

Appendix tables for Part A

Table A1: All projects, number and per cent of evaluation clients by main source of cash income

Source of cash income	Number	Per cent
Age Pension	194	77.9
DVA pension	28	11.2
Superannuation	10	4.0
Disability pension	4	1.6
Primary cash	1	0.4
Property cash	3	1.2
Income of spouse or partner	2	0.8
Other government payment	1	0.4
Other income	3	1.2
Nil income	2	0.8
Not stated	1	0.4
Total	249	100.0

Table A2: All projects, number and per cent of clients by frequency of selected behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia

Behaviour	Frequency of behavioural symptoms				Total
	Not applicable	Occasional	Intermittent	Extensive	
	(number)				
Memory loss	3	36	54	134	227
Problem wandering or intrusive behaviour	98	49	27	53	227
Verbally disruptive or noisy behaviour	108	45	46	28	227
Physical aggression	155	42	18	12	227
Emotional or psychological symptoms	45	48	68	66	227
Danger to self or others	99	42	44	42	227
	(per cent)				
Memory loss	1.3	15.9	23.8	59.0	100.0
Problem wandering or intrusive behaviour	43.2	21.6	11.9	23.3	100.0
Verbally disruptive or noisy behaviour	47.6	19.8	20.3	12.3	100.0
Physical aggression	68.3	18.5	7.9	5.3	100.0
Emotional or psychological symptoms	19.8	21.1	30.0	29.1	100.0
Danger to self or others	43.6	18.5	19.4	18.5	100.0

Table A6: All clients with repeated BPSD measures: number and per cent of clients by severity of BPSD at baseline and final assessments (Brodaty et al. 2003)

Baseline assessment	Last assessment				Total
	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5	
	(number)				
Tier 2	6	3	4	6	18
Tier 3	4	9	—	9	22
Tier 4	6	2	3	10	21
Tier 5	12	11	16	95	134
Total	28	24	23	120	195
	(per cent)				
Tier 2	3.1	1.0	2.1	3.1	9.2
Tier 3	2.1	4.6	—	4.6	11.3
Tier 4	3.1	1.0	1.5	5.1	10.8
Tier 5	6.2	5.6	8.2	48.7	68.7
Total	14.4	12.3	11.8	61.5	100.0

— Nil.

Table A7: DBAMS clients: number of clients by severity of BPSD (Brodaty et al. 2003) at baseline and final assessments

Baseline assessment	Last assessment				Total
	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5	
	(number)				
Tier 2	—	—	—	—	—
Tier 3	1	—	—	—	1
Tier 4	—	—	1	—	1
Tier 5	3	1	4	25	33
Total	4	1	5	25	35

— Nil.

Table A8: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot short-term care projects, time spent on initial needs assessment per client by project, June–November 2004

Project	Number of records	Time spent on initial needs assessment per client (hours)				Standard deviation
		Minimum	Median	Maximum	Mean	
DBAMS	39	1.5	3.0	4.5	3.3	0.7
DRAH	31	11.0	18.0	29.5	19.5	5.1
FCS	24	1.0	2.0	3.0	1.9	0.6
NEDID	14	2.0	3.3	6.0	3.6	1.0
Total	123	1.0	3.0	29.5	7.0	7.8

Table A9: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot long-term care projects, time spent on initial needs assessment per client by project, June–November 2004

Project	Number of records	Time spent on initial needs assessment per client (hours)				
		Minimum	Median	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
RSL Care Pilot	32	2.0	4.0	16.0	5.0	3.7
South Brisbane & Gold Coast Pilot	23	2.0	8.0	24.0	9.4	5.3
Ozcare Packages	35	1.0	2.25	6.5	2.6	1.3
DCAS	27	1.5	3.0	4.0	3.2	0.8
Sundowner Club	15	1.5	3.0	4.0	2.7	0.8
Total	132	1.0	3.0	24	4.5	3.8

Table A10: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot short-term and long-term care package projects, minimum, maximum and percentiles of weekly average hours of assistance per client excluding case management, clinical work-up and ancillary services^(a)

Project	Count	Minimum	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	Maximum
DRAH	31	1.2	5.5	10.2	14.5	21.3
FCS	23	2.9	5.2	9.2	12.9	18.9
NEDID	14	5.3	12.2	19.8	29.0	47.7
RSL Care Pilot	32	0.6	2.3	4.3	7.1	20.9
SBG Pilot	21	3.1	8.1	11.7	23.1	34.7
Ozcare Packages	32	1.0	6.5	11.3	18.3	38.3
DCAS	27	4.1	8.8	14.6	21.6	39.0

(a) Minimum estimates of hours of assistance cover personal assistance, nursing and allied health care, domestic assistance, food preparation other than delivered meals, social support, in-home and centre-based respite care.

