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## Slide 1: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander 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 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

* Population prevalence
* Scheme prevalence

Comparison of NDIS Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander1 participants, and to compare this experience to non-Indigenous participants.
* The term ‘Indigenous participants’ is used throughout the following sections to refer to participants of the NDIS who have identified as Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander, or both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander during the access and/or planning process.
* The term ‘Non-Indigenous participants’ refers to participants of the NDIS who have not identified or not stated that they are Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander during the access and/or planning process.

1Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander is the collective term for all people who identify and are recognised as descendants of the original inhabitants of Australia, and acknowledges the many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander groups in Australia.

## 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: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander engagement Strategy

* The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Engagement Strategy is a statement of the National Disability Insurance Agency’s (NDIA) commitment to walk with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in delivering the NDIS across Australia.
* The NDIA aims to develop a collaborative planning and working model to inform practice which can meet the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples with disability, their families, carers and communities.
* The strategy acknowledges the importance of a community-by-community approach to meeting the needs of diverse Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The approach involves developing local solutions and a commitment to maximising opportunities for employment, training and economic development in the rollout of the Scheme.

Source: https://www.ndis.gov.au/about-us/strategies/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-strategy

## Slide 7: Key points (1)

As of 30 June 2019, there were 16,417 Indigenous participants in the NDIS, making up 5.7% of all active participants in the NDIS.

Compared to non-Indigenous participants:

* a larger proportion of Indigenous participants are aged 0 to 24 (65% for Indigenous compared to 54% for non-Indigenous) and a lower proportion are aged 35 and over.
* a smaller proportion of Indigenous participants have autism as their primary disability (28% for Indigenous compared to 31% for non-Indigenous) and a higher proportion of Indigenous participants have an intellectual disability as their primary disability (30% for Indigenous compared to 27% for non-Indigenous).
* a smaller proportion of Indigenous participants live in major cities (43% for Indigenous compared to 68% for non-Indigenous), and a much higher proportion live in remote or very remote regions (11% for Indigenous compared to 1% for non-Indigenous).

Supported Independent Living (SIL) arrangements are included in the plans of 6% of Indigenous participants, compared to 7% for non-Indigenous participants. For participants aged 25 and over, SIL arrangements are included in the plans of 15% of Indigenous participants and 15% of non-Indigenous participants

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, the rate of exit from the Scheme amongst Indigenous participants has been:

* Lower for ages 0 to 14 and ages 35 to 44, driven by lower non-mortality exit rates
* Higher for ages 15 to 34 and ages 45 and over, driven by higher mortality exit rates

## Slide 8: Key points (2)

There are two charts.

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

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

* Higher for participants of all ages except 15 to 18 who have SIL arrangements included in their plans
* Higher for participants of all ages except for 19 to 24 who do not have SIL arrangements included in their plans

These charts are identical to those on slide 34.

## Slide 9: Key points (3)

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants have approximately 1% lower average payments on active plans. This is after standardising for mix of participants with SIL and the age of participants.

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants utilise slightly less of their plans (that is, utilisation of committed supports is slightly lower). Indigenous participants utilise 60% of their plans on average compared to 67% for non-Indigenous participants. This is after standardising for mix of participants with SIL and the age of participants.

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants have had a lower complaint rate for the duration of the Scheme. At March 2019, the complaint rate for Indigenous participants is 5.1%, compared to 6.5% for non-Indigenous 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants are:

* Children age 0 to 14: Indigenous participants are more likely to be able to make friends, but are less likely to participate in social and community activities compared to non-Indigenous participants. For school aged children, fewer Indigenous participants are attending school in a mainstream class and developing skills appropriate to their ability.
* Age 15 and over: Indigenous participants are less likely be happy with or feel safe in their home compared to non-Indigenous participants, and generally report poorer outcomes in respect to employment, health and wellbeing, and lifelong learning. Indigenous participants in remote communities have the lowest employment rates for all groups and reported having the least amount of choice and control.
* The families and carers of Indigenous participants are considerably less likely to have a paid job, and are more likely to be receiving a Carer Payment. The families/carers of Indigenous participants are also more likely to have friends and family they see as often as they like compared to non-Indigenous participants.

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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants are:

* Age 0 to starting school: The increase in the percentage of children who could tell their parent or carer what they want is similar for both groups.
* School age to 14: Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants experienced a deterioration in the percentage of children who could develop appropriate skills, make friends, and attend a mainstream class. However, the size of the decrease was larger for Indigenous participants.
* Age 15 to 24: Indigenous participants reported improvements in their ability to choose who supports them and to choose what they do each day, and this was higher than the equivalent rate of improvement for non-Indigenous participants.
* Age 25 and over: The percentage of participants who want more choice and control in their life increased by similar rates for both groups, and the improvement in access to health services was highest for Indigenous participants.
* Families/carers of Indigenous participants aged 0 to 14 had a smaller increase in paid employment and a larger increase in receipt of Carer Payment compared to families/carers of non-Indigenous participants.
* Indigenous participants of all ages and their families and carers were less likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them at their first plan review compared to non-Indigenous participants.

## Slide 12: Key points (6)

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

* Age 15 to 24: Indigenous participants reported a +5% improvement in employment, which was lower than the +9% improvement for non-Indigenous participants.
* Age 25 and over: The percentage of participants in paid work remained broadly stable, albeit at a considerably higher rate for non-Indigenous participants (25%) compared to Indigenous participants (12%).
* For all Indigenous participants aged 15 and over, there was a considerable increase in community and social participation from a baseline of 37% to 46%, which is equivalent to the rate of community participation for non-Indigenous participants.

Perceptions of the NDIS generally improved for Indigenous participants (and their families/carers) between their first and second year in the Scheme, and the gap between positive response rates for Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants narrowed.

