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30 April 2013  
  
The Hon Julia Gillard MP  
Prime Minister  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600  
  
  
Dear Prime Minister

On behalf of the COAG Reform Council I am pleased to present our report *Disability 2011–12: Comparing performance across Australia.*

Australians generally enjoy good quality of life with the opportunity to earn an income and participate in their communities in positive ways. It is the belief of all Australian governments, as set out in the National Disability Agreement, that those living with disability should enjoy the same opportunities. However, as we know, in Australia almost half the population of people with disability lives in poverty or near poverty—earning, on average, about half as much as people without disability.

In our fourth report on the National Disability Agreement, we are pleased to show that there have been some improvements in the proportion of people with disability using the specialist services they need to foster choice, independence and wellbeing.

However, we also report some markers of lower and decreasing economic participation by people with disability and their carers. These inequalities are even more acutely experienced by people with disability who are Indigenous or who were born in non-English speaking countries.

All Australian governments have agreed that more should be done to remove the barriers to economic and social participation faced by people with disability and the people who care for them. The council hopes that the findings in this report will further assist governments to shape the policies that will deliver a better future for people with disability.   
  
  
Yours sincerely  
  
  
  
  
  
  
JOHN BRUMBY   
Chairman

****
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# 

# Disability 2011–12 key findings

### People receiving the Disability Support Pension are less likely to participate in the economy than three years ago. Carers also face challenges in the labour force. However, there is better news for service use—with an increase in overall use of disability services.

**The proportion of people receiving the Disability Support Pension who report earnings is going down**

Working and earning an income are positive indicators of social and economic inclusion for people with disability. People receiving the Disability Support Pension can receive a part-payment while still working up to 30 hours per week.

However, between 2009 and 2012, the proportion of people receiving the Disability Support Pension who reported earnings from other sources went down—nationally (from 9.3% to 8.6%) and in all jurisdictions. During the same period, the proportion of people with disability receiving the Newstart or Youth Allowance, who reported earnings, went up from 14% to 16.3%. However, this is a smaller group—121 291 people with disability received the Newstart or Youth Allowance in 2012, compared with 801 687 people receiving the Disability Support Pension.

**Figure 1. Disability Support Pension recipients reporting earnings (%)**
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**The proportion of people who use State or Territory-delivered disability support services** **increased**

These services aim to support people with disability to live well, to enjoy choice and independence. Between 2008–09 and 2010–11 there was an increase in the proportion of people with disability who used services from 32.4% to 34.9%. The biggest increase was for people under 25 years.

When broken down by service type, the increase was mainly confined to use of essential community support services which increased from 22.7% to 25.9%. Rates of use of accommodation, community access and respite services remained stable nationally.



**Working-age carers of people with disability were less likely to be in the labour force**

The National Carer Strategy emphasises that the opportunity to participate in paid work can improve the social and emotional wellbeing of everyone in the family. However in 2009, 68.7% of all working-age carers (aged 15–64) and 53.7% of primary carers were in the labour force. This contrasts with the labour force participation rate for working-age non-carers of 79.9%. Carers were also less likely to be employed—with 63.3% of all carers and 50.7% of primary carers working in 2009.



**Most carers experience negative impacts from their caring role**

58.3% of primary carers experience negative impacts arising from their caring role—62.5% for women and 48.4% for men.
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# Recommendations

### Recommendation 1

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG **note** that:

1. **an indicator of the economic participation of people with disability—the proportion of people receiving the Disability Support Pension who also report earnings—fell from 9.3% in 2009 to 8.6% in 2012**
2. **working age primary carers of people with disability (53.7%) were less likely than working age non-carers (79.9%) to be in the labour force in 2009**
3. **34.9% of people who may have needed a State or Territory-delivered disability service in 2010–11 actually used a service—an increase of 2.5 percentage points on the previous year.**

### Recommendation 2

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG **agree** to consider making further data available to the council, including:

1. **data to allow an analysis of patterns of change over time in the proportions of people with and people without disability who receive income support and also report earnings**
2. **data disaggregations by socio-economic status**
3. **disaggregation of carer-related data by Indigenous status.**

### Recommendation 3

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG **agree** to further work being done to develop a benchmark with a quantifiable target to assess whether families and carers of people with disability are well supported. This would be consistent with the findings of the 2012 review of the National Disability Agreement.
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# Chapter 1. Economic participation and social inclusion

## This chapter reports on indicators for the proportion of people with disability receiving income support who also report other earnings. It also looks at how social and cultural background and gender affect these proportions.

#### How this chapter links to the National Disability Agreement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section in this chapter** | **NDA performance indicator** | **NDA outcome** |
| **Income support  and earnings**  **Different patterns in  income support and earnings** | (c) proportion of income support recipients who report earnings | People with disability achieve economic participation and social inclusion |

#### Like to know more about the indicators?

**Appendix A** outlines the structure of the National Disability Agreement and details the indicators and benchmarks under the agreement that are not included in this report in detail, either due to data quality and availability issues, or because there was little change in performance year on year.

# Key findings

#### Our previous report found lower labour force participation by people with disability compared to those without disability. This year we focus on new data on income support recipients with disability who report earnings. It is a positive outcome for people receiving income support to report earnings—indicating greater economic and social participation, and greater ability to meet the day-to-day costs associated with living with disability.