Table A11: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot care package projects, minimum, maximum and percentiles of weekly respite care (in-home and day centre respite) per client

Project	Count	Minimum	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	Maximum
DRAH	24	0.0	4.7	7.4	9.8	20.0
FCS	23	2.0	3.8	5.6	9.4	15.0
NEDID	13	1.0	3.5	5.9	15.5	24.0
RSL Care Pilot	22	0.0	1.6	2.8	5.9	9.0
SBG Pilot	20	0.0	0.9	2.5	8.6	16.0
Ozcare Packages	27	0.0	2.5	7.9	13.1	35.0
DCAS	13	0.0	1.7	4.6	12.2	37.0

Table A12: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot long-term care projects, per cent of clients by quarter in which Pilot services were commenced, by project

Project	1 Jul– 30 Sep 03	1 Oct– 31 Dec 03	1 Jan– 31 Mar 04	1 Apr– 30 Jun 04	1 Jul– 30 Sep 04	1 Oct– 31 Dec 04	Total
Ozcare	0.0	34.3	14.3	20.0	28.6	2.9	100.0
RSL Care	3.1	3.1	15.6	25.0	46.9	6.3	100.0
South Brisbane & Gold Coast	0.0	42.3	23.1	11.5	19.2	3.9	100.0
DCAS	0.0	24.2	33.3	21.2	18.2	3.0	100.0
The Sundowner Club	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.3	33.3	13.3	100.0
Total	0.7	22.7	19.2	23.4	29.1	5.0	100.0

Table A13: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot short-term care projects, total place days, client service days, new income, total expenditure and expenditure on services per client service day by project. 1 July–31 December 2004

Project	Allocated place days	Client service days	Mean weekly hours of service per client ^(a)	Income ^(b) per client service day (\$)	Total service expenditure (\$)	Total expenditure (\$)
DRAH	2,760	2,660 ^(c)	10.2	230,708	226,980	274,207
NEDID	1,891	1,691	20.9	201,592	94,437	201,378
FCS	3,680	3,680	9.9	355,692	160,824	415,500
DBAMS	2,944	2,938	..	724,163	855,845	855,846

Note: DBAMS—average hours of service per week per client not included due to residential component of project.

(a) Includes personal assistance, nursing care, domestic assistance, social support, food service other than delivered meals, allied health care. Excludes transport, delivered meals and other services not measured in time units. Calculated from evaluation client data.

(b) Includes Australian Government Innovative Pool subsidies, client co-payments and income from other sources. Excludes funds carried forward from previous financial quarter.

(c) Project A client service days includes 2,033 days of active service and 627 'maintenance days', as reported by the project.

.. Not applicable.

Source: Project financial reports.

Table A14: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot long-term care projects, available funds and expenditure by project (dollars), 1 July–31 December 2004

Project	Income			Funds carried forward	Total available funds	Expenditure			Surplus/deficit
	Flexible care subsidy ^(a)	Other income	New income			Total service expenditure	Non-service expenditure	Total expenditure	
RSL Care	592,839	20,487	613,326	—	613,326	259,025	95,110	354,135	259,191
SBGC
Ozcare Packages	442,873	21,870	464,743	—	464,743	319,341	-1,023	318,319	146,424
DCAS
Sundowner Club	81,776	647	82,422	—	82,422	59,066	12,641	71,707	10,715

(a) As reported by the projects. May be different from official figures.

Source: Project financial reports.

Table A15: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot short-term care projects, available funds and expenditure by project (dollars), 1 July–31 December 2004

Project	Income			Funds carried forward	Total available funds	Expenditure			Surplus/deficit
	Flexible care subsidy ^(a)	Other income	New income			Total service expenditure	Non-service expenditure	Total expenditure	
DBAMS	269,984	454,179	724,163	827	724,990	855,845	1	855,846	-130,856
DRAH	228,499	2,208	230,708	43,500	274,208	226,980	47,227	274,207	—
FCS	355,692	—	355,692	78,000	433,692	160,824	254,676	415,500	18,192
NEDID	194,965	6,628	201,592	99,054	300,646	94,437	106,941	201,378	99,268

(a) As reported by the projects. May be different from official figures.

— Nil.

Source: Project financial reports.

Appendix tables for Part B

Table B1: DBAMS community clients, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	8	3	5	16
Bladder management	6	6	4	16
Toilet use	4	7	5	16
Bathing/showering	2	.. ^(a)	14	16
Dressing	3	12	—	15
Grooming	6	.. ^(a)	10	16
Feeding	10	6	—	16
Mobility (level surface)	15	1	—	16
Transfers	11	4	1	16
Stairs	7	9	—	16

(a) Scored on a two-point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

.. Not applicable.

— Nil.

Table B2: DBAMS community clients, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	1	15	—	16
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	13	3	16
Prepare meals	—	8	8	16
Household chores	1	12	3	16
Correctly administer own medications	—	13	3	16
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	—	9	7	16
Use the telephone	3	11	2	16

— Nil.

Table B3: DBAMS residential high care clients, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	3	4	5	12
Bladder management	—	4	8	12
Toilet use	1	6	5	12
Bathing/showering	—	(a)	12	12
Dressing	—	5	7	12
Grooming	—	(a)	12	12
Feeding	7	4	1	12
Mobility (walking on a level surface)	10 ^b	1	1	12
Transfers	7	4	1	12
Stairs	1	5	6	12

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

(b) Includes one client who is wheelchair independent.

