator results for aged care services**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust | | **Equity – access indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Use by different groups** | | | | | | | | | | | Access to aged care services across special needs group — proportion of service clients who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, compared with the proportion of the aged care target population who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13)  Aged care target population, June 2015 | | | | | | | | | | | % | 2.9 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 4.5 | 1.7 | 43.2 | 2.9 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.2  Residential aged care, at 30 June 2 015   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | % | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 53.8 | 1.1 |   Source: Attachment table 13A.24  Home care levels 1‑2, at 30 June 2 015   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | % | 2.6 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 5.3 | 4.8 | 57.8 | 4.3 |   Source: Attachment table 13A.24  Home care levels 3‑4, at 30 June 2 015   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | % | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 22.6 | 1.6 |   Source: Attachment table 13A.24  HACC, 2 014‑15   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | % | 4.0 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 54.7 | 2.9 |   Source: Attachment table 13A.30 | | | | | | | | | | | **Effectiveness — access indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Operational aged care places** | | | | | | | | | | | Total operational aged care places per 1000 people aged 70 years or over (excluding transition care), 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | no. | 111.2 | 112.3 | 107.5 | 109.1 | 119.1 | 108.7 | 113.6 | 195.5 | 111.5 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.19 | | | | | | | | | | | **Elapsed times for aged care services** | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of people entering residential aged care services who did so within 3 months of ACAT approval, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 58.8 | 63.4 | 53.0 | 56.2 | 57.4 | 61.7 | 39.7 | 36.1 | 58.4 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.35 | | | | | | | | | | | **Effectiveness — appropriateness indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Assessed long‑term care arrangements**  Proportion of clients recommended to remain in the community, 2013‑14  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 51.4 | 62.2 | 42.3 | 50.7 | 40.9 | 64.2 | 67.8 | 74.3 | 52.7 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.39 | | | | | | | | | | | **Hospital patient days used by aged care type patients**  Proportion of separations for ‘aged care type’ public hospitals patients that were 35 days or longer, 2013‑14  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 6.7 | 29.7 | 13.0 | 15.5 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 28.7 | 58.5 | 11.5 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.41 | | | | | | | | | | | **Effectiveness — quality indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Compliance with service standards for residential care**  Proportion of all re‑accredited residential aged care services that have been granted a re‑accreditation approval for a period of three years, as at 30 June 2015  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 97.6 | 98.5 | 95.2 | 98.3 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 97.6 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.46   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Compliance with service standards for home care and support**  Proportion of reviews that met all expected outcomes under each of the Standards (NRCP and Home Care services), 30 June 2015  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | | *Standard 1 — Effective management* | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 82.1 | 93.2 | 82.7 | 80.6 | 100.0 | 86.7 | 100.0 | 76.9 | 86.0 | | *Standard 2 — Appropriate access and service delivery* | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 83.2 | 98.9 | 89.8 | 83.9 | 100.0 | 90.0 | 100.0 | 38.5 | 88.6 | | *Standard 3 — Service user rights and responsibilities* | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 95.8 | 100.0 | 99.0 | 90.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 84.6 | 97.4 |   *Source*: Attachment table 13A.48  **Complaints resolution**  Number of complaints received by the Complaints Scheme per 1000 permanent care recipients, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | no. | 21.8 | 23.0 | 22.9 | 15.1 | 19.7 | 24.5 | 11.8 | 37.1 | 21.6 | | *Source*: Attachment table 13A.47 | | | | | | | | | | | **Efficiency indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Cost per output unit**  Australian Government expenditure on aged care assessments, per assessment, 2013‑14  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 542 | 446 | 592 | 595 | 657 | 512 | 475 | 1 244 | 537 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.50  **Expenditure per head of aged care target population**  Governments’ real expenditure on residential services per person aged 65 years or over and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians aged 50–64 years (including payroll tax), 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 2 928 | 3 175 | 2 812 | 2 606 | 3 399 | 2 788 | 2 303 | 1 339 | 2 951 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.52 | | | | | | | | | | | **Outcome indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Social participation in the community** | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of older people aged 65 years or over who did not leave home or did not leave home as often as they would like, 2012  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | *With profound or severe disability* | | | | | | | | | | | % | 49.3 ± 4.7 | 44.9 ± 5.7 | 49.8 ± 6.9 | 39.2 ± 9.7 | 45.2 ± 9.1 | 40.6 ± 9.0 | 42.6 ± 11.2 | 56.3 ± 23.3 | 46.8 ± 2.5 | | *Without disability* | | | | | | | | | | | % | 5.2 ± 1.5 | 6.6 ± 1.8 | 9.2 ± 2.3 | 4.7 ± 2.1 | 4.5 ± 1.7 | 10.4 ± 3.7 | 4.4 ± 3.3 | 6.3 ± 5.4 | 6.4 ± 0.7 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.58 | | | | | | | | | | | **Maintenance of individual functioning**  Improvement in Transition Care Program (TCP) client’s level of functioning, reflected in the movement from the average Modified Barthel Index (MBI) score on entry to the average MBI score on exit, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 13) | | | | | | | | | | | *Average MBI on entry* | | | | | | | | | | | no. | 80 | 64 | 73 | 58 | 68 | 66 | 86 | 84 | 71 | | *Average MBI on exit* | | | | | | | | | | | no. | 91 | 72 | 85 | 67 | 85 | 84 | 93 | 93 | 82 | | Source: Attachment table 13A.59 | | | | | | | | | | |
| a See chapter 13 and attachment 13A for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: Chapter 13 and attachment 13A. |
|  |
|  |