#### In last year’s report we noted that, in 2009, Western Australia and the ACT had higher rates of labour force participation for people with disability than other jurisdictions—62.4% in Western Australia and 71.4% in the ACT compared with a national rate for people with disability of 54.3%. Combined with this year’s results for rates of reporting earnings by people receiving the Disability Support Pension, this suggests a pattern of better economic participation by people with disability in those jurisdictions.

**The proportion of people receiving the Commonwealth-delivered Disability Support Pension who also reported earnings decreased nationally from 9.3% to 8.6% between 2009 and 2012.** This decrease was consistent across all jurisdictions.

**The proportion of people with disability receiving the Newstart or Youth Allowance who also reported earnings increased nationally from 14% to 16.3% between 2009 and 2012.** There were decreases during this time in Western Australia (18.0% to 16.4%) and the Northern Territory (8.4% to 7.1%).

**Indigenous Australians with disability have lower rates of reporting earnings for both types of income support.** For people born overseas rates of reporting earnings are also lower among those receiving the Disability Support Pension.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of key findings in this chapter | | |
| Of people with disability who received income support in 2012... | | |
| 8.6% of Disability Support Pension recipients reported earnings  down from 9.3%  in 2009 | 16.3% of Newstart or Youth Allowance recipients reported earnings  up from 14% in 2009 | 3.5 % of Indigenous Disability Support Pension recipients reported earnings  down from 3.9% in 2009 |

## Income support and earnings

The proportion of people receiving the Commonwealth-delivered Disability Support Pension who also report earnings has decreased—while a greater proportion of those who receive the Commonwealth Newstart or Youth Allowance are also reporting earnings.

**Rates of reporting earnings by Disability Support Pension recipients decreased nationally and in all States and Territories**

Nationally in 2012, 8.6% of people receiving the Commonwealth-delivered Disability Support Pension (or 68 990 of 801 687) reported earnings additional to their pension—down from 9.3% in 2009 (Figure 1.1). The total number of people receiving the Disability Support Pension increased during this time from 743 496 to 801 687.

Figure 1.1 shows decreases in the proportion reporting earnings in all jurisdictions.

* The ACT had the highest proportion of people receiving the Disability Support Pension who also reported earnings at 11.6%, down from 13% in 2009.
* The Northern Territory had the lowest proportion at 4.2%, down from 5.3% in 2009.

Figure 1.1 Disability Support Pension recipients who also reported earnings

Source: FaHCSIA—see Appendix B.

**Rates of reporting earnings by Newstart or Youth Allowance recipients increased nationally**

In 2012, of people with disability who received the Commonwealth-delivered Newstart or the Youth Allowance, 16.3% (or 19 720 of 121 291) reported earnings nationally—compared with 14% in 2009 (Figure 1.2). There were decreases during this time in Western Australia (18.0% to 16.4%) and the Northern Territory (8.4% to 7.1%). Between 2010 and 2012 there was also a decrease in Tasmania from 18.4% to 16.2%.

People with lower capacity for further work—including because of more severe disability—were less likely to report any earnings than those with greater capacity for further work. Of people who could work 0–14 hours, 12% reported earnings compared with 16.5% of people who could work 15–29 hours.

Women were more likely to report earnings than men—at 20% and 13% respectively overall (Figure 1.3 below).

Figure 1.2 Newstart/Youth Allowance recipients with disability who also reported earnings



Source: DEEWR—see Appendix B.

Figure 1.3 Newstart/Youth Allowance recipients with disability who also reported earnings—men and women



Source: DEEWR—see Appendix B.

## Different patterns in income support and earnings

Indigenous Australians and people born overseas have lower rates of reporting earnings when receiving Commonwealth-delivered income support.

Indigenous Australians report earnings at less than half the overall rate

Figure 1.4 shows that in 2012, among Indigenous Australians with disability:

* 3.5% (or 1539 of 44 464) who received the Disability Support Pension also reported earnings—compared with 8.6% of the total population.
* The Northern Territory had the lowest proportion of Indigenous Australians who receive the Disability Support Pension and who also report earnings—at 1.8%. The highest rate was in Tasmania—at 6.1% (data were not available for the ACT).
* 7.6% of Indigenous Australians with disability who received the Newstart or Youth Allowance also reported earnings—compared with 16.3% of all persons (data were not available for the ACT or Northern Territory).

Figure 1.4 People with disability who receive income support who also report earnings, by Indigenous status, 2012



Source: DEEWR and FaHCSIA—see Appendix B.

**People born overseas report earnings at lower rates**

In 2012, among people with disability who receive the Disability Support Pension and who were born overseas, those born in non-English speaking countries had the lowest rate (4.4%) of reporting earnings—less than half the rate for people born in Australia (9.6%). By jurisdiction:

* NSW had the lowest proportion of people born in non-English speaking countries who receive the Disability Support Pension and report earnings—at 3.8%
* the highest rate was in Western Australia—at 8%.

