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## Slide 1: Culturally and Linguistically Diverse participants

30 June 2019

National Disability Insurance Agency

## Slide 2: Outline

This slide shows the contents of the presentation, as follows:

Introduction

Key points

Prevalence estimates of disability for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) people

* Population prevalence
* Scheme prevalence

Comparison of NDIS CALD and non-CALD participant experience as at 30 June 2019

* Access and eligibility
* Participant characteristics
* Participant plans
* Outcomes

## Slide 3: Introduction

* The National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) provides reasonable and necessary funding to people with a permanent and significant disability to access the supports and services they need to live and enjoy their life.
* The purpose of this report is to present information on the experience of NDIS CALD participants, and to compare this experience to non-CALD participants.
* The term ‘CALD participants’ is used throughout the following sections to refer to participants of the NDIS who were either not born in Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States of America, Canada or South Africa, and/or where the primary language spoken at home is not English.

## Slide 4: Key definitions

**Access request:** A formal request by an individual for a determination of eligibility to access the Scheme.

**Carer:** Someone who provides personal care, support and assistance to a person with a disability and who is not contracted as a paid or voluntary worker.

**Early Childhood Early Intervention (ECEI):** An approach which supports children aged 0-6 who have developmental delay or disability and their families/carers. Depending on individual circumstances a child may move through the ECEI program to become an NDIS participant on either an s.24 Permanent Disability (PD) or s.25 Early Intervention (EI) participant.

**Supported Independent Living (SIL):** Supported Independent Living (SIL) is help with and/or supervision of daily tasks to develop the skills of an individual to live as independently as possible. Assistance provided to a participant will be included as part of their plan depending on the level of support they require to live independently in the housing option of their choice.

## Slide 5: Key measures

**Average committed supports:** The average cost of supports contained within participant’s plans, approved to be provided to support participant’s needs. This amount is annualised to allow for comparison of plans of different lengths. In this report, average committed supports are the average annualised committed supports allocated to active plans at 30 June 2019.

**Average payments:** Payments are made to providers, participants or their nominees for supports received as part of a participant’s plan. In this report, average payments represent the average cash and in-kind supports paid over the 2018-19 financial year on active plans at 30 June 2019. In-kind refers to existing Commonwealth or State/ Territory government programs delivered under existing block grant funding arrangements.

**Average utilisation of committed supports:** Utilisation represents the proportion of committed supports in participant plans that are utilised. Utilisation is calculated as payments divided by committed supports. In this report, average utilisation of committed supports is calculated for the period beginning 1 October 2018 and ending 31 March 2019.

**Complaint rate:** Complaint rates are calculated as the number of complaints made by people who have sought access divided by the number of people who have sought access. The number of people who have sought access used in the calculation takes into account the length of time since access was sought. Complaints submitted after 31 March 2019 have been excluded from the report as the results for the most recent quarter may be impacted by a lag in data collection.

**Exit rate:** Exit rates represent the number of participants that have left the Scheme as a proportion of the amount of time participants have been active in the Scheme. Reasons for exit include death (mortality exits), being found ineligible or choosing to leave the Scheme (non-mortality exits). In this report, exit rates are annualised and reflect the period beginning 1 January 2017 and ending 30 June 2019.

## Slide 6: Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Strategy

The Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) Strategy is a public commitment to give people with a disability from CALD backgrounds the opportunity to benefit from the NDIS on an equal basis with the broader population.

The strategy is underpinned by the following five priority areas:

* 1. Engage with communities
  2. Make information about the NDIS accessible
  3. Increase community capacity and broaden consumer choice
  4. Improve our approach to monitoring and evaluation
  5. Enhance cultural competency within the NDIA and its Partners in the Community

This report forms a part of the NDIA’s commitment to:

* Continuously improve systems and processes to collect, monitor and evaluate information.
* Take an analytical approach to understanding the experience of people from CALD backgrounds compared to the experience of the wider community.
* Improve the collection and analysis of results from outcomes questionnaires completed by participants to better understand the links between outcomes and key factors (such as supports received, participant characteristics and risk factors).

Source: https://www.ndis.gov.au/about-us/strategies/cultural-and-linguistic-diversity-strategy

## Slide 7: Key points (1)

As of 30 June 2019, there were 24,023 CALD participants in the NDIS, making up 8.4% of all scheme participants.

Compared to non-CALD participants:

* a smaller proportion of CALD participants are aged 0 to 14 (31% for CALD compared to 38% for non-CALD) and a greater proportion are aged 35 and over (47% for CALD compared to 35% for non-CALD).
* a lower proportion of CALD participants have an intellectual disability (19% for CALD compared to 26% for non-CALD) or autism (20% for CALD compared to 31% for non-CALD) as their primary disability.
* a higher percentage of CALD participants live in major cities (88% for CALD compared to 65% for non-CALD)

Supported Independent Living (SIL) arrangements are included in the plans of 3% of CALD participants, compared to 8% for non-CALD participants. For participants aged 25 and over, SIL arrangements are included in the plans of 5% of CALD participants, compared to 16% for non-CALD participants

Compared to non-CALD applicants to the Scheme, a lower proportion of CALD applicants to the Scheme have been found eligible (76% of access decisions for CALD applicants compared to 83% of access decisions for non-CALD applicants)

Compared to non-CALD participants, exit rates for CALD participants are:

* Higher for ages 0 to 14, driven by higher non-mortality exit rates
* Lower for ages 15 to 24, driven by lower non-mortality exit rates
* Lower for ages 25 and over, driven by lower mortality exit rates

## Slide 8: Key points (2)

There are two charts.

The first chart displays average committed supports by age for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays average committed supports by age for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

Compared to non-CALD participants, average committed supports for CALD participants are:

* Higher for participants with SIL arrangements included in their plans
* Higher for participants aged 0 to 24 and 65 and over without SIL arrangements included in their plans
* Lower for participants aged 25 to 64 without SIL arrangements included in their plans

These charts are identical to those on slide 34.

## Slide 9: Key points (3)

Compared to non-CALD participants, CALD participants have approximately 2% higher average payments on active plans. This is after standardising for mix of participants with SIL and the age of participants.

Compared to non-CALD participants, CALD participants are utilising slightly more of their plans (that is, utilisation of committed supports is slightly higher). CALD participants utilise 68% of their plans on average compared to 66% for non-CALD participants. This is after standardising for mix of participants with SIL and the age of participants.

Compared to non-CALD participants, CALD participants have had a lower complaint rate for the duration of the Scheme. At March 2019, the complaint rate for CALD participants is 4.7%, compared to 6.6% for non-CALD participants. This is after standardising for the age of participants and remoteness.

## Slide 10: Key points (4)

Upon entering the Scheme, the key differences in outcomes for CALD and non-CALD participants are:

* Children age 0 to 14: CALD participants generally have poorer outcomes compared to non-CALD participants. In particular, CALD participants are considerably less likely to be able to make friends outside the family, have a genuine say in decisions about themselves, and fewer attend school in a mainstream class.
* Age 15 and over: CALD participants are slightly more likely to be involved in a community, cultural or religious group, however they are less likely to have a paid job or have friends other than family or paid staff compared to non-CALD participants. For CALD participants aged 15 to 24, baseline outcomes are also consistently poorer in the choice and control domain, and CALD participants aged 25 and over have worse health outcomes compared to non-CALD participants.
* In general, the families and carers of CALD participants have poorer outcomes at baseline compared to the families and carers of non-CALD participants, including being less likely to have a paid job or being able to advocate for their child or family member.

Note: At the time participants enter the Scheme, the NDIS has not yet impacted on their outcomes. Consequently, the success of the Scheme should be judged not on baseline outcomes, but on how far participants have come since they entered the Scheme, acknowledging their different starting points.

## Slide 11: Key points (5)

After one year in the Scheme, the key changes in outcomes for CALD and non-CALD participants are:

* Age 0 to starting school: There was a greater increase in the percentage of CALD participants who can tell their parent or carer what they want compared to non-CALD participants.
* School age to 14: The parents and carers of CALD and non-CALD participants reported similar improvements in the child’s level of independence, however there was a larger decrease in the percentage of CALD participants who could make friends or spent time after school with friends/in mainstream programs. The percentage of CALD participants attending school in mainstream classes decreased less than for non-CALD participants.
* Age 15 to 24: There was a larger increase in CALD participants volunteering compared to non-CALD participants, but also larger increases in the percentage of CALD participants who want more choice and control in their life and who don’t have any friends other than family or paid staff.
* Age 25 and over: Both CALD and non-CALD participants wanted more choice and control in their life, and had similar deteriorations in health outcomes. The proportion of CALD participants who feel safe in their home decreased by a higher percentage compared to non-CALD participants.
* Families/carers of CALD participants had a larger increase in paid employment compared to the families/carers of non-CALD participants.
* The parents and carers of CALD participants aged 0 to 14 were generally more likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them at their first plan review compared to non-CALD participants. However, CALD participants aged 25 and over had poorer perceptions of the NDIS compared to non-CALD participants.

## Slide 12: Key points (6)

After two years in the Scheme, the key changes in employment and social and community participation outcomes for CALD and non-CALD participants are:

* Age 15 to 24: CALD participants reported a +18% improvement in social and community participation, which was larger than the +12% improvement for non-CALD participants. Both CALD and non-CALD participants had a +9% improvement in paid employment.
* Age 25 and over: CALD and non-CALD participants had similar improvements in social and community participation, and the percentage of participants in paid work remained broadly stable, albeit at a higher rate for non-CALD participants (25%) compared to CALD participants (22%).

In general, CALD participants’ perceptions of whether the NDIS had helped them improved between their first and second year in the Scheme. However, the perceptions of the NDIS by their families and carers generally remained the same.

## Slide 13: Key figures (1)

A table displays key statistics, access and eligibility statistics, and participant characteristics statistics. There is no commentary.