#### Services for people with disability

The performance indicator framework for services for people with disability is presented in figure F.7. An overview of services for people with disability performance indicator results are presented in table F.4.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.7 Services for people with disability performance indicator framework |
| |  | | --- | | Figure F.7 Services for people with disability performance indicator framework   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table F.4 Performance indicator results for services for people with disability**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | | Vic | | Qld | | WA | | SA | | Tas | | ACT | | NT | | Aust | | | **Equity — Access to appropriate services on the basis of relative need** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Access to National Disability Agreement (NDA) accommodation support services** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of potential population who used accommodation support services, 2013‑14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | rate | 5.6 | | 4.7 | | 5.4 | | 6.1 | | 11.1 | | 9.5 | | 5.7 | | 5.6 | | 5.8 | | | *Source*: 14A.19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Service use by severity of disability** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | People using accommodation support services who need help with Activities of Daily Living, 2013-14  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 83.5 | | 77.4 | | 84.8 | | 93.5 | | 87.3 | | 88.7 | | 82.4 | | 79.2 | | 84.3 | | | *Source*: 14A.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Service use by special needs groups** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians using accommodation support services per 1000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander potential population, 2013‑14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | rate | 40.7 | | 24.5 | | 42.8 | | 67.7 | | 117.4 | | 31.7 | | 43.2 | | 100.1 | | 51.5 | | | *Source*: 14A.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Access to community accommodation and care services** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Users of NDA community accommodation and care services as a proportion of all accommodation support service users, 2013‑14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 90.5 | | 95.5 | | 90.1 | | 95.9 | | 92.0 | | 87.2 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 92.3 | | | *Source*: 14A.56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Assistance for younger people with disability in residential aged care** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rate of younger people admitted to permanent residential aged care per 10 000 potential population, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | rate | 35.7 | | 35.2 | | 26.5 | | 24.0 | | 31.9 | | 49.0 | | 15.1 | | 5.7 | | 31.6 | | | *Source*: 14A.63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Effectiveness — Quality — Client and carer perceptions** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Client and Carer Satisfaction** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of people with disability who are satisfied with the quality of assistance received, 2012  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 81.3 ± 3.3 | | 77.6 ± 3.7 | | 79.6 ± 5.3 | | 83.0 ± 8.5 | | 85.3 ± 5.8 | | 92.1 ± 6.9 | | 77.5 ± 11.9 | | 87.5 ± 16.2 | | 79.5 ± 2.4 | | | *Source*: 14A.76 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of primary carers who are satisfied with the quality of assistance received, 2012  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete, subject to caveats (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 65.0 ± 8.1 | | 68.4± 12.8 | | 74.9 ± 14.0 | | 61.4 ± 19.9 | | 67.3 ± 14.6 | | 82.5± 22.1 | | 60.2 ± 18.2 | | 100.0 ± – | | 69.0 ± 5.0 | | | *Source*: 14A.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Efficiency indicators ― cost per output unit** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Government contribution per user of non‑government provided services** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Government funding per user of non‑government provided accommodation support services in institutional/residential setting, 2013‑14  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable, but are complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 61 566 | | 30 345 | | 66 212 | | 117 540 | | 64 385 | | 52 521 | | .. | | .. | | 63 479 | | | *Source*: 14A.84 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Cost per user of State and Territory administered services** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total estimated expenditure per service user, State and Territory government administered programs, 2013‑14  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable, but are complete (subject to caveats)(chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 40 407 | | 26 851 | | 42 394 | | 43 761 | | 27 721 | | 26 585 | | 18 061 | | 31 675 | | 39 072 | | | *Source*: 14A.87 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Efficiency indicators ― administrative cost** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Administrative expenditure as a proportion of total recurrent expenditure** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Administration expenditure as a proportion of total expenditure (including actual and imputed payroll tax), 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable, but are complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | NSW | Vic | | Qld | | WA | | SA | | Tas | | ACT | | NT | | Aus Gov | | Aust | | % | 6.5 | 8.4 | | 5.2 | | 3.3 | | 3.7 | | 6.2 | | 8.7 | | 4.7 | | 7.0 | | 6.2 | | *Source*: 14A.88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Outcome indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Labour force participation and employment of people with disability** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Labour force participation rate for people with disability aged 15‑64 years, 2012  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 50.6± 1.7 | | 53.9± 2.7 | | 54.0± 2.8 | | 56.5± 5.1 | | 52.6± 1.9 | | 45.8± 3.1 | | 63.0± 5.3 | | 58.6± 7.0 | | 52.8± 1.3 | | | *Source*: 14A.89 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Labour force participation of primary carers of people with disability** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Labour force participation rate for primary carers aged 15‑64 years, 2012  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 47.5. +7.3 | | 53.4 +4.4 | | 55.6 +6.6 | | 59.4 +8.6 | | 52.7 +9.6 | | 58.2 +12.7 | | 67.8 +14.7 | | 91.2 +21.1 | | 52.8 +3.2 | | | *Source*: 14A.100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Social participation of people with disability** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | People with disability aged 15‑64 years who have had face to face contact with ex‑household family or friends in the previous week, 2012  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 72.8 +2.9 | | 76.3 +3.2 | | 69.7 +1.6 | | 77.6 +3.0 | | 77.5 +2.6 | | 78.1 +5.9 | | 73.8 +20.4 | | 72.7 +5.3 | | 74.2 +1.2 | | | Source: 14A.114 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a See chapter 14 and attachment 14A for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats.. .. Not applicable. |
| *Source*: Chapter 14 and attachment 14A. |
|  |
|  |

