

National Disability Agreement: (f)-Number of Indigenous people with disability receiving disability services as a proportion of the Indigenous potential population requiring services, 2012 QS

Exported from METEOR (AIHW's Metadata Online Registry)

© Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2024

This product, excluding the AIHW logo, Commonwealth Coat of Arms and any material owned by a third party or protected by a trademark, has been released under a Creative Commons BY 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) licence. Excluded material owned by third parties may include, for example, design and layout, images obtained under licence from third parties and signatures. We have made all reasonable efforts to identify and label material owned by third parties.

You may distribute, remix and build on this website's material but must attribute the AIHW as the copyright holder, in line with our attribution policy. The full terms and conditions of this licence are available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Enquiries relating to copyright should be addressed to info@aihw.gov.au.

Enquiries or comments on the METEOR metadata or download should be directed to the METEOR team at meteor@aihw.gov.au.

National Disability Agreement: (f)-Number of Indigenous people with disability receiving disability services as a proportion of the Indigenous potential population requiring services, 2012 QS

Identifying and definitional attributes

Metadata item type:	Data Quality Statement
METEOR identifier:	478532
Registration status:	Community Services (retired) , Standard 05/03/2012 Indigenous , Standard 11/09/2012

Data quality

Data quality statement summary:

1. The quality of data about Indigeneity varies substantially between jurisdictions and data sources. Caution should be exercised when interpreting these data. It is recommended that these data be viewed in close conjunction with information about the data quality.
2. DS/CSTDA NMDS data are generated by processes that deliver services to people. It is assumed that these processes involve the determination of eligibility and the assessment of disability support needs following broadly consistent principles across jurisdictions, although it is known that differing assessment tools are in use across jurisdictions. This assumption is untested.
3. Data measuring the Indigenous potential population is not explicitly available for the required time point and so has been estimated from several different data sources under several key assumptions. Previous research has confirmed that Indigenous Australians experience severe or profound core activity limitation at more than twice the rate as non-Indigenous Australians but relative rates by age group and sex, across states and territories and remoteness areas, have not been fully investigated. In particular, caution should be exercised in comparing indicators for jurisdictions with very different remoteness area distributions of Indigenous population.
4. The use of 2006 Census data to adjust underlying age-sex specific rates of severe or profound core activity limitation to account for the higher level of disability among Indigenous Australians involves mixing self-report data from a relatively simple instrument for measuring need for assistance with sample survey data collected by trained interviewers using a comprehensive survey instrument. The cultural appropriateness for Indigenous people of data collection instruments designed for the total population is not known; nor is it known how this, combined with different data collection methods, impacts on the accuracy of the estimated Indigenous potential population used in this indicator.
5. There are issues with the consistency of the numerator and denominator for this performance indicator, as the numerator and denominator are drawn from differently defined populations and different data sources.

Institutional environment:

The AIHW is an Australian Government statutory authority accountable to Parliament and operates under the provisions of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987. The AIHW provides expert analysis of data on health, housing and community services. More information about the AIHW is available on the [AIHW website](#).

For general issues relating to the DS/CSTDA NMDS, refer to the DS/CSTDA NMDS Data Quality Statement.

For information on the institutional environment of the ABS, including the legislative obligations of the ABS, please see [ABS Institutional Environment](#).

Timeliness:	<p>CSTDA NMDS 2008–09 and DS NMDS 2009–10</p> <p>ABS SDAC 2009; Census 2006; Indigenous projected population at 30 June 2008 and 30 June 2009 (projected population is based on data from the 2006 Census)</p>
Accessibility:	<p>The AIHW provides a variety of products that draw upon the DS/CSTDA NMDS. Published products available on the AIHW website are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disability support services (annual report) • Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people with disability, part of the Indigenous Observatory • Interactive disability data cubes • Ad hoc data are available on request (charges apply to recover costs) • METeOR – online metadata repository • National Community Services Data Dictionary. <p>The ABS website provides information and data on the ERP and the Indigenous Project Population, Census Need for Assistance and SDAC profound/ severe core-activity limitation. Detailed data extractions are available through the National Information Referral Service (cost-recovery applies).</p>
Interpretability:	<p>Information to assist in interpretation of the performance indicator is contained in the NDA performance indicator glossary, which accompanies these Data Quality Statements.</p> <p>Supporting information on the quality and use of the DS/CSTDA NMDS are published annually in 'Disability support services' available in hard copy or on the AIHW website (<www.aihw.gov.au>).</p>