## 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 access met

* Indigenous: 18,215
* Non-Indigenous: 290,371

Active participants

* Indigenous: 16,417
* Non-Indigenous: 269,598

% of active participants in the Scheme

* Indigenous: 6%
* Non-Indigenous: 94%

### 2. Access and eligibility

% Access decisions: eligible

* Indigenous: 86%
* Non-Indigenous: 85%
* Difference: 1%

% Access decisions: Ineligible

* Indigenous: 14%
* Non-Indigenous: 15%
* Difference: -1%

% Early intervention

* Indigenous: 22%
* Non-Indigenous: 18%
* Difference: 4%

### 3. Participant characteristics

% Gender: Female

* Indigenous: 35%
* Non-Indigenous: 37%
* Difference: -2%

% Primary disability: Autism

* Indigenous: 28%
* Non-Indigenous: 31%
* Difference: -3%

% Primary disability: Intellectual disability

* Indigenous: 30%
* Non-Indigenous: 27%
* Difference: 3%

% Primary disability: Psychosocial disability

* Indigenous: 9%
* Non-Indigenous: 9%
* Difference: 0%

% Level of function: Low

* Indigenous: 26%
* Non-Indigenous: 29%
* Difference: -3%

% Remote or very remote

* Indigenous: 11%
* Non-Indigenous: 1%
* Difference: 10%

% Culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD)

* Indigenous: 5%
* Non-Indigenous: 9%
* Difference: -4%

% In Supported Independent Living (SIL)

* Indigenous: 6%
* Non-Indigenous: 7%
* Difference: -1%

## 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)

* Indigenous: $74,519
* Non-Indigenous: $65,701
* Difference: 13%

Average committed supports: SIL (standardised for age)

* Indigenous: $349,421
* Non-Indigenous: $293,752
* Difference: 19%

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

* Indigenous: $53,527
* Non-Indigenous: $48,287
* Difference: 11%

Average payments: Overall (standardised for age and SIL)

* Indigenous: $38,182
* Non-Indigenous: $38,713
* Difference: -1%

Average payments: SIL (standardised for age)

* Indigenous: $213,338
* Non-Indigenous: $199,012
* Difference: 7%

Average payments: non-SIL (standardised for age)

* Indigenous: $23,034
* Non-Indigenous: $24,851
* Difference: -7%

Utilisation: Overall (standardised for age and SIL)

* Indigenous: 60%
* Non-Indigenous: 67%
* Difference: -7%

Utilisation: SIL (standardised for age)

* Indigenous: 81%
* Non-Indigenous: 85%
* Difference: -3%

Utilisation: non-SIL (standardised for age)

* Indigenous: 49%
* Non-Indigenous: 58%
* Difference: -9%

### 2. Participant experience

Exit rate: Overall

* Indigenous: 1.71%
* Non-Indigenous: 1.75%
* Difference: -0.04%

Rate of participant complaints at 31 March 2019

* Indigenous: 5.07%
* Non-Indigenous: 6.51%
* Difference: -1.43%

### 3. Outcomes

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

* Indigenous: 18%
* Non-Indigenous: 22%
* Difference: -4%

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

* Indigenous: 40%
* Non-Indigenous: 44%
* Difference: -4%

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

* Indigenous: 12%
* Non-Indigenous: 25%
* Difference: -14%

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

* Indigenous: 49%
* Non-Indigenous: 47%
* Difference: 2%

## Slide 15: Proportion of Indigenous 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 by Indigenous status and by age group as per SDAC 2015 and the Census 2016.

The overall prevalence of disability amongst Indigenous people is estimated to be 7% by both the SDAC 2015 and Census 2016, compared to 5% for non-Indigenous people.

Prevalence of disability amongst Indigenous people is estimated to be 5-6% at ages 0-14, 3-4% at ages 15-34, 7-8% at ages 35-54 and 16-18% at ages 55+, as per SDAC 2015 and the Census 2016. The estimated prevalence rates amongst non-Indigenous people are lower than for Indigenous people across all age groups, and the difference is largest in the 35-54 and 55+ age groups. Prevalence of disability amongst non-Indigenous people is estimated to be 3-4% at ages 0-14, 2% at ages 15-34, 2-3% at ages 35-54 and 10-11% at ages 55+, as per SDAC 2015 and the Census 2016.

Both surveys show that the prevalence of disability amongst Indigenous people is approximately 1.5 to 2 times that of non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people.

Note: The SDAC proportion reflects percentage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander / non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people with a profound/severe core activity limitation. The Census proportion reflects the percentage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander / non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people with a need for assistance with core activities.

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

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

The methodology for estimating the number of Indigenous 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, Indigenous status, sex and age group.
2. Use the above tabulation to calculate the number of Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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 Indigenous as the ratio of the number of Indigenous 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 identify as Indigenous 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 Indigenous

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

The actual proportion of participants in the NDIS who are Indigenous decreases with age, from 7% at ages 0-14 to 3% at ages 55+. The same decreasing pattern is observed in the SDAC 2015 and Census 2016 and is consistent with the expected proportions of Indigenous participants across age groups.

The proportion of Indigenous participants in the NDIS has been lower than expected across all age groups. The scheme is over half way towards reaching a steady intake state and it is possible phasing order impacts the mix of participants. The number of participants with missing or ‘not stated’ Indigenous status also continues to be a limitation when comparing actual experience against expected.

Note: The SDAC and Census measures of disability are not necessarily consistent with each other nor consistent with the conditions for eligibility for the NDIS, but are helpful for comparing between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people.

## Slide 21: Access and eligibility

Comparison of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participant experience

## Slide 22: Phasing process

A chart displays the distribution of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants by pathway status. 60% (18,215) of Indigenous participants have a pathway status of eligible, 10% (3,139) have a status of ineligible, 1% have a status of revoked/ceased, 1% have a status of closed, 5% have a status of in progress, 4% have a status of withdrawn, 16% (4,871) have a status of cancelled and 4% have a status of draft.

The distribution of Indigenous participants by pathway status is broadly consistent with the distribution of non-Indigenous participants by pathway status.

## Slide 23: Phasing process - cancellations

A chart displays the distribution of cancelled access requests of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants. 28% (1,373) of the cancelled access requests of Indigenous participants have a status of ARF not return, 33% (1,598) have a status of evidence not provided, 7% have a status of phase in decline and 32% have a status of unable to contact.

A smaller proportion of non-Indigenous participants have cancelled access requests arising from “Access Request Form (ARF) not returned” (20%) and “Unable to contact” (27%) compared to Indigenous participants.

## Slide 24: Participant characteristics

Comparison of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participant experience

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

There are two charts.

The first chart displays the distribution of active participants by jurisdiction (state/territory). The secondary axis shows the proportion of active participants within each jurisdiction that are Indigenous.