In contrast to this, country of birth does not greatly affect the rate of reporting earnings for those receiving the Newstart/Youth allowance. People born overseas, whether in English-speaking or   
non-English speaking countries, report earnings at a slightly lower rate than Australian-born people (Figure 1.5). In 2012, among people with disability born in non-English speaking countries:

* rates of reporting earnings by those receiving the Newstart/Youth allowance were highest in Tasmania—at 18%
* rates of reporting earnings by those receiving the Newstart/Youth allowance were also higher than the national rate in the ACT and Western Australia—at 17% and 17.3% respectively
* South Australia had the lowest rate of Newstart/Youth allowance recipients who also reported earnings at 14.8% compared to the national rate of 15.5%.

Figure 1.5 People with disability who receive income support and also report earnings, by country of birth, 2012



Source: DEEWR—see Appendix B.



# Chapter 2. Choice, wellbeing and independent living

## This chapter reports on rates of service use by people with disability—including State/Territory-delivered disability support services and Commonwealth-delivered employment support services.

#### How this chapter links to the National Disability Agreement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section in this chapter** | **NDA performance indicators** | **NDA outcome** |
| **Disability services**  **Different patterns in  disability service use**  **Open and supported employment services** | (d) the proportion of people with disability accessing disability services | People with disability enjoy choice, wellbeing and the opportunity to live as independently as possible |

#### Like to know more about the indicators?

**Appendix A** outlines the structure of the National Disability Agreement and details the indicators and benchmarks under the agreement that are not included in this report in detail, either due to data quality and availability issues, or because there was little change in performance year on year.

# Key findings

**The proportion of people with disability using State and Territory delivered disability services increased nationally between 2008–09 and 2010–11.** However, there is still a high degree of variation between individual jurisdictions. The lowest rate in 2010–11 was 22.2% in the Northern Territory and the highest rate was 53.2% in Tasmania. Increases were smaller for people in older age groups (25–64 years), and negligible for people in outer regional/remote areas.

**Looking at different types of services, the increase was largely limited to community support services—for things such as therapy, case management, early childhood intervention and case coordination.** There was little or no change at the national level in the use of accommodation, respite and community access services, for which the number of people who would potentially need these services is smaller.

**Use of Commonwealth-delivered open employment support services is increasing, particularly among younger age groups.** The only jurisdiction not to see an increase was the Northern Territory where the rate remained stable.

**Use of Commonwealth-delivered supported employment services, on the other hand, is decreasing, nationally and in most jurisdictions.** In 2010–11, rates of use in South Australia (16%) and Tasmania (10.6%) were still well above the national average. In the Northern Territory the rate of 3.2% in 2010–11 was less than half the national average.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of key findings in this chapter | | |
| Of people with disability, who could have used services in 2010–11.... | | |
| 34.9% used State/Territory-delivered disability support services    up from 32.4%  in 2008–09  up from 5.9%  in 2008–09 | 7.1% used Commonwealth-delivered open employment services    down from 9.2%  in 2008–09 | 8.6% used Commonwealth-delivered supported employment services |
|  |  |  |

## Disability services

Use of State and Territory-delivered disability services has increased overall—mainly due to increasing use of community support services.

Use of specialist State or Territory-delivered disability services has increased

Among people who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability services there was an increase in the proportion who actually used them—nationally and in most jurisdictions. The national increase was from 32.4% in 2008–09 to 34.9% (or 171 671 of 492 143 people who may have needed services) in 2010–11. Figure 2.1 shows the overall increase between 2008–09 and 2010–11—nationally and in most jurisdictions.

Figure 2.2 shows that when broken down by service type, the increase in the rate of use over the past three years is mainly limited to community support services—for which the increase was 3.2 percentage points. The number of people using these services is also much higher than for other service types—at 127 622 in 2010–11—compared with 30 631 using accommodation support, 44 068 using community access services and 32 550 using respite services.

From 2008–09 to 2010–11 rates of use of accommodation support, community access and respite services were stable nationally.

Figure 2.1 Proportion of people who may have needed disability support services, who used them



Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.

Figure 2.2 Proportion of people who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability support services, who did use them, by service type.



Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.

## Different patterns in disability service use

Use of State and Territory-delivered disability services has increased overall—but not consistently in all parts of the community.

Increases are largely driven by people under 25 years, and in major cities and inner-regional areas

The largest increases are in the 0–9 and 15–24 year age groups—which increased their use by 4.7 and 5.3 percentage points respectively from 2008–09 to 2010–11.

Figure 2.3 Proportion of people who may have needed State or Territory-delivered community support services, who did use them, by age (years)



Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.

Looking at geographic location, Figure 2.4 shows only a marginal increase in overall use of disability support services in outer regional and remote areas—at 1 percentage point—compared with a 3.5 percentage point increase in inner regional areas and a 2.4 percentage point increase in major cities.

Figure 2.4 Proportion of people who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability support services, who did use them, by location

Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.

Rates of service use are higher for Indigenous Australians—and lower for people born overseas

In 2008–09, Indigenous Australians used State and Territory delivered disability support services at similar rates to the overall population at 32.5%. However, the rate for Indigenous Australians has increased more rapidly than for the total population. It was 40.5% in 2010–11 compared with 34.9% for the total population.

Figure 2.5 shows that in 2010–11 Indigenous Australians in outer-regional/remote/very remote areas used disability support services at more than double the rate of Indigenous Australians in major cities—at 61.1% and 26.4% respectively.

People born overseas had lower rates of use for all service types. The rate was 11.7% for people from non-English speaking countries and 15.3% for people from English-speaking countries other than Australia in 2010–11—both less than half the national rate (Figure 2.6).

