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Australasian Rehabilitation Outcomes Centre (AROC)

- AROC is a joint initiative of the Australian rehabilitation sector established in 2002.
- AROC manages a rehabilitation benchmarking initiative in Australia and New Zealand whose ultimate aim is the improvement of outcomes for rehabilitation patients.
- To achieve this, AROC requires member rehabilitation services to collect a defined set of data against each and every rehabilitation patient they treat.
Introduction

- Explore the question, are rehabilitation services equally accessible across Australia?
  - Patients and facilities
- Exclusion factors which may affect equality:
  - Socioeconomic status
  - Rural or remote
  - Public vs. private rehabilitation service
Methods

- Inpatient data for the period 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010.
  - 70,449 episodes
  - 165 facilities (of 180 nationwide)
- How were these exclusion factors measured?
  - Allocating a socioeconomic status category
    - SEIFA
  - Allocating a geographical location category
    - ASGC-RA
  - Measuring distance
    - Trigonometry based on latitude/longitude of centre of postcodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Postcode SEIFA Score</th>
<th>Postcode Population</th>
<th>Socioeconomic Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6434</td>
<td>469.69</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6770</td>
<td>544.25</td>
<td>2740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0852</td>
<td>548.07</td>
<td>7679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6522</td>
<td>981.20</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400</td>
<td>981.21</td>
<td>782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2134</td>
<td>981.24</td>
<td>11,566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4031</td>
<td>1038.35</td>
<td>11,728</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3951</td>
<td>1038.48</td>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3634</td>
<td>1038.65</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distributions across socioeconomic and geographic levels

People who reside in:

- higher socioeconomic areas
- Major Cities
receive proportionally more rehabilitation.
There is a clear relationship between socioeconomic status and remoteness, with lower socioeconomic areas being closely associated with regional/remote areas.
Distributions of socioeconomic level by public/private

People who live in high socioeconomic areas are more likely to access private rehabilitation treatment.
Private rehabilitation facilities are more likely to be found in high socioeconomic areas.

And less likely to be found in regional or remote areas.
Distance travelled to rehabilitation services

People residing in outer regional and remote high socioeconomic areas travel further to access rehabilitation than those in similarly located low socioeconomic areas.
Distance travelled by impairment

For impairments treated largely in specialist units (e.g., brain and spinal injury), the central locations of these services drives some of the differential in travel distance.
Additional information

- LOS was different between socioeconomic levels but is because of public/private discrepancies
- No significant differences in FIM change between socioeconomic levels
- Average travel distance to access rehabilitation services varied considerably across different impairments
- Average travel distance to access rehabilitation services decreased as age increased
Conclusion

• The main finding of the study is that access to rehabilitation in Australia is inequitable
  ▫ People in lower socioeconomic areas
  ▫ People in regional and remote areas
• Access to public and private rehabilitation services differ across socioeconomic and geographic locations
  ▫ People residing in high socioeconomic areas are more likely to afford private rehabilitation services.
  ▫ Also, private rehabilitation services are more likely to be situated in high socioeconomic areas which also increases accessibility.