The key figures are as follows:

### 1. Key statistics

People who have had their access met

* CALD: 26,605
* Non-CALD: 281,981

Active participants

* CALD: 24,023
* Non-CALD: 261,992

% of active participants in the Scheme

* CALD: 8%
* Non-CALD: 92%

### 2. Access and eligibility

% Access decisions: eligible

* CALD: 79%
* Non-CALD: 86%
* Difference: -7%

% Access decisions: Ineligible

* CALD: 21%
* Non-CALD: 14%
* Difference: 7%

% Early Intervention

* CALD: 15%
* Non-CALD: 18%
* Difference: -3%

### 3. Characteristics of active participants in the Scheme

% Gender: Female

* CALD: 40%
* Non-CALD: 37%
* Difference: 3%

% Primary disability: Autism

* CALD: 20%
* Non-CALD: 31%
* Difference: -10%

% Primary disability: Intellectual disability

* CALD: 19%
* Non-CALD: 26%
* Difference: -7%

% Primary disability: Psychosocial disability

* CALD: 11%
* Non-CALD: 8%
* Difference: 3%

% Level of function: Low

* CALD: 31%
* Non-CALD: 29%
* Difference: 3%

% Remote or very remote

* CALD: 3%
* Non-CALD: 1%
* Difference: 1%

% Indigenous

* CALD: 8%
* Non-CALD: 11%
* Difference: -3%

% In Supported Independent Living (SIL)

* CALD: 3%
* Non-CALD: 8%
* Difference: -5%

## Slide 14: Key figures (2)

A table displays plans statistics, participant experience statistics, and outcomes statistics. There is no commentary.

The key figures are as follows:

### 1. Plans

Average committed supports: Overall (standardised for age and SIL)

* CALD: $65,745
* Non-CALD: $66,295
* Difference: -1%

Average committed supports: SIL (standardised for age)

* CALD: $316,501
* Non-CALD: $295,236
* Difference: 7%

Average committed supports: non-SIL (standardised for age)

* CALD: $46,597
* Non-CALD: $48,813
* Difference: -5%

Average payments: Overall (standardised for age and SIL)

* CALD: $39,574
* Non-CALD: $38,675
* Difference: 2%

Average payments: SIL (standardised for age)

* CALD: $205,764
* Non-CALD: $199,545
* Difference: 3%

Average payments: non-SIL (standardised for age)

* CALD: $25,202
* Non-CALD: $24,763
* Difference: 2%

Utilisation: Overall (standardised for age and SIL)

* CALD: 68%
* Non-CALD: 66%
* Difference: 2%

Utilisation: SIL (standardised for age)

* CALD: 82%
* Non-CALD: 84%
* Difference: -3%

Utilisation: non-SIL (standardised for age)

* CALD: 61%
* Non-CALD: 57%
* Difference: 4%

### 2. Participant experience

Exit rate: Overall

* CALD: 1.78%
* Non-CALD: 1.76%
* Difference: 0.01%

Rate of participant complaints at 31 March 2019

* CALD: 4.70%
* Non-CALD: 6.56%
* Difference: -1.86%

### Outcomes

Note: SCC refers to ‘Social, community and civic’ activities.

% in paid employment after two years in the Scheme: age 15 to 24

* CALD: 19%
* Non-CALD: 22%
* Difference: -4%

% participating in SCC after two years in the Scheme: age 15 to 24

* CALD: 54%
* Non-CALD: 42%
* Difference: 11%

% in paid employment after two years in the Scheme: age 25+

* CALD: 22%
* Non-CALD: 25%
* Difference: -3%

% participating in SCC after two years in the Scheme: age 25+

* CALD: 47%
* Non-CALD: 47%
* Difference: 0%

## Slide 15: Proportion of CALD participants in the NDIS and prevalence of disability

Comparison of SDAC 2015, Census 2016 and Scheme experience

## Slide 16: SDAC classification of core activity limitation

* The Survey of Disability Ageing and Carers (SDAC) is considered by the ABS to be the most detailed and comprehensive source of disability data.
* It collects information on core activity limitations related to communication, mobility and self-care, along with information on other activity limitations.
* To identify whether a person has a particular type of limitation, information is collected on need for assistance, difficulty experienced, and use of aids or equipment to perform selected tasks associated with each type of limitation.
* Limitations are classified as profound, severe, moderate or mild. The charts in the following slides are in reference to people with profound and/or severe core activity limitations.

Source: Australia Bureau of Statistics, 2015, *Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia: Summary of Findings*, cat. no. 4430.0, viewed 14 November 2019, https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Previousproducts/4430.0Glossary12015?opendocument&tabname=Notes&prodno=4430.0&issue=2015

## Slide 17: Census classification of need for assistance with core activities

* For the purpose of calculating prevalence, The Census “Core Activity Need for Assistance” is used, which is an approximation for the number of people with a profound or severe core activity limitation.
* People with a profound or severe core activity limitation are defined as those people needing help or assistance in one or more of the three core activity areas of self-care, mobility and communication, because of a disability, long-term health condition (lasting six months or more) or old age.

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016, *Census of Population and Housing: Census Dictionary*, cat. no. 2901.0, viewed 14 November 2019, https://www.ausstats.abs.gov.au/ausstats/subscriber.nsf/0/4D2CE49C30755BE7CA2581BE001540A7/$File/2016%20census%20dictionary.pdf

## Slide 18: Prevalence of disability by Indigenous status

A chart displays the estimated prevalence of disability amongst people from CALD and non-CALD backgrounds as per SDAC 2015 and the Census 2016, by age group.

The Census 2016 and SDAC 2015 estimates of prevalence of disability for people with a CALD background are similar, except at age 0 to 14 where there is a low volume of data for people with a CALD background in the SDAC 2015.

The prevalence of disability for CALD people generally decreases with age from ages 0 to 34, and then increases with age from 35 to 64.

The overall prevalence of disability amongst CALD people is estimated to be 3% by SDAC 2015 and the Census 2016, compared to 4% for non-CALD people.

Prevalence of disability amongst CALD people is estimated to be 0-2% at ages 0-14, 1% at ages 15-34, 2-4% at ages 35-54 and 8% at ages 55-64, as per SDAC 2015 and the Census 2016. The estimated prevalence rates amongst non-CALD people are higher than for CALD people across all age groups except 55-64, and the difference is largest at younger ages. Prevalence of disability amongst non-CALD people is estimated to be 3-4% at ages 0-14, 2-3% at ages 15-44, 4% at ages 45-54 and 6-7% at ages 55-64, as per SDAC 2015 and the Census 2016.

Overall, the Census 2016 and SDAC 2015 show the prevalence of disability amongst CALD people to be approximately 0.7 and 0.8, respectively, of the prevalence of disability amongst non-CALD people.

Note: The SDAC proportion reflects percentage of people with a profound/severe core activity limitation. The Census proportion reflects the percentage of people with a need for assistance with core activities.

## Slide 19: NDIS expected proportion of CALD participants in the NDIS

For planning and reporting purposes, the NDIA requires projections of CALD participants by geographical area, such as Local Government Area (LGA). The Census is therefore used as the basis for estimating NDIS CALD participant numbers as it is the only source providing the required level of geographical subdivision.

The methodology for estimating the number of CALD participants in the NDIS by the ‘steady intake date’ as a proportion of all NDIS participants can be summarised as follows:

1. From Census 2016, obtain a tabulation of the population by the core activity need for assistance variable, LGA, CALD status (as per the definition in Key definitions), sex and age group.
2. Use the above tabulation to calculate the number of CALD and non-CALD people with need for assistance, for each LGA and age group.
3. Of people with need for assistance, for each age group derive the proportion who are CALD as the ratio of the number of CALD people with need for assistance, to the total number of people with need for assistance.

This proportion is considered a reasonable estimate of the proportion of NDIS participants who are expected to be CALD in each age group and LGA.

Note: ‘Steady intake date’ refers to the point in time where new entrants into the Scheme primarily represents participants with new incidence of disability, as opposed to participants transferring into the Scheme with existing disabilities.

## Slide 20: Proportion of participants in the NDIS who are CALD

A chart displays the estimated proportion of participants in the NDIS who are CALD by age group.

The proportion of participants in the NDIS who are CALD broadly increases with age, from 7% at ages 0-14 to 12% at ages 55-64. The same increasing pattern is observed by SDAC 2015 and the Census 2016.

The proportion of CALD participants has been less than expected across all age groups.

Note 1: Information in the 2016 Census was used to estimate the number of CALD NDIS participants expected to approach the Scheme.

Note 2: The SDAC proportion reflects percentage of people with profound/severe core activity limitation who are CALD. Similarly, the Census proportion reflects percentage of people who have need for assistance with core activities who are CALD. The SDAC and Census measures of disability are not necessarily consistent with each other nor consistent with the conditions for eligibility for the NDIS.

## Slide 21: Access and eligibility

Comparison of CALD and non-CALD participant experience

## Slide 22: Phasing process

A chart displays the distribution of CALD and non-CALD participants by pathway status. 56% (26,605) of CALD participants have a pathway status of eligible, 15% (7,315) have a status of ineligible, 1% have a status of revoked/ceased, 1% have a status of closed, 7% have a status of in progress, 4% have a status of withdrawn, 12% (5,898) have a status of cancelled and 2% have a status of draft.

A higher proportion CALD applicants are found to be ineligible compared to non-CALD applicants, and a lower proportion of CALD applicants have had their access requests cancelled.

Note: The higher proportion of CALD applicants found ineligible is partly driven by the difference in age distribution between CALD and non-CALD applicants.

## Slide 23: Phasing process - cancellations

A chart displays the distribution of cancelled access requests of CALD and non-CALD participants. 19% (1,108) of the cancelled access requests of CALD participants have a status of ARF not return, 50% (2,954) have a status of evidence not provided, 9% have a status of phase in decline and 22% have a status of unable to contact.

Note: ARF refers to ‘Access request form’.

A larger proportion of CALD participants have cancelled access requests arising from “Evidence not provided” (50%) compared to non-CALD participants (38%).

## Slide 24: Participant characteristics

Comparison of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participant experience

## Slide 25: Active participants by jurisdiction and access decision

There are two charts.

The first chart displays the distribution of active participants by jurisdiction (state/territory).