Figure 2.5 Indigenous Australians who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability support services, who did use them



Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.

Figure 2.6 People born overseas, who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability support services, who did use them, by country of birth, 2010–11



Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.

## Open and supported employment services

Use of Commonwealth-delivered supported employment services is decreasing—while use of Commonwealth-delivered open employment services is increasing.

**Use of supported employment services decreased**

Supported employment services provide employment opportunities and assistance to people with disability to work in specialised and supported environments. In 2010–11, 21 146 people used supported employment services. This was 8.6% of the 246 215 people who may have needed these services (aged 15–64 and adjusted for labour force participation)—down from 9.2% in 2008–09.

Figure 2.7 shows that rates of use were highest in South Australia (16.0%) and Tasmania (10.6%), but were nearly half the national average in the Northern Territory (3.2%).

In 2010–11, Indigenous Australians (6.1%) used supported employment services at lower rates than the overall population of service users. The rate for Indigenous Australians decreased in all jurisdictions between 2008–09 and 2010–11, except for:

* Western Australia—where there was a 5.8 percentage point increase
* Queensland—where there was a 0.4 percentage point increase
* NSW—where the rate remained stable.

Data were not available for the ACT for this measure.

In the three years to 2010–11, people born in non-English speaking countries used supported employment services (2.5%) at lower rates than the general population.

Figure 2.7 Proportion of people who may have needed supported employment services, who did use them



Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.

**Use of open employment services increased**

Open employment services help people with disability to gain and keep paid employment in the open labour market. In 2010–11, of 1.5 million people with disability with an employment restriction, 107 294 or 7.1% used open employment services—up from 5.9% in 2008–09.

Figure 2.8 shows that there were increases in all jurisdictions except the Northern Territory where the rate remained stable. The largest increase was in South Australia at 1.8 percentage points to 8%.

Figure 2.9 shows that the increase in use of open employment services was largely limited to people under 35 years old—with the largest increase for 15–24 year olds, at 3.7 percentage points.

Nationally, in 2010–11, 6.8% of Indigenous Australians with disability (or 4700 of 69 088) used open employment services. For people born in non-English speaking countries the rate was 5.1%.

Figure 2.8 Proportion of people with disability who used open employment services

Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.

Figure 2.9 Proportion of people with disability who used open employment services, by age



Source: AIHW—see Appendix B.



# Chapter 3. Support for carers and families

## This chapter reports on indicators for carer labour force participation, satisfaction and wellbeing. It looks at differences in outcomes for primary carers, and also looks at differences for male and female primary carers.

#### How this chapter links to the National Disability Agreement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section in this chapter** | **NDA performance indicators** | **NDA outcome** |
| **Participation in the labour  force and employment**  **Wellbeing , satisfaction  and need for assistance** | (g) the proportion of carers of people with disability participating in the labour force  (h) the proportion of primary carers who report their health and wellbeing as positive  (i) proportion of primary carers of people with disability who are satisfied with the range of services available and with the adequacy and quality of services provided, to the person with disability and to the carer. | Families and carers are well supported |

#### Like to know more about the indicators?

**Appendix A** outlines the structure of the National Disability Agreement and details the indicators and benchmarks under the agreement that are not included in this report in detail, either due to data quality and availability issues, or because there was little change in performance year on year.

# Key findings

**In 2009 carers were significantly less likely to be in the labour force and employed than people who were not carers.** In addition, in five states—NSW, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia—as well as nationally, primary carers had significantly lower labour force participation than all carers.

**Most primary carers reported that their role negatively affects their wellbeing in some way. One-fifth reported being satisfied with their role,** though only slightly more than this reported a need for more assistance. In the ACT, 39% of primary carers reported needing more assistance, which was significantly higher than the national proportion of 22.8%.

**There was a significant difference between the proportion of men and women who reported experiencing negative impacts on their wellbeing due to their caring role.**In 2009,48.4% of men reported experiencing negative impacts, compared with 62.5% of women.This difference was also significant in NSW where 63.1% of women and 39.6% of men reported experiencing negative impacts.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of key findings in this chapter | | |
| Among primary carers.... | | |
| 53.7% were in the labour force    compared with 79.9% of non-carers | 58.3% reported experiencing negative impacts on their wellbeing due to their caring role | 22.8% reported needing further assistance in their caring role |
|  |  |  |

## Participation in the labour force and employment

Carers of people with disability are less likely to be in the labour force and employed.

Primary carers have lower labour force participation than non-carers

Nationally and in every State and Territory primary carers have lower labour force participation than non-carers. Figure 3.1 shows that nationally in 2009, the labour force participation rate for 15–64 year-olds was:

* 79.9% for non-carers
* 68.7% for all carers—this was significantly lower than the rate for non-carers
* 53.7% for primary carers—this was significantly lower than the rate for all carers combined.

Nationally and in NSW (56.0%), Victoria (51.7%), Queensland (52.4%), Western Australia (53.5%) and South Australia (52.8%), the labour force participation rates for primary carers were significantly lower than the rate for all carers. The differences were only significant in these five States, though estimates were lower in all States and Territories.

We note that a revision to the carer population included in this measure has resulted in a minor change to the information we reported on labour force participation in our previous report.