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, a significantly larger proportion of Indigenous participants live in the Northern Territory (7.2% of Indigenous participants compared to 0.4% of non-Indigenous participants) or Queensland (24% for Indigenous compared to 17% for non-Indigenous), and a significantly lower proportion live in Victoria (11% of Indigenous participants compared to 27% of non-Indigenous participants). 38% of Indigenous participants live in NSW, 8% in TAS, 2% in the NT and 6% in WA, broadly similar to the percentages of non-Indigenous 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-Indigenous participants, a larger proportion of Indigenous participants are accessing the Scheme via early intervention (22% of Indigenous participants compared to 18% of non-Indigenous participants). This is primarily driven by the higher proportion of Indigenous participants who are aged 0 to 14, compared to non-Indigenous 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 group. The secondary axis shows the proportion of active participants within each age group that are Indigenous. Indigenous participants have tended to be younger compared to non-Indigenous participants. In particular, a higher proportion of Indigenous participants are aged 0 to 34 and a lower proportion are aged 35 or over.

The second chart displays the distribution of active participants by gender. The secondary axis shows the proportion of active participants within each gender that are Indigenous. Compared to non-Indigenous participants, a higher proportion of Indigenous participants are male.

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. The secondary axis shows the proportion of active participants within each primary disability group that are Indigenous. Compared to non-Indigenous participants, a larger proportion of Indigenous participants have a primary intellectual disability, development delay or global developmental delay.

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. The secondary axis shows the proportion of active participants within each level of function that are Indigenous. Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants are more likely to have a high level of function, and are less likely to have a medium or low level of function.

The second chart displays the distribution of active participants by Supported Independent Living (SIL) status. The proportion of Indigenous participants with SIL in their plans is slightly lower than the proportion of non-Indigenous participants with SIL in their plans. The proportion of participants with SIL in their plans is the same for Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants aged 25 and over (15% for both groups).

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. Compared to non-Indigenous participants, a significantly higher proportion of Indigenous participants live in ‘Remote’ or ‘Very Remote’ regions, and a significantly lower proportion live in ‘Major Cities’.

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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants.

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

The overall exit rate for Indigenous participants is 1.71%, compared to 1.75% for non-Indigenous participants.

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

* Lower for ages 0 to 18 and ages 35 to 44, driven by lower non-mortality exit rates
* Higher for ages 19 to 34 and ages 45 and over, driven by higher mortality exit rates

The exit rate for Indigenous participants is approximately 3% for ages 45-54, 6% for ages 55-64 and 8% for ages 65+. This compares to an exit rate for non-Indigenous participants of approximately 2% for ages 45-54, 3.5% for ages 55-64 and 5.5% for ages 65+.

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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants.

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants have had a lower rate of complaint across all quarters. The complaint rate for Indigenous participants was 4.3% in December 2016, peaked at 5.7% in March 2018 and has fallen steadily since then to 5.1% at March 2019. The complaint rate for non-Indigenous participants was increasing over the same period, from 5.6% in December 2016 to 6.6% in December 2019, only decreasing in the most recent quarter (March 2019) to 6.5%.

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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants and the remoteness and age profiles of the total population.

## Slide 32: Average committed supports

Comparison of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participant experience

## Slide 33: Average committed supports by SIL status

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

Unadjusted average committed supports for Indigenous SIL participants are $354k, around 20% higher than actual average committed supports for non-Indigenous SIL participants. Actual average committed supports for non-SIL participants are very similar for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, at around $48k. Standardising has little impact on average committed supports for Indigenous participants or non-Indigenous SIL participants. However, for Indigenous non-SIL participants, standardised average committed supports are 11% higher than the actual committed supports at $54k.

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants have higher average committed supports, for both SIL and non-SIL participants.

Average committed supports are significantly higher for SIL participants than for non-SIL participants.

Note 1: The age-standardised average committed supports have been standardised for the difference between the age profiles of Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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.

## Slide 34: Average committed supports by age

There are two charts.

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

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

* Lower for SIL participants aged 15 to 18
* Higher for SIL participants aged 19 and over
* Higher for non-SIL participants in all age groups except 19 to 24

For Indigenous SIL participants, average committed supports are relatively similar across age groups, at around $325k to $390k, with no clear trend. This compares to non-Indigenous SIL participants, for which average committed supports decrease steadily as age increases, from about $435k for ages 15 to 18, to about $264k for ages 65 and over.

For both Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants, average committed supports increase significantly as age increases. Both cohorts are around $45k for ages 15 to 18, increase to about $88k for Indigenous participants and about $76k for non-Indigenous participants for all ages 45 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 35: Average committed supports by disability type

There are two charts.

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

Compared to non-Indigenous participants average committed supports for Indigenous participants are higher across all disability types. In particular, average committed supports for Indigenous participants with a psychosocial disability or spinal cord injury are higher than those of non-Indigenous participants.

For Indigenous SIL participants, the disability types associated with the highest average committed supports include spinal cord injury and ‘other neurological’, both over $425k. Most other disability types have average committed supports in the range $250k to $370k.

Average committed supports by disability type are more varied for non-SIL participants. Participants with a developmental delay, hearing impairment or other sensory/speech have around $10k to $15k in average committed supports for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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 range of $60k to $100k, where participants with a spinal cord injury have the highest average committed supports for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants.

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

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

## Slide 36: Average committed supports by remoteness

There are two charts.

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

For both SIL and non-SIL participants, average committed supports are higher amongst Indigenous participants across all remoteness categories compared to non-Indigenous participants.

In major cities, average committed supports are around $290k for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous SIL participants. Supports are significantly higher for Indigenous participants compared to non-Indigenous participants in areas with a ‘population greater than 50,000’, at around $387k compared to $316k. In remote and very remote areas, Indigenous participants have higher average committed supports, at around $485k, compared to $435k for non-Indigenous participants.

For non-SIL participants, average committed supports are similar between Indigenous participants and non-Indigenous participants in most non-remote categories. Average committed supports in major cities through to areas with ‘population less than 5000’ are all around $49k for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, albeit they are slightly higher amongst Indigenous participants. In remote areas, average committed supports for Indigenous participants are around $68k (17% higher than non-Indigenous), and in very remote areas they are around $80k (22% higher than non-Indigenous).

Note 1: Average committed supports have been standardised for the difference between the age profile of Indigenous / non-Indigenous 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous participant experience

## Slide 38: Average payments by SIL status

A chart displays average payments by SIL status for Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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.

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants with SIL supports have higher average payments.

Conversely, Indigenous participants without SIL supports have lower payments on average compared to non- Indigenous participants.

Actual average payments for Indigenous SIL participants are $218k, around 9% higher than actual average payments for non-Indigenous SIL participants. Actual average payments for non-SIL participants are $21k for Indigenous participants, 15% lower than for non-Indigenous participants. Standardising average payments has very little impact for non-Indigenous participants. For Indigenous SIL participants, average payments decrease slightly ($5k), closer to the average payments for non-Indigenous SIL participants, and for Indigenous non-SIL participants, average payments increase slightly ($2k), closer to the average payments for non-Indigenous non-SIL participants.