.. Not applicable.

— Nil.

Table B4: DBAMS residential high care clients, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	—	9	3	12
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	—	12	12
Prepare meals	—	1	8	9
Household chores	—	3	9	12
Correctly administer own medications	—	4	8	12
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	—	—	12	12
Use the telephone	—	4	7	11

— Nil.

Table B5: DBAMS residential low care clients, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	5	3	3	11
Bladder management	4	5	2	11
Toilet use	3	6	2	11
Bathing/showering	—	(a)	11	11
Dressing	1	8	2	11
Grooming	1	(a)	10	11
Feeding	5	4	2	11
Mobility (walking on a level surface)	11	—	—	11
Transfers	6	4	1	11
Stairs	3	5	3	11

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

.. Not applicable.

— Nil.

Table B6: DBAMS residential low care clients, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	—	11	—	11
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	5	6	11
Prepare meals	—	1	8	9
Household chores	—	1	7	8
Correctly administer own medications	—	8	3	11
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	—	4	7	11
Use the telephone	1	5	5	11

— Nil.

Table B7: DBAMS clients, number of clients by extent of behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia at baseline, interim and final assessments and usual accommodation setting

Client group	Baseline assessment					Interim assessment					Final assessment				
	N/A	Occ.	Int.	Ext.	Total	N/A	Occ.	Int.	Ext.	Total	N/A	Occ.	Int.	Ext.	Total
Community clients															
Memory loss	—	4	4	8	16	5	1	4	6	16	—	3	6	7	16
Wandering/intrusion	2	6	4	4	16	5	6	4	1	16	7	5	1	3	16
Verbal disruption	6	3	6	1	16	11	2	2	1	16	9	4	1	2	16
Physical aggression	7	3	5	1	16	13	3	—	—	16	11	1	2	2	16
Emotional/psychological symptoms	1	5	6	4	16	6	5	5	—	16	7	2	5	2	16
Danger to self/others	2	2	6	6	16	10	3	1	2	16	8	5	2	1	16
Other behaviour	4	2	7	3	16	11	2	2	1	16	9	3	3	1	16
RAC high care															
Memory loss	—	2	1	9	12	5	—	2	5	12	2	—	2	8	12
Wandering/intrusion	1	1	—	10	12	5	2	1	4	12	4	2	2	4	12
Verbal disruption	1	1	3	7	12	5	2	2	3	12	4	2	4	2	12
Physical aggression	1	2	4	5	12	7	1	4		12	3	5	4		12
Emotional/psychological symptoms	—	1	3	8	12	5	2	1	4	12	2	5	4	1	12
Danger to self/others	1	2	1	8	12	5	2	4	1	12	3	3	4	2	12
Other behaviour	—	2	5	5	12	5	—	2	5	12	6	1	2	3	12

(continued)

Table B7 continued: DBAMS clients, number of clients by extent of behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia at baseline, interim and final assessments and usual accommodation setting

Client group	Baseline assessment					Interim assessment					Final assessment				
	N/A	Occ.	Int.	Ext.	Total	N/A	Occ.	Int.	Ext.	Total	N/A	Occ.	Int.	Ext.	Total
RAC low care															
Memory loss	—	—	2	9	11	3	—	1	7	11	2	—	4	5	11
Wandering/intrusion	1	1	1	8	11	5	1	3	2	11	2	2	3	4	11
Verbal disruption	1	3	3	4	11	5	3	1	2	11	4	2	4	1	11
Physical aggression	2	3	4	2	11	6	2	2	1	11	4	5	1	1	11
Emotional/psychological symptoms	1	—	4	6	11	4	2	3	2	11	3	2	3	3	11
Danger to self/others	—	2	3	6	11	4	4	2	1	11	3	3	3	2	11
Other behaviour	—	1	4	6	11	4	2	3	2	11	6	1	2	2	11

Notes

1. N/A: Not applicable, includes clients for whom no assessment was recorded.
 2. Occ.: occasional.
 3. Int.: intermittent.
 4. Ext.: extensive.
- Nil.

Table B9: Dementia Rehabilitation at Home, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	26	3	2	31
Bladder management	17	10	4	31
Toilet use	18	9	4	31
Bathing/showering	12	.. ^(a)	19	31
Dressing	14	14	3	31
Grooming	17	.. ^(a)	14	31
Feeding	24	7	—	31
Mobility (level surface)	27 ^(b)	3	1	31
Transfers	20	9	2	31
Stairs	14	13	4	31

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

(b) Includes one client who is wheelchair independent.

.. Not applicable.

— Nil

Table B10: Dementia Rehabilitation at Home, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	5	16	10	31
Shop for groceries or clothes	2	10	19	31
Prepare meals	3	14	14	31
Household chores	—	12	19	31
Correctly administer own medications	3	18	9	30
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	2	8	20	30
Use the telephone	8	15	8	31

— Nil.