Figure 3.1 Labour force participation by carers of people with disability, 2009



Source: ABS—see Appendix B.

Carers are less likely to be employed

Figure 3.2 shows that the poor outcomes for carers in the labour force—especially primary carers— are also reflected in employment rates.

In 2009, nationally, the employment rate was:

* 75.7% for non-carers
* 63.3% for all carers—this was significantly lower than for non-carers
* 50.7% for primary carers—this was significantly lower than all carers combined.

Primary carers were significantly less likely to be employed than all carers in NSW (52.6%), Victoria (48.6%), Queensland (49.1%) and Western Australia (50.3%).

Female carers were also significantly less likely than male carers to be employed—with employment rates of 57.1% and 70.2% respectively. This compares with employment rates for non carers—male and female—of 81.2% and 70.0% respectively in 2009.

Complete data were not available for South Australia and the Northern Territory, and no data were available for Tasmania for this measure.

**Figure 3.2 Carers of people with disability employment rate, 2009**



Source: ABS—see Appendix B.

## Wellbeing, satisfaction and need for assistance

Most primary carers of people with disability experience negative impacts on their wellbeing relating to their caring role, though a minority report needing more assistance. Women are more likely than men to experience negative impacts.

More than half of primary carers report negative impacts on their wellbeing—and one fifth reported feeling satisfied with their caring role

In 2009, nationally, 58.3% of primary carers reported experiencing negative impacts on their wellbeing due to their caring role. A much lower rate of men (48.4%) reported negative impacts than women (62.5%), a pattern seen most strongly in NSW (see Figure 3.3).

In terms of satisfaction with their caring role, 20.4% of primary carers reported feeling satisfied. There were no significant differences across States and Territories, but a higher proportion (31.8%) of primary carers aged 65 and over reported being satisfied with their role than younger carers.

While one-fifth of carers reported feeling satisfied with their caring role, only 22.8% of primary carers reported a need for further assistance in their caring role. Only the ACT had a significantly different result, with its rate (39.0%) being significantly higher than the national rate (see Figure 3.4).

Primary carers who reported negative impacts on their wellbeing were those who reported one or more of the following specific impacts: ‘*frequently feeling worried, depressed, angry or resentful, feeling weary or lacking energy, or have been diagnosed with a stress related illness due to their caring role.’*

Figure 3.3 Primary carers who report experiencing negative impacts on their wellbeing due to their caring role—men and women, 2009



Source: ABS—see Appendix B.

**Figure 3.4** **Primary carers who report needing more assistance with their caring role, 2009**



Source: ABS—see Appendix B.



# Chapter 4. Improving performance reporting

## This chapter outlines the council’s views on how to improve the performance reporting framework for the National Disability Agreement.

## More comprehensive measurement

### Despite good changes to the performance reporting framework, it can still be improved. A performance benchmark for carers and families is needed, as is more comprehensive information about economic participation, socio-economic status and Indigenous carers.

At its July 2012 meeting, COAG adopted a revised performance framework for the National Disability Agreement. We support this new framework, which has better conceptual links between the outcomes of the agreement and the agreed indicators. Under the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations, the council may advise COAG on changes to improve the performance reporting framework.

A performance benchmark for the outcome that carers and families are supported is needed

Consistent with the 2012 review of the National Disability Agreement, COAG agreed that further work would be done to develop a benchmark with a quantifiable target for the outcome that families and carers are well supported. This work should be a priority for completion in 2013 after the Standing Council on Federal Financial Relations’ review of funding adequacy. The benchmark should be ambitious, measurable and quantifiable in line with the recommendation of the 2012 review.

Comparison data for the economic participation of people without disability would add relevance

Amendments to this indicator have improved its relevance for reporting on the outcome that people with disability achieve economic participation and social inclusion. The inclusion of Newstart/Youth allowance recipients with disability in this assessment has also meant that a more comprehensive group is covered—including people whose disability may be temporary or may temporarily limit work capacity.

We note that the intention of this indicator is to track performance in improving economic participation, rather than just the numbers receiving a particular type of income support. It could be improved by adding comparison data for the proportion of people without disability who receive income support and who report earnings. A direct comparison of point-in-time rates is not proposed given people with disability are less likely in general to be in the workforce. There would still be benefit in comparing changes over time in the different groups to distinguish between general labour market movements and those specific to people with disability.

There is a continuing need for better information by socio-economic status

In our 2008–09 baseline report, we recommended that further disaggregation of data be provided for people with disability and their carers by degree of socio-economic disadvantage. We reiterate this recommendation in the context of clear trends, from four years of reporting performance under the Agreement, that people with disability have generally poorer levels of economic participation, and that this is exacerbated by locality and severity of disability.

Further information is needed about carers who are Indigenous Australians

Consistent with COAG’s commitment to address social inclusion, the 2012 review of the National Disability Agreement recommended that all performance indicators be disaggregated by Indigenous status, where possible.

This report shows the very different experiences of Indigenous Australians with disability. For instance, they generally have lower rates of reporting income when receiving income support, but higher rates of service use, particularly in outer remote areas. However, we are not able to report on the experience of carers who are Indigenous Australians. This is needed to give a full and comprehensive picture of progress on the outcome that families and carers are well supported.