#### Child protection services

The performance indicator framework for child protection services is presented in figure F.8. An overview of child protection and out‑of‑home care services performance indicator results are presented in table F.5.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.8 Child protection services performance indicator framework |
| |  | | --- | | Figure F.8 Child protection services performance indicator framework   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table F.5 Performance indicator results for child protection services**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust | | **Effectiveness — child protection services** | | | | | | | | | | | **Response times**  Proportion of investigations completed within 28 days of notification, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 48.6 | 33.4 | 21.3 | 20.7 | 24.2 | 33.7 | 22.2 | 37.5 | 38.2 | | *Source*: 15A.16 | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of investigations completed in more than 90 days from notification, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 19.4 | 22.1 | 24.4 | 37.5 | 29.2 | 15.7 | 5.0 | 27.7 | 22.5 | | *Source*: 15A.16 | | | | | | | | | | | **Substantiation rate**  Proportion of finalised child protection investigations that were substantiated, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 35.8 | 58.9 | 33.5 | 32.7 | 49.3 | 69.4 | 41.0 | 38.7 | 40.1 | | *Source*: 15A.9 | | | | | | | | | | | **Effectiveness — out‑of‑home care indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Safety in out‑of‑home care** | | | | | | | | | | | Children in care who were the subject of a substantiation and the person responsible was living in the household providing out‑of‑home care, as a proportion of all children in care, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are neither comparable or complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 0.1 | na | 0.6 | 1.2 | na | .. | | *Source*: 15A.27 | | | | | | | | | | | **Stability of placement** | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of children on a care and protection order exiting care after less than 12 months in 1 or 2 placements, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 89.6 | 89.7 | 84.2 | 82.5 | 87.8 | 94.7 | 95.8 | 77.8 | 87.8 | | *Source*: 15A.26 | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of children on a care and protection order exiting care after 12 months or more in 1 or 2 placements, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 72.8 | 46.0 | 41.1 | 57.5 | 29.2 | 56.5 | 63.4 | 34.1 | 60.3 | | *Source*: 15A.26 | | | | | | | | | | | **Children aged under 12 years in home‑based care** | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of children aged under 12 years in out‑of‑home care who were in a home‑based placement at 30 June 2015  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 99.4 | 99.1 | 97.6 | 93.7 | 88.3 | 95.6 | 97.9 | 93.0 | 97.4 | | *Source*: 15A.25 | | | | | | | | | | | **Placement with extended family**  Proportion of children in out‑of‑home care placed with relatives/kin, 30 June 2015  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 49.1 | 54.9 | 42.9 | 49.5 | 44.4 | 28.2 | 53.1 | 3.2 | 47.3 | | *Source*: 15A.23 | | | | | | | | | | | **Placement in accordance with Aboriginal Child Placement Principle** | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children placed in accordance with