Compared to non-CALD participants, a smaller proportion of CALD participants live in QLD (10% of CALD participants compared to 18% of non-CALD participants), SA (8% of CALD participants compared to 10% of non-CALD participants) and WA (4% of CALD participants compared to 6% of non-CALD participants), and a larger proportion live in NSW (40% of CALD participants compared to 35% of non-CALD participants), VIC (31% of CALD participants compared to 26% of non-CALD participants), NT (3% of CALD participants compared to 1% of non-CALD participants) and ACT (3% of CALD participants compared to 2% of non-CALD participants).

The second chart displays the distribution of active participants by access decision type (the two categories being ‘Early Intervention’ and ‘Disability’). Compared to non-CALD participants, a smaller proportion of CALD participants are accessing the Scheme via early intervention (15% of CALD participants compared to 18% of non-CALD participants). This is primarily driven by the lower proportion of CALD participants who are aged 0 to 14, compared to non-CALD participants, as the percentage of participants who access the Scheme via early intervention is significantly higher in younger ages.

Note: The distributions are calculated excluding active participants with a missing classification.

## Slide 26: Active participants by age and gender

There are two charts.

The first chart displays the distribution of active participants by age. CALD participants have tended to be older compared to non-CALD participants. In particular, a significantly lower proportion of CALD participants are aged 7 to 14 (18% of CALD participants compared to 25% of non-CALD participants), and a higher proportion are aged 35 or over (47% of CALD participants compared to 35% of non-CALD participants).

The second chart displays the distribution of active participants by gender. Compared to non-CALD participants, a higher proportion of CALD participants are female (40% of CALD participants compared to 37% of non-CALD participants).

Note: The distributions are calculated excluding active participants with a missing classification.

## Slide 27: Active participants by disability type

A chart displays the distribution of active participants by primary disability. Compared to non-CALD participants, a smaller proportion of CALD participants have a primary disability type of intellectual disability (19% of CALD participants compared to 26% of non-CALD participants) or autism (20% of CALD participants compared to 31% of non-CALD participants), and a higher proportion have a primary disability type of psychosocial disability (11% of CALD participants compared to 9% of non-CALD participants) or hearing impairment (12% of CALD participants compared to 3% of non-CALD participants).

Note: The distribution is calculated excluding active participants with a missing classification.

## Slide 28: Active participants by level of function and SIL status

There are two charts.

The first chart displays the distribution of active participants by level of function. Compared to non-CALD participants, a smaller proportion of CALD participants have a high or medium level of function (69% compared to 71%), and a larger proportion have a low level of function (31% compared to 29%). 43% of CALD participants have a medium level of function and 26% have a high level of function.

The second chart displays the distribution of active participants by Supported Independent Living (SIL) status. A smaller proportion of CALD participants have Supported Independent Living arrangements in their plans (3%) compared to non-CALD participants (8%). For participants aged 25 and over only, SIL arrangements are included in the plans of 5% of CALD participants, compared to 16% for non-CALD participants.

Note: The distributions are calculated excluding active participants with a missing classification.

## Slide 29: Active participants by remoteness

A chart displays the distribution of active participants by remoteness category. Compared to non-CALD participants, a higher proportion of CALD participants live in major cities (88% of CALD participants compared to 65% of non-CALD participants) and in very remote regions (1.9% of CALD participants compared to 0.4% of non-CALD participants).

Note: The distributions are calculated excluding active participants with a missing classification.

## Slide 30: Exit rates

A chart displays exit rates by exit type (mortality and non-mortality) and age for CALD and non-CALD participants.

From ages 0 to 24, most exits from the Scheme are non-mortality exits, and for all ages 25 and over, most exits from the Scheme are mortality exits, for both CALD and non-CALD participants.

The overall exit rate for CALD participants is 1.78%, compared to 1.76% for non-CALD participants.

Compared to non-CALD participants, exit rates for CALD participants are:

* Higher for ages 0 to 14, driven by higher non-mortality exit rates
* Lower for ages 15 to 25, driven by lower non-mortality exit rates
* Lower for ages 25 and over, driven by lower mortality exit rates

Note 1: Due to the low volumes and the reporting lag associated with exits from the scheme, caution should be exercised when interpreting these numbers.

Note 2: A non-mortality exit occurs when participant exits the scheme because they no longer meet the eligibility criteria or if they cease their participation.

## Slide 31: Complaint rates

A chart displays cumulative participant complaint rates by quarter from December 2016 to March 2019 for CALD and non-CALD participants.

Compared to non-CALD participants, CALD participants have had a lower rate of complaint across all quarters. The complaint rate for CALD participants was 3.5% in December 2016, peaked at 4.8% in December 2018 and has fallen since to 4.7% at March 2019. The complaint rate for non-CALD participants was 5.7% in December 2016, increasing to 6.7% in December 2019, decreasing in the most recent quarter (March 2019) to 6.6%.

Note 1: The complaint rate is calculated as the number of complaints made to date divided by the exposure to date. Exposure to date represents the total amount of time an access request has been active, measured in years, summed across all participants and people who have ever made an access request.

Note 2: Complaint rates have been standardised for the difference between the remoteness and age profiles of CALD and non-CALD participants and the remoteness and age profiles of the total population.

## Slide 32: Average committed supports

Comparison of CALD and non-CALD participant experience

## Slide 33: Average committed supports by SIL status

A chart displays average committed supports by SIL status for CALD and non-CALD participants. Both unadjusted average committed supports and age-standardised average committed supports are shown.

Note 1: The age-standardised average committed supports have been standardised for the difference between the age profiles of CALD and non-CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: Average committed supports are the average annualised committed supports allocated to active plans at 30 June 2019.

Unadjusted average committed supports for CALD SIL participants are $316k, around 7% higher than actual average committed supports for non-CALD SIL participants. Unadjusted average committed supports for CALD non-SIL SIL participants are $51k, around 5% higher than actual average committed supports for non-CALD non-SIL participants. Standardising has little impact on average committed supports for CALD participants or non-CALD SIL participants. However, for CALD non-SIL participants, standardised average committed supports are 8% lower than the unadjusted average committed supports at $47k.

CALD participants living in SIL have slightly higher average committed supports compared to non-CALD participants living in SIL.

For participants not in SIL, the average committed supports are similar for both CALD and non-CALD participants.

Overall, average committed supports are significantly higher for SIL participants than for non-SIL participants.

## Slide 34: Average committed supports by age

There are two charts.

The first chart displays average committed supports by age for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays average committed supports by age for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

For participants living in SIL, average committed supports for CALD participants are slightly higher across all age groups compared to non-CALD participants.

For non-SIL participants, average committed supports for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants are:

* Slightly higher for ages 0 to 24 and 65 and over.
* Slightly lower for ages 25 to 64.

For CALD SIL participants, average committed supports decrease as age increases, from around $400k for participants aged 19 to 24 to around $275k for participants aged 55 and over. This compares to non-CALD SIL participants, for which average committed supports also decrease steadily as age increases, from $360k for ages 19 to 24, to $265k for ages 65 and over.

For both CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants, average committed supports increase significantly as age increases, with a $5k dip at ages 35 to 54 (the dip is more pronounced for CALD participants). Both cohorts are around $45k for ages 15 to 18, increase to $78k for CALD participants and $76k for non-CALD participants for ages 65 and over. Committed supports are significantly lower for participants aged 0 to 14, as a much higher proportion are ‘early intervention’ participants, who typically have lower average committed supports.

Note: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group. Data is deemed insufficient if there are 10 or fewer participants in the category.

## Slide 35: Average committed supports by disability type

There are two charts.

The first chart displays average committed supports by disability type for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays average committed supports by disability type for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

Note 1: Average committed supports have been standardised for the difference between the age profile of CALD / non-CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group.

For participants living in SIL, average committed supports are higher for CALD participants with an acquired brain injury or other physical disability compared to non-CALD participants.

For CALD SIL participants, the disability type with the highest average committed supports is acquired brain injury, at around $385k. Most other disability types have average committed supports in the region of $270k to $360k.

For non-SIL participants, average committed supports by CALD status are similar across each of the primary disability types.

Average committed supports by disability type are significantly more varied for non-SIL participants. Participants with a developmental delay, hearing impairment or other sensory/speech have around $12k to $19k in average committed supports for both CALD and non-CALD participants. Participants with autism or visual impairment have average committed supports of around $30k. Participants with most other disability types have average committed supports in the $60k to $100k range, with spinal cord injuries having the highest average committed supports for both CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants, at around $125k.

## Slide 36: Average committed supports by remoteness

There are two charts.

The first chart displays average committed supports by remoteness for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays average committed supports by remoteness for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

For participants living in SIL, average committed supports for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants are:

* Similar in major cities.
* Higher in areas with a population greater than 50,000, and remote and very remote areas.

For non-SIL participants, average committed supports for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants are significantly higher in remote and very remote areas and slightly lower elsewhere.

In major cities, average committed supports are around $290k for both CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. Supports are significantly higher for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants in areas with a ‘population greater than 50,000’, at $420k compared to $320k. In remote areas, CALD and non-CALD participants have similar average committed supports, at around $470k.

For non-SIL participants, average committed supports are slightly lower for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants in most non-remote categories. Average committed supports in major cities through to areas with ‘population less than 5000’ are all around $45k for CALD participants and $48k for non-CALD participants. In remote areas, average committed supports for CALD participants are $80k (35% higher than non-CALD), and in very remote areas they are $86k (20% higher than non-CALD).

Note 1: Average committed supports have been standardised for the difference between the age profile of CALD / non-CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group.

## Slide 37: Average payments

Comparison of CALD and non-CALD participant experience

## Slide 38: Average payments by SIL status

A chart displays average payments by SIL status for CALD and non-CALD participants. Both unadjusted average payments and age-standardised average payments are shown.

Note 1: The age-standardised average payments have been standardised for the difference between the age profiles of CALD and non-CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: Average payments represent the average cash and in-kind supports paid over the 2018-19 financial year on active plans at 30 June 2019.

Average payments for CALD participants are slightly higher compared to non-CALD participants, across both SIL and non-SIL.