# Appendices



## Appendix A The National Disability Agreement

### About the agreement

### The National Disability Agreement—the Agreement between the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments in relation to people with disability and their carers—commenced on 1 January 2009. Its objective is that people with disability and their carers have an enhanced quality of life and participate as valued members of the community.

### There are three outcomes to be achieved under the agreement:

### people with disability achieve economic participation and social inclusion

### people with disability enjoy choice, wellbeing and the opportunity to live as independently as possible

### families and carers are well supported.

### The agreement was reviewed by COAG in 2012, resulting in amendments to performance indicators. The diagram at the end of this section provides an overview of the agreement structure and revised indicators.

### Performance indicators not reported

### Each year, we report on only a selection of performance indicators in the National Disability Agreement. In some years, we cannot report on indicators for reasons such as data not being available or measures not yet being agreed between governments.

### We also may choose not to report some indicators for which we have been given data because there has been little change since the previous year or because we think the data are not helpful for measuring progress toward COAG’s agreed outcome.

### Data for indicators not included in the report at all, or not in detail, are still published in our statistical supplement to this report which comprises data provided by the Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision as well as additional data we have used. It includes complete data for all reported indicators, including data quality statements, and is available on our website. Below, we detail what we cannot report and what we do not report. This is also summarised by indicator in the table that follows.

What we cannot report on indicators for economic participation and social inclusion

Two indicators on labour force participation and participation in social and community activities rely on data from the ABS’s Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers (SDAC), which is run every three years and most recently in 2009. These were reported in last year’s report. There are no new data available for these indicators, and accordingly they are not reported again this year.

In the National Disability Agreement governments have also agreed to the performance benchmark that between 2009 and 2018 there is a five percentage point national increase in the proportion of people with disability participating in the labour force. There are also no new data to report progress this year since the 2009 data included in last year’s report.

What we cannot report on indicators for choice, wellbeing and independent living

The indicator on the proportion of people with disability who are satisfied with the range of services available and the adequacy and quality of services provided relies the SDAC, which is run every three years and most recently in 2009.

A measure for this indicator—the proportion of people needing more formal assistance—was reported last year and is not reported again this year. However, we note that last year’s data have been revised since the 2010–11 because of a change in the method of calculating the potential population. The revised proportion was lower than the previously reported rate—at 31.9% overall. Data for other measures under this indicator—on satisfaction with service options and the quality of assistance received—are expected to be available from the 2012 SDAC and will be included in next year’s report.

Governments have also agreed to the benchmark that between 2009 and 2018 there will be a five percentage point national decrease in the proportion of people who report a need for formal assistance. As there are no updates to the 2009 data reported last year, progress toward this benchmark is not assessed in this report.

What we do not report on indicators for choice, wellbeing and independent living

The proportion of young people entering, living in and leaving permanent residential aged care is not comprehensively reported this year because small proportions of people are affected and meaningful comparisons between jurisdictions, and over time, are not possible.

However, in terms of total numbers, Australia-wide, there was a reduction from 1835 of 475 078 of the potential population admitted to permanent residential aged care in 2008–09 to 1815 of 492 505 in 2011–12—an overall reduction of 20 admissions. There was also a reduction in the number of people under 64 years living in permanent residential aged care—by 195 people overall and 207 for people under 49 years. In addition, there was an overall decrease in the number of non-Indigenous Australians under 49 years who were admitted to residential aged care—from 211 in 2008–09 to 164 in 2011–12.

We also do not report data provided for the Commonwealth’s Disability Management Services—part of the open employment services program. Data could not be provided for previous years and cannot be aggregated with the other employment services data to allow comparison over time. However, 2010–11 data for this program can be found in the statistical supplement to this report.

What we cannot report on indicators for support for carers and families

Data for three measures—under indicators on primary carers who are satisfied with the range of services available and with the adequacy and quality of services provided, and on carer labour force participation—were not available for this report, and are anticipated to be available from the 2012 SDAC for next year’s report.

They are:

* the proportion of primary carers of people with disability who are satisfied with the range of organised and formal service options available to help them in their caring role
* the proportion of carers of people with disability who are satisfied with the quality of assistance received form organised and formal services, for the person with the disability and the carer, in the last six months
* the proportion of carers who usually work less than 35 hours per week, who wanted to work more hours and would be able to start work with more hours in the next four weeks.