the Aboriginal Child Placement Principle, 30 June 2015  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 79.1 | 71.8 | 56.5 | 64.4 | 66.5 | 38.8 | 56.4 | 34.8 | 67.1 | | *Source*: 15A.24 | | | | | | | | | | | **Children with current documented case plans** | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of children with current documented case plans, 30 June 2015  Most recent data for this measure are neither comparable or complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 79.9 | 99.2 | 97.1 | 82.2 | na | 68.2 | 87.7 | na | 86.6 | | *Source*: 15A.17 | | | | | | | | | | | **Efficiency — child protection services** | | | | | | | | | | | **Total expenditure on all child protection activities, per notification, investigation and substantiation** | | | | | | | | | | | Expenditure per notification, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 3 043 | 2 180 | 14 086 | 9 159 | 2 841 | 1 422 | 1 303 | 2 081 | .. | | *Source*: 15A.2 | | | | | | | | | | | Expenditure per investigation, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 5 091 | 7 953 | 14 086 | 11 490 | 11 344 | 12 090 | 8 560 | 5 002 | .. | | *Source*: 15A.2 | | | | | | | | | | | Expenditure per substantiation, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 14 529 | 14 143 | 48 922 | 42 543 | 26 817 | 21 331 | 23 291 | 17 783 | .. | | *Source*: 15A.2 | | | | | | | | | | | **Efficiency — out‑of‑home care services** | | | | | | | | | | | **Total expenditure on all out‑of‑home care divided by the number of children in all out‑of‑home care at 30 June** | | | | | | | | | | | Cost per child in out‑of‑home care, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 52 908 | 51 809 | 52 799 | 62 257 | 80 830 | 44 086 | 51 165 | 98 551 | .. | | *Source*: 15A.3 | | | | | | | | | | | **Out‑of‑home care expenditure per placement night** | | | | | | | | | | | Cost per placement night, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | $ | 143 | 151 | 146 | 176 | 230 | 123 | 151 | 287 | 157 | | *Source*: 15A.29 | | | | | | | | | | | **Outcome indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Improved safety** | | | | | | | | | | | Substantiation rate after decision not to substantiate, 3 months, 2013‑14  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 5.3 | 6.4 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 7.4 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 6.4 | .. | | *Source*: 15A.10 | | | | | | | | | | | Substantiation rate after decision not to substantiate, 12 months, 2013‑14  Data for this measure are not comparable, but complete (subject to caveats) (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 14.1 | 17.2 | 10.6 | 8.8 | 15.5 | 16.6 | 14.5 | 18.2 | .. | | *Source*: 15A.10 | | | | | | | | | | | Substantiation rate after a prior substantiation, 3 months, 2013‑14  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 10.2 | 2.7 | 7.4 | 5.1 | 11.6 | 5.1 | 8.2 | 8.2 | .. | | *Source*: 15A.11 | | | | | | | | | | | Substantiation rate after a prior substantiation, 12 months, 2013‑14  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 15) | | | | | | | | | | | % | 22.3 | 15.2 | 18.2 | 13.8 | 21.9 | 18.5 | 17.4 | 22.4 | .. | | *Source*: 15A.11 | | | | | | | | | | |
| a See chapter 15 and attachment 15A for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats.  .. Not applicable. **na** Not available. |
| *Source*: Chapter 15 and attachment 15A. |
|  |
|  |

