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Executive summary

This Report presents the results of the Australian Community Sector Survey 2006 (ACSS). The Report provides information on service use, income, expenditure and workforce issues for the community services and welfare sector.

The ACSS is the only annual survey which covers the non-profit community services and welfare sector, which is a major provider of the community services that most of us rely on at some point in our lives but which are particularly important to people on low incomes.

The ACSS 2006 was completed by 1182 agencies which provided information about their activities over the financial years 2003-4 and 2004-5. Respondents to the ACSS were drawn from the membership of the State and Territory Councils of Social Service and ACOSS. Collectively these organisations provided the following services:

- Health services
- Aged care
- Community care
- Child care
- Child welfare
- Employment services
- Housing services
- Supported accommodation for people with a disability
- Legal services
- Individual and family relationship counselling
- Community activities, information and referral services.

Key findings

Demand for services

Client demand is at the forefront of concerns for many agencies. When asked about the three most important issues facing their service, client demand was reported by 39% of respondents.

In 2004-5 respondent agencies provided services to 2,740,000 people, which is 220,000 people (or 9%) more than the 2,520,000 people who received a service in 2003-4.

In 2004-5 respondent agencies turned away 171,366 people. This is 38,130 people (or 29%) more than the 133,236 people turned away in 2003-4.
Of the 171,366 people turned away in 2004-5:
- 23% were not eligible for the service or needed a different service
- 40% were eligible for the service and the service provided the person with only basic information and assistance
- 37% were eligible for the service but were turned away from the service without assistance.

This shows that while some people are turned away because they are ineligible for the service, the majority are turned away because services have already operating at maximum capacity and must ration access. Table 1 shows the increase in demand and the number of eligible people turned away, by State and Territory.

### Table 1: Demand by State & Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10,811</td>
<td>13,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>49,815</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>1,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30,016</td>
<td>22,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>80,625</td>
<td>28,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29,013</td>
<td>9,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20,798</td>
<td>26,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>5,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the number of times people are turned away is compared to the number of services actually provided by service type, it is clear that housing services and legal services experience particular problems. Over a third of eligible people are turned away from housing services and just under a third from legal services.

The majority of agencies reported tighter targeting of their services than in the past. Fifty-one per cent of respondents agreed that their organisation was targeting services more tightly than in the past and another 23% were neutral on the question (suggesting neither an increase or decrease in rationing).

Ninety per cent of respondents reported that their waiting lists were the same or had worsened between 2003-4 and 2004-5.

Sixty-three per cent of respondents disagreed with the statement that other community agencies had referred fewer clients to their organisation in 2004-5 than in 2003-4. Only 10 per cent of respondents agreed with the statement.
Health services (including mental health and drug and alcohol services) and long term housing were clearly identified as the services most needed by the clients of community service and welfare agencies. These were followed by income support and crisis and supported accommodation.

While it is useful to see where priorities lie in terms of need for individual types of service, many agencies report that it is the complexity of client needs that is the real problem. Sixty-five per cent of respondents agreed that their clients in 2004-5 had more complex needs than in 2003-4. A further 22% neither agreed nor disagreed and only 8% disagreed.

The survey confirms the particular importance of community and welfare services to low income and disadvantaged groups. It finds that Indigenous people are six times more likely to use community services than their representation in the general community would suggest and that people who are jobless are two and half times more likely to use community and welfare services.

The survey gathered information on two indicators of service quality – the use of community language translating and interpreting services and the handling of client complaints.

Forty-three per cent of respondents reported using translating and interpreting services and of these 55% reported no difficulties in accessing translating and interpreting services. However, 60% used family members and friends of the client to assist with translating and interpreting and 58% found the cost of services a barrier to access. This suggests that professional translating and interpreting services are being underutilised, with potentially adverse consequences for the quality of service delivery.

Agencies score well on the handling of client complaints, with 81% conducting regular client surveys to assess satisfaction with the services provided and 90% having written policies for the handling of client complaints.

Of course service quality is largely determined by the resources, both human and financial, available to agencies.

**Delivery - Workforce**

There was an overall increase of 599 full time equivalent employees (or 4%) working in respondent organisations during 2004-5. When compared with the 7.5% increase in overall income and the 9.0% increase in the number of clients between 2003-4 and 2004-5, it is clear that while staff numbers have risen, both overall income and the number of people assisted have increased at a greater rate.
In 2004-5, respondent agencies employed 14,991 full time equivalent staff and lost 2,391 full time equivalent staff. Average staff turnover across respondent agencies is therefore equivalent to 15.9% which is high compared to the all Australian industry average of between 10% and 12%.¹

Part of the explanation for the high level of staff turnover in the industry may be the reliance on unpaid work by staff. In looking at the capacity of agencies to meet demand within existing resources, many try to squeeze more out of their existing resources, which includes the use of increased volunteer and unpaid staff labour. Seventy-five per cent of agencies agreed that the unfunded work by staff and volunteers had increased between 2003-4 and 2004-5.