Table B11: Flexible Care Service, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level				Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	Not stated	
Bowel management	6	11	6	1	24
Bladder management	3	4	16	1	24
Toilet use	—	16	7	1	24
Bathing/showering	2	.. ^(a)	21	1	24
Dressing	2	14	7	1	24
Grooming	2	.. ^(a)	21	1	24
Feeding	2	18	3	1	24
Mobility (level surface)	19	4	—	1	24
Transfers	8	14	1	1	24
Stairs	7	8	8	1	24

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

.. Not applicable.

— Nil.

Table B12: Flexible Care Service clients, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability				Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	Not stated	
Get to places out of walking distance	—	19	4	1	24
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	14	9	1	24
Prepare meals	—	7	16	1	24
Household chores	—	—	23	1	24
Correctly administer own medications	—	13	10	1	24
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	—	—	23	1	24
Use the telephone	1	10	11	2	24

— Nil.

Table B13: North East Dementia Innovations Demonstration, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	4	4	6	14
Bladder management	2	5	7	14
Toilet use	3	7	4	14
Bathing/showering	4	(a)	10	14
Dressing	3	7	4	14
Grooming	4	(a)	10	14
Feeding	6	7	1	14
Mobility (level surface)	8 ^(b)	3	3	14
Transfers	5	9	—	14
Stairs	2	5	7	14

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

(b) Includes one client who is wheelchair independent.

. . Not applicable.

— Nil.

Table B14: North East Dementia Innovations Demonstration, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	—	10	4	14
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	5	9	14
Prepare meals	—	1	13	14
Household chores	—	2	12	14
Correctly administer own medications	—	2	12	14
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	1	3	10	14
Use the telephone	1	8	5	14

— Nil.

Table B15: RSL Care Innovative Dementia Care Pilot, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	7	10	14	31
Bladder management	5	9	17	31
Toilet use	4	11	16	31
Bathing/showering	4	(a)	27	31
Dressing	6	14	11	31
Grooming	7	(a)	24	31
Feeding	5	21	5	31
Mobility (level surface)	24 ^(b)	4	3	31
Transfers	11	18	2	31
Stairs	9	12	10	31

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

(b) Includes two clients who are independent with the use of a wheelchair.

. . . Not applicable.

Table B16: RSL Care Innovative Dementia Care Pilot, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Able without help	Able with help	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	1	21	9	31
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	14	17	31
Prepare meals	—	4	27	31
Household chores	—	5	26	31
Correctly administer own medications	—	19	12	31
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	—	3	28	31
Use the telephone	—	8	23	31

— Nil.

Table B17: South Brisbane and Gold Coast Innovative Dementia Care Pilot, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	3	14	6	23
Bladder management	5	9	9	23
Toilet use	4	9	10	23
Bathing/showering	1	(a)	22	23
Dressing	2	13	8	23
Grooming	5	(a)	18	23
Feeding	3	14	6	23
Mobility (level surface)	10 ^(b)	7	6	23
Transfers	3	14	6	23
Stairs	2	11	10	23

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

(b) Includes four clients who are independent with the use of a wheelchair.

. . . Not applicable.

Table B18: South Brisbane and Gold Coast Innovative Dementia Care Pilot, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	—	11	12	23
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	6	17	23
Prepare meals	—	3	20	23
Household chores	—	2	21	23
Correctly administer own medications	1	8	14	23
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	3	6	14	23
Use the telephone	5	9	9	23

— Nil.

Table B19: Ozcare Innovative Dementia Care Pilot, number of clients by level of ADL function at first assessment

Activity of daily living	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	16	9	9	34
Bladder management	10	8	16	34
Toilet use	9	16	9	34
Bathing/showering	4	.. ^(a)	30	34
Dressing	5	21	8	34
Grooming	5	.. ^(a)	29	34
Feeding	11	18	5	34
Mobility (walking on a level surface)	24 ^(b)	8	2	34
Transfers	17	16	1	34
Stairs	8	20	6	34

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

(b) Includes two clients who are independent with the use of a wheelchair.

.. Not applicable.

Table B20: Ozcare Innovative Dementia Care Pilot, number of clients by level of IADL function at first assessment

Advanced activity of daily living	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	—	29	5	34
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	14	20	34
Prepare meals	—	17	17	34
Household chores	—	9	25	34
Correctly administer own medications	1	13	19	33
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	1	7	26	34
Use the telephone	2	14	18	34

— Nil.

Table B21: Dementia Care in Alternative Settings, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	18	11	4	33
Bladder management	12	14	7	33
Toilet use	9	14	10	33
Bathing/showering	4	(a)	29	33
Dressing	11	11	11	33
Grooming	10	(a)	23	33
Feeding	13	19	1	33
Mobility (level surface)	25	8	—	33
Transfers	20	13	—	33
Stairs	9	22	2	33

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

. . Not applicable.

— Nil.