#### Youth justice services

The performance indicator framework for youth justice services is presented in figure F.9. An overview of youth justice services performance indicator results for 2014‑15 are presented in table F.6.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure F.9 Youth justice services performance indicator framework |
| |  | | --- | | Figure F.9 Youth justice services performance indicator framework   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table F.6 Performance indicator results for youth justice services**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | | Vic | | Qld | | WA | | SA | | Tas | | ACT | | NT | | Aust | | | **Effectiveness — diversion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Group conferencing outcomes** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of group conferences resulting in an agreement, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are not comparable but are complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 99.5 | | 100.0 | | 97.9 | | 90.1 | | 88.3 | | 92.3 | | 98.2 | | 100.0 | | 93.3 | | | *Source*: 16A.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Effectiveness — rehabilitation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Education and training attendance** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of young people in detention of compulsory school age attending an education course, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 95.3 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 98.8 | | | *Source*: 16A.15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Effectiveness — safe and secure environment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Deaths in custody** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Number of young people who died in custody, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable and complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | no. | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | | *Source*: 16A.14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Escapes** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rate of escapes from detention per 10 000 custody nights, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | – | | 0.4 | | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | 7.9 | | 0.4 | | | *Source*: 16A.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rate of escapes from escorted movement per 10 000 escorted movements, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 6.7 | | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | 53.1 | | 10.9 | | | *Source*: 16A.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Absconds from unescorted leave** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rate of absconds per 1000 periods of unescorted leave, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | – | – | | .. | | na | | – | | – | | – | | – | | – | | | *Source*: 16A.17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Assaults in custody** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rate of young people and staff injured as a result of a serious assault per 10 000 custody nights, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are neither comparable or complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | – | | 0.8 | | 0.2 | | na | | – | | – | | – | | 0.7 | | np | | | *Source*: 16A.18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rate of young people and staff injured as a result of an assault per 10 000 custody nights, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are neither comparable or complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 4.1 | | 5.0 | | 5.8 | | np | | 12.0 | | 47.9 | | – | | 11.9 | | np | | | *Source*: 16A.19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Self‑harm and attempted suicide in custody** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rate of incidents of self‑harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation per 10 000 custody nights, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are neither comparable or complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 0.8 | | 0.4 | | 0.2 | | na | | – | | – | | – | | 2.0 | | np | | | *Source*: 16A.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rate of incidents of self‑harm or attempted suicide in custody that did not require hospitalisation per 10 000 custody nights, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are neither comparable or complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 2.9 | | – | | 4.1 | | na | | 2.9 | | 8.0 | | – | | 7.9 | | np | | | *Source*: 15A.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Effectiveness ― statutory responsibilities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Case plans prepared** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of case plans prepared or reviewed within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced detention order, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) but not complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 100.0 | | 98.3 | | 87.3 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 48.0 | | 97.2 | | | *Source*: 16A.22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of case plans prepared or reviewed within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced  community‑based order, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) but not complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 96.3 | | 96.8 | | 89.2 | | na | | 96.5 | | 47.8 | | 68.1 | | 28.6 | | 90.6 | | | *Source*: 16A.22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Completion of orders** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of community‑based orders successfully completed , 2014‑15  Most recent data for this measure are comparable (subject to caveats) but not complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 80.9 | | 90.5 | | 80.5 | | 63.4 | | 66.7 | | 85.7 | | 60.6 | | 59.1 | | 78.6 | | | *Source*: 16A.21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Efficiency indicators ― inputs per outputs** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Centre utilisation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Proportion of community‑based orders successfully completed, 2014‑15  Most recent data for this indicator are comparable (subject to caveats) and complete (chapter 16) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | % | 69.5 | | 66.7 | | 79.7 | | 68.7 | | 66.5 | | 42.9 | | 22.8 | | 58.5 | | 67.9 | | | *Source*: 16A.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a See chapter 16 and attachment 16A for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **..** Not applicable. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero. **np** Not published. |
| *Source*: Chapter 16 and attachment 16A. |
|  |
|  |