### Structure of the National Disability Agreement

### Key:

## Appendix B Terms used in this report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ABS** | Australian Bureau of Statistics |
| **AIHW** | Australian Institute of Health and Welfare |
| **Carer** | A person caring for someone with a disability who lives with the carer. Further information about the definitions for carers and primary carers is in Appendix C and is published in the statistical supplement to this report published on our website. |
| **COAG** | Council of Australian Governments |
| **DEEWR** | Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations |
| **Disability** | Any activity limitation, restriction or impairment that restricts everyday activities and lasts longer than six months. Information on how the term is defined for specific measures in this report can be found in the statistical supplement published on our website. |
| **FACSHIA** | Australian Government Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs |
| **Indigenous** | We use the terms ‘Indigenous’, ‘Indigenous Australians’ and ‘Indigenous people’ to refer to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. |
| **Primary carer** | A person aged 15 years and over who provides the most informal assistance, in terms of help or supervision, to a person aged 0-64 years with one or more disabilities. The assistance has to be ongoing, or likely to be ongoing, for at least six months and be provided for one or more of the core activities (communication, mobility and self-care). Further information about the definitions for carers and primary carers is published in Appendix C and in the statistical supplement to this report published on our website. |
| **Remoteness** | Remoteness in this report refers to the Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC) developed by the ABS for Major Cities, Inner Regional, Outer Regional, Remote, and Very Remote Areas. These areas are based on the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA), and are provide an indication of the degree of remoteness (or distance) from major urban centres.  In the Disability Services National Minimum Data Set, a service user’s Remoteness Area was calculated based on their residential postcode and the ASGC 2009 classification. In the 2009 SDAC, the ASGC 2006 Collection Districts were used. Very Remote Areas were excluded from the scope of this survey. As a result, remoteness data is presented as Major Cities, Inner Regional and Outer Regional/Remote. Further information is available in Appendix C regarding how these definitions were applied. |
| **SCRGSP** | Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, an intergovernmental committee, supported by a Secretariat within the Productivity Commission. Under the IGA, the Steering Committee is responsible for compiling and supplying performance information for the COAG Reform Council’s reports. |
| **Significant** | The term ‘significant’ is used to say that a difference or change is not due to chance. There are various tests for significance. The word ‘significant’ is not used outside this statistical meaning. |

###### A note on the number of people who may have needed services:

In this report we refer to the number or proportion of people who may have needed services. This is a reference to the potential population for disability services which is an estimate of the number of people who are likely to require a disability service at some time. The potential population is the estimated number of:

* People aged 0–9 years with a disability with a restriction (i.e. extends beyond severe/profound limitation in core activities for all impairment groups)
* People aged 10–64 years (10–49 years for Indigenous people) with:
  + a physical disability—profound core activity limitation (i.e. restricted to profound category in the SDAC)
  + a psychiatric/sensory disability—severe/profound core activity limitation
  + an intellectual/neurological disability/Acquired Brain Injury—with a restriction.

Detailed information on the way in which the potential population is applied to particular indicators can be found in the statistical supplement on our website.

## Appendix C Data sources and notes

The Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision compiled and supplied performance information to the COAG Reform Council for this report. We have also used performance information in addition to that provided by the Steering Committee. We publish the Steering Committee’s report and any additional data we have used in our statistical supplement. The table below lists each figure in the report and gives a corresponding reference to the table in our statistical supplement, available on our website.

The Steering Committee supplies data quality statements on the data they provide, which we have republished in the statistical supplement to this report. Where users require data quality information beyond that provided alongside the non-Steering Committee data in our statistical supplement, data quality information regarding these sources is generally available from the relevant data provider.