Fifty-four per cent indicated that they had experienced difficulty attracting appropriately qualified staff in the past year compared to 46% who indicated they had no difficulty.

**Income and expenditure**

Agencies report that the single most important issue facing them is resources. Seventy-seven per cent of respondents named resource problems as one of the three most important issues facing their service, with insufficient funding being singled out by over 700 respondents.

While income has increased over the year by $100 million between 2003-4 and 2004-5, operating expenses have increased by $120 million, which has increased the overall deficit by $20 million to $160 million, or 10% of total income. The rate at which expenditure is growing (8.2%) is outstripping the growth in income (7.5%).

Agencies have secured a 7.5% increase in overall amount of income between 2003-4 and 2004-5. Income has grown across all the major sources with a:

- 9% increase in government funding
- 5% increase in client fee incomes
- 3% increase in agency own source income.

---

Methodology

This survey examines changes in the operating environment of community services and welfare organizations between 2003-4 and 2004-5, as well as gathering information about the size and type of services in the community sector. Specific questions have been included in this year’s survey about the clients using community services, the types of services which are most needed by clients and access to translating and interpreter services.

As with previous years, a variation of Dillman’s method was used to distribute and collect the surveys. This involved mailing out a cover letter and a copy of the survey to all organisations, followed one week later with a mailed reminder letter thanking those people who had already returned the survey and reminding those who were yet to complete the survey of the importance of doing so. The reminder letter also referred organisations to a website where the survey could be completed. The official date to return the surveys was four weeks after they were sent. Follow up phone calls made by the state and territory Councils of Social Service to those organisations whose surveys had not been received by the official date for return.

The ACSS 2005 was completed by 1,182 agencies who provided information about their activities over the financial years 2003-4 and 2004-5. The year on year comparisons in this report refer only to the information collected from this survey. No comparisons are made between this and previous surveys.

### Table 2: Survey returns by State/Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1182</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Respondents to the survey vary from year to year which makes direct comparisons with previous surveys of this kind misleading.
The survey population

To place the ACSS in the context of other quantitative information which is available on parts of the sector, we compare the services and organisations covered by the ACSS with those covered by Community Services Australia,^4^ and Australia’s Welfare 2005.^5^

The ACSS 2006 was completed by 1,182 agencies who provided information about their activities over the past two financial years, 2002-3 and 2003-4. Respondents to the ACSS were drawn from the membership of the State and Territory Councils of Social Service and ACOSS. Collectively these organisations provided the following services:

- health services
- aged care
- community care
- child care
- child welfare
- employment services
- housing services
- supported accommodation for people with a disability
- legal services
- individual and family relationship counselling
- community activities information and referral services.

The respondents to the ACSS cover a wider field of services than those categorised under the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare National Classification of Community Services, as they include employment, housing and health services as well as the traditional community services such as aged care and child care.

The ACSS is also wider in scope than Community Services Australia. Community Services Australia covers only employing businesses and organisations that provide community services as defined by the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification, which encompasses:

- nursing homes
- child care
- accommodation for the aged
- residential care services
- non-residential care services
- employment placement services
- interest groups involved in community service advocacy
- government administration responsible for funding community services or directly involved in the provision of community services.

---

^4^ Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2001), Community Services Australia, ABS Catalogue No. 8696.0
^5^ Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Australia’s Welfare 2005, Canberra, 2005
However, the ACSS is narrower than *Community Services Australia* in so far as the ACSS does not include for-profit businesses.

**Size and scope of sector**

Although it is not possible to compare the results of the ACCS 2006 with other surveys because the surveyed populations and time frames are different, some information from *Community Services Australia* and *Australia’s Welfare 2005* is provided here as context for the results of the ACCS.

**Size of Sector**

The ABS has estimated that at the end of June 2000 there were 9,287 employing businesses and organisations involved in the provision of community services. The 9,287 businesses and organisations comprised 2,800 ‘for profit’ organisations, 5,938 ‘not for profit’ organisations and 548 government organisations. While the number of government organisations has remained virtually the same since June 1996, the number of ‘for profit’ and ‘not for profit’ organisations have increased by 32% and 10% respectively.\(^6\)

**Expenditure**

According to the ABS, direct community services expenditure by these organisations has increased by 28% since 1995-96. Increases were different by sector, with expenditure by ‘for-profit’ organisations increasing by 16% (to $2.1 billion), ‘not for profit’ organisations by 47% (to $7.1 billion) and government organisations by 6% (to $3.4 billion).\(^7\)

**Workforce**

In 2004 there were approximately 243,000 people employed (202,906 Full Time Equivalent) in community services industries in Australia, representing 2.5% of all employed persons across all industries. This translates to 1,362 (Full Time Equivalent) community service workers per 100,000 population in Australia.