Relevance:

Data from several different sources, each referencing different time periods, are used to produce performance indicator (f). Data used are from the CSTDA NMDS 2008–09 and DS NMDS 2009–2010, SDAC 2009, Indigenous Projected Population June 2008 and June 2009, and Census 2006. This may reduce the overall quality of the estimates. Some particular issues are listed in the Relevance section of the Data Quality Statement for performance indicator (c). Additionally,

- The indigeneity data item from the SDAC 2009 is not readily available, so a rate ratio adjustment, calculated from information from the Census, is made to the national all person age-sex specific severe/profound core activity limitation rates, as detailed in the Measure section. The use of these adjustments assumes consistency between the rate ratio as calculated from Census information, and the corresponding information if it were collected from the SDAC 2009. Two particular points of note with regards to this assumption are:
 1. Information from Census 2006 about people with need for assistance with core activities is based on the self enumeration (interview in Indigenous communities) of four questions, whereas people are defined as having a severe/profound core activity limitation in SDAC 2009 on the basis of a comprehensive interviewer administered module of questions, and thus the two populations are different, although they are conceptually related.
 2. ABS research indicates that the Indigenous identification rate differs between the Census and interviewer administered surveys.
- The cultural appropriateness for Indigenous people, of data collection instruments designed for the total population is not known; nor is it known how this, combined with different data collection methods, impacts on the accuracy of the estimated Indigenous potential population used in this indicator.

DS/CSTDA NMDS data are generated by processes that deliver services to people. It is assumed that these processes involve the determination of eligibility and the assessment of disability support needs following broadly consistent principles across jurisdictions, although it is known that differing assessment tools are in use across jurisdictions. This assumption is untested.

The scope of services provided under the CSTDA/NDA varied across jurisdictions. In Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia (in some cases), specialist psychiatric disability services were provided under the CSTDA/NDA. In all other jurisdictions specific mental health services were funded and provided under health, rather than disability, portfolios. To facilitate comparability of data, specialist psychiatric disability services in Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia are excluded from the NDA performance indicators. That is, the data excludes those who only receive specialist psychiatric disability services, but does not exclude those people with a psychiatric condition who receive other specialist disability services. In addition, the predominant service models vary across jurisdictions, and this may affect comparability of data. For example, differences across the states and territories in the predominant model of accommodation support lead to differences in the number of people accessing those services. Caution is recommended in the use or interpretation of performance at the service type level. There is a risk when service type level data is interpreted in isolation as various service types are complementary and the emphasis on different services reflects jurisdictional policy directions. For more information, see [Disability support services 2008–09](#) and [Disability support services 2009–10](#).

Accuracy:

A potential source of error in the DS/CSTDA NMDS is people for whom Indigenous status is not stated or not collected. For 2009–10, the not stated/not collected rate varied across jurisdictions from a low rate of 0.3% for Australian Government agencies, to a high rate of 13.1% for Northern Territory agencies; the overall rate being 4.2%. For 2008–09, the not stated/not collected rate varied across jurisdictions from a low rate of 0.2% for Australian Government agencies, to a high rate of 12.6% for Victorian agencies; the overall rate being 4.6%. See the accompanying appendix for further details. Not stated or not collected Indigenous status may introduce bias into the results affecting both the accuracy of estimates and the comparability of estimates across jurisdictions. In addition, a coding audit of the Indigenous status data item has not been undertaken, thus the accuracy of the rate of Indigenous identification in the NMDS is not known.

For general issues relating to the DS/CSTDA NMDS, refer to the DS/CSTDA

NMDS Data Quality Statement.