Unadjusted average payments for CALD SIL participants are $206k, around 3% higher than unadjusted average payments for non-CALD SIL participants. Actual average payments for non-SIL participants are $26k for CALD participants, 7% higher than for non-CALD participants. Standardising average payments has very little impact for non-CALD participants. For CALD SIL participants, average payments stay the same, and for CALD non-SIL participants, average payments decrease slightly ($1k), closer to the average payments for non-CALD non-SIL participants.

## Slide 39: Average payments by age

There are two charts.

The first chart displays average payments by age for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays average payments by age for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

For participants living in SIL, average payments for CALD participants are slightly higher than non-CALD participants across all age groups.

For non-SIL participants, average payments for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants are:

* Slightly higher for ages 0 to 24 and 65 and over.
* Slightly lower for ages 25 to 64.

Average payments are $275k for CALD SIL participants aged 19 to 24. They steadily decrease as age increases, from $210k for ages 25 to 34 to $180k for ages 55 to 64. This compare to average payments of around $195k to $225k for non-CALD SIL participants aged 19 to 64, also decreasing as age increases, within the given ranges.

For both CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants, average payments increase steadily with age prior to a peak at ages 25 to 34 (around $34k). Average payments for ages 35 to 64 are around $30k, before increasing to around $45k for ages 65 and over.

Note: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group. Data is deemed insufficient if there are 10 or fewer participants in the category.

## Slide 40: Average payments by disability type

There are two charts.

The first chart displays average payments by disability type for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays average payments by disability type for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

Note 1: Average payments have been standardised for the difference between the age profile of CALD / non-CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group.

For participants living in SIL, average payments are higher for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants where the participant’s primary disability type is autism ($243k for CALD participants compared to $216k for non-CALD participants) or other physical disability ($260k for CALD participants compared to $189k for non-CALD participants). Most other disability types have average payments that are similar between CALD and non-CALD participants, and that are in the region of $180k to $210k.

Average payments by disability type are more varied for non-SIL participants, and average payments are similar for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants across each of the primary disability types. Participants with autism or visual impairment have average payments of around $15k to $20k. Participants with most other disability types have average payments in the $35k to $45k range, with spinal cord injuries having the highest average payments for both CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants at around $65k.

## Slide 41: Average payments by remoteness

There are two charts.

The first chart displays average payments by remoteness for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays average payments by remoteness for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

Note 1: Average payments have been standardised for the difference between the age profile of CALD / non-CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group.

For participants living in SIL, average payments for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants are:

* Higher in remote areas.
* Lower in areas with population between 15,000 and 50,000.

For non-SIL participants, average payments for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants are:

* Slightly higher in major cities, very remote areas and areas with population between 5,000 and 15,000.
* Lower across all other remoteness categories.

In major cities, average payments are $200k for CALD and $190k for non-CALD SIL participants. In remote areas, CALD participants have higher average payments, at around $303k, compared to $293k for non-CALD participants. For CALD participants, average payments in very remote areas are slightly lower than in remote areas, at around $264k.

For non-SIL participants living in major cities, average payments are $25k for CALD and $24k for non-CALD participants. In areas with population greater than 50,000 or between 15,000 and 50,000, average payments are around $20k for CALD non-SIL participants, 20% lower than average payments for non-CALD non-SIL participants ($25k). In remote areas, average payments for CALD participants are $12k (29% lower than non-CALD), but in very remote areas they are $22k (14% higher than non-CALD).

## Slide 42: Utilisation of committed supports

Comparison of CALD and non-CALD participant experience

## Slide 43: Utilisation of committed supports by SIL status

A chart displays utilisation of committed supports by SIL status for CALD and non-CALD participants.

Note: For the current slide and all following slides, average utilisation of committed supports is shown for the period beginning 1 October 2018 and ending 31 March 2019 and has been standardised for the difference between the age profile of CALD / non- CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

CALD participants living in SIL have slightly lower average utilisation of average committed supports compared to non-CALD participants living in SIL.

For participants not in SIL, average utilisation of committed supports is higher for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants.

Standardising for age has little impact on the average utilisation of committed supports.

Note: ‘pp’ refers to percentage points in all following paragraphs and slides.

The unadjusted average utilisation for CALD SIL participants is 82%, 2 percentage points (pp) lower than the unadjusted average utilisation for non-CALD SIL participants (i.e. 84%). Unadjusted average utilisation for non-SIL participants is 58% for CALD participants, 1pp higher than for non-CALD participants.

## Slide 44: Utilisation of committed supports by plan number

A chart displays utilisation of committed supports by plan number for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

Note 1: Average utilisation of committed supports has been standardised for the difference between the age profile of CALD / non-CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: For utilisation by plan number, participants receiving in-kind supports are excluded as it is not possible to accurately separate in-kind payments and committed amounts between plans. Only utilisation for non-SIL participants are shown due to insufficient data for SIL participants. The overall level of utilisation includes in-kind supports and is not directly comparable to utilisation by plan number.

Note: ‘pp’ refers to percentage points.

For both CALD and non-CALD participants, utilisation generally increases with plan number. For both CALD and non-CALD participants, this is from about 46-47% for participants on their 1st plan to 67-70% for participants on plan 5+.

Compared to non-CALD participants, CALD participants have slightly higher utilisation at earlier plan numbers, and slightly lower utilisation at later plan numbers. Utilisation for CALD participants is around 1pp higher than that of non-CALD participants for plan 1, but is 4pp lower than that of non-CALD participants for plans 5+.

## Slide 45: Utilisation of committed supports by age

There are two charts.

The first chart displays utilisation of committed supports by age for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays utilisation of committed supports by age for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

For participants living in SIL, average utilisation of committed supports for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants is:

* Slightly lower for ages 35-54 and 65+
* Similar for all other ages

For non-SIL participants, average utilisation of committed supports is generally higher for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants across all age groups.

Average utilisation is around 80% to 85% for CALD SIL participants aged 19 to 64, decreasing as age increases. This compares to average utilisation of around 85% for non-CALD SIL participants aged 19 to 64, stable across all age groups.

For both CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants, average utilisation decreases steadily with age, with the exception of a small increase for ages 7 to 14 compared to ages 0 to 6. For CALD non-SIL participants, average utilisation falls from a peak of 72% for ages 7 to 14 to a low of 51% for ages 55 and over. For non-CALD non-SIL participants, average utilisation falls from a peak of 65% for ages 7 to 14 to a low of 44% for ages 65 and over.

Note: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group.

## Slide 46: Utilisation of committed supports by disability type

There are two charts.

The first chart displays utilisation of committed supports by disability type for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays utilisation of committed supports by disability type for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

For CALD SIL participants, average utilisation is slightly lower for most disability types compared to non-CALD SIL participants. Utilisation for all disability types is in the range of 76% to 86%, and CALD SIL participants with an intellectual disability have the highest utilisation at 86%. For non-CALD SIL participants, average utilisation is similar across all disability types, all in the range of 78% to 85%, with participants with primary disabilities of autism and intellectual disability having the highest utilisation at 85%.

For non-SIL participants, average utilisation of committed supports for CALD participants compared to non-CALD participants is higher for all primary disability types, especially so for participants with a primary disability of autism.

Note 1: Average utilisation of committed supports has been standardised for the difference between the age profile of CALD / non- CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group.

## Slide 47: Utilisation of committed supports by remoteness

There are two charts.

The first chart displays utilisation of committed supports by remoteness for CALD and non-CALD SIL participants. The second chart displays utilisation of committed supports by remoteness for CALD and non-CALD non-SIL participants.

Across all categories, average utilisation is lower for CALD participants, compared to non-CALD participants.

CALD participants living in remote or very remote areas have lower average utilisation compared to non-CALD participants, and the difference is greatest for SIL participants living in very remote areas.

In major cities and areas with population greater than 15,000, average utilisation is around 82% for CALD and 85% for non-CALD SIL participants. In remote areas, CALD participants have similar average utilisation to non-CALD participants, at around 78%. However, average utilisation in very remote areas is significantly lower than in remote areas, at 50% for CALD and 71% for non-CALD SIL participants.

For non-SIL participants in major cities, average utilisation for CALD participants is 65% 5pp higher than that of non-CALD participants. However, in areas with population greater than 50,000 and between 15,000 and 50,000, average utilisation for CALD participants is 55%, 4pp lower than that of non-CALD participants. In remote and very remote areas, CALD non-SIL participants have significantly lower utilisation, at 26% and 29% respectively, compared to 41% and 34% respectively for non-CALD participants.

In remote and very remote areas, average utilisation for CALD participants is around 27%, around 25pp-30pp lower than utilisation in non-remote areas. This difference was larger than that of non-CALD participants, who have average utilisation of 41% and 34% in remote and very remote areas, respectively.

Note 1: Average utilisation of committed supports has been standardised for the difference between the age profile of CALD / non-CALD participants and the age profile of the total population.

Note 2: Results are not shown if there is insufficient data in the group.

## Slide 48: Participant outcomes

Comparison of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participant experience

## Slide 49: Methodology for analysing outcomes

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 50: Measures of participant outcomes

### Baseline outcomes

Measures how participants and their families and carers are going at their point of entry into the NDIS.

Information on outcomes is collected during pre-planning for participants who entered the Scheme from 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2019. Of these participants, baseline outcomes were recorded for 99% of CALD and non-CALD participants.

### 2. Longitudinal outcomes

Describes how outcomes have changed for participants between their point of entry into the NDIS and after their first year in the Scheme. For participants aged 15 and over, changes in employment and social and community participation outcomes are also considered after their second year.

Longitudinal outcomes are reported for participants who entered the Scheme between 1 July 2016 and 30 June 2018.

### 3. Has the NDIS helped?

Measures whether participants think that the NDIS has helped in areas related to specific outcome domains.

This information has been collected after the first and second plan reviews for participants who entered the Scheme between 1 July 2016 and 30 June 2018.

## Slide 51: Outcome domains

Outcomes are analysed to understand how participants and their families and carers are progressing in different areas (domains) of their lives. The domains that are relevant to the participant differ by age group.