The number of persons employed in community services industries increased by 22.6% between 1999 and 2004. This compares with a 10.5% increase across all industries. Within community services industries, the number employed in childcare services increased by 42% and in community care services by 10.2%.\(^8\)

Employees in community services were predominantly female (81.0%) and nearly half (45.8%) worked part time.

\(^6\) ABS (2001), p.5  
\(^7\) ABS (2001), p.8  
\(^8\) AIHW (2005), p.81
Survey results

Demand

Service coverage

In terms of geographic coverage, 21% of respondent agencies\(^9\) provide services across an entire State or Territory and 12% across a region, while only 3% provide services across the nation. Among the other geographic categories:

- 15% provide services primarily in a regional centre
- 14% provide services primarily in an inner metropolitan area
- 13% provide services primarily in another metropolitan area
- 11% provide services primarily in a rural centre
- 3% provide services primarily in a remote area.

Service users

As Table 4 shows, specific groups within the Australian population are over-represented as users of community and welfare services.

Most significantly:

- Indigenous people are six times more likely to use community and welfare services than their representation in the general community would suggest.
- People who are jobless are two and half times more likely to use community and welfare services than their representation in the general community would suggest.
- People with a disability are one and a half times more likely to use community and welfare services than their representation in the general community would suggest.
- Women are one and a quarter times more likely to use community and welfare services than their representation in the general community would suggest.

This accords with the fact that community and welfare services are particularly important to low income and disadvantaged groups within the community.

Levels of disadvantage are known to be much higher among Indigenous communities and in jobless households. Women are much more likely to be the primary carers of children in single parent households (and at a high risk of poverty) and also more likely to approach community and welfare agencies in times of family need in couple parent families.

---

\(^9\) Number of respondents to this question (N) = 1103.
Table 3: Service users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Percentage of service users</th>
<th>Percentage of general community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with a disability</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20.0%¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.4%¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobless</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20.0%¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally and linguistically diverse</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17.0%¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50.3%¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People under 18 years of age</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One fifth of agency clients are from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, which makes access to community language translating and interpreting services important.

Of the 731 respondents to questions about access to community language translating and interpreting services, 313 (or 43%) said that they used these services.

¹⁰ ABS, *Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia*, Cat. No. 4430.0, 2003, p.3
¹⁴ This statistic and the age statistics that follow are taken or derived from: ABS, *Measures of Australia’s Progress*, ABS Cat. No. 1370.0, 2004.
Of these:
- 55% reported difficulties in accessing translating and interpreting services
- 60% used family members and friends of the client to assist with translating and interpreting
- 58% found the cost of services a barrier to access
- 41% experienced difficulties because of the cap on access to free services.

These results suggest a significant underutilisation of professional translating and interpreting services. A minority of agencies use these services, and, for those that do, a large proportion (45%) experience difficulties in accessing the service. The service gap is filled by a reliance on family members and friends, which can be detrimental to both communication and outcomes for individual clients. Using untrained people as interpreters is a risk. They are unlikely to have expertise in the particular service area and so can make mistakes. They are not trained to seek clarification about unfamiliar language or obscure terminology and they are not obliged to abide by professional ethics such as impartiality. There may also be cultural and familial patterns which prevent a client speaking openly through a family member or friend and there is a risk that a family member or friend will interpret or filter what the client is saying.

**Demand for services**

Client demand is at the forefront of concerns for many agencies. When asked about the three most important issues facing their service, client demand was reported by 39% of respondents.

In 2004-5 respondent agencies\(^{15}\) provided services to 2,740,000 people, which is 220,000 people (or 9%) more than the 2,520,000 people who received a service in 2003-4.

In 2004-5 respondent agencies\(^{16}\) turned away 171,366 people, which is 38,130 people (or 29%) more than the 133,236 people turned away in 2003-4.

Of the 171,366 people turned away in 2004-5 it is estimated that:
- 23% were not eligible for the service or needed a different service
- 40% were eligible for the service and the service provided the person with only basic information and assistance
- 37% were eligible for the service but were turned away from the service without assistance.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{15}\) N=675
\(^{16}\) N=421
\(^{17}\) % based on N=240.
This shows that while some people are turned away because they are ineligible for the service, the majority are turned away because services are operating at maximum capacity and have to ration access.