## Slide 39: Average payments by age

There are two charts.

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

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, average payments for Indigenous participants are:

* Lower for SIL participants aged 15 to 18 ($98k compared to $178k)
* Higher for SIL participants aged 19 and over
* Lower for non-SIL participants in all age groups except for the 45 to 54 age group and participants aged 65 and over.

Average payments are around $200k to $235k for Indigenous SIL participants aged 19 to 64, compared to average payments of around $190k to $225k for non-Indigenous SIL participants aged 19 to 64.

For both Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants, average payments increase steadily with age prior to a peak at ages 25 to 34 (around $35k). Average payments for ages 35 to 64 are around $32k, before increasing to around $41k 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous SIL participants. The second chart displays average payments by disability type for Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants.

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

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

Average payments by disability type are higher amongst Indigenous SIL participants compared to non-Indigenous participants across all disability types except spinal cord injury.

Conversely, average payments are lower amongst non-SIL Indigenous participants across most disability types compared to non-Indigenous participants.

For Indigenous SIL participants, the disability types associated with the highest average payments include autism, cerebral palsy and ‘other neurological’, at $240k to $280k. Most other disability types have average payments in the range $165k to $220k.

Average payments by disability type are more varied for non-SIL participants. Participants with a developmental delay, hearing impairment or other sensory/speech have around $6k to $9k in average payments for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants. Participants with autism or visual impairment have average payments of around $15k. Participants with most other disability types have average payments in the $35k to $45k range, with spinal cord injury having the highest average payments for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants.

## Slide 41: Average payments by remoteness

There are two charts.

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

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

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

Compared to non-Indigenous SIL participants, average payments for Indigenous SIL participants are lower across most categories, but notably higher in remote areas.

For non-SIL participants, average payments are lower across most categories of remoteness amongst Indigenous participants compared to non-Indigenous participants.

In major cities, average payments are $170k for Indigenous and $191k for non-Indigenous SIL participants. In remote areas, Indigenous participants have higher average payments, at around $329k, compared to $240k for non-Indigenous participants. However, average payments in very remote areas are significantly lower than in remote areas, and on par with average payments to participants in areas with populations between 5,000 and 50,000 (around $180k to $190k).

For non-SIL participants, average payments are similar between Indigenous participants and non-Indigenous participants in most non-remote categories. Average payments in major cities through to areas with ‘population between 5,000 and 15,000’ are all around $20k to $25k for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants. In remote areas, average payments for Indigenous participants are $15k (22% lower than non-Indigenous), and in very remote areas they are $20k (2% lower than non-Indigenous).

## Slide 42: Utilisation of committed supports

Comparison of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participant experience

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

A chart displays utilisation of committed supports by SIL status for Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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 Indigenous / non- Indigenous participants and the age profile of the total population. While remoteness and time in the scheme are known drivers of lower utilisation, standardising for these factors have a minimal impact on average utilisation rates (in the order of 1%).

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants have lower average utilisation for both SIL and non-SIL. 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.

Unadjusted average utilisation for Indigenous SIL participants is 82%, 3 percentage points (pp) lower than the unadjusted average utilisation for non-Indigenous SIL participants (i.e. 85%). Unadjusted average utilisation for non-SIL participants is 51% for Indigenous participants, 7pp lower than for non-Indigenous participants.

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

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

Note 1: Average utilisation of committed supports has been standardised for the difference between the age profile of Indigenous / non- Indigenous 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, utilisation increases with plan number. For Indigenous participants, this is from 36% for participants on their 1st plan to 66% for participants on plans 3, 4 and 5+. For non-Indigenous participants, this is from 45% for participants on their 1st plan to 73% for participants on plans 4 and 5+.

The difference between the average utilisation of Indigenous and non-Indigenous is relatively similar across all plan numbers, with the exception of participants on their 3rd plan. For plans 1, 2, 4 and 5+, utilisation for Indigenous participants is around 6pp to 9pp lower than that of non-Indigenous participants. For participants on their 3rd plan, utilisation is 3pp lower.

## Slide 45: Utilisation of committed supports by age

There are two charts.

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

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants have lower average utilisation in every age group, for both SIL and non-SIL participants.

Average utilisation is around 80% to 85% for Indigenous SIL participants aged 19 to 64, decreasing as age increases. This compares to average utilisation of around 85% for non-Indigenous SIL participants aged 19 to 64, stable across all age groups. Utilisation for participants aged 15 to 18 is lower for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, but the difference is larger for Indigenous participants (average utilisation of 66%, 19pp lower than that of those aged 19 to 24).

For both Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants, average utilisation decreases with age, with the exception of a small increase for ages 7 to 14 compared to ages 0 to 6 and for ages 25 to 34 compared to ages 19 to 24. For Indigenous non-SIL participants, average utilisation falls from a peak of 59% for ages, 7 to 14 to a low of 38% for ages 55 to 64 (ages 65 and over have average utilisation of 42%). For non-Indigenous non-SIL participants, average utilisation falls from a peak of 66% for ages 7 to 14 to a low of 45% 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous SIL participants. The second chart displays utilisation of committed supports by disability type for Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants.

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, average utilisation of committed supports is lower for Indigenous participants across almost all disability types, with exceptions being multiple sclerosis, other disabilities, visual impairment, and, for SIL participants only, autism and other neurological disabilities.

For Indigenous SIL participants, average utilisation is similar across all disability types, all in the range of 78% to 84% (except autism at 88%). For non-Indigenous SIL participants, average utilisation is similar across all disability types, all in the range of 73% to 85%.

Non-SIL participants with autism, cerebral palsy, spinal cord injury or other disabilities have the highest average utilisation of between 58% and 64%. Average utilisation is lower for Indigenous participants with autism, cerebral palsy or spinal cord injury compared to non-Indigenous participants.

Note 1: Average utilisation of committed supports has been standardised for the difference between the age profile of Indigenous / non- Indigenous 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous SIL participants. The second chart displays utilisation of committed supports by remoteness for Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants.

Across all categories, average utilisation is lower for Indigenous participants, compared to non-Indigenous participants. The difference between the average utilisation for Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants increases with remoteness. Utilisation for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous non-SIL participants decreased with remoteness.

In major mities and areas with population greater than 15,000, average utilisation is around 83% for Indigenous and 85% for non-Indigenous SIL participants. In remote areas, Indigenous participants have similar average utilisation to non-Indigenous participants, at around 80%. However, average utilisation in very remote areas is significantly lower than in remote areas, at 67% for Indigenous participants (insufficient data for non-Indigenous participants).

