

Welfare Division Working Paper No 15

**Effectiveness indicators
and descriptors:
First results for disability services**

The members of the Institute team working on the indicators were:
Ros Madden, Ken Black, Ching Choi, Xingyan Wen, Simon Eckerman

March 1997

Introduction

This paper has been prepared by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare in its role as a member of the Disability Services Working Group, established by the Steering Committee of the Review of Commonwealth/State service provision.

The paper informed the calculations of effectiveness indicators for the report of the Steering Committee in early 1997 and should be read in conjunction with Chapter 8 of that report. This paper is published for the interest of those readers of the larger report who may wish to understand more details of the calculations of the effectiveness indicators for disability services. It should be understood that further work occurred during finalisation of the Steering Committee (referred to in this paper as 'the final report') and that report should be followed if there are any differences in the numbers.

The paper should also be read in conjunction with the CSDA Minimum Data Set (MDS) Data Guide for 1995.

Outline

The Institute's work was presented as three main papers.

Paper 1: 'Potential population'—an indicator for use in the denominator of some performance indicators for disability services. This paper contains an explanation of the 'potential population' figures used in the denominators of indicators on accommodation services and employment services.

Paper 2: The effectiveness indicators. This paper contains a table for each of several indicators published in the final report.

Paper 3: The descriptors. This paper presents data for descriptors requested by the working group, and subsequently refined.

This collection of papers relates to a working framework and definitions used in the course of the work of the working group. There may be refinements in the final report which do not correspond perfectly to this paper, which is published as a background paper to clarify the approach underlying the indicator calculations.

Scope of CSDA MDS collection, 1995

The CSDA Minimum Data Set (MDS) 1995 collection has been used as the data source for service data for the effectiveness indicators. The scope of this collection is as follows.

The disability support services provided under the CSDA were listed and described as:

- *accommodation support services*: include both provision of accommodation (eg. group homes, hostels, large institutions etc.), and support to maintain accommodation (eg. attendant care);
- *advocacy services*: include 'self advocacy', 'citizen advocacy' and 'group advocacy';
- *competitive employment, training and placement services*: to assist persons to obtain and retain paid employment in the workforce;
- *independent living training services*: to assist persons with disabilities to develop or maintain the personal skills and self-confidence necessary to enhance their independence and self-reliance in the community;
- *information services*: services to facilitate access to information by persons with disabilities, and their family and carers;
- *print disability services*: services to facilitate access to, or use of, printed material;
- *recreation services*: to facilitate the integration of, and participation by, persons with disabilities in recreation and leisure activities available to the general community;
- *respite care services*: services for relief or assistance, for limited periods, to persons with disabilities living in the community, and their families and carers;
- *supported employment services*: services to support the paid employment of persons with disabilities for whom competitive employment at or above award wages is unlikely—can be both to obtain and retain employment;
- *early intervention therapy services*: services for children below school age;
- *other therapy services*: (excluded from growth funding unless a component of other service types not separately identifiable as therapy);
- in addition, *research and development, assessment, case management, and staff training* were support services associated with both direct service delivery, and program management.

The final agreed CSDA 'planning base' (the scope of services considered by the various jurisdictions to fall within the original CSDA) varied between the States and Territories.

From information supplied by State and Territory contacts to the Institute in the course of the CSDA evaluation, the CSDA base was generally agreed to consist of:

- those services for people with a disability that were transferred from the Commonwealth to the States and Territories under the CSDA;
- those services for people with a disability that were funded or provided by the 'disability program area' of each State and Territory before the CSDA Agreement (other than employment services transferred to the Commonwealth); and
- services provided or funded with CSDA dollars since the signing of the CSDA Agreement.

Neither psychiatric services nor early childhood intervention services were included in every State or Territory, and there were other exceptions or 'grey areas':

- In New South Wales, psychiatric disability services is a grey area, some having been transferred to the Department of Health, after CSDA transfer from the Commonwealth to the Department of Community Services.
- In Victoria, early intervention services may have been included in the base but have since been transferred to another division within the Department of Health and Community Services. It is not clear if these services should still be included in the Minimum Data Set collection.
- In Queensland, the base included psychiatric disability services funded and provided by the Mental Health Branch of Queensland Health. The base excluded services funded under the 'Gaming Machine Community Benefit Fund'.
- In the Northern Territory, mental health services were not included in the base funds.
- In the Australian Capital Territory, it is unclear whether mental health services were included in the base.
- Therapy services are not included in all States, and can be a component within other service types.

Aligning the scope of the performance indicators with available data

The desired scope of the indicators work was agreed by the Working Group, and differs from the CSDA MDS collection, in the removal of one of the 'grey areas' listed above, by the exclusion of psychiatric services.

This exclusion was performed by excluding services from the 1995 CSDA MDS data set, specified by each jurisdiction as being psychiatric services.

The number of services thereby excluded from each jurisdiction was:

NT	1
ACT	3

NSW	6
Vic	96
Qld	20
WA	1
SA	0
Tas	0

Other publications referring to the CSDA MDS will usually include these services.

Therapy and equipment services are included only in so far as they are included in the above description of the scope. There is a range of therapy and equipment services not included under the CSDA, for instance many 'PADP' schemes and the Continence Aids Assistance Scheme.