The following table shows the number of people who received a service by type of service in 2004-5, the number of people turned away from a service, and the percentage of eligible people turned away as a proportion of the number of people who received a service. This provides a guide to the level of demand and unmet demand for specific services.

When the number of times people are turned away is compared to the number of services actually provided by service type, it is clear that housing services and legal services experience particular problems. Over a third of eligible people are turned away from housing services and just under a third from legal services.

Table 4: Number of people assisted and not assisted by service type 2004-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Number of people</th>
<th>Number of people turned away</th>
<th>Eligible people turned away as % of people assisted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Assistance (no of clients per year)</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>13,979</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Legal Centre (no of people per year)</td>
<td>47,801</td>
<td>17,741</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Supported Accommodation (no of residents per year)</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care (no of children per year)</td>
<td>25,629</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Material Support (no of clients per year)</td>
<td>70,442</td>
<td>7,713</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare Service (no of children per year)</td>
<td>43,247</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Advocacy (no of clients per year)</td>
<td>32,391</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family relationship service (no of clients per year)</td>
<td>41,049</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Aged Care (no of clients per year)</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care (no of clients per year)</td>
<td>197,350</td>
<td>8,966</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Service (no of clients per year)</td>
<td>150,732</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Service (no of clients per year)</td>
<td>34,092</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, advice and referral (no of contacts per year)</td>
<td>396,025</td>
<td>4,894</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^{18})</td>
<td>660,992</td>
<td>30,430</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total(^{19})</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,240,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,994</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg: 4.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{18}\) Includes Community Transport, Training, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services, Crisis Accommodation, Recreational Arts, Tenancy, Financial Counselling, Counselling.

\(^{19}\) Note that these totals are lower than the figures given on p12. This is due to differences in the number of respondents to Questions 6 & 8 and Question 9 in the survey.
**Perceptions of demand**

Agency responses to questions about the targeting of services, the use of waiting lists and the number of referrals into agencies from other agencies show that agencies perceive demand to be increasing (which is consistent with the increase in the number of people presenting at services).

**Service targeting**

Agencies use service targeting as a means of filtering those who qualify for their service and those who do not. The majority of agencies reported tighter targeting of their services than in the past. Fifty-one per cent of respondents agreed that their organisation was targeting services more tightly than in the past and another 23% were neutral on the question (suggesting neither an increase or decrease in rationing).

**Figure 1: Targeting services: proportion agree/disagree with statement:**

‘this organisation is targeting our services more tightly than in the past’

\[N=1149\]
**Waiting lists**

Waiting lists are used by respondent agencies to ration their services. Waiting lists are an acceptable means of rationing where they sort more urgent cases from less urgent ones and where there are acceptable benchmarks governing the length of time people have to wait for a service. Many waiting lists do not have these features and it is concerning that waiting lists may be growing for a large minority of respondent agencies. Ninety-one per cent of respondents reported that their waiting lists were the same or had worsened between 2003-4 and 2004-5.

**Figure 2: Use of waiting lists: proportion agree/disagree with statement: ‘our waiting list was shorter this year than it was last year’**

![Bar chart showing agreement levels with the statement](chart)

**Referrals**

Another indicator of demand is the number of referrals to agencies. Sixty-three per cent of respondents disagreed with the statement that other community agencies had referred fewer clients to their organisation in 2004-5 than in 2003-4. Only 10 per cent of respondents agreed with the statement.
**What services are needed?**

Agencies were asked to list, in priority order, the services most needed by their clients (other than the services provided by their own agency).

Health services (including mental health and drug and alcohol services) and long term housing were clearly identified as the services most needed by the clients of community service and welfare agencies. These were followed by income support and crisis and supported accommodation.

It is striking that the top three responses all relate to services and supports that are, or should be, universally available and capable of meeting the basic needs of the entire population.
Table 5: Client need by service type 2004-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service type</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score$^{20}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health care (including mental health and drug and alcohol services)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis and supported accommodation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family relationship services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged and disability services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, education and training programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, arts, recreation, sport, information and social activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with the cost of energy, water, telecommunications</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{20}$ Derived by adding the number of times respondents marked a service type as the most important (1), second most important (2) and third most important (3) and weighting according to priority. The value is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100.
**Complexity of client need**

While it is useful to see where priorities lie in terms of individual types of service, many agencies report that it is the complexity of client needs that is the real problem.

Sixty-five per cent of respondents agreed that their clients in 2004-5 had more complex needs than in 2003-4. A further 23% neither agreed or disagreed and 12% disagreed.