## F.3 Cross‑cutting and interface issues

### Community services pathways

Although this Report discusses four areas of community services in separate chapters, it is recognised that there are many linkages between different community services. Governments are increasingly emphasising the need for integrated, client‑centred community services.

Many community services are linked by the provision of different services to individuals at different stages of life. Other services are not as strictly, or not at all, age‑specific, and some individuals may receive multiple services at the same time — for example, a child who is in receipt of youth justice services together with homelessness, child protection or disability services. Disability services can continue throughout an individual’s lifetime and overlap with the provision of aged care services.

The sequence of interventions or services can be referred to as ‘pathways’ of community service provision. However, there is a paucity of information on the patterns of access by individuals to the range of community services, either concurrently or in succession over a lifetime. A greater understanding of the links between the use of various community services, the nature of these links, and whether interventions in one area of service provision result in reduced need for other services, will help to inform government social policy.

Examples of relevant research include:

* a cohort study carried out in Queensland, which found a correlation between contact with child protection services and the youth justice system (Stewart, Dennison and Hurren 2005)
* a longitudinal study of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children investigating the links between early childhood experiences and later life outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children, covering areas such as health, culture, education, housing and family relationships (FaHCSIA 2008)
* the Australian Community Sector Survey (ACSS) is an annual national survey which collects data about the non‑government, non‑profit community services and welfare sector (Australian Council of Social Service 2014)
* data linkage projects being undertaken by the AIHW involving the linkage of available homelessness data, youth justice data and child protection data. These projects involve analysing the characteristics and pathways of children and young people who are involved in these sectors.

In September 2009, the Australian Government launched the Australian Institute for Population Ageing Research (AIPAR), based at the University of New South Wales. The AIPAR maintains a ‘Longevity Index’ to track the extent to which Australians are able to maintain their living standards over their lifetime (UNSW 2009).

On 30 April 2009, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) endorsed *Protecting Children is Everyone’s Business: National Framework for Protecting Australia’s Children 2009–2020* (the National Framework). The National Framework emphasises that protecting children should be seen as a community and cross‑sector responsibility. The National Framework is intended to deliver a more integrated response to protecting Australia’s children and emphasises the role of government, the non‑government sector, and the community in achieving these aims.