Being a sample survey, estimates from the SDAC 2009 are subject to sampling variability. A measure of the sampling variability, the relative standard error (RSE) percent, was estimated for the age-sex specific rates of severe/profound core activity limitation and can be found in the Accuracy section of the Data Quality Statement for Indicator (c).

The cultural appropriateness for Indigenous people of data collection instruments designed for the total population is not known. Poor cultural sensitivity of data collection instruments is a potential source of non-sampling error which affects the accuracy of Indigenous potential population estimates. The size of this error, if present, cannot be measured.

Potential sources of error in CQuality statements about Census 2006 data items can be found on the ABS website.

For general issues relating to the SDAC, Census and Indigenous Projected Population, refer to ABS data quality statements.

Census include failure to return a Census form or failure to answer every applicable question. Information calculated from Census 2006 data excludes people for whom data item information was not available. Should the characteristics of interest of the people excluded differ from those people included, there is potential for bias to be introduced. In particular for Indigenous estimates, undercounting of Indigenous Australians may introduce bias into the results which would affect the comparability of estimates across jurisdictions. The net Census undercount for all Indigenous Australians was estimated at 11.5%, calculated as the difference between the Census count and estimated Indigenous population on Census night. Estimates of the Indigenous net undercount for all jurisdictions are included below.

Estimated Indigenous net Census undercount

Jurisdiction	Undercount rate %
NSW	8.6
Vic.	9.4
Qld	11.6
WA	16.6
SA	8.6
Tas.	8.8
ACT	8.8
NT	16.0

Source: ABS Cat no. 3238.0.55.001

Quality statements about Census 2006 data items can be found on the [ABS website](#).

For general issues relating to the SDAC, Census and Indigenous Projected Population, refer to ABS data quality statements.

Coherence: For general issues relating to the DS/CSTDA NMDS, refer to the DS/CSTDA NMDS Data Quality Statement.

There are issues with the consistency of the numerator and denominator for this performance indicator, as the numerator and denominator are drawn from differently defined populations and different data sources. These issues reduce the consistency of the performance indicators and lead to quality issues such as cells greater than 100%. For example, the proportion of the 15–24 year old Victorian Indigenous potential population accessing State/Territory delivered disability support services in 2009–10 is reported to be 128.4% (131.6% in 2008–09). A combination of data quality issues, as discussed in this and previous sections, has led to this impossible figure.

While the numerator is taken from the DS/CSTDA NMDS, the denominator is an estimate derived from SDAC, Indigenous Projected Population and Census data. In the denominator, 'estimated potential population for specialist disability services' is defined as the estimated population with severe or profound core activity limitation. However, this does not match well with the numerator, which consists of people who used specialist disability services. People who used these services do not necessarily have a severe or profound core activity limitation (mobility, communication, or self-care). They may instead have a mild/moderate core activity limitation or limitations in other activities—for example, with working or education. This mismatch is more evident in certain types of services, such as open employment services, which are not necessarily tailored towards people with a severe or profound core activity limitation.

The method used to calculate the Indigenous potential population estimates is the same as that adopted by the Disability Services Working Group for calculation of special needs group indicators for the Report on Government Services 2011.

For general issues relating to the SDAC, Census and Indigenous Projected Population, refer to ABS data quality statements.

Relational attributes

Related metadata references:	Supersedes Number of Indigenous people with disability receiving disability services as a proportion of the Indigenous potential population requiring services, 2011 QS Community Services (retired) , Superseded 05/03/2012
Indicators linked to this Data Quality statement:	National Disability Agreement: f(1)-Number of Indigenous people with disability receiving disability services as a proportion of the Indigenous potential population requiring services, 2012 Community Services (retired) , Superseded 23/05/2013 Indigenous , Standard 11/09/2012 National Disability Agreement: f(2)-Number of Indigenous people with disability receiving disability services as a proportion of the Indigenous potential population requiring services, 2012 Community Services (retired) , Superseded 23/05/2013 Indigenous , Standard 11/09/2012