| **National Disability Agreement: figure numbers and performance information** | |
| --- | --- |
| Figure 1: Rates of Disability Support Pension recipients reporting earnings | |
| Reference | C.1, C.4, C.7, C.10: People with disability aged 16-64 years, who receive the Disability Support Pension, who report earnings, by sex and age group State/Territory, 29 June 2012, 24 June 2011, 25 June 2010, 26 June 2009. |
| Source | FAHCSIA/Centrelink unpublished administrative data |
| Figure 1.1 Disability Support Pension recipients who also reported earnings | |
| Reference | C.1, C.4, C.7, C.10: People with disability aged 16-64 years, who receive the Disability Support Pension, who report earnings, by sex and age group State/Territory, (year) 29 June 2012, 24 June 2011, 25 June 2010, 26 June 2009. |
| Source | FAHCSIA/Centrelink unpublished administrative data |
| Figure 1.2 Newstart/Youth Allowance recipients with disability who also reported earnings | |
| Reference | C.13, C.17, C.21, C.25: People with disability aged 16–64 years who receive the Newstart or Youth Allowance who report earnings, by assessed further work capacity (hours per week), by sex, State/Territory 29 June 2012, 24 June 2011, 25 June 2010, 26 June 2009. |
| Source | DEEWR unpublished administrative data |
| Figure 1.3 Newstart/Youth Allowance recipients with disability who also reported earnings—men and women | |
| Reference | C.13, C.17, C.21, C.25: People with disability aged 16–64 years who receive Newstart or Youth Allowance who report earnings, by assessed further work capacity (hours per week), by sex, State/Territory 29 June 2012, 24 June 2011, 25 June 2010, 26 June 2009. |
| Source | DEEWR unpublished administrative data |
| Figure 1.4 People with disability who receive income support who also report earnings, by Indigenous status, 2012 | |
| Reference | C.3: Indigenous people with disability, aged 16–64 years who receive the Disability Support Pension who report earnings, 29 June 2012  C.16 Indigenous people with disability aged 16–64 years who receive Newstart or Youth Allowance who report earnings (assessed further work capacity 0–29 hours per week), by sex, State/Territory, 29 June 2012. |
| Source | FAHCSIA/Centrelink unpublished administrative data  DEEWR unpublished administrative data |
| Figure 1.5: People with disability who receive income support and also report earnings, by country of birth, 2012 | |
| Reference | C.2: People with disability aged 16–64 years who receive the Disability Support Pension who report earnings, by country of birth, State/Territory, 29 June 2012  C15: People with disability aged 16–64 years who receive Newstart or Youth Allowance who report earnings (assessed further work capacity 0–29 hours per week), by country of birth, State/Territory, 29 June 2012 |
| Source | FAHCSIA/Centrelink unpublished administrative data  DEEWR unpublished administrative data |
| Notes | Other English speaking countries are as stated in the English Proficiency Group Classification (Dept of Immigration and Citizenship) and include Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America and Zimbabwe. |
| Figure 2.1: Proportion of people who may have needed disability support services, who used them | |
| Reference | D.1, D.20, D.30: Potential population aged 0–64 years accessing State/Territory delivered disability support services (total), by sex, by age group and State/Territory, 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and Housing (denominator) |
| Figure 2.2: Proportion of people who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability support services, who did use them, by service type | |
| Reference | D.2–D.5, D.21–D.24, D.31–D.34: Potential population aged 0–64 years accessing State/Territory delivered disability support services (by type), by sex, age group and State/Territory, 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and Housing (denominator) |
| Notes | Some jurisdictions provide specialist psychiatric services under the NDA, whilst others provide these services under health. For comparability, the indicator excludes those who only receive specialist psychiatric disability services. This does not exclude those people with a psychiatric condition who receive other specialist disability services. |
| Figure 2.3: Proportion of people who may have needed State or Territory-delivered community support services, who did use them, by age (years) | |
| Reference | D.3, D.22, D.32: Potential population aged 0–64 years accessing State/Territory delivered disability support services (total), by sex, by age group and State/Territory, 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and Housing (denominator) |
| Figure 2.4: Proportion of people who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability support services, who did use them, by location | |
| Reference | D.6, D.25, D.35: Potential population aged 0–64 years who used State/Territory delivered disability support services, by type of service, by country of birth and remoteness, 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and Housing (denominator) |
| Figure 2.5: Indigenous Australians who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability support services, who did use them | |
| Reference | D.42, D.57, D.67: Indigenous potential population aged 0–64 years accessing State/Territory delivered disability support services, by remoteness area, Australia, 2010–11, 2009–10, 2008–09. |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and Housing (denominator) |
| Notes | Some jurisdictions provide specialist psychiatric services under the NDA, whilst others provide these services under health. For comparability, the indicator excludes those who only receive specialist psychiatric disability services. This does not exclude those people with a psychiatric condition who receive other specialist disability services. |
| Figure 2.6: People born overseas, who may have needed State or Territory-delivered disability support services, who did use them, 2010–11 | |
| Reference | D.6: Potential population aged 0–64 years who used State/Territory delivered disability support services, by type of service, by country of birth and remoteness, 2010–11 |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and Housing (denominator) |
| Figure 2.7: Proportion of people who may have needed supported employment services, who did use them | |
| Reference | D.17, D.28, D.38: Potential population (aged 15–64 years and adjusted by labour force participation) accessing Australian Disability Enterprises/Supported Employment Services, by sex, age group and State/Territory 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and housing (denominator) |
| Figure 2.8: Proportion of people with disability who used open employment services | |
| Reference | D.12, D.26, D.36: People with disability (aged 15–64 years with an employment restriction) accessing Disability Employment Services/Open Employment Services (Employment Support Services), by sex, age group and State/Territory 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and Housing (denominator) |
| Figure 2.9: Proportion of people with disability who used open employment services, by age | |
| Reference | D.12, D.26, D.36: People with disability (aged 15–64 years with an employment restriction) accessing Disability Employment Services/Open Employment Services (Employment Support Services), by sex, age group and State/Territory, 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 |
| Source | Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (numerator)  Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers, Estimated Resident Population and Census of Population and Housing (denominator) |
| Figure 3.1: Labour force participation by carers of people with disability, 2009 | |
| Reference | G.1: Labour force profile for primary carers (carers of people aged 0–64 with disability) aged 15–64 years, by State and Territory, 2009  G4: Labour force profile for all carers (carers of people aged 0–64 with disability) and non-carers aged 15–64 years, by State and Territory, 2009 |
| Source | Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers |
| Figure 3.2 Carers of people with disability employment rate, 2009 | |
| Reference | G.1: Labour force profile for primary carers (carers of people aged 0–64 with disability) aged 15–64 years, by State and Territory, 2009, (G2: relative standard error, G3: 95 per cent confidence intervals)  G4: Labour force profile for all carers (carers of people aged 0–64 with disability) and non-carers aged 15–64 years, by State and Territory, 2009, (G5: relative standard error, G6: 95 per cent confidence intervals) |
| Source | Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers |
| Figure 3.3: Primary Carers who report experiencing negative impacts on their wellbeing due to their caring role—men and women, 2009 | |
| Reference | Additional 1: Proportion of primary carers (carers of people with disability aged 0–64 years) who experience negative impacts on their wellbeing due to caring role, by carer sex, by carer age group, by State/Territory, 2009  (Additional 2: relative standard error, Additional 3: 95 per cent confidence intervals) |
| Source | ABS unpublished data |
| Figure 3.4: Primary carers who report needing more assistance with their caring role, 2009 | |
| Reference | I.1: Proportion of primary carers (carers of people with disability aged 0–64 years) who report a need for further assistance in their caring roles, by carer sex, by carer age group, by State/Territory, 2009  (I.2: relative standard error, I.3: 95 per cent confidence intervals) |
| Source | Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers |
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