There are also links between community services and other government services. Access to effective community services can influence outcomes for clients of education, health, housing and justice sector services. In turn, access to these other service areas can affect community services outcomes. The report, *Children and young people at risk of social exclusion* (AIHW 2012), presents findings from analysis of linked client data across three service areas; homelessness, youth justice, and child protection, and found that a greater proportion of young people under youth justice supervision received specialist homelessness support, compared to those in the general population.

The community services and health sectors are closely related and their effective interaction assists the provision of services in both sectors. The disability sector is also closely linked to health services by the needs of clients. A higher proportion of people with disability have long term health conditions and more difficulty accessing health services than the general population (ABS 2015c and unpublished). Other links, such as the role of medical and other health professional staff as a source of child protection notifications, also reinforce the importance of the relationship between community services and health.

### Basic community care services across the community services sector

Data are reported in the Aged care services chapter for people aged 65 years or older and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians aged 50–64 years. Data are reported in the Services for people with disability chapter for people aged 64 years or under and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians aged 49 years or under.

|  |
| --- |
| Box F.9 Basic Community Care / Home and Community Care services |
| Under the National Health Reform Agreement (NHRA), the Australian Government has:   * full policy and funding responsibility for aged care services (for people aged 65 years or over and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged 50–64 years), including basic community care services (delivered under the Commonwealth Home and Community Care (HACC) program * funding responsibility for specialist disability services delivered under the NDA for people aged 65 years or over and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged  50–64 years.   Under the NHRA the State and Territory governments have:   * full policy and funding responsibility for specialist disability services for people aged under 65 years or under and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged 49 years or under, including Basic Community Care (BCC) * funding responsibility for packaged community care and residential care delivered through aged care programs to people aged 64 years or under, except for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged 50–64 years. |
|  |
|  |

In Victoria and WA, basic community care continues to be delivered under HACC as a joint Australian and State governments’ funded program. The Australian Government and the Victorian and WA governments have maintained bilateral agreements for that purpose.

### Respite care

The National Respite for Carers Program (NRCP) is part of the Australian Government’s strategy to achieve an enhanced quality of life for older people, people with moderate, severe or profound disabilities, and their carers. It is part of a suite of programmes which seek to support healthy ageing for older people and quality, cost effective care for frail aged people and their carers. The aim of the NRCP is to contribute to the support and maintenance of relationships between carers and care recipients by facilitating access to information, respite care and other support appropriate to both the carer’s and the care recipient’s needs and circumstances. In 2013‑14, $212.3 million was provided for the NRCP. As of 1 July 2015, these services were consolidated under the Commonwealth Home Support Programme.

### Housing

Livable Housing Australia (LHA) is a not‑for‑profit organisation established to encourage Australians constructing new homes to comply with design standards to meet the changing needs of home occupants across their lifetime. LHA has developed guidelines to help guide the residential and building industry and all levels of government. The Livable Housing Design guidelines seek to raise national awareness about the benefits of designing homes for everyone, irrespective of their abilities.

The housing industry, the disability and the ageing sectors are working towards having all new homes built to reflect the new standards by 2020. They have also committed to a strategic plan that provides a pathway over the next decade to work towards this target. The Australian Government committed $1 million over three years, 2011‑12 to 2013‑14 to drive this innovative partnership with the building and property sectors to promote universal housing design.

## F.4 Future directions in performance reporting

This community services sector overview will continue to be developed in future reports. Prospective work may focus on the development of measures to enable reporting against the sector‑wide indicators ‘Wellbeing of older people’ and ‘Quality of life of people with disability’.

Individual chapters contain a service‑specific section on future directions in performance reporting.