For non-SIL participants, average utilisation for Indigenous participants is around 5pp to 8pp lower than that of non-Indigenous participants in non-remote categories. Average utilisation for Indigenous non-SIL participants in major cities is 53%, decreasing steadily as remoteness increases, to around 48% in areas with population less than 5,000. A similar pattern is observed for non-Indigenous non-SIL participants.

In remote and very remote areas, average utilisation for Indigenous participants is around 31%, around 17pp to 20pp lower than utilisation in non-remote areas. This difference was larger than that of non-Indigenous participants, who have average utilisation of 45% and 38% in remote and very remote areas, respectively, around 10pp to 15pp lower than that of non-Indigenous participants in non-remote areas.

Note 1: Average utilisation of committed supports has been standardised for the difference between the age profile of Indigenous / non- Indigenous 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

### 1. 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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: Baseline outcomes and remoteness

Prior research1 has shown that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people living in remote or very remote areas have poorer outcomes in several areas of health and welfare compared to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in non-remote areas

Furthermore, 31% of Indigenous participants living in remote or very remote areas have a CALD background compared to 1% of Indigenous participants in non-remote areas. This may impact the ability of Indigenous participants in remote communities to access the Scheme and engage with disability service providers.

As a result, baseline outcomes2 for Indigenous participants have also been analysed by the remoteness status of the participant.3

Footnotes:

1. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2015. The health and welfare of Australia’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples 2015. Cat. no. IHW 147. Canberra: AIHW
2. There is currently insufficient longitudinal data to credibly analyse longitudinal outcomes by both Indigenous status and remoteness
3. As defined by categories 6 and 7 in the Modified Monash Model 2015

## Slide 52: 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 domains 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 53: 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 54: Participants from birth to before starting school

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 55: Participants aged 0 to starting school: Baseline outcomes

A chart displays the following selected baseline outcomes for participants from age 0 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, the proportion who are welcomed or actively included - S/CP

Outcomes are shown for:

* Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-Indigenous participants
* Remote Indigenous participants
* Non-remote Indigenous participants

At baseline, the parents and carers of Indigenous participants reported better relationship outcomes but worse social participation outcomes for their child compared to the parents/carers of non-Indigenous participants. Indigenous participants in remote areas had the highest rate of participation in community/cultural/religious activities of all groups.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

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

* Indigenous: 67%
* Non-Indigenous: 67%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 68%
* Remote Indigenous: 58%

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

* Indigenous: 71%
* Non-Indigenous: 71%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 72%
* Remote Indigenous: 65%

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

* Indigenous: 65%
* Non-Indigenous: 61%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 66%
* Remote Indigenous: 54%

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

* Indigenous: 47%
* Non-Indigenous: 52%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 46%
* Remote Indigenous: 62%

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

* Indigenous: 64%
* Non-Indigenous: 63%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 65%
* Remote Indigenous: 54%

## Slide 56: Participants aged 0 to starting school: Longitudinal outcomes

A chart displays the change in the outcomes of participants from age 0 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:

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

After one year in the Scheme, the parents/carers of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants reported improvements in most of the outcome domains, the largest improvement being made in the choice and control domain.

However, improvements in outcomes were slightly smaller for Indigenous participants compared to non-Indigenous participants with the exception of social and community participation.

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

* Indigenous: 4.5%
* Non-Indigenous: 7.0%

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

* Indigenous: 11.3%
* Non-Indigenous: 13.3%

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

* Indigenous: 4.6%
* Non-Indigenous: 5.2%

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

* Indigenous: 1.6%
* Non-Indigenous: 1.3%

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

* Indigenous: 2.5%
* Non-Indigenous: 4.9%

## Slide 57: Participants aged 0 to starting school: Has the NDIS helped?

A chart displays the proportion of participants from age 0 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:

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

For the parents and carers of Indigenous participants, perceptions of the NDIS have improved between year one and year two in the daily living and choice and control domains, but deteriorated in the relationship and social participation domains.

In general, parents and carers of Indigenous participants were less likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped their child compared to the parents and carers of non-Indigenous participants across each of the outcome domains.

Note: Results for Indigenous participants in Year 2 should be interpreted with caution as numbers are small.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

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

* Indigenous year 1: 90%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 92%
* Indigenous year 2: 98%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 94%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 88%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 90%
* Indigenous year 2: 90%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 92%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 82%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 83%
* Indigenous year 2: 88%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 85%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 72%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 74%
* Indigenous year 2: 68%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 76%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 57%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 61%
* Indigenous year 2: 53%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 63%

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

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 59: 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:

* Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-Indigenous participants
* Non-Remote Indigenous participants
* Remote Indigenous participants

At baseline, the parents and carers of Indigenous participants reported better relationship outcomes for their child compared to non-Indigenous participants, being highest for those in remote communities.

However, Indigenous participants had poorer social participation outcomes, were less likely to be developing skills appropriate to their ability and circumstances, and had lower attendance in mainstream classes, compared to non-Indigenous participants.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

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

* Indigenous: 25%
* Non-Indigenous: 28%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 26%
* Remote Indigenous: 21%

### Child is becoming more independent - DL

* Indigenous: 38%
* Non-Indigenous: 40%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 38%
* Remote Indigenous: 37%

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

* Indigenous: 66%
* Non-Indigenous: 65%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 66%
* Remote Indigenous: 58%

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

* Indigenous: 64%
* Non-Indigenous: 61%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 63%
* Remote Indigenous: 73%

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

* Indigenous: 14%
* Non-Indigenous: 12%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 13%
* Remote Indigenous: 27%

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

* Indigenous: 32%
* Non-Indigenous: 36%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 31%
* Remote Indigenous: 32%

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

* Indigenous: 76%
* Non-Indigenous: 75%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 75%
* Remote Indigenous: 78%

### Child attends school in mainstream class - LL

* Indigenous: 56%
* Non-Indigenous: 62%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 56%
* Remote Indigenous: 62%

## Slide 60: 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:

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

After one year in the Scheme, the parents and carers of Indigenous participants reported a deterioration in their child’s ability to develop appropriate skills, make friends with people outside the family, and their attendance in mainstream classes.

The parents and carers of non-Indigenous participants also reported deteriorations in these outcomes, however the size of the change was larger for Indigenous participants.