The outcome domains are as follows:

* Daily living (DL)
* Choice and control (CC)
* Relationships (REL)
* Social, community and civic participation (S/CP)
* Lifelong learning (LL)
* Health and wellbeing (HW)
* Home (HM)
* Work (WK)

The age groups are as follows:

* Children 0 to before starting school
* Children starting school to age 14
* Young adults 15 to 24
* Adults 25 and over

For young adults (ages 15 to 24) and adults (ages 25 and over), all outcomes domains are relevant. For children 0 to before starting school, only daily living, choice and control, relationships and social, community and civic participation are relevant. For children starting school to age 14, lifelong learning is also relevant in addition to the domains relevant for children 0 to before starting school.

## Slide 52: Outcomes and mainstream services

Mainstream services are the government systems providing services to the Australian public, including health, mental health, education, justice, housing, child protection and employment. The NDIS supports people with a disability to access mainstream services, but is not intended to replace them.

Some of the domains included in the outcomes framework, such as home, health and wellbeing, lifelong learning and work may reflect participant’s experiences with mainstream services that are not the primary responsibility of the NDIS. However, they are included in the measurement of outcomes to provide a fuller picture of participants’ circumstances.

## Slide 53: Participants from birth to before starting school

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 54: Participants from birth to starting school: Baseline outcomes

A chart displays the following selected baseline outcomes for participants from birth to before starting school, upon entry to the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each outcome):

* Has concerns in 6 or more areas of child’s development - DL
* Child is able to tell them what he/she wants - CC
* Child can make friends with people outside the family - REL
* Child participates in age appropriate community/cultural/religious activities - S/CP
* Of these, % who are welcomed or actively included - S/CP

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants
* Non-CALD participants

At baseline, the parents and carers of CALD participants generally reported worse outcomes for their child compared to the parents/carers of non-CALD participants. In particular, CALD participants were considerably less likely to be able to make friends with people outside the family compared to non-CALD participants.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Has concerns in 6 or more areas of child’s development - DL

* CALD: 68%
* Non-CALD: 67%

### Child is able to tell them what he/she wants – CC

* CALD: 58%
* Non-CALD: 72%

### Child can make friends with people outside the family - REL

* CALD: 43%
* Non-CALD: 63%

### Child participates in age appropriate community/cultural/religious activities - S/CP

* CALD: 49%
* Non-CALD: 52%

### Of these, % who are welcomed or actively included - S/CP

* CALD: 52%
* Non-CALD: 64%

## Slide 55: Participants from birth to starting school: Longitudinal outcomes

A chart displays the change in the outcomes of participants from birth to before starting school, after one year in the Scheme compared to baseline. The selected outcomes are the same as the selected baseline outcomes in the previous slide.

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-CALD participants

After one year in the Scheme, there was a considerable improvement in the percentage of CALD participants who could tell their parents/carers what they want, and this increase was higher than for non-CALD participants.

There was also an increase in the percentage of parents/carers of CALD participants who had concerns about their child’s development, but to a lesser extent compared to non-CALD parents/carers.

Note: At least some of the change may be normal age-related development as children are one year older at review.

The change in each outcome between baseline and year 1 for each participant cohort are listed below:

### Has concerns in 6 or more areas of child’s development - DL

* CALD: 4.6%
* Non-CALD: 7.0%

### Child is able to tell them what he/she wants – CC

* CALD: 16.2%
* Non-CALD: 13.0%

### Child can make friends with people outside the family - REL

* CALD: 3.5%
* Non-CALD: 5.2%

### Child participates in age appropriate community/cultural/religious activities - S/CP

* CALD: 3.0%
* Non-CALD: 1.2%

### Of these, % who are welcomed or actively included - S/CP

* CALD: 4.5%
* Non-CALD: 4.8%

## Slide 56: Participants from birth to starting school: Has the NDIS helped?

A chart displays the proportion of participants from birth to before starting school who responded ‘yes’ to the following ‘Has the NDIS helped?’ questions at the end of their 1st and 2nd years in the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each question):

* Has the NDIS improved your child’s development? - DL
* Has the NDIS improved your child’s access to specialist services? - DL
* Has the NDIS helped increase your child’s ability to communicate what they want? - CC
* Has the NDIS improved how your child fits into family life? - REL
* Has the NDIS improved how your child fits into community life? - S/CP

Results are shown for:

* CALD participants: year 1
* Non-CALD participants: year 1
* CALD participants: year 2
* Non-CALD participants: year 2

For the parents and carers of CALD participants, perceptions of the NDIS have improved between year one and year two with regards to improving their child’s development and communication, but deteriorated in the other areas.

In general, perceptions of the NDIS were similar between CALD and non-CALD participants, with the exception that non-CALD participants were more likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped with their child’s ability to communicate.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

### Has the NDIS improved your child’s development? - DL

* CALD year 1: 91%
* Non-CALD year 1: 92%
* CALD year 2: 95%
* Non-CALD year 2: 94%

### Has the NDIS improved your child’s access to specialist services? – DL

* CALD year 1: 92%
* Non-CALD year 1: 89%
* CALD year 2: 91%
* Non-CALD year 2: 92%

### Has the NDIS helped increase your child’s ability to communicate what they want? - CC

* CALD year 1: 77%
* Non-CALD year 1: 83%
* CALD year 2: 82%
* Non-CALD year 2: 86%

### Has the NDIS improved how your child fits into family life? - REL

* CALD year 1: 75%
* Non-CALD year 1: 73%
* CALD year 2: 68%
* Non-CALD year 2: 76%

### Has the NDIS improved how your child fits into community life? - S/CP

* CALD year 1: 61%
* Non-CALD year 1: 61%
* CALD year 2: 58%
* Non-CALD year 2: 63%

## Slide 57: Participants from starting school to age 14

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 58: Participants from starting school to age 14: Baseline outcomes

A chart displays the following selected baseline outcomes for participants from starting school to age 14, upon entry to the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each outcome):

* Child is developing skills appropriate to their ability and circumstances - DL
* Child is becoming more independent - DL
* Child has a genuine say in decisions about themselves - CC
* Child can make friends with people outside the family - REL
* Child spends time with friends without an adult present - REL
* Child spends time after school/weekends with friends and/or in mainstream programs - S/CP
* Of these, % who are welcomed or actively included - S/CP
* Child attends school in mainstream class - LL

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants
* Non-CALD participants

At baseline, parents/carers of CALD participants reported worse outcomes compared to non-CALD participants across each of the outcome domains. In particular, CALD participants were considerably less likely to have a genuine say in decision making, make friends with people outside the family, and attend school in a mainstream class.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Child is developing skills appropriate to their ability and circumstances – DL

* CALD: 24%
* Non-CALD: 28%

### Child is becoming more independent - DL

* CALD: 32%
* Non-CALD: 41%

### Child has a genuine say in decisions about themselves - CC

* CALD: 51%
* Non-CALD: 66%

### Child can make friends with people outside the family - REL

* CALD: 51%
* Non-CALD: 62%

### Child spends time with friends without an adult present - REL

* CALD: 10%
* Non-CALD: 12%

### Child spends time after school/weekends with friends and/or in mainstream programs - S/CP

* CALD: 26%
* Non-CALD: 36%

### Of these, % who are welcomed or actively included - S/CP

* CALD: 72%
* Non-CALD: 75%

### Child attends school in mainstream class - LL

* CALD: 48%
* Non-CALD: 62%

## Slide 59: Participants from starting school to age 14: Longitudinal outcomes

A chart displays the change in the outcomes of participants from starting school to age 14, after one year in the Scheme compared to baseline. The selected outcomes are the same as the selected baseline outcomes in the previous slide.

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-CALD participants

After one year in the Scheme, the parents and carers of CALD participants reported an improvement in their child’s level of independence that was broadly in line with non-CALD participants.

However, CALD participants also experienced a deterioration in a number of areas including the ability to make friends, and the amount of time spent with friends or in mainstream programs. Non-CALD participants generally did not experience the same level of deterioration in outcomes, with the exception of attending school in a mainstream class.

The change in each outcome between baseline and year 1 for each participant cohort are listed below:

### Child is developing skills appropriate to their ability and circumstances – DL

* CALD: 1.2%
* Non-CALD: -0.4%

### Child is becoming more independent - DL

* CALD: 4.5%
* Non-CALD: 4.0%

### Child has a genuine say in decisions about themselves - CC

* CALD: -0.8%
* Non-CALD: 1.2%

### Child can make friends with people outside the family - REL

* CALD: -1.8%
* Non-CALD: -0.5%

### Child spends time with friends without an adult present - REL

* CALD: 0.4%
* Non-CALD: -0.2%

### Child spends time after school/weekends with friends and/or in mainstream programs - S/CP

* CALD: -1.9%
* Non-CALD: -0.1%

### Of these, % who are welcomed or actively included - S/CP

* CALD: -0.8%
* Non-CALD: -0.1%

### Child attends school in mainstream class - LL

* CALD: -1.5%
* Non-CALD: -2.0%

## Slide 60: Participants from starting school to age 14: Has the NDIS helped?

A chart displays the proportion of participants from starting school to age 14 who responded ‘yes’ to the following ‘Has the NDIS helped?’ questions at the end of their 1st and 2nd years in the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each question):

* Has the NDIS helped your child become more independent? - DL
* Has the NDIS improved your child’s access to education? - LL
* Has the NDIS improved your child’s relationships with family and friends? - REL
* Has the NDIS improved your child’s social and recreational life? - S/CP

Results are shown for:

* CALD participants: year 1
* Non-CALD participants: year 1
* CALD participants: year 2
* Non-CALD participants: year 2

For the parents and carers of CALD participants, perceptions of the NDIS have improved by a small amount between year one and year two in all outcome domains with the exception of social and community participation.