Publication of ABS data

Data from ABS surveys were provided to the Working Group with no adjustment or rounding to observe publication conventions. This rounding has not been carried out before the publication of this working paper in order to preserve the original working. Due care should be exercised by anyone using the data, in particular to read footnotes about standard errors of the estimates

Paper 1

‘Potential population’— an indicator for use in the denominator of some performance indicators for disability services

This paper outlines the calculation of ‘potential population’ data for the denominator of the proposed performance indicators relating to accommodation and employment services.

The term ‘potential population’ is not the same as the population needing the services, but is intended to indicate the outline of the ‘population at risk’ or with the potential to require disability services.

‘Potential population’ for indicator on accommodation services

Indicator 4 in this paper is ‘current users of accommodation service per 1,000 potential population’. The number of service users was obtained from the CSDA MDS 1995 collection and from other administrative collections in each jurisdiction.

This paper addresses what number to use in the denominator. The paper sets out the method, and the related tables contain the calculations and data which provide the denominator for use in this performance indicator. Table 1.1 calculates the 1995 ‘expected’ numbers of people with severe or profound handicap. Table 1.2 adjusts these numbers for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population.

Data for the denominators

To select a denominator is to define the ‘population at risk’. The appropriate denominator depends on the subject matter and purpose of the measurement. In a comparison of mortality rates of different States and Territories in Australia, population figures provide directly relevant and generally available denominators. However, to define the population ‘at risk’ for disability services is more difficult and complex. The subject matter suggests that we should restrict attention to people with a disability, particularly those who need support.

There is no ideal data source in Australia at the present time to be used for defining the population who need or demand disability services, and to relate perfectly to the concepts and framework of disability support services. Under this circumstance, we have to rely on data sources which can produce meaningful measures although not perfect. The ABS Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers provides estimates of the numbers of people with ‘severe or profound handicap’ in Australia.

There are two main reasons for using ABS estimates of severe and profound handicap to base estimates of the 'potential population'.

First the survey's concepts relate to the CSDA definitions because the notion of 'severe and profound handicap' in the ABS survey relates directly to the notion of 'need for ongoing support' (see eg Madden et al 1996). The term 'need for ongoing support services' is one of the critical indicators distinguishing the need for CSDA services from the need for mainstream services.

In ABS survey definitions, severity of handicap does not directly relate to any particular category or level of impairment. Rather, it is measured by the need for, and the intensity of, personal support in three of the five areas which define the handicap. People aged 5 years and over, who reported that they always or sometimes needed help with self-care, mobility or verbal communication, were classified by the ABS as having (respectively) a profound or severe handicap. These people are considered to conform quite well to the definition of the target group of CSDA services (substantially reduced capacity in communication, learning or mobility, and needing ongoing support services); the additional area of self-care included in the ABS severity rating has a clear relationship to daily accommodation support.

Second, the concepts seem to have some stability over time, unlike the survey concepts of 'disability' and 'handicap'. Comparative analysis of the three ABS disability surveys (1981, 1988, 1993) suggested that the age standardised prevalence rates of severe or profound 'handicap', as defined by the ABS survey, have remained fairly steady since 1981. This result suggests that people's perception of severe handicap have been fairly constant. Such consistency in reported prevalence of severe or profound handicap over time increases the confidence with which these prevalence rates can be used as statistical measures in calculating the indicators, although the possibility of future changes in the prevalence rates need to be reviewed in the long-term.

Table 1.1: Derivation of Row (e)

The 1993 ABS Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers provides data which can be extrapolated to give a broad national picture of the population with a disability. The estimates derived from the survey at the national level contain valid and reliable information, while the estimates at State level are subject to relatively higher standard errors, particularly for those Territories and States with small populations. Use of national age-sex-specific rates, rather than State and Territory rates, aims to overcome the inaccuracy in the estimated prevalence rates of States due to small sample size (a disadvantage of estimates from the ABS survey—Row (d)).

This derivation of estimates proceeds in three steps.

Step 1: Data from the 1993 ABS disability survey are used to derive age-sex-specific rates of 'severe and profound handicap' **nationally**, excluding people aged 65 and over.

Step 2: These rates are applied to the 1995 age and sex distributions (from ABS population data) in each State and Territory, to calculate 'expected current

numbers' of people with severe and profound handicap by age and sex for each jurisdiction.

Step 3: The resulting numbers are added to give what may be considered to be an estimate of the 'expected current number of people' with severe and profound handicap in that jurisdiction—the 'potential population'.

The advantages of using these figures as the 'potential population' are that they:

- are based on ABS notions of 'severe and profound handicap (argued to be relevant to the concepts of the CSDA);
- are updated from 1993, the date of the survey—to 1995;
- use national rates of severe and profound handicap (with lower standard errors than State rates), applied to the age and sex structure of each jurisdiction's current population.

Assumptions

1. The underlying assumption for Row (e) is that each State or Territory has the same age–sex–specific prevalence rates as those of the national average and that the 'expected numbers' are not affected by other factors. Since the ABS population data are applied to these rates, the demographic differences across States and Territories are taken into account.

2. The scope of activities that were used to measure the 'severity of handicap' in the ABS survey was restricted to limited activities of daily living which may emphasise the presence of handicap arising from physical impairment. Therefore, using the number of people with profound or severe handicap may mismatch, to some extent, the number of people who are receiving supports or need supports. For example, some people with intellectual/learning or psychiatric disability who are current service recipients might be classified, by ABS survey definition, as having 'mild', 'moderate' handicap or even 'disability but no handicap'. The underlying assumption has to be made, that there is a high degree of correlation between the presence of intellectual disability and high support needs in ABS terms. (According to CSDA MDS data this is not an unreasonable assumption.)