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

* Indigenous: -2.9%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.1%

### Child is becoming more independent - DL

* Indigenous: 2.1%
* Non-Indigenous: 4.2%

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

* Indigenous: 0.9%
* Non-Indigenous: 1.4%

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

* Indigenous: -2.2%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.4%

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

* Indigenous: 0.1%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.1%

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

* Indigenous: 0.6%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.3%

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

* Indigenous: -0.7%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.1%

### Child attends school in mainstream class - LL

* Indigenous: -3.1%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.9%

## Slide 61: Participants from starting school to age 14: Has the NDIS helped?

A chart displays the proportion of participants from before 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:

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

For the parents and carers of Indigenous participants, perceptions of the NDIS have improved between year one and year two in all outcome domains with the exception of education.

Across each review year, the parents and carers of Indigenous participants were less likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped their child in each of the outcome domains compared to the families and carers of non-Indigenous participants.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

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

* Indigenous year 1: 47%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 58%
* Indigenous year 2: 54%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 65%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 32%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 37%
* Indigenous year 2: 32%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 39%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 38%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 47%
* Indigenous year 2: 43%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 50%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 36%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 42%
* Indigenous year 2: 39%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 46%

## Slide 62: Participants aged 15 to 24

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 63: 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:

* Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-Indigenous participants
* Non-Remote Indigenous participants
* Remote Indigenous participants

More Indigenous participants reported that they were able to choose what they do each day at baseline compared to non-Indigenous participants. However, Indigenous participants in remote communities were considerably less likely to choose what they do each day and choose who supports them compared to all other participants.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

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

* Indigenous: 36%
* Non-Indigenous: 36%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 36%
* Remote Indigenous: 38%

### Chooses who supports them - CC

* Indigenous: 35%
* Non-Indigenous: 35%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 36%
* Remote Indigenous: 26%

### Chooses what they do each day - CC

* Indigenous: 48%
* Non-Indigenous: 43%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 49%
* Remote Indigenous: 38%

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

* Indigenous: 19%
* Non-Indigenous: 20%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 20%
* Remote Indigenous: 16%

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

* Indigenous: 82%
* Non-Indigenous: 81%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 82%
* Remote Indigenous: 75%

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

* Indigenous: 32%
* Non-Indigenous: 32%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 32%
* Remote Indigenous: 36%

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

* Indigenous: 32%
* Non-Indigenous: 34%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 32%
* Remote Indigenous: 33%

## Slide 64: 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:

* Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-Indigenous participants
* Non-Remote Indigenous participants
* Remote Indigenous participants

Indigenous participants reported considerably worse outcomes in the home and work domains at baseline compared to non-Indigenous participants. Health and lifelong learning outcomes were also poorer for Indigenous participants.

Indigenous participants in remote communities were the least likely to have a paid job or be a volunteer at baseline compared to all other participant groups, but were the most likely to rate their health as good, very good or excellent.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Happy with their home - HM

* Indigenous: 70%
* Non-Indigenous: 81%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 69%
* Remote Indigenous: 75%

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

* Indigenous: 77%
* Non-Indigenous: 85%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 77%
* Remote Indigenous: 80%

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

* Indigenous: 65%
* Non-Indigenous: 68%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 64%
* Remote Indigenous: 74%

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

* Indigenous: 64%
* Non-Indigenous: 69%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 64%
* Remote Indigenous: 67%

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

* Indigenous: 27%
* Non-Indigenous: 30%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 26%
* Remote Indigenous: 36%

### Has a paid job - WK

* Indigenous: 11%
* Non-Indigenous: 18%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 11%
* Remote Indigenous: 7%

### Is a volunteer - WK

* Indigenous: 9%
* Non-Indigenous: 13%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 9%
* Remote Indigenous: 4%

## Slide 65: 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:

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

After one year in the Scheme, Indigenous participants increased their rates of paid employment and community participation by +3% and +4%, respectively. However, the rate of improvement in community participation was just over half the equivalent increase for non-Indigenous participants.

Indigenous participants also reported improvements in their ability to choose who supports them and to choose what they do each day, and this was higher than the equivalent rate of improvement for non-Indigenous 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

* Indigenous: -0.2%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.5%

### Chooses who supports them - CC

* Indigenous: 3.3%
* Non-Indigenous: 1.0%

### Chooses what they do each day - CC

* Indigenous: 2.5%
* Non-Indigenous: 0.7%

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

* Indigenous: 0.0%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.8%

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

* Indigenous: 5.2%
* Non-Indigenous: 5.8%

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

* Indigenous: 0.3%
* Non-Indigenous: 1.3%

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

* Indigenous: 3.5%
* Non-Indigenous: 6.5%

### Happy with their home - HM

* Indigenous: -1.1%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.2%

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

* Indigenous: -2.3%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.5%

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

* Indigenous: 0.2%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.8%

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

* Indigenous: 2.2%
* Non-Indigenous: 1.9%

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

* Indigenous: -2.9%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.6%

### Has a paid job - WK

* Indigenous: 3.1%
* Non-Indigenous: 3.0%

### Is a volunteer - WK

* Indigenous: 1.0%
* Non-Indigenous: 0.9%

## Slide 66: 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:

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

Indigenous 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.

Indigenous participants were generally less likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them compared to non-Indigenous participants, although the size of the differential reduced in the second year for all domains except work.

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

* Indigenous year 1: 52%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 59%
* Indigenous year 2: 63%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 64%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 52%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 58%
* Indigenous year 2: 61%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 65%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 42%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 49%
* Indigenous year 2: 50%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 53%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 20%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 20%
* Indigenous year 2: 18%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 18%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 33%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 40%
* Indigenous year 2: 40%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 45%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 27%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 35%
* Indigenous year 2: 34%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 37%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 15%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 18%
* Indigenous year 2: 12%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 17%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 45%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 53%
* Indigenous year 2: 56%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 58%

## Slide 67: Participants aged 25 and over

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 68: 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:

* Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-Indigenous participants
* Non-Remote Indigenous participants
* Remote Indigenous participants

Indigenous participants were considerably less likely to be happy with their home or feel safe in their home at baseline compared to non-Indigenous participants. The choice and control and relationship domains also showed poorer outcomes for Indigenous participants.