Table B22: Dementia Care in Alternative Settings, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	1	32	—	33
Shop for groceries or clothes	—	16	17	33
Prepare meals	1	10	22	33
Household chores	—	9	24	33
Correctly administer own medications	1	26	6	33
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	—	12	21	33
Use the telephone	3	18	12	33

— Nil.

Table B23: The Sundowner Club, number of clients by level of ADL function at entry

	Dependency level			Total
	Independent	Partially dependent	Fully dependent	
Bowel management	11	3	1	15
Bladder management	6	7	2	15
Toilet use	11	3	1	15
Bathing/showering	12	(a)	3	15
Dressing	12	3	—	15
Grooming	11	(a)	4	15
Feeding	15	—	—	15
Mobility (level surface)	14	1	—	15
Transfers	11	4	—	15
Stairs	10	5	—	15

(a) Scored on a two point scale scoring system, independent and needs help with personal care.

. . Not applicable.

— Nil.

Table B24: The Sundowner Club, number of clients by level of IADL function at entry

	Capability			Total
	Help not needed	Help needed	Completely unable	
Get to places outside of walking distance	5	10	—	15
Shop for groceries or clothes	3	10	2	15
Prepare meals	1	12	2	15
Household chores	3	10	2	15
Correctly administer own medications	2	10	2	14
Monetary transactions (e.g. pay bills)	3	10	1	14
Use the telephone	10	5	—	15

— Nil.

Table B25: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot short-term care projects, expenditure on services by project, 1 July–31 December 2004

Service type	Project			
	DBAMS	DRAH	FCS	NEDID
Assessment	4,648	—	1,500	8,265
Care coordination and case management	7,452	136,701	35,220	23,580
Nursing services	658,798	—	2,930	1,655
Medical services	11,451	—	—	—
Physiotherapy/occupational therapy	1,631	—	1,200	1,125
Behaviour management therapy	6,846	—	—	—
Counselling and support (client and carer)	26,451	—	200	10,101
Other allied health care	1,716	—	4,372	1,183
Personal assistance	38,134	12,583	24,268	30,128
Social support	—	—	—	395
Domestic assistance	—	15,390	8,015	3,802
Food services	—	2,900	—	—
Home maintenance	—	1,239	11,204	189
Home modifications	—	873	272	483
Pilot program residential accommodation	54,483	—	11,265	—
Accommodation assistance	—	—	—	679
Transport	99	8,467	1,391	—
Provision of aids and equipment	—	3,675	10,457	4,612
Interpreter and translation service	—	—	225	701
Leisure and recreational programs	4,760	1,342	—	—
Centre-based day care	—	—	1,465	1,560
Respite care	—	38,865	46,842	22,103
Carer support and education	—	3,429	—	—
Staff training	—	1,516	—	—
Pharmaceuticals	13,524	—	—	—
Medical supplies	1,863	—	—	—
Special service supplies	2,058	—	—	—
Repair and maintenance	21,931	—	—	—
Total	855,845	226,980	160,824	110,561

Note: DRAH—care coordination and case management includes assessment and case management of the following types: nursing, medical, physiotherapy and occupational therapy, behaviour management therapy, counselling and support, and other allied health.

— Nil.

Source: Project financial reports.

Table B26: Innovative Pool Dementia Pilot long-term care projects, expenditure on services by project, 1 July–31 December 2004

Service type	Project				
	RSL Care Pilot	South Brisbane & Gold Coast Pilot	Ozcare Packages	DCAS	Sundowner Club
Assessment	—	..	2,279	..	10,367
Care coordination and case management	17,342	..	1,150	..	6,911
Nursing services	6,302	..	2,059	..	—
Counselling and support (client and carer)	2,085	..	—	..	—
Other allied health care	1,295	..	—	..	—
Personal assistance	75,361	..	76,180	..	—
Social support	—	..	25,300	..	—
Domestic assistance	49,453	..	25,697	..	—
Food services	1,005	..	23,928	..	8,744
Transport	—	..	9,070	..	13,875
Provision of aids and equipment	1,513	..	2,475	..	—
Leisure and recreational programs	—	..	—	..	19,169
Respite care	104,669	..	151,203	..	—
Total	259,025	..	319,341	..	59,066

Note: DCAS and South Brisbane & Gold Coast Pilot did not provide financial reports.

— Nil.

.. Not applicable.

Source: Project financial reports.