Further multipliers?

The use of further multipliers has been considered, to address the following two issues:

- potential factors other than age and sex may affect the 'exposure to risk' of some jurisdictions;
- the scale of the 'potential population' may be very different from the numbers of people receiving services.

Possible solutions are discussed in turn.

Multipliers for other factors – Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population

Possible factors, other than age and sex, affecting the ‘exposure to risk’ of some jurisdictions are worth considering, especially for jurisdictions with a high proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, whose life

expectancy is lower than that of the general population, and whose 'ageing' takes place at younger chronological ages. Applying national age-sex-standardised prevalence rates may be particularly problematic for that sub-population.

Similar issues are addressed by the Commonwealth Grants Commission in deciding relativities between States for funding government services. Three apparently relevant CGC 'relative disability weights' were investigated as possible multipliers—those for family and child welfare, aged and disabled welfare, and 'other welfare'. Two of these weights contain a factor to allow for the additional use and cost of services for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. It was considered, however, that each of these 'relative disability weights' posed problems as multipliers for a potential population for disability support services, for instance because of weighting the aged population or irrelevant pensions. One possibility considered would be to use the per capita 'relative disability weight' applied by the CGC to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population in two of these 'relative disability weights', namely a factor of 6. However, this factor allows for possibly higher incidence, higher severity and cost of disability services, and not all these are relevant to the weighting of the denominator under consideration, where the prime issue is higher incidence.

It could be expected that rates of disability among Indigenous people would be higher than those of the general population, because of higher rates of disabling conditions (AIHW 1996, ABS 1997). A study in a NSW region applying the ABS approach found rates of severe handicap about 2.4 times higher than the total population (Thomson and Snow 1994). Subsequent studies of service use are consistent with this finding: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the NT were twice as likely to be users of disability support services (Black and Eckerman 1997) and made greater use of HACC services at younger ages (Jenkins 1995).

Perhaps most relevant, the CSDA MDS data indicate that the proportion of Indigenous people in the Northern Territory using these services is approximately twice as high as the proportion of non-indigenous people.

It is therefore proposed that a weighting of 2 be applied to the number of indigenous people in each jurisdiction. The detailed method and results are presented in Table 1.2.

Scaling for size of 'potential population'

To clarify that 'potential population' is not the same as 'need', and to scale so as to avoid expressing numbers as small decimals, ratios are defined as the number of clients per 1,000 potential population.

Potential population for indicator on employment services

It is proposed to use a similar procedure for Indicator 5 (current users of employment service users relative to potential users), but with some modification

in recognition that this indicator relates to employment services, which have a different target population from accommodation services.

The proposed modifications are:

- people of age under 15 years are excluded from the denominator (both the general population and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population); and
- the denominator is scaled back by a factor reflecting the labour force participation rates of the overall population, aged from 15 to 64, in each jurisdiction; while the participation rates for people with a disability are generally lower than those for the overall population, it is more appropriate to use the overall rates as relating to the goal of disability services outlined in the framework of the main report.

These calculations are carried out for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population in Table 1.2, and the remaining calculations can be seen in the table for Indicator 5 in Paper 2.

References

Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision (1997). Report on Government Service Provision. Commonwealth of Australia or Industry Commission Melbourne?

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 1996. Australia's health. Canberra: AGPS.

Australian Bureau of Statistics and Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 1997 The health and welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples ABS Cat No. 4704.0

Black K and Eckerman S 1997. Disability support services provided under the Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement: first national data, 1995. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

CSDA Minimum Data Set Data Guide 1995. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Canberra

Jenkins 1995 Aged care service use by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Information Bulletin. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Canberra.

Madden R, Wen X, Black K, Malam K & Mallise S 1996. The demand for disability support services in Australia. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Canberra.

Table 1.1 Population aged under 65 years, number of people with profound or severe handicap(a), by state and territory

		NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
1993 population	No.	5,263,891	3,931,729	2,771,385	1,267,291	1,506,918	413,799	164,371	279,130	15,598,514
aged under 65 years(b)	%	33.7	25.2	17.8	8.1	9.7	2.7	1.1	1.8	100.0
1995 population	No.	5,351,548	3,949,021	2,908,214	1,271,375	1,552,178	413,637	168,344	282,718	15,897,035
aged under 65 years(c)	%	33.7	24.8	18.3	8.0	9.8	2.6	1.1	1.8	100.0
1993 ABS survey estimate	No.	119,416	92,174	72,306	30,448	34,426	9,674	2,886	6,948	368,277
severe/profound handicap(d)	%	32.4	25.0	19.6	8.3	9.3	2.6	0.8	1.9	100.0
1995 expected severe/profound handicap (e)	No.	128,403	94,596	68,919	30,855	36,862	9,948	3,696	6,498	379,777
	%	33.8	24.9	18.1	8.1	9.7	2.6	1.0	1.7	100.0

(a) Estimates of 1,900 or less have a relative standard error (RSE) of 50% or more. Estimates of 8,000 or less have an RSE of 25% or more.