The parents/carers of CALD participants were also considerably more likely to perceive that the NDIS had improved their child’s access to education compared to the parents/carers of non-CALD participants.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

### Has the NDIS helped your child to become more independent? - DL

* CALD year 1: 60%
* Non-CALD year 1: 57%
* CALD year 2: 63%
* Non-CALD year 2: 65%

### Has the NDIS improved your child’s access to education? - LL

* CALD year 1: 46%
* Non-CALD year 1: 36%
* CALD year 2: 47%
* Non-CALD year 2: 38%

### Has the NDIS improved your child’s relationships with family and friends? - REL

* CALD year 1: 48%
* Non-CALD year 1: 46%
* CALD year 2: 49%
* Non-CALD year 2: 50%

### Has the NDIS improved your child’s social and recreational life? - S/CP

* CALD year 1: 45%
* Non-CALD year 1: 42%
* CALD year 2: 43%
* Non-CALD year 2: 46%

## Slide 61: Participants aged 15 to 24

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 62: Participants aged 15 to 24: Baseline outcomes (1)

A chart displays the following selected choice and control, relationships and social/community participation baseline outcomes for participants from age 15 to age 24, upon entry to the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each outcome):

* Happy with their level of independence/control - CC
* Chooses who supports them - CC
* Chooses what they do each day - CC
* Has been given the opportunity to participate in a self-advocacy group meeting - CC
* Wants more choice and control in their life - CC
* Has no friends other than family or paid staff - REL
* Has been actively involved in a community/cultural/religious group in the last 12 months - S/CP

Note: This slide shows only the first half of the baseline outcomes. The second half are shown on the next slide.

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants
* Non-CALD participants

Slightly moreCALD participants reported that they were actively involved in a community, cultural or religious group in the last 12 months compared to non-CALD participants. For the choice and control and relationship domains, CALD participants reported poorer outcomes for all questions compared to non-CALD participants.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Happy with their level of independence/control - CC

* CALD: 29%
* Non-CALD: 36%

### Chooses who supports them - CC

* CALD: 28%
* Non-CALD: 35%

### Chooses what they do each day - CC

* CALD: 36%
* Non-CALD: 44%

### Has been given the opportunity to participate in a self-advocacy group meeting - CC

* CALD: 19%
* Non-CALD: 21%

### Wants more choice and control in their life - CC

* CALD: 79%
* Non-CALD: 81%

### Has no friends other than family or paid staff - REL

* CALD: 42%
* Non-CALD: 31%

### Has been actively involved in a community/cultural/religious group in the last 12 months - S/CP

* CALD: 36%
* Non-CALD: 34%

## Slide 63: Participants aged 15 to 24: Baseline outcomes (2)

A chart displays the following selected home, health and wellbeing, lifelong learning and work baseline outcomes for participants from age 15 to age 24, upon entry to the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each outcome):

* Happy with their home - HM
* Feels safe or very safe in their home - HM
* Rates their health as good, very good or excellent - HW
* Did not have any difficulties accessing health services - HW
* Currently or previously attended school in a mainstream class - LL
* Has a paid job - WK
* Is a volunteer - WK

Note: This slide shows only the second half of the baseline outcomes. The first half are shown on the previous slide.

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants
* Non-CALD participants

CALD participants reported slightly better outcomes in the home domain at baseline compared to non-CALD participants. Health and learning outcomes were consistent for both groups, but CALD participants were less likely to have a paid job or be a volunteer.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Happy with their home - HM

* CALD: 83%
* Non-CALD: 80%

### Feels safe or very safe in their home - HM

* CALD: 84%
* Non-CALD: 84%

### Rates their health as good, very good or excellent - HW

* CALD: 68%
* Non-CALD: 68%

### Did not have any difficulties accessing health services - HW

* CALD: 68%
* Non-CALD: 69%

### Currently or previously attended school in a mainstream class - LL

* CALD: 29%
* Non-CALD: 30%

### Has a paid job - WK

* CALD: 13%
* Non-CALD: 18%

### Is a volunteer - WK

* CALD: 8%
* Non-CALD: 13%

## Slide 64: Participants aged 15 to 24: Longitudinal outcomes

A chart displays the change in the outcomes of participants from age 15 to age 24, after one year in the Scheme compared to baseline. The selected outcomes are the same as the selected baseline outcomes in the previous 2 slides.

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-CALD participants

After one year in the Scheme, CALD participants reported larger improvements in social and community participation and volunteering compared to non-CALD participants. They also had larger increases in the percentage of participants who want more choice and control in their life, and those who don’t have any friends other than family or paid staff.

The increase in the percentage of participants in a paid job at year one was broadly similar for CALD and non-CALD participants.

The change in each outcome between baseline and year 1 for each participant cohort are listed below:

### Happy with their level of independence/control - CC

* CALD: 1.1%
* Non-CALD: -0.6%

### Chooses who supports them - CC

* CALD: -1.0%
* Non-CALD: 1.3%

### Chooses what they do each day - CC

* CALD: 0.0%
* Non-CALD: 0.9%

### Has been given the opportunity to participate in a self-advocacy group meeting - CC

* CALD: -1.1%
* Non-CALD: -0.7%

### Wants more choice and control in their life - CC

* CALD: 7.1%
* Non-CALD: 5.7%

### Has no friends other than family or paid staff - REL

* CALD: 2.3%
* Non-CALD: 1.1%

### Has been actively involved in a community/cultural/religious group in the last 12 months - S/CP

* CALD: 9.9%
* Non-CALD: 6.1%

### Happy with their home - HM

* CALD: 0.1%
* Non-CALD: -1.3%

### Feels safe or very safe in their home - HM

* CALD: -2.4%
* Non-CALD: -0.5%

### Rates their health as good, very good or excellent - HW

* CALD: -1.6%
* Non-CALD: -1.7%

### Did not have any difficulties accessing health services - HW

* CALD: 1.7%
* Non-CALD: 1.9%

### Currently or previously attended school in a mainstream class - LL

* CALD: -1.4%
* Non-CALD: -1.7%

### Has a paid job - WK

* CALD: 2.9%
* Non-CALD: 3.0%

### Is a volunteer - WK

* CALD: 1.8%
* Non-CALD: 0.8%

## Slide 65: Participants aged 15 to 24: Has the NDIS helped?

A chart displays the proportion of participants from age 15 to age 24 who responded ‘yes’ to the following ‘Has the NDIS helped?’ questions at the end of their 1st and 2nd years in the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each question):

* Has the NDIS helped you have more choices and more control over your life? - CC
* Has the NDIS helped you with daily living activities? - DL
* Has the NDIS helped you to meet more people - REL
* Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you to choose a home that’s right for you? - HM
* Has your involvement with the NDIS improved your health and wellbeing? - HW
* Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you to learn things you want to learn or to take courses you want to take? - LL
* Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you find a job that’s right for you? - WK
* Has the NDIS helped you be more involved? - S/CP

Results are shown for:

* CALD participants: year 1
* Non-CALD participants: year 1
* CALD participants: year 2
* Non-CALD participants: year 2

CALD participants’ perceptions that the NDIS has helped them have improved between year one and year two in all outcome domains with the exception of finding a home and employment.

In general, perceptions of the NDIS were fairly similar for both CALD and non-CALD participants for each of the outcome domains and review years.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

### Has the NDIS helped you have more choices and more control over your life? - CC

* CALD year 1: 57%
* Non-CALD year 1: 59%
* CALD year 2: 63%
* Non-CALD year 2: 64%

### Has the NDIS helped you with daily living activities? - DL

* CALD year 1: 56%
* Non-CALD year 1: 58%
* CALD year 2: 67%
* Non-CALD year 2: 65%

### Has the NDIS helped you to meet more people - REL

* CALD year 1: 47%
* Non-CALD year 1: 48%
* CALD year 2: 57%
* Non-CALD year 2: 53%

### Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you to choose a home that’s right for you? - HM

* CALD year 1: 23%
* Non-CALD year 1: 19%
* CALD year 2: 21%
* Non-CALD year 2: 18%

### Has your involvement with the NDIS improved your health and wellbeing? – HW

* CALD year 1: 41%
* Non-CALD year 1: 40%
* CALD year 2: 46%
* Non-CALD year 2: 44%

### Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you to learn things you want to learn or to take courses you want to take? - LL

* CALD year 1: 32%
* Non-CALD year 1: 35%
* CALD year 2: 41%
* Non-CALD year 2: 36%

### Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you find a job that’s right for you? - WK

* CALD year 1: 18%
* Non-CALD year 1: 17%
* CALD year 2: 16%
* Non-CALD year 2: 16%

### Has the NDIS helped you be more involved? - S/CP

* CALD year 1: 47%
* Non-CALD year 1: 53%
* CALD year 2: 55%
* Non-CALD year 2: 58%

## Slide 66: Participants aged 25 and over

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 67: Participants aged 25 and over: Baseline outcomes (1)

A chart displays the following selected choice and control, relationships, social/community participation and home baseline outcomes for participants 25 and over, upon entry to the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each outcome):

* Chooses who supports them - CC
* Chooses what they do each day - CC
* Has been given the opportunity to participate in a self-advocacy group meeting - CC
* Wants more choice and control in their life - CC
* Has no friends other than family or paid staff - REL
* Has been actively involved in a community/cultural/religious group in the last 12 months - S/CP
* Happy with their home - HM
* Feels safe or very safe in their home - HM

Note: This slide shows only the first half of the baseline outcomes. The second half are shown on the next slide.

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-CALD participants

CALD participants reported better outcomes in the social participation domain but worse outcomes in the relationships and home domains compared to non-CALD participants. CALD participants were also more likely to chose who supports them and choose what they do each day, but were less likely to have been given the opportunity to participate in a self-advocacy meeting and wanted more choice and control in their life.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Chooses who supports them - CC

* CALD: 58%
* Non-CALD: 55%

### Chooses what they do each day - CC

* CALD: 65%
* Non-CALD: 64%

### Has been given the opportunity to participate in a self-advocacy group meeting - CC

* CALD: 24%
* Non-CALD: 28%

### Wants more choice and control in their life - CC

* CALD: 81%
* Non-CALD: 77%

### Has no friends other than family or paid staff - REL

* CALD: 35%
* Non-CALD: 28%

### Has been actively involved in a community/cultural/religious group in the last 12 months - S/CP

* CALD: 39%
* Non-CALD: 37%

### Happy with their home - HM

* CALD: 69%
* Non-CALD: 74%

### Feels safe or very safe in their home - HM

* CALD: 67%
* Non-CALD: 75%

## Slide 68: Participants aged 25 and over: Baseline outcomes (2)

A chart displays the following selected health and wellbeing, lifelong learning and work baseline outcomes for participants aged 25 and over, upon entry to the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each outcome):

* Rates their health as good, very good or excellent - HW
* Did not have any difficulties accessing health services - HW
* Participates in education, training or skill development - LL
* Of those who participate, % who do so in mainstream settings - LL
* Unable to do course/training in the last 12 months - LL
* Has a paid job - WK
* Is a volunteer - WK

Note: This slide shows only the second half of the baseline outcomes. The first half are shown on the previous slide.