Indigenous participants in remote communities had the worst reported outcomes of all groups for choosing who supports them, but had the highest positive response rate to the community participation question.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Chooses who supports them - CC

* Indigenous: 50%
* Non-Indigenous: 55%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 51%
* Remote Indigenous: 44%

### Chooses what they do each day - CC

* Indigenous: 60%
* Non-Indigenous: 64%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 60%
* Remote Indigenous: 57%

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

* Indigenous: 25%
* Non-Indigenous: 27%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 26%
* Remote Indigenous: 19%

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

* Indigenous: 80%
* Non-Indigenous: 77%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 81%
* Remote Indigenous: 73%

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

* Indigenous: 32%
* Non-Indigenous: 29%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 32%
* Remote Indigenous: 31%

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

* Indigenous: 38%
* Non-Indigenous: 37%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 36%
* Remote Indigenous: 46%

### Happy with their home - HM

* Indigenous: 63%
* Non-Indigenous: 74%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 62%
* Remote Indigenous: 64%

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

* Indigenous: 66%
* Non-Indigenous: 74%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 65%
* Remote Indigenous: 68%

## Slide 69: 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:

* Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote participants)
* Non-Indigenous participants
* Non-Remote Indigenous participants
* Remote Indigenous participants

Compared to non-Indigenous participants, Indigenous participants had worse reported outcomes for all questions in the health and wellbeing and work domains. Indigenous participants were also less likely to participate in education and training, however those who did were more likely to do so in a mainstream setting.

Indigenous participants in remote communities had the poorest work and learning outcomes, and were less likely to be able to access health services, compared to all other participants.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

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

* Indigenous: 41%
* Non-Indigenous: 47%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 40%
* Remote Indigenous: 45%

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

* Indigenous: 60%
* Non-Indigenous: 66%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 61%
* Remote Indigenous: 56%

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

* Indigenous: 9%
* Non-Indigenous: 12%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 10%
* Remote Indigenous: 4%

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

* Indigenous: 57%
* Non-Indigenous: 51%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 56%
* Remote Indigenous: 68%

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

* Indigenous: 37%
* Non-Indigenous: 35%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 39%
* Remote Indigenous: 27%

### Has a paid job - WK

* Indigenous: 12%
* Non-Indigenous: 24%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 13%
* Remote Indigenous: 8%

### Is a volunteer - WK

* Indigenous: 9%
* Non-Indigenous: 12%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 10%
* Remote Indigenous: 6%

## Slide 70: 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:

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

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

The improvement in access to health services is highest for Indigenous participants, although non-Indigenous participants started with a higher baseline response.

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

### Chooses who supports them - CC

* Indigenous: -0.3%
* Non-Indigenous: 0.2%

### Chooses what they do each day - CC

* Indigenous: 0.6%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.2%

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

* Indigenous: 0.3%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.3%

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

* Indigenous: 4.4%
* Non-Indigenous: 5.0%

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

* Indigenous: 1.0%
* Non-Indigenous: 0.5%

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

* Indigenous: 4.6%
* Non-Indigenous: 5.2%

### Happy with their home - HM

* Indigenous: 0.9%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.5%

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

* Indigenous: 0.7%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.3%

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

* Indigenous: -0.7%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.9%

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

* Indigenous: 3.5%
* Non-Indigenous: 1.8%

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

* Indigenous: -0.8%
* Non-Indigenous: 1.3%

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

* Indigenous: -5.8%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.8%

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

* Indigenous: -1.5%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.1%

### Has a paid job - WK

* Indigenous: -0.4%
* Non-Indigenous: -0.9%

### Is a volunteer - WK

* Indigenous: -0.3%
* Non-Indigenous: 0.1%

## Slide 71: 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:

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

Indigenous 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 their first year, Indigenous participants were less likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them compared to non-Indigenous participants. However, by the second year this gap had closed for the daily living and social and community participation questions.

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

* Indigenous year 1: 60%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 67%
* Indigenous year 2: 71%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 74%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 65%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 71%
* Indigenous year 2: 79%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 79%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 50%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 51%
* Indigenous year 2: 57%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 59%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 28%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 28%
* Indigenous year 2: 28%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 29%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 44%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 49%
* Indigenous year 2: 51%
* Non-Indigenous 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

* Indigenous year 1: 26%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 29%
* Indigenous year 2: 31%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 32%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 15%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 19%
* Indigenous year 2: 15%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 19%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 55%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 58%
* Indigenous year 2: 67%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 65%

## Slide 72: Participants aged 15 and over: Employment and community participation

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 73: 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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 Indigenous participants in paid work increased from a baseline of 13% to 18% in year two for those aged 15 to 24. In comparison, non-Indigenous participants aged 15 to 24 had a higher increase in employment rates from 13% 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 considerably higher rate for non-Indigenous participants (25%) compared to Indigenous participants (12%).

Overall, the percentage of participants in paid employment has increased from 12% to 14% for Indigenous participants, and from 23% to 25% for non-Indigenous participants.

Note: Although participants employment outcomes vary greatly with remoteness, it is not a significant driver of the difference in the proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants in paid employment.

## Slide 74: 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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 Indigenous participants aged 15 and over, there was a considerable increase in community and social participation from a baseline of 37% to 46% in year two. The corresponding increase for non-Indigenous participants was slightly higher, from 35% at baseline to 46% in year two. Overall, the percentage of Indigenous participants and non-Indigenous participants who are engaged in community and social activities is the same after two years in the Scheme.

The percentage of Indigenous participants aged 15 to 24 engaging in community and social activities increased from a baseline of 32% to 40% in year two. In comparison, the percentage of non-Indigenous participants aged 15 to 24 engaging in community and social activities increased from 31% at baseline to 44% in year two.

The percentage of Indigenous participants aged 25 and over engaging in community and social activities increased from a baseline of 41% to 49% in year two. In comparison, the percentage of non-Indigenous participants aged 25 and over engaging in community and social activities increased from 36% at baseline to 47% in year two.

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

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 76: 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 Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote)
* The families and carers of non-Indigenous participants
* The families and carers of non-remote Indigenous participants
* The families and carers of remote Indigenous participants.

The percentage of families/carers in a paid job was considerably lower at baseline for Indigenous participants compared to non-Indigenous participants. The families and carers of Indigenous participants were also more likely to be receiving Carer Payment, although those living in remote communities were considerably less likely to be receiving both Carer Payment and Carer Allowance.