(b) ABS estimated number of resident population, 30 June 1993

(c) ABS estimated number of resident population, 30 June 1995

(d) Estimated numbers from the ABS 1993 Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers.

(e) Expected numbers or 'potential population' were calculated using national age-sex-specific prevalence rates derived from the ABS 1993 Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers.

Source: ABS 1994, Australian demographic statistics, March quarter 1994 Cat. no. 3101.0; ABS 1996, Australian demographic statistics, December quarter 1995 Cat. no. 3101.0;

AIHW analysis of ABS 1993 Survey of disability, ageing and Carers.

Table 1.2: Calculation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (Indigenous) factor

	NSW	Vic	QLD	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	TOTAL
Population aged under 65									
Indigenous population (a)	73,362	17,380	72,284	16,793	42,777	9,269	42,269	1,603	275,725
Non-Indigenous population (b)	5,125,736	3,894,992	2,568,744	1,242,783	1,434,573	402,169	118,887	269,700	15,057,596
Weighted population (c)	5,272,460	3,929,752	2,713,312	1,276,369	1,520,127	420,707	203,425	272,906	15,609,046
Weighted population per capita(d)	1.01	1.00	1.03	1.01	1.03	1.02	1.26	1.01	1.02
Indigenous factor (e)	99.62	98.67	100.92	99.54	101.08	100.45	124.00	98.81	100.00
Population aged 15-64									
Indigenous population (a)	44,052	10,623	42,962	10,100	25,043	5,380	25,475	958	164,587
Non-Indigenous population (b)	3,883,248	2,960,142	1,926,516	935,317	1,087,866	298,132	89,602	202,375	11,383,204
Weighted population (c)	3,971,352	2,981,388	2,012,440	955,518	1,137,952	308,892	140,552	204,291	11,712,378
Weighted population per capita(d)	1.01	1.00	1.02	1.01	1.02	1.02	1.22	1.00	1.01
ABTSI factor (e)	99.70	98.95	100.75	99.65	100.81	100.34	120.42	99.06	100.00

(a) ABS estimates of Aboriginal population as at June 1991 as cited by Commonwealth Grants Commission working paper. The source used by the CGC is: ABS, 1994, Experimental estimates of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population June 1986 to 1991, Cat. No. 3230.0.

(b) From ABS total population by State and Territory (as at June, 1991 - ABS Cat No. 3201.0) less population from (a).

(c) Aboriginal population weighted at 2, non-Aboriginal population at 1.

(d) Weighted population divided by total population ((a)+(b)).

(e) Indigenous factor calculated as weighted population per capita (d) standardised for Australia =100.00.

Paper 2: The effectiveness indicators

This paper contains a table for each of Indicators 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10. (These numbers were assigned to indicators during their development and are retained in this working paper for quick reference. Whenever the subject of the indicator is needed, and in the tables, the descriptive title is assigned.)

The following points should be noted:

1. For a number of the indicators two presentations have been retained:

- PI per 1,000 which enables trends over time to be monitored, but is perhaps harder for current interstate comparisons, or
- the PI relative index which facilitates current interstate comparison, but does not enable trends over time in within-state levels of provision to be monitored.

It was decided that PI per 1000 would be generally the preferred presentation.

2. For performance indicators 6 and 7 (accommodation):

- only percentages from these indicators should be used in the final publication. Because of the revision of total numbers by WA, Vic, SA and Qld, some of the cells and totals may no longer agree with performance indicators 4 and 9, or Table 3.2 in the descriptors.
- the States changing their MDS data were not able to supply new data on severity of handicap or indigenous or NESB background.
- WA has been deleted from P.I.6a, but not from P.I.7
- the large number of 'unknown' data for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and for NESB people cast a question mark over Indicator 7:

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander 'unknown/missing' data identification:

NSW 14.4%	Vic 12.4%	Qld 44.0%
WA not known	SA 14.7%	Tas 22.7
ACT 1.2%	NT 1.1%	Commonwealth 9.5%

NESB 'unknown/missing' data identification:

NSW 1.9%	Vic 4.1%	Qld 17.4%
WA not known	SA 3.7%	Tas 1.7%
ACT 0.4%	NT 0.0%	Commonwealth 5.2%

3. Indicator 10 is the proportion of people employed per 1,000 population with a disability, aged 15-64, living in households and in the labour force, 1993.

4. Estimates based on the ABS Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers are quoted without rounding to show the working used. Most of these estimates should be published only after rounding to allow for standard errors. Notes are provided on the relevant tables.

Performance indicator 4: current users of accommodation services relative to potential population aged under 65 (per '000 and index), 1995

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
Severe and profound handicap(a)	128,403	94,596	68,919	30,855	36,862	9,948	3,696	6,498	379,777
Indigenous factor(b)	99.62	98.67	100.92	99.54	101.08	100.45	124.00	98.81	100.00
Denominator(c)	127,915	93,338	69,555	30,714	37,259	9,992	4,583	6,421	379,777
Numerator(from MDS)(d)	5,594	5,593	3,043	2,083	2,251	666	103	251	19,584
PI (per '000)(e)	43.73	59.92	43.75	67.82	60.41	66.65	22.47	39.09	51.57
PI index(f)	84.8	116.2	84.8	131.5	117.2	129.2	43.6	75.8	100.0

(a) The expected number of Australians aged under 65 with severe or profound handicap in 1995 (see Table 1.1).

Figures should be rounded to nearest 100 if published—shown here to show working.