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants
* Non-CALD participants

CALD participants reported poorer health outcomes at baseline compared to non-CALD participants, and were also slightly less likely to participate in education or have paid employment.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Rates their health as good, very good or excellent - HW

* CALD: 42%
* Non-CALD: 47%

### Did not have any difficulties accessing health services - HW

* CALD: 57%
* Non-CALD: 67%

### Participates in education, training or skill development - LL

* CALD: 10%
* Non-CALD: 12%

### Of those who participate, % who do so in mainstream settings - LL

* CALD: 66%
* Non-CALD: 49%

### Unable to do course/training in the last 12 months - LL

* CALD: 40%
* Non-CALD: 35%

### Has a paid job - WK

* CALD: 22%
* Non-CALD: 23%

### Is a volunteer - WK

* CALD: 9%
* Non-CALD: 13%

## Slide 69: Participants aged 25 and over: Longitudinal outcomes

A chart displays the change in the outcomes of participants aged 25 and over, after one year in the Scheme compared to baseline. The selected outcomes are the same as the selected baseline outcomes in the previous 2 slides.

Outcomes are shown for:

* CALD participants
* Non-CALD participants

After one year in the Scheme, CALD participants increased their rates of community participation by +5%, which is broadly in line with non-CALD participants. Similarly, the percentage of participants who want more choice and control in their life increased by similar rates for both groups.

The proportion of CALD participants who feel safe or very safe in their home decreased by a higher percentage compared to non-CALD participants, while both groups had similar decreases in the percentage of participants who rate their health as good, very good or excellent.

The change in each outcome between baseline and year 1 for each participant cohort are listed below:

### Chooses who supports them - CC

* CALD: 0.1%
* Non-CALD: 0.2%

### Chooses what they do each day - CC

* CALD: 0.5%
* Non-CALD: -0.3%

### Has been given the opportunity to participate in a self-advocacy group meeting - CC

* CALD: -0.2%
* Non-CALD: -0.3%

### Wants more choice and control in their life - CC

* CALD: 4.1%
* Non-CALD: 5.0%

### Has no friends other than family or paid staff - REL

* CALD: 0.7%
* Non-CALD: 0.5%

### Has been actively involved in a community/cultural/religious group in the last 12 months - S/CP

* CALD: 4.5%
* Non-CALD: 5.2%

### Happy with their home - HM

* CALD: 0.3%
* Non-CALD: -0.5%

### Feels safe or very safe in their home - HM

* CALD: -2.5%
* Non-CALD: -1.1%

### Rates their health as good, very good or excellent - HW

* CALD: -1.8%
* Non-CALD: -1.9%

### Did not have any difficulties accessing health services - HW

* CALD: 1.6%
* Non-CALD: 1.9%

### Participates in education, training or skill development - LL

* CALD: 1.2%
* Non-CALD: 1.3%

### Of those who participate, % who do so in mainstream settings - LL

* CALD: -2.9%
* Non-CALD: -1.9%

### Unable to do course/training in the last 12 months - LL

* CALD: 0.0%
* Non-CALD: -1.3%

### Has a paid job - WK

* CALD: -0.6%
* Non-CALD: -0.9%

### Is a volunteer - WK

* CALD: -0.3%
* Non-CALD: 0.2%

## Slide 70: Participants aged 25 and over: Has the NDIS helped?

A chart displays the proportion of participants aged 25 and over who responded ‘yes’ to the following ‘Has the NDIS helped?’ questions at the end of their 1st and 2nd years in the Scheme (note that the outcome domain abbreviation is show after the dash for each question):

* Has the NDIS helped you have more choices and more control over your life? - CC
* Has the NDIS helped you with daily living activities? - DL
* Has the NDIS helped you to meet more people - REL
* Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you to choose a home that’s right for you? - HM
* Has your involvement with the NDIS improved your health and wellbeing? - HW
* Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you to learn things you want to learn or to take courses you want to take? - LL
* Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you find a job that’s right for you? - WK
* Has the NDIS helped you be more involved? - S/CP

Results are shown for:

* CALD participants: year 1
* Non-CALD participants: year 1
* CALD participants: year 2
* Non-CALD participants: year 2

CALD participants’ perceptions that the NDIS has helped them have improved between year one and year two in all outcome domains with the exception of finding a home and employment.

Across both years, CALD participants were less likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them compared to non-CALD participants for all of the outcome domains.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

### Has the NDIS helped you have more choices and more control over your life? - CC

* CALD year 1: 64%
* Non-CALD year 1: 67%
* CALD year 2: 69%
* Non-CALD year 2: 74%

### Has the NDIS helped you with daily living activities? - DL

* CALD year 1: 66%
* Non-CALD year 1: 71%
* CALD year 2: 74%
* Non-CALD year 2: 79%

### Has the NDIS helped you to meet more people - REL

* CALD year 1: 47%
* Non-CALD year 1: 52%
* CALD year 2: 54%
* Non-CALD year 2: 59%

### Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you to choose a home that’s right for you? - HM

* CALD year 1: 25%
* Non-CALD year 1: 28%
* CALD year 2: 25%
* Non-CALD year 2: 29%

### Has your involvement with the NDIS improved your health and wellbeing? – HW

* CALD year 1: 47%
* Non-CALD year 1: 49%
* CALD year 2: 51%
* Non-CALD year 2: 56%

### Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you to learn things you want to learn or to take courses you want to take? - LL

* CALD year 1: 26%
* Non-CALD year 1: 29%
* CALD year 2: 28%
* Non-CALD year 2: 33%

### Has your involvement with the NDIS helped you find a job that’s right for you? - WK

* CALD year 1: 16%
* Non-CALD year 1: 20%
* CALD year 2: 15%
* Non-CALD year 2: 19%

### Has the NDIS helped you be more involved? - S/CP

* CALD year 1: 53%
* Non-CALD year 1: 58%
* CALD year 2: 59%
* Non-CALD year 2: 66%

## Slide 71: Participants aged 15 and over: Employment and community participation

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 72: Participants in work

A chart displays the proportion of participants in paid employment, at baseline and after two years in the Scheme. Outcomes are shown by age group (15 to 24, 25 and over and 15 and over) split by CALD and non-CALD participants.

The NDIA is acutely aware of the benefits that employment brings to participants and tracks employment outcomes to see whether the NDIS has helped participants to find paid work.

The percentage of CALD participants in paid work increased from a baseline of 10% to 19% in year two for those aged 15 to 24. Non-CALD participants aged 15 to 24 had a similar sized increase in employment rates from 14% at baseline to 22% in year two.

The percentage of participants aged 25 and over who are in paid work remained stable between baseline and year 2, albeit at a slightly higher rate for non-CALD participants (25%) compared to CALD participants (22%).

Overall, the percentage of participants in paid employment has increased from 20% to 21% for CALD participants, and from 23% to 24% for non-CALD participants.

## Slide 73: Participants in community and social activities

A chart displays the proportion of participants participating in community and social activities, after two years in the Scheme compared to baseline. Outcomes are shown by age group (15 to 24, 25 and over and 15 and over) for CALD and non-CALD participants.

The number of participants engaging in community and social activities is one of the key measures for ensuring quality experiences and outcomes for participants.

For all CALD participants aged 15 and over, there was a considerable increase in community and social participation from a baseline of 37% to 48% in year two. The corresponding increase for non-CALD participants was similar, from 35% at baseline to 46% in year two.

The increase was largest for CALD participants aged 15 to 24, from 36% at baseline to 54% in year two. This was larger than the corresponding change for non-CALD participants aged 15 to 24, of 31% to 42%.

The percentage of CALD participants aged 25 and over engaging in community and social activities increased from a baseline of 37% to 47% in year two. In comparison, the percentage of non-CALD participants aged 25 and over engaging in community and social activities increased from 36% at baseline to 47% in year two.

## Slide 74: Families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 75: Families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14: Baseline outcomes

A chart displays the following selected baseline outcomes of the families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14, upon the participant’s entry to the Scheme (baseline):

* Receiving Carer Payment
* Receiving Carer Allowance
* Has a paid job
* Is able to advocate for their child / family member
* Has friends and family they see as often as they like
* Feels very or somewhat confident in supporting their child’s development
* Rates their health as good, very good or excellent

Outcomes are shown for:

* The families and carers of all CALD participants
* The families and carers of non-CALD participants

The families and carers of CALD participants generally had poorer outcomes at baseline compared to the families and carers of non-CALD participants, particularly with respect to being able to advocate for their child and supporting their child’s development.

Families/carers of CALD participants were also slightly less likely to have a paid job, and were less likely to receive either the Carer Payment or Carer Allowance.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Receiving Carer Payment

* CALD: 20%
* Non-CALD: 23%

### Receiving Carer Allowance

* CALD: 44%
* Non-CALD: 52%

### Has a paid job

* CALD: 43%
* Non-CALD: 47%

### Is able to advocate for their child / family member

* CALD: 59%
* Non-CALD: 79%

### Has friends and family they see as often as they like

* CALD: 40%
* Non-CALD: 44%

### Feels very or somewhat confident in supporting their child’s development

* CALD: 74%
* Non-CALD: 87%

### Rates their health as good, very good or excellent

* CALD: 74%
* Non-CALD: 72%

## Slide 76: Families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14: Longitudinal outcomes

A chart displays the change in the outcomes of the families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14, after one year in the Scheme compared to baseline. The selected outcomes are the same as the selected baseline outcomes in the previous slide.

Outcomes are shown for:

* The families and carers of all CALD participants
* The families and carers of non-CALD participants

After one year in the Scheme, the percentage of families and carers of CALD participants who had a paid job increased 2.9%, compared to a 2.1% increase for the families and carers of non-CALD participants. There was also a significant increase in the percentage of families/carers receiving carer allowance, and this was similar for both groups.