References

- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) 2004. Disability, Ageing and Carers: Summary of findings, Australia, 2003. ABS cat. no. 4430.0. Canberra: ABS.
- Access Economics 2005. Dementia Estimates and Projections: Australian States and Territories. Viewed October 2005, <www.alzheimers.org.au>.
- Aguglia E, Onor ML, Trevisiol M et al. 2004. Stress in the caregivers of Alzheimer's patients: an experimental investigation in Italy. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementias* 19(4):248-52.
- Andrieu S, Bocquet H, Joel A et al. 2005. Changes in informal care over one year for elderly persons with Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Nutrition, Health and Aging* 9(2):121-26.
- AIHW (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare) 2003. Aged Care Innovative Pool dementia and disability pilot services evaluation: report on the scope of a national evaluation framework. Welfare Division working paper no. 41. Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW 2004a. The impact of dementia on the health and aged care systems. AIHW cat. no. AGE 37. Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW 2004b. Carers in Australia: assisting frail older people and people with a disability. AIHW cat no. AGE 41. Canberra: AIHW (Aged Care Series).
- AIHW 2004c. Community Aged Care Packages Census 2002. AIHW cat. no. AGE 35 (Aged Care Statistics Series no. 17). Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW 2004d. Extended Aged Care at Home Census: a report on the results of the census conducted in May 2002. AIHW cat. no. AGE 33 (Aged Care Statistics Series no. 15). Canberra: AIHW.
- Angel JL, Angel RJ, Aranda MP & Miles TP 2004. Can the family still cope? *Journal of Aging and Health* 16(3):338-54.
- Banerjee S, Murray J, Foley B et al. 2003. Predictors of institutionalisation in people with dementia. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry* 74(9):1315-6.
- Borson S, Scanlan JM, Watanabe J, Tu S & Lessig M 2005. Simplifying detection of cognitive impairment: comparison of the Mini-Cog and Mini-Mental State Examination in a multiethnic sample. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 53:871-4.
- Braunberger P 2001. The clock drawing test. Ontario: McMaster University. Viewed 28 June 2005, <www.neurosurgical.ca/ClinicalAssistant/scales/clock_drawing_test>.
- Brodsky H, Draper BM, & Low L 2003. Behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia: a seven-tiered model of service delivery. *Medical Journal of Australia* 178:231-4.
- Brown L, Lymer S, Yap M, Singh M & Harding A (National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling) 2005. Where are aged care services needed in NSW? Small area projections of care needs and capacity for self-provision of older Australians. Conference paper presented at the Aged Care Association of Victoria State Congress, Melbourne, May 2005.
- Bruce DG, Paley GA, Underwood PJ et al. 2002. Communication problems between dementia carers and general practitioners: effect on access to community support services. *Medical Journal of Australia* 177(4):186-8.
- Bruce DG & Paterson A 2000. Barriers to community support for the dementia carer: a qualitative study. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 15: 451-7.

- Caro J, Ward A, Ishak K et al. 2002. To what degree does cognitive impairment in Alzheimer's disease predict dependence of patients on caregivers? *BMC Neurology* 2(6). Viewed through Open Access in May 2005, <www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2377/2/6>.
- Collin C, Wade DT, Davies S et al. 1996. The Barthel ADL Index: a reliability study. In: McDowell I & Newell C. *Measuring health: a guide to rating scales and questionnaires*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 56-63.
- Cooper D & Jenkins A 1998. Home and Community Care service standards client appraisal data development project: literature review. Canberra: AIHW.
- Derouesne C, Thibault S, Lozeron P, Baudouin-Madec V et al. 2002. Perturbations of activities of daily living in Alzheimer's disease. A study of 172 patients using a questionnaire completed by caregivers. *Revue Neurologique* 158:684-700.
- Desai AK & Grossberg GT 2005. Diagnosis and treatment of Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology* 64(Suppl 3):S34-S39.
- Edelbrock D, Waite LM, Broe A, Grayson DA & Creasey H 2003. The relation between unpaid support and the use of formal health services: the Sydney Older Persons Study. *Australasian Journal on Ageing* 22(1):2-8.
- Edelman P & Hughes S 1990. The impact of community care on provision of informal care to homebound elderly persons. *Journal of Gerontology* 45:874-84.
- Feldman HH, Van Baelen B, Kavanagh SM & Torfs KE 2005. Cognition, function and caregiving time patterns in patients with mild-to-moderate Alzheimer disease: a 12 month analysis. *Journal of Alzheimer Disease and Associated Disorders* 19(1):29-36.
- Folstein MF 1975. The Mini-Mental State Examination. In: McDowell I & Newell C. *Measuring health: a guide to rating scales and questionnaires*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 314.
- Goldberg D & Williams P 1988. *A user's guide to the General Health Questionnaire*. London: nferNelson Publishing Company Ltd.
- Henderson AS & Jorm AF 1998. *Dementia in Australia: a report for the Department of Health and Family Services*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Higginson IJ, Jefferys PM & Hodgson CS 1997. Outcome measures for routine use in dementia services: some practical considerations. *Quality in Health Care* 6:120-4.
- Holmes C & Lovestone S 2003. Long-term cognitive and functional decline in late onset Alzheimer's disease: therapeutic implications. *Age and Ageing* 32(2):200-4.
- Huusko TM, Karppi P, Avikainen V, Kautiainen H & Sulkava R 2000. Randomised, clinically controlled trial of intensive geriatric rehabilitation in patients with hip fracture: subgroup analysis of patients with dementia. *British Medical Journal* 321:1107-11.
- Kosloski K, Montgomery RJV & Karner TX 1999. Differences in the perceived need for assistive services by culturally diverse caregivers of persons with dementia. *The Journal of Applied Gerontology* 18(2): 239-56.
- Kurlowicz L 1999. *The Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS). Try this: best practices in nursing care to older adults*, 4. New York: Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing. Viewed 6 June 2005, <www.hartfordign.org/publications/trythis/issue04>.
- Lichtenberg PA, MacNeill SE & Mast BT 2000. Environmental stress and adaptation to disability in hospitalized live-alone older adults. *The Gerontologist* 40(5):549-56.