(b) The Indigenous factor adjusts for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations (see Table 1.2).

(c) The denominator is calculated as column (a) weighted by the Indigenous factor (b).

Figures should be rounded to nearest 100 if published—shown here to show working.

(d) The numerator comes from the 1995 CSDA Minimum Data Set (MDS). Accommodation services are MDS data item service type 1 (1.01 to 1.06), & the data represent the number of people receiving accommodation services provided or funded under the CSDA (excluding services identified as psychiatric services).

(e) The performance indicator (PI) is calculated as the ratio of numerator (d) divided by the denominator (c), multiplied by 1000.

(f) The relative performance indicator index is calculated by setting Australia equal to 100 (from (e)), and adjusting the States by the appropriate factor (100/51.57).

Performance indicator 5: current users of employment services relative to potential labourforce aged 15 to 64 (per '000 and index), 1995

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
Severe and prof.hand.(a)	66,855	50,281	37,357	16,052	20,300	4,898	2,075	3,946	201,765
ABTSI factor(b)	99.70	98.95	100.75	99.65	100.81	100.34	120.42	99.06	100.00
Denominator(c)	66,655	49,751	37,635	15,996	20,465	4,915	2,499	3,909	201,826
Numerator(from MDS)(d)	8,962	7,501	4,718	2,373	3,104	649	154	394	27,855
PI (per '000)(e)	134.45	150.77	125.36	148.35	151.68	132.04	61.62	100.78	138.01
PI index(f)	97.42	109.24	90.83	107.49	109.90	95.67	44.65	73.02	100.00

(a) The expected number of Australians aged 15 to 64 with severe or profound handicap in 1995 (see Table 1.1) multiplied by the labour force participation rate for each State and Territory as at June 1995 (ABS, June 1995, the Labour Force Australia, Catalogue No. 6203.0).

The participation rates are: NSW 62.3%; Vic 63.4%; Qld 65.4%; SA 62.0%; WA 66.7%; Tas 59.8%; NT 70.8%; ACT 72.8%; Australia 63.7%.

Figures should be rounded to nearest 100 if published—shown here to show working.

(b) The Indigenous factor adjusts for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations see Table 1.2).

(c) The denominator is calculated column (a) weighted by the Indigenous factor (b).

Figures should be rounded to nearest 100 if published—shown here to show working.

(d) The numerator comes from the CSDA Minimum Data Set (MDS). Employment services are MDS data item service type 5 (5.01 to 5.06), & the data represent the number of people receiving employment services funded by the Commonwealth under the CSDA

(e) The performance indicator (PI) is calculated as the ratio of numerator (d) divided by the denominator (c), multiplied by 1,000.

(f) The relative performance indicator index is calculated by setting Australia equal to 100 (from (e)), and adjusting the States by the appropriate factor (100/138.01).

Performance indicator 6A: Clients in accommodation

services(a) by 'severity' (b) of handicap (States and Territories), 1995

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
Moderate to no handicap(c)	360	363	433	111	141	68	2	39	1,517
% of all handicap	6.46	8.07	14.23	5.80	7.31	9.88	1.94	15.54	8.40
Severe handicap(d)	2,597	2,462	1,235	818	978	361	39	127	8,617
% of all handicap	46.62	54.71	40.60	43.00	50.70	52.76	37.86	50.60	47.90
Profound handicap(e)	2,614	1,675	1,374	972	810	235	62	85	7,827
% of all handicap	46.92	37.22	45.17	51.10	41.99	37.35	60.19	33.86	43.70
All handicap(f)	5,571	4,500	3,042	1,901	1,929	664	103	251	17,961
% of all handicap	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

(a) Service type 1 (1.01 to 1.06) in the CSDA MDS - accommodation services funded by the States and Territories under the CSDA (excluding services identified as psychiatric services). CSDA MDS data not available from WA; other administrative data supplied by WA.

(b) Severity of handicap is derived from the 1995 MDS data item 'level of support needed - activities of daily living' (support a). This item uses the same areas of need as the ABS for determining handicap: self care, mobility and verbal communication.

(c) Moderate to no handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a =1'.

(d) Severe handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 2 or 3'.

(e) Profound handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 4'.

(f) All handicap excludes responses from the MDS with level of 'support a' not known (76 people).

Performance indicator 6B: Clients in employment services(a) by 'severity' (b) of handicap, 1995

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
Moderate to no handicap(c)	3,704	2,427	2,122	814	922	465	63	67	10,584
% of all handicap	41.33	32.39	44.99	34.30	29.70	71.65	40.91	17.01	38.01
Severe handicap(d)	4,586	4,453	2,054	1,403	1,851	172	84	299	14,902
% of all handicap	51.17	59.42	43.54	59.12	59.63	26.50	54.55	75.89	53.51
Profound handicap(e)	672	614	541	156	331	12	7	28	2,361
% of all handicap	7.50	8.19	11.47	6.57	10.66	1.85	4.55	7.11	8.48
All handicap(f)	8,962	7,494	4,717	2,373	3,104	649	154	394	27,847
% of all handicap	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

(a) Service type 5 (5.01 to 5.06) in the CSDA MDS - employment services funded by the Commonwealth under the CSDA.

(b) Severity of handicap is derived from the 1995 MDS data item 'level of support needed - activities of daily living' (support a). This item uses the same areas of need as the ABS for determining handicap: self care, mobility and verbal communication.