Families/carers of Indigenous participants were more likely to have friends and family they see as often as they like at baseline, and this increased further for those in remote areas.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Receiving Carer Payment

* Indigenous: 32%
* Non-Indigenous: 22%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 32%
* Remote Indigenous: 24%

### Receiving Carer Allowance

* Indigenous: 51%
* Non-Indigenous: 52%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 52%
* Remote Indigenous: 37%

### Has a paid job

* Indigenous: 29%
* Non-Indigenous: 48%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 29%
* Remote Indigenous: 30%

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

* Indigenous: 76%
* Non-Indigenous: 77%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 77%
* Remote Indigenous: 60%

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

* Indigenous: 49%
* Non-Indigenous: 43%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 48%
* Remote Indigenous: 62%

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

* Indigenous: 86%
* Non-Indigenous: 86%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 87%
* Remote Indigenous: 80%

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

* Indigenous: 71%
* Non-Indigenous: 72%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 71%
* Remote Indigenous: 76%

## Slide 77: 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 Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote)
* The families and carers of non-Indigenous participants

After one year in the Scheme, the percentage of families and carers of Indigenous participants who had a paid job increased 0.3%, compared to a 2.2% increase for the families and carers of non-Indigenous participants. There was also a larger increase in the percentage of families/carers of Indigenous participants receiving a Carer Payment, while both groups had a significant increase in the proportion of families/carers receiving Carer Allowance.

The improvement in the proportion of families and carers of Indigenous participants who felt confident in supporting their child’s development was lower compared to the families and carers of non-Indigenous participants. However, the percentage of families and carers who rated their health as good, very good or excellent decreased by a smaller amount for the families/carers of Indigenous participants compared to non-Indigenous participants.

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

### Receiving Carer Payment

* Indigenous: 2.1%
* Non-Indigenous: 0.8%

### Receiving Carer Allowance

* Indigenous: 6.1%
* Non-Indigenous: 7.1%

### Has a paid job

* Indigenous: 0.3%
* Non-Indigenous: 2.2%

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

* Indigenous: -0.2%
* Non-Indigenous: 0.7%

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

* Indigenous: -0.5%
* Non-Indigenous: -1.1%

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

* Indigenous: 0.7%
* Non-Indigenous: 2.3%

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

* Indigenous: -2.3%
* Non-Indigenous: -3.4%

## Slide 78: 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:

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

For the families and carers of Indigenous participants, perceptions of the NDIS have improved between year one and year two, with the exception of whether the NDIS has helped with their health and wellbeing.

In their first year, the families and carers of Indigenous participants were considerably less likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them compared to non-Indigenous participants. However, this differential narrowed in the second year for all questions except for 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?

* Indigenous year 1: 51%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 58%
* Indigenous year 2: 53%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 58%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 55%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 64%
* Indigenous year 2: 63%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 68%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 61%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 67%
* Indigenous year 2: 65%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 70%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 60%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 71%
* Indigenous year 2: 67%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 74%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 34%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 39%
* Indigenous year 2: 31%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 39%

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

There is only a title on this slide.

## Slide 80: 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 Indigenous participants (both remote and non-remote)
* The families and carers of non-Indigenous participants
* The families and carers of non-remote Indigenous participants
* The families and carers of remote Indigenous participants.

The families/carers of Indigenous participants are less likely to be in a paid job and are more likely to be receiving Carer Payment at baseline compared to non-Indigenous participants. They also have poorer outcomes regarding advocating for the participant, selecting services, and their own health but are more likely to have friends and family they see as often as they like.

For families/carers of Indigenous participants in remote areas, they are considerably less likely to receive Carer benefits and generally have poorer outcomes compared to other groups, except in respect to seeing friends and family and their health.

Results for each outcome and participant cohort are listed below:

### Receiving Carer Payment

* Indigenous: 33%
* Non-Indigenous: 25%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 34%
* Remote Indigenous: 26%

### Receiving Carer Allowance

* Indigenous: 42%
* Non-Indigenous: 43%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 45%
* Remote Indigenous: 25%

### Has a paid job

* Indigenous: 29%
* Non-Indigenous: 41%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 30%
* Remote Indigenous: 29%

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

* Indigenous: 65%
* Non-Indigenous: 69%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 68%
* Remote Indigenous: 52%

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

* Indigenous: 47%
* Non-Indigenous: 45%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 44%
* Remote Indigenous: 64%

### Feels in control of selecting services

* Indigenous: 38%
* Non-Indigenous: 41%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 39%
* Remote Indigenous: 29%

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

* Indigenous: 56%
* Non-Indigenous: 60%
* Non-Remote Indigenous: 56%
* Remote Indigenous: 60%

Note: Longitudinal outcomes are not shown for families and carers of participants aged 15 and over due to insufficient data.

## 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:

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

Similarly to the 0 to 14 group, perceptions of the NDIS have improved between year one and year two for the families and carers of Indigenous participants, with the exception of health and wellbeing.

The families/carers of Indigenous participants were less likely to perceive that the NDIS had helped them compared to the families/carers of non-Indigenous participants, with the largest differences being with respect to the level of support for the family and access to services.

Results for each question and participant cohort are listed below:

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

* Indigenous year 1: 45%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 48%
* Indigenous year 2: 50%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 50%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 52%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 61%
* Indigenous year 2: 60%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 64%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 51%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 57%
* Indigenous year 2: 61%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 63%

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

* Indigenous year 1: 31%
* Non-Indigenous year 1: 34%
* Indigenous year 2: 25%
* Non-Indigenous year 2: 32%

Note: Results for Indigenous participants in year 2 should be interpreted with caution as numbers are small.

## 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 Indigenous and non-Indigenous 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, Indigenous participants have similar satisfaction at all stages of the pathway as non-Indigenous participants. The exceptions are the questions on knowing what happens next, for which Indigenous participants had lower rates of satisfaction.

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

### Access:

* Was the person from the NDIS respectful? 94% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 94% of non-Indigenous participants.
* Are you happy with how coming into the NDIS has gone? 74% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 75% of non-Indigenous participants.
* Do you understand what will happen next with your plan? 59% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 70% of non-Indigenous participants.

### Pre-planning:

* Did you understand why you needed to give the information you did? 96% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 96% of non-Indigenous participants.
* Did the person from the NDIS understand how your disability affects your life? 87% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 88% of non-Indigenous participants.
* Are you clear on what happens next with your plan? 73% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 75% of non-Indigenous participants.

### Planning:

* Did you understand why you needed to give the information you did? 94% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 96% of non-Indigenous participants.
* Did the person from the NDIS understand how your disability affects your life? 82% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 86% of non-Indigenous participants.
* Are you clear on what happens next with your plan? 68% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 75% of non-Indigenous participants.

### Plan Review:

* Did you feel prepared for your plan review? 79% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 82% of non-Indigenous participants.
* Did the person from the NDIS understand how your disability affects your life? 73% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 78% of non-Indigenous participants.
* Is your NDIS plan helping you to make progress towards your goals? 81% of Indigenous participants agreed, compared with 82% of non-Indigenous participants.