*Figure 4: Complexity of client need: proportion agree/disagree with statement: ‘our clients have more complex needs than last year’*

**Service Quality**

In an environment of high demand, it is important for agencies to ensure that clients receive the service they need and that it is of good quality. An important element in monitoring and evaluating the quality of a service is client access to proper complaints handling processes.
Of the 730 respondents to questions about complaints handling procedures, 81% conduct regular client surveys to assess satisfaction with the services provided and 90% have written policies for the handling of client complaints.

Important though complaints handling procedures and client surveys are, the most important determinant of service quality in community services is widely recognised to be the quality of the workforce.

**Delivery**

**Character of the workforce**

The workforce of respondent agencies is characterised by the dominance of voluntary labour, which constitutes over 70% of the workforce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Workforce by category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work category</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid staff (full time equivalent)</td>
<td>14,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary board/management</td>
<td>6,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary service delivery</td>
<td>32,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,756</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff hiring and leaving**

There was an overall increase of 599 full time equivalent employees working in respondent organisations during 2004-5. This represents an increase of 4.0% on the total number of paid staff. When compared with the 7.5% increase in overall income and the 9.0% increase in the number of clients between 2003-4 and 2004-5, it is clear that while staff numbers have risen, both overall income and the number of people assisted have increased at a greater rate.
Table 7: Staff hired and left 2004-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee category</th>
<th>Hired (FTE)</th>
<th>Left (FTE)</th>
<th>Difference (FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service worker</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/administration</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff turnover

Staff turnover is a function of the number of staff leaving over the number of staff employed. In 2004-5, respondent agencies employed 14,991 full time equivalent staff and lost 2,391 full time equivalent staff. Average staff turnover across respondent agencies is therefore equivalent to 15.9% which is high compared to the all Australian industry average of between 10% and 12%.²¹

What constitutes unacceptably high turnover is a complex issue. Some turnover is clearly desirable in providing job opportunities and ensuring new ideas and approaches are brought into organisations. Excessive turnover on the other hand may be a sign of job pressures and insufficient support for employees and can lead to a lack of continuity and corporate knowledge within organisations. Turnover is also expensive, especially where skilled and experienced staff leave and new staff need to be trained.

Unpaid work

Part of the explanation for the high level of staff turnover in the industry may be the reliance on unpaid work by staff. In looking at the capacity of agencies to meet demand many try to squeeze more out of existing resources, which includes the use of increased volunteer and unpaid staff labour. Seventy-five per cent of agencies agreed that the unfunded work by staff and volunteers had increased between 2003-4 and 2004-5.

Figure 5: Use of unpaid work: proportion agree/disagree with statement:
‘compared to last year unfunded work by staff and volunteers has increased’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=1150

Attracting appropriately qualified staff

Of the 717 respondents to this question, 386 (54%) indicated that they had experienced difficulty attracting appropriately qualified staff in the past year compared to 331 (46%) who had no difficulty.

Occupational health and safety

Of the 755 respondents to the questions on occupational health and safety, 210 (28%) reported a workplace injury in 2004-5, compared with 545 (72%) who did not report a workplace injury. The total number of reported incidents was 784.

Of course, capacity to recruit, pay, train and support a high quality workforce depends largely on the financial capacity of the industry.
Income and Expenditure

Agencies report that the single most important issue facing them is resources. Seventy-seven per cent of respondents named resource problems as one of the three most important issues facing their service, with insufficient funding being singled out by over 700 respondents.

This concern was reflected in the information provided by respondents on operating expenses and income.

Table 8: Income and Expenditure 2003-4 & 2004-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total operating expenses(^2) ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total income ($ millions)</th>
<th>Deficit/Surplus ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004/5</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/4</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While income has increased over the year by $100 million, operating expenses have increased by $120 million, which has increased the overall deficit by $20 million to $160 million, or 10% of total income. The rate at which expenditure is growing (8.2%) is outstripping the growth in income (7.5%).

\(^2\) N=776
### Income

Agencies have secured a 7.5% increase in overall amount of income between 2003-4 and 2004-5. Income has grown across all the major sources with a:

- 9% increase in government funding
- 5% increase in client fee incomes
- 3% increase in agency own source income.

#### Table 6: Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2003-04 (millions)</th>
<th>2004-05 (millions)</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% total (2004-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Government</td>
<td>276.5</td>
<td>309.6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Territory Government</td>
<td>605.7</td>
<td>653.1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client fee income</td>
<td>135.1</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own source income*</td>
<td>288.1</td>
<td>297.9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* incl. non-govt payments for goods and services, donations etc