(c) Moderate to no handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 1'.

(d) Severe handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 2 or 3'.

(e) Profound handicap is mapped from the MDS as 'support a = 4'.

(f) All handicap excludes responses from the MDS with level of 'support a' not known (8 people).

Performance indicator 7A: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients in accommodation (a) services per 1,000 population by State, 1995

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	Tas	NT	ACT
Indigenous clients acc.serv.(b)	102	21	103	32	7	67	2
Total clients acc.serv.(c)	4,930	4,106	2,207	1,696	518	103	250
Indigenous as a % acc. clients(d)	2.07	0.51	4.67	1.89	1.35	65.05	0.80
Indigenous under 65 population(e)	73,362	17,380	72,284	16,793	9,269	42,269	1,603
Total under 65 population(f)	5,199,098	3,912,372	2,641,028	1,259,576	411,438	161,156	271,303
Indigenous as a % total population(g)	1.41	0.44	2.74	1.33	2.25	26.23	0.59
P1(h)	1.47	1.15	1.71	1.42	0.60	2.48	1.35
Indigenous in acc.serv./1000(i)	1.39	1.21	1.42	1.91	0.76	1.59	1.25

(a) Accommodation service type 1 from the CSDA MDS (excluding services identified as psychiatric services).

(b) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders (Indigenous people) using accommodation services (from the 1995 MDS). data from WA not available.)

(d) The proportion of accommodation clients who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders (b)/(c).

(e) Indigenous population under 65 in 1991 (from Table 1.2).

(f) Total population under 65 in 1991 (from ABS Cat No. 3201.0).

(g) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as a percentage of total population ((e)/(f)).

(h) Ratio of percentage Indigenous people in accommodation services to percentage Indigenous people in general population ((d)/(g)).

(i) The rate (per 1000) of CSDA accommodation use by Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander populations aged under 65 ((b)/(e)*1000).

**Performance indicator 7B: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients in employment (a)
services per 1,000 population by State, 1995**

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
Indigenous clients empl.serv.(b)	135	53	105	27	72	11	31	4	438
Total clients empl.serv.(c)	8,645	6,992	3,238	2,372	3,002	591	154	390	25,384
Indigenous as a % empl. clients(d)	1.56	0.76	3.24	1.14	2.40	1.86	20.13	1.03	1.73
Indigenous 15-64 population(e)	44,052	10,623	42,962	10,100	25,043	5,380	25,475	958	164,593
Total 15-64 population(f)	3,927,300	2,970,765	1,969,478	960,360	1,097,966	303,512	115,077	203,333	11,547,791
Indigenous people as a % total population(g)	1.12	0.36	2.18	1.05	2.28	1.77	22.14	0.47	1.43
PI(h)	1.39	2.12	1.49	1.08	1.05	1.05	0.91	2.18	1.21
PI index(i)	115.00	175.10	122.79	89.40	86.86	86.74	75.11	179.83	100.00
Indigenous in empl.serv./1000(j)	3.06	4.99	2.44	2.67	2.88	2.04	1.22	4.18	2.66
PI index(k)	115.16	187.48	91.84	100.45	108.04	76.84	45.73	156.91	100.00

(a) Employment service type 5 from the 1995 CSDA MDS.

(b) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders (Indigenous people) using employment services (from the 1995 MDS).

(c) Total employment clients from the 1995 MDS (excludes 2,471 persons for whom the answer to the Indigenous question was not known or missing.)

(d) The proportion of accommodation clients who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders (b)/(c).

(e) Indigenous population aged 15 to 64 in 1991 (from Table 1.2 & 1.3).

Figures should be rounded to nearest 100 if published—shown here to show working.

(f) Total population aged 15 to 64 in 1991 (from ABS Cat No. 3201.0).

(g) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as a percentage of total population ((e)/(f)).

(h) Ratio of percentage Indigenous in employment services to percentage Indigenous in general population ((d)/(g)).

(i) Relative index of (h), setting Australia equal to 100 and multiplying the States by the appropriate factor (100/1.21).

(j) The rate (per 1000) of CSDA employment service use by Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander populations aged 15-64 ((b)/(e)*1000).

(k) Relative index of (j), setting Australia equal to 100 and multiplying the States by the appropriate factor (100/2.66).

Performance indicator 7C: Non English Speaking Background clients in accommodation (a) services per 1,000 population by State, 1995

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	Tas	NT	ACT
NESB clients acc.serv.(b)	149	115	41	54	5	0	5
Total clients acc.serv.(c)	5,521	4,431	1,847	1,912	655	103	251
NESB as a % acc. clients(d)	2.70	2.60	2.22	2.82	0.76	0.00	1.99
NESB under 65 population(e)	760,821	620,034	179,561	124,486	15,272	15,386	35,413
Total under 65 population(f)	4,931,531	3,697,948	2,574,776	1,205,194	394,422	162,537	258,116
NESB as a % total population(g)	15.43	16.77	6.97	10.33	3.87	9.47	13.72
P(h)	0.17	0.15	0.32	0.27	0.20	0.00	0.15
NESB in acc.serv./1000(i)	0.20	0.19	0.23	0.43	0.33	0.00	0.14

(a) Accommodation service type 1 from the MDS (excluding services identified as psychiatric services).