The families/carers of CALD participants generally had larger improvements in outcomes at year one compared to families/cares of non-CALD participants, including confidence in supporting their child’s development, advocating for their child, and having friends and family they see as often as they like. However, both groups had a similar deterioration in the percentage of families/carers who rate their health as good, very good or excellent.

The change in each outcome between baseline and year 1 for each participant cohort are listed below:

### Receiving Carer Payment

* CALD: 0.5%
* Non-CALD: 0.9%

### Receiving Carer Allowance

* CALD: 7.1%
* Non-CALD: 7.0%

### Has a paid job

* CALD: 2.9%
* Non-CALD: 2.1%

### Is able to advocate for their child / family member

* CALD: 1.6%
* Non-CALD: 0.6%

### Has friends and family they see as often as they like

* CALD: 2.1%
* Non-CALD: -1.3%

### Feels very or somewhat confident in supporting their child’s development

* CALD: 4.4%
* Non-CALD: 2.1%

### Rates their health as good, very good or excellent

* CALD: -2.8%
* Non-CALD: -3.3%

## Slide 77: Families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14: Has the NDIS helped?

A chart displays the proportion of families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14 who responded ‘yes’ to the following ‘Has the NDIS helped?’ questions at the end of the participant’s 1st and 2nd years in the Scheme:

* Has the NDIS improved your capacity to advocate (stand up) for your child?
* Has the NDIS improved the level of support for your family?
* Has the NDIS improved your access to services, programs and activities in the community?
* Has the NDIS improved your ability/capacity to help your child develop and learn?
* Has the NDIS improved your health and wellbeing?

Results are shown for:

* CALD participants: year 1
* Non-CALD participants: year 1
* CALD participants: year 2
* Non-CALD participants: year 2

For the families and carers of CALD participants, perceptions of the NDIS have not changed significantly between year one and year two, except for a decrease in the percentage of families/carers who perceive that the NDIS has improved their capacity to advocate for their child.

In their first year, the families and carers of CALD participants were more likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them compared to non-Indigenous participants. This differential generally narrowed in the second year, however the families/carers of CALD participants remained more likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them improve their health and wellbeing.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

### Has the NDIS improved your capacity to advocate (stand up) for your child?

* CALD year 1: 64%
* Non-CALD year 1: 57%
* CALD year 2: 60%
* Non-CALD year 2: 58%

### Has the NDIS improved the level of support for your family?

* CALD year 1: 67%
* Non-CALD year 1: 63%
* CALD year 2: 68%
* Non-CALD year 2: 67%

### Has the NDIS improved your access to services, programs and activities in the community?

* CALD year 1: 70%
* Non-CALD year 1: 66%
* CALD year 2: 71%
* Non-CALD year 2: 70%

### Has the NDIS improved your ability/capacity to help your child develop and learn?

* CALD year 1: 74%
* Non-CALD year 1: 70%
* CALD year 2: 75%
* Non-CALD year 2: 74%

### Has the NDIS improved your health and wellbeing?

* CALD year 1: 46%
* Non-CALD year 1: 39%
* CALD year 2: 45%
* Non-CALD year 2: 38%

## Slide 78: Families and carers of participants aged 15 and over

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 79: Families and carers of participants aged 15 and over: Baseline outcomes

A chart displays the following selected baseline outcomes of the families and carers of participants aged 15 and over, upon the participant’s entry to the Scheme (baseline):

* Receiving Carer Payment
* Receiving Carer Allowance
* Has a paid job
* Is able to advocate for their child / family member
* Has friends and family they see as often as they like
* Feels in control of selecting services
* Rates their health as good, very good or excellent

Outcomes are shown for:

* The families and carers of all CALD participants
* The families and carers of non-CALD participants

Similarly to child participants, the families and carers of CALD participants aged 15 and over generally had poorer outcomes compared to the families and carers of non-CALD participants. The largest differences related to being able to advocate for their child or family member, and feeling in control when selecting services.

Families/carers of CALD participants also had lower rates of paid employment and were less likely to receive the Carer Allowance compared to non-CALD participants.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Receiving Carer Payment

* CALD: 26%
* Non-CALD: 25%

### Receiving Carer Allowance

* CALD: 34%
* Non-CALD: 44%

### Has a paid job

* CALD: 36%
* Non-CALD: 41%

### Is able to advocate for their child / family member

* CALD: 48%
* Non-CALD: 71%

### Has friends and family they see as often as they like

* CALD: 42%
* Non-CALD: 46%

### Feels in control of selecting services

* CALD: 28%
* Non-CALD: 42%

### Rates their health as good, very good or excellent

* CALD: 59%
* Non-CALD: 60%

## Slide 80: Families and carers of participants aged 15 and over: Longitudinal outcomes

A chart displays the change in the outcomes of the families and carers of participants 15 and over, after one year in the Scheme compared to baseline. The selected outcomes are the same as the selected baseline outcomes in the previous slide.

Outcomes are shown for:

* The families and carers of all CALD participants (both remote and non-remote)
* The families and carers of non-CALD participants

After one year in the Scheme, the percentage of families and carers of CALD participants who had a paid job increased 1.4%, compared to a 0.8% increase for the families and carers of non-CALD participants. There was also a larger increase in the percentage of families/carers of CALD participants receiving the Carer Payment.

The deterioration in the proportion of families and carers who are able to advocate for their child / family member was considerably larger for the family/carers of CALD participants, whereas the deterioration in those who rate their health as good, very good or excellent was similar for the families/carers of CALD and non-CALD participants.

The change in each outcome between baseline and year 1 for each participant cohort are listed below:

### Receiving Carer Payment

* CALD: 3.9%
* Non-CALD: 0.2%

### Receiving Carer Allowance

* CALD: 3.5%
* Non-CALD: 2.7%

### Has a paid job

* CALD: 1.4%
* Non-CALD: 0.8%

### Is able to advocate for their child / family member

* CALD: -4.5%
* Non-CALD: -1.1%

### Has friends and family they see as often as they like

* CALD: 0.0%
* Non-CALD: 1.0%

### Feels in control selecting services

* CALD: 0.8%
* Non-CALD: -0.4%

### Rates their health as good, very good or excellent

* CALD: -3.4%
* Non-CALD: -2.9%

## Slide 81: Families and carers of participants aged 15 and over: Has the NDIS helped?

A chart displays the proportion of families and carers of participants aged 15 and over responded ‘yes’ to the following ‘Has the NDIS helped?’ questions at the end of the participant’s 1st and 2nd years in the Scheme:

* Has the NDIS helped you to know your rights and advocate effectively?
* Has the NDIS improved the level of support for your family?
* Has the NDIS helped you to access services, programs and activities in the community?
* Has the NDIS improved your health and wellbeing?

Results are shown for:

* CALD participants: year 1
* Non-CALD participants: year 1
* CALD participants: year 2
* Non-CALD participants: year 2

For the families and carers of CALD participants, perceptions of whether the NDIS have helped with access to the community improved between year one and year two, and remained steady for the other questions.

In general, perceptions of the NDIS are similar for the families and carers of both CALD and non-CALD participants. However, the families / carers of CALD participants were more likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them improve their health and wellbeing in both year one and year two, and the families / carers of non-CALD participants were more likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them know their rights and advocate effectively in year 2.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

### Has the NDIS helped you to know your rights and advocate effectively?

* CALD year 1: 47%
* Non-CALD year 1: 47%
* CALD year 2: 46%
* Non-CALD year 2: 50%

### Has the NDIS improved the level of support for your family?

* CALD year 1: 60%
* Non-CALD year 1: 61%
* CALD year 2: 61%
* Non-CALD year 2: 64%

### Has the NDIS helped you to access to services, programs and activities in the community?

* CALD year 1: 55%
* Non-CALD year 1: 57%
* CALD year 2: 63%
* Non-CALD year 2: 63%

### Has the NDIS improved your health and wellbeing?

* CALD year 1: 36%
* Non-CALD year 1: 33%
* CALD year 2: 36%
* Non-CALD year 2: 32%

## Slide 82: Participant satisfaction

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 83: Participant satisfaction – new survey method

A chart displays the proportion of participants who agreed with statements about the different stages of the NDIS journey in 2018-2019 Q4, for CALD and non-CALD participants.

A new participant satisfaction survey has been developed to better record the experience of NDIS participants and their families and carers at different stages of the participant pathway.

It began roll-out on 1 September 2018 and will become the primary tool for analysing participant experience. The new survey is designed to gather data at the four primary stages of the participant pathway:

* Access
* Pre-planning
* Planning
* Plan Review

Generally CALD participants have similar satisfaction rates to non-CALD participants at the pre-planning, planning and plan review stages of the pathway. The satisfaction rates at the access stage are slightly higher for CALD participants.

The statements in the survey and the results are as follows:

### Access:

* Was the person from the NDIS respectful? 96% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 94% of non-CALD participants.
* Are you happy with how coming into the NDIS has gone? 84% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 74% of non-CALD participants.
* Do you understand what will happen next with your plan? 75% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 69% of non-CALD participants.

### Pre-planning:

* Did you understand why you needed to give the information you did? 94% of CALD agreed positively, compared with 96% of non-CALD participants.
* Did the person from the NDIS understand how your disability affects your life? 94% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 87% of non-CALD participants.
* Are you clear on what happens next with your plan? 76% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 75% of non-CALD participants.

### Planning:

* Did you understand why you needed to give the information you did? 94% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 96% of non-CALD participants.
* Did the person from the NDIS understand how your disability affects your life? 90% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 85% of non-CALD participants.
* Are you clear on what happens next with your plan? 77% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 74% of non-CALD participants.

### Plan Review:

* Did you feel prepared for your plan review? 80% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 82% of non-CALD participants.
* Did the person from the NDIS understand how your disability affects your life? 82% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 78% of non-CALD participants.
* Is your NDIS plan helping you to make progress towards your goals? 82% of CALD participants agreed, compared with 82% of non-CALD participants.