## F.5 List of attachment tables

Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this appendix by an ‘FA’ prefix (for example, table FA.1). Attachment tables are available on the website (www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Table FA.1** | Number of carers living in households, by State and Territory, by age, 2012 | | **Table FA.2** | Number and proportion of all people living in households aged 65 years and over, type of social or community activities participated in away from home in the past three months, 2012 (‘000) | | **Table FA.3** | Number and proportion of primary carers who participated in social or community activities in the past 3 months, 2012 | | **Table FA.4** | Jobless families, at June | | **Table FA.5** | Proportion of children who are developmentally vulnerable according to Australian Early Development Census (AEDC) data | |

## F.6 References

Allen Consulting Group 2003, *Protecting children: The child protection outcomes project*, Allen Consulting Group, Sydney.

ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) 2010, *Community Services Australia, 2008‑09*, Cat. no. 8696.0, Canberra.

—— 2014, *Caring in the Community, Australia,* Cat. no. 4436.0, Canberra.

—— 2015a, *Australian National Accounts: National Income, National Expenditure and Product*, Cat. no. 5206.0, Canberra.

—— 2015b, *Family, household and income unit variables, 2014*, Cat. no. 1286.0, Canberra.

—— 2015c, *General Social Survey: Summary Results, Australia, 2014,* Cat. no. 4159.0, Canberra.

Australian Council of Social Service 2009, *Australian Community Sector Survey Report 2009*, Strawberry Hills.

—— 2014, *Australian Community Sector Survey,* ACOSS. http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/acoss\_2014australiancommunitysectorsurvey\_dec\_2014.pdf [Accessed 9 October 2015]

Australian Government 2008, *Families in Australia: 2008*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

—— 2011, *Addressing barriers for jobless families: Australian Social Inclusion Board,* Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

AIHW (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare) 2003 (and previous issues), *National Classifications of Community Services, Version 2.0*, Cat. no. HWI 40, Canberra.

—— 2005, *National Community Services Information Strategic Plan 2005–2009*, Cat. no. AUS 68, Canberra

—— 2006, *Disability and disability services in Australia*, Cat. no. DIS 43, Canberra.

—— 2010, *Australia’s health 2010,* Cat. no. AUS 122, Canberra.

—— 2011, *Australia’s welfare 2011,* Australia’s welfare series no. 10, Cat. no. AUS 142, Canberra.

—— 2012, *Children and young people at risk of social exclusion: Links between homelessness, child protection and juvenile justice*, Data linkage series no. 13, Cat. no. CSI 13, Canberra.

—— 2015, *Australia’s welfare 2015,* Australia’s welfare series no. 12, Cat. no. AUS 189, Canberra.

Bromfield, L. M., and Holzer, P. J., 2008, *NCPASS comparability of child protection data: Project report*, Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.

Deloitte Access Economics, 2015, *The economic value of informal care in Australia in 2015* http://www.carersaustralia.com.au/storage/Access%20Economics%20Report.pdf [Accessed 10 September 2015]

Diener, E. 1984, Subjective well‑being, *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542‑575.

FaHCSIA (Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs) 2008, *Research News*, Issue 31, Canberra.

NHHRC (National Health and Hospitals Reform Commission) 2009, *A Healthier Future for All Australians – Final Report June 2009*, Canberra.

Productivity Commission 2011a, *Disability Care and Support,* Report no. 54, Canberra.

—— 2011b, *Caring for Older Australians,* Report No. 53, Final inquiry Report, Canberra.

Richards, K. 2011, What makes juvenile offenders different from adult offenders? *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 409, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Stewart, A., Dennison, S., and Hurren, E. 2005, *Final Report, Juvenile Offending Trajectories: Pathways from Child Maltreatment to Juvenile Offending, and Police Cautioning in Queensland,* Griffith University.

Stutzer, A. and Frey, B.S. 2010, *Recent Advances in the Economics of Individual Subjective Wellbeing. Discussion Paper No. 4850*, Institute for the Study of Labor, Zurich.

UNSW (University of New South Wales), Australian Institute for Population Ageing Research website, 2009, www.business.unsw.edu.au/research/research-centres-institutions/population-ageing-research-institute (accessed 15 October 2015).