(b) Persons of Non English Speaking Background (NESB) using accommodation services (from the 1995 MDS).

(c) Total accommodation clients from the 1995 MDS (excludes 1,350 persons for whom the answer to the NESB question was not known or missing, and 823 ISIS consumers).

(d) The proportion of accommodation clients who are from Non English Speaking Backgrounds (b)/(c).

(e) NESB population under 65 in 1991 (from ABS expanded profile, catalogue no. 2722.0).

(f) Total population under 65 in 1991, excluding those with background not stated (from ABS).

(g) Non English Speaking Background persons as a percentage of total population ((e)/(f)).

(h) Ratio of percentage NESB in accommodation services to percentage NESB in general population ((d)/(g)).

(i) The rate (per 1000) of CSDA accommodation use by non English speaking population aged under 65 ((b)/(e)*1000).

**Performance indicator 7D: Non English Speaking Background clients in employment (a)
services per 1,000 population by State, 1995**

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
NESB clients empl.serv.(b)	390	442	94	76	130	5	12	19	1,168
Total clients empl.serv.(c)	8,670	7,196	4,150	2,324	2,857	647	154	392	26,390
NESB as a % empl. clients(d)	4.50	6.14	2.27	3.27	4.55	0.77	7.79	4.85	4.43
NESB 15-64 population(e)	693,094	573,746	161,987	115,705	148,029	14,030	13,767	31,999	1,752,357
Total 15-64 population(f)	3,708,454	2,789,755	1,921,356	914,675	1,040,923	289,581	117,888	192,418	10,975,050
NESB as a % total population(g)	18.69	20.57	8.43	12.65	14.22	4.84	11.68	16.63	15.97
PI(h)	0.24	0.30	0.27	0.26	0.32	0.16	0.67	0.29	0.28
PI index(i)	86.83	107.74	96.92	93.26	115.43	57.54	240.72	105.15	100.00
NESB in empl.serv./1000(j)	0.56	0.77	0.58	0.66	0.88	0.36	0.87	0.59	0.67
PI index(k)	84.42	115.58	87.06	98.55	131.76	53.47	130.77	89.08	100.00

(a) Employment service type 5 from the MDS.

(b) Persons of Non English Speaking Background (NESB) using employment services (from the 1995 MDS).

(c) Total employment clients from the 1995 MDS (excludes 1,465 persons for whom the answer to the NESB question was not known or missing.)

(d) The proportion of employment clients who are from Non English Speaking Backgrounds (NESB) (b)/(c).

(e) NESB population 15 to 64 in 1991 (from ABS expanded profile, catalogue no. 2722.0)).

(f) Total population 15 to 64 in 1991, excluding those with background not stated (from ABS).

(g) Non English Speaking Background persons as a percentage of total population ((e)/(f)).

(h) Ratio of percentage NESB in employment services to percentage NESB in general population ((d)/(g)).

(i) Relative index of (h), setting Australia equal to 100 and multiplying the States by the appropriate factor (100/0.28).

(j) The rate (per 1000) of CSDA employment service use by NESB population aged 15 to 64 ((b)/(e)*1000).

(k) Relative index of (j), setting Australia equal to 100 and multiplying the States by the appropriate factor (100/0.67).

Performance indicator 9: Clients (a) receiving community based or in home accommodation support (b) as a percentage of total accommodation clients, 1995

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
Institutional/hostel accommodation(c)	2,724	2,004	617	1,171	904	304	0	20	7,744
Clients in non-institutional accomm.(b)	2,870	3,589	2,426	871	1,347	362	103	231	11,799
Clients in all accomm. services(a)	5,594	5,593	3,043	2,042	2,251	666	103	251	19,543
P(d)	51.30	64.17	79.72	42.65	59.84	54.35	100.00	92.03	60.37

(a) MDS service type 1.01 to 1.06 (excluding services identified as psychiatric services).

(b) MDS service type 1.03 to 1.06

(c) MDS service types 1.01 and 1.02 (institutional or hostel accommodation).

(d) Percentage of total accommodation clients receiving community based or in home accommodation support (100*(b)/(a)).

Performance indicator 10: proportion employed per 1,000 population with a disability aged 15-64 years living in households and in the labour force, by state and territory, Australia, 1993 (a)

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Australia
Employed (1)	228,923	200,623	144,852	69,154	92,978	19,800	9,598	19,216	785,144
Unemployed (2)	48,678	43,762	39,383	13,850	16,495	4,126	1,967	1,735	169,996
Total in the labour force (3)=(1)+(2)	277,601	244,385	184,235	83,004	109,473	23,926	11,565	20,951	955,140
Not in the labour force (4)	248,636	199,196	158,979	70,749	69,512	23,581	3,916	9,705	784,274
Total with a disability (5)	526,237	443,581	343,214	153,753	178,985	47,507	15,481	30,656	1,739,414
Proportion employed (6)=(1)/(3)*1000	824.6	820.9	786.2	833.1	849.3	827.6	829.9	917.2	822.0
PI index(b)	100.3	99.9	95.6	101.4	103.3	100.7	101.0	111.6	100.0

(a) At national level, estimates of 8,000 or less have a relative standard error (RSE) of 25% (2,000) or more, while such estimates for States and

Territories such as NSW, N.T. have an RSE of 28% (2,250), 13% (1,050) or more respectively. Likewise, national estimates of 1,900 or less have an RSE of 50% (950) or more, while such estimates have an RSE of 60% (1,150) or more for NSW and 28% (550) or more for N.T.