- LoGiudice D, Waltrowicz W, Ames D, Brown K, Burrows C & Flicker L 1997. Health care costs of people referred to an aged care assessment team: the effect of cognitive impairment. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 21(3):311-16.
- Loh PPK, Maher S, Goldswain P, Flicker L, Ramesh P & Saligari J 2005. Diagnostic accuracy of telehealth community assessments. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 53(11):2043.
- Mahoney FI, Wood OH & Barthel DW 1958. Rehabilitation of chronically ill patients: the influence of complications on the final goal. In: McDowell I & Newell C. *Measuring health: a guide to rating scales and questionnaires*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 56.
- Mendez M, Perryman K, Ponton M & Cummings J 1999. Bilingualism and dementia. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience* 11(3):411-12.
- McDowell I & Newell C 1996. *Measuring health: a guide to rating scales and questionnaires*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mittelman MS, Ferris SH, Steinberg G, Shulman E, Mackell JA et al. 1993. An intervention that delays institutionalisation of Alzheimer's disease patients: treatment of spouse-caregivers. *The Gerontologist* 33(6):730-40.
- Neville CC & Byrne GJA 2001. Literature review: behaviour rating scales for older people with dementia: which is the best for use by nurses? *Australasian Journal on Ageing* 20(4):163-218.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) 2005. *Long-term care for older people*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Robinson BC 1983. Validation of a caregiver strain index. *Journal of Gerontology* 38(3): 344-48.
- Schneider J, Hallam A, Kamrul Islam M et al. 2003. Formal and informal care for people with dementia: variations in costs over time. *Ageing & Society* 23:303-26.
- Schofield H, Murphy B, Herrman HE, Boch S & Singh BS 1998. Carers of people aged over 50 with physical impairment, memory loss and dementia: a comparative study. *Ageing and Society* 18:355-69.
- Shah S, Vanclay F & Cooper B 1989. Improving the sensitivity of the Barthel Index for stroke rehabilitation. In: McDowell I & Newell C. *Measuring health: a guide to rating scales and questionnaires*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 57.
- Suh GH, Ju YS, Yeon BK & Shah A 2004. A longitudinal study of Alzheimer's disease: rates of cognitive and functional decline. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 19(9): 817-24.
- Teri L, Truax P, Logsdon R et al. 1992. Assessment of behavioural problems in dementia: the revised memory and behaviour problems checklist. In: Neville CC & Byrne GJA. *Literature review: behaviour rating scales for older people with dementia: which is the best for use by nurses?* *Australasian Journal on Ageing* 20(4):170.
- Uhlmann RF & Larson EB 1991. Effect of education on the Mini-Mental State Examination as a screening test for dementia. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 39:149-55.
- Vernooij-Dassen MJ, Persoon JM & Felling AJ 1996. Predictors of sense of competence in caregivers of demented persons. *Social Science and Medicine* 43(1):41-9.
- VDHSHACC (Victorian Department of Human Services Home and Community Care Program) 2001. *Identifying and planning assistance for home-based adults who are nutritionally at risk: a resource manual*. Melbourne: Aged, Community and Mental Health Division.

Waszynski C 2001. Confusion Assessment Method (CAM). Try this: best practices in nursing care to older adults, 13. New York: Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing. Viewed 28 June 2005, <www.hartfordign.org/publications/trythis/issue13>.

WHO (World Health Organization) 2001. The world health report: 2001: mental health: new understanding, new hope. Geneva: WHO.

Yesavage J, Brink T, Rose T, Lum O, Huang V, Adey M et al. 1983. Development and validation of a geriatric depression screening scale: A preliminary report. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 17:37-49.

Attachment

Functional assessment instruments

Modified Barthel Index (adapted)

The Barthel Index measures functional independence in personal care and mobility. Please rate the client's level of need for assistance on each personal care and mobility item and record ratings directly onto the *Client Profile and Assessment Form* where indicated at *Section B.6 Client Functional Assessment* for Baseline, Interim and Final Assessments.

Bowels (preceding week)

- 0 = incontinent (or needs to be given enemata)
- 1 = occasional accident (once/week)
- 2 = continent

Bladder (preceding week)

- 0 = incontinent (or catheterised and unable to manage)
- 1 = occasional accident (maximum once per 24 hours)
- 2 = continent (for over 7 days, or catheterized and can completely manage the catheter alone)

Grooming (preceding 24-48 hours)

- 0 = needs help with personal care
- 1 = independent face/hair/teeth/shaving (implements can be provided)

Toilet use

- 0 = dependent
- 1 = needs some help, but can do some things alone
- 2 = independent (can reach toilet/commode, undress sufficiently, clean self, dress and leave)

Feeding

- 0 = unable
- 1 = needs help cutting, spreading butter etc.
- 2 = independent (able to eat any normal food, not only soft food, cooked and served by others but not cut up).