(b) The relative performance indicator index is calculated by setting Australia equal to 100 (from (6)), and adjusting the States by the appropriate factor (100/822.0).

Figures from population surveys should be rounded to nearest 100 if published—shown here to show working.

Source: AIHW analysis of ABS 1993 Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers data.

Paper 3: The descriptors.

This paper presents data for the descriptors identified by the working group.

The data are presented in two tables.

Table 3.1: People with a disability aged under 65, by severity of handicap, by State and Territory

Table 3.2: Number of clients
by government provided or funded non-government service
by service type
by States and Territories

Table 3.2 number of clients by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, by States and Territories, CSDA MDS 1995

New South Wales—State funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995

Service type	Government services	Non government services	Not stated	Total
Accommodation	2,872	2,722	0	5,594
Community support	2,215	1,090	0	3,305
Community access	1,375	1,176	0	2,551
Respite	352	191	0	543
Other/not stated	0	0	0	0
Total	6,814	5,179	0	11,993

Accommodation = MDS codes 1.01-1.06, Community support = MDS codes 2.01-2.13, Community access = MDS codes 3.01-3.03, Respite = MDS codes 4.01-4.04

Victoria—State funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995

Service type	Government services	Non government services	Not stated	Total
Accommodation	3,522	2,071	0	5,593
Community support	451	2,221	0	2,672
Community access	2,077	3,328	0	5,405
Respite	221	296	0	517
Other/not stated	0	0	0	0
Total	6,271	7,916	0	14,187

Accommodation = MDS codes 1.01-1.06, Community support = MDS codes 2.01-2.13, Community access = MDS codes 3.01-3.03, Respite = MDS codes 4.01-4.04

Queensland—State funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995

Service type	Government services	Non government services	Not stated	Total
Accommodation	1,011	2,032	0	3,043
Community support	915	131	0	1,046
Community access	36	1,003	0	1,039
Respite	147	318	0	465
Other/not stated	0	0	0	0
Total	2,109	3,484	0	5,593

Accommodation = MDS codes 1.01-1.06, Community support = MDS codes 2.01-2.13, Community access = MDS codes 3.01-3.03, Respite = MDS codes 4.01-4.04

South Australia—State funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995

Service type	Government services	Non government services	Not stated	Total
Accommodation	821	1,262	0	2,083
Community support	376	456	0	832
Community access	67	917	0	984
Respite	48	129	0	177
Other/not stated	6	44	0	50
Total	1,318	2,808	0	4,126

Accommodation = MDS codes 1.01-1.06, Community support = MDS codes 2.01-2.13, Community access = MDS codes 3.01-3.03, Respite = MDS codes 4.01-4.04

Western Australia(a)—State funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995

Service type	Government services	Non government services	Not stated	Total
Accommodation	1,130	1,121	0	2,251
Community support	NA	NA	NA	NA
Community access	NA	NA	NA	NA
Respite	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other/not stated	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA

(a) Western Australian data is for all consumers over the 12 months to 30 June 1995, no snapshot day data available

NA means that the data are not available

Tasmania—State funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995

Service type	Government services	Non government services	Not stated	Total
Accommodation	112	554	0	666
Community support	109	177	0	286
Community access	100	208	0	308
Respite	14	50	0	64
Other/not stated	0	0	0	0
Total	335	989	0	1,324

Accommodation = MDS codes 1.01-1.06, Community support = MDS codes 2.01-2.13, Community access = MDS codes 3.01-3.03, Respite = MDS codes 4.01-4.04

Northern Territory—Territory funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995

Service type	Government services	Non government services	Not stated	Total
Accommodation	0	103	0	103
Community support	0	15	0	15
Community access	0	21	0	21
Respite	15	22	0	37
Other/not stated	0	0	7	7
Total	15	161	7	183

Accommodation = MDS codes 1.01-1.06, Community support = MDS codes 2.01-2.13, Community access = MDS codes 3.01-3.03, Respite = MDS codes 4.01-4.04

ACT—Territory funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995

Service type	Government services	Non government services	Not stated	Total
Accommodation	143	108	0	251
Community support	49	25	0	74
Community access	0	78	0	78
Respite	20	30	0	50
Other/not stated	0	0	0	0
Total	212	241	0	453

Accommodation = MDS codes 1.01-1.06, Community support = MDS codes 2.01-2.13, Community access = MDS codes 3.01-3.03, Respite = MDS codes 4.01-4.04

All States and Territories—State or Territory funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, CSDA MDS 1995:

Australian totals not available because of unavailability of WA data.

Australia—Commonwealth funded services, client numbers by government provided or funded non-government service, by service type, by States and Territories, CSDA MDS 1995

State	Service type	Government services	Non government services	Total
New South Wales	Employment	408	8,554	8,962
Victoria	Employment	833	6,668	7,501
Queensland	Employment	551	4,167	4,718
South Australia	Employment	412	1,961	2,373
Western Australia	Employment	309	2,795	3,104
Tasmania	Employment	376	273	649
Northern Territory	Employment	59	95	154
ACT	Employment	126	268	394
Total all States	Employment	3,074	24,781	27,855

Employment = MDS codes 5.01-5.06, Other = all other MDS codes