Please turn over and continue on the next page

Transfer (from bed to chair and back)

0 = unable -- no sitting balance

1 = major help (one strong/skilled or two people, physical, can sit)

2 = minor help (verbal or physical, one person easily can assist if necessary)

3 = independent

Mobility

0 = immobile

1 = wheelchair independent including corners etc.

2 = walks with help of one person (verbal or physical)

3 = Walks with use of a walker, crutches or aid other than stick

4 = Independent (may use stick)

Dressing

0 = dependent

1 = needs help, but can do about half unaided

2 = independent (can select and put on all clothes, which may be adapted, including buttons, zips, laces etc.).

Stairs

0 = unable

1 = needs help (verbal, physical, help to carry walking aid)

2 = independent up and down, carries own walking aid if applicable.

Bathing

0 = dependent

1 = Needs help to get in or out of bath or shower but can bathe without supervision

2 = Independent. Can get in and out unsupervised and wash self.

Source: Collin C, Wade DT, Davies S, Horne V, 1988. The Barthel ADL Index: a reliability study. *International Disability Studies* 1988 (adapted). In: McDowell & Newell 1996. *Measuring health: a guide to rating scales and questionnaires*. 2nd edn. New York: Oxford University Press.

OARS Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (adapted)

The OARS IADL (adapted) measures personal functioning status for some important activities of daily living. Please rate the client's level of functioning for each activity and record ratings directly onto the *Client Profile and Assessment Form* where indicated at *Section B.6 Client Functional Assessment* for Baseline, Interim and Final Assessments.

Can the client use the telephone...

0 = completely unable to use the telephone

1 = with some help (can answer phone or dial in an emergency, but needs a special phone or help in getting the number or dialling)

2 = without help, including looking up numbers and dialling

9 = unable to assess

Can the client get to places outside of walking distance...

0 = unable to travel unless emergency arrangements are made for a specialised vehicle such as an ambulance

1 = with some help (needs someone to help him/her or go with him/her when travelling)

2 = without help (drives own car, or travels alone on buses or in taxis)

9 = unable to assess

Can the client go shopping for groceries or clothes (assuming he/she has transportation)...

0 = completely unable to do any shopping

1 = with some help (needs someone to go with him/her on all shopping trips)

2 = without help (can take care of shopping needs him/herself, assuming he/she has transportation)

9 = unable to assess

Can the client prepare his/her own meals...

0 = completely unable to prepare any meals

1 = with some help (can prepare some things but is unable to cook full meals him/herself)

2 = without help (can plan and cook full meals for him/herself)

9 = unable to assess

Please turn over and continue on the next page

Can the client do his/her housework

0 = completely unable to do any housework

1 = with some help (can do light housework but needs help with heavy work)

2 = without help (can clean floors etc.)

9 = unable to assess

Can the client take his/her own medicine...

0 = completely unable to take his/her medicines

1 = with some help (can take medication if someone prepares it for him/her and/or reminds him/her to take it)

2 = without help (can take the right dose at the right time)

9 = unable to assess

Can the client handle his/her own money...

0 = completely unable to handle money

1 = with some help (can manage day-to-day buying but needs help managing chequebook and paying bills)

2 = without help (writes cheques, pays bills etc.)

9 = unable to assess

Source: Fillenbaum G 1988. Multidimensional Function Assessment of Older Adults: the Duke Older Americans Resources and Services procedures. New Jersey, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mini-Mental State Examination

MiniMental, LLC holds the Copyright for the Mini-Mental State Examination. The instrument was last published in 2001 by *Psychological Assessment Resources Incorporated* in the USA. The AIHW obtained permission to use and purchased forms from the Australian Council for Educational Research, the authorised distributor in Australia (www.acer.edu.au).

Client behaviour and psychological symptoms (adapted from the Resident Classification Scale)

Behaviour management clients only

The Behaviour Scale rates the frequency with which behaviour management clients exhibit 'problem' behaviours. Please rate the frequency of the following behaviours **over the last week** and record ratings directly onto the *Client Profile and Assessment Form* where indicated at *Section B.6 Client Functional Assessment* for baseline, interim and final assessments. Please note there is a separate worksheet to be completed by carers (Behaviour Scale – Carer Reactions).

Memory Loss – relates to the care recipient forgetting information such as the names of family members, location of personal items, or recent activities.

0 = Not applicable (does not require monitoring)

1 = Occasionally (requires monitoring but not regular supervision)

2 = Intermittently (requires monitoring for recurrence then supervision on a less than daily basis)

3 = Extensively (requires monitoring for recurrence and supervision on a daily basis)

Problem wandering or intrusive behaviours – relates to the care recipient wandering, absconding or interfering with other people or their belongings whilst wandering.

0 = Not applicable (does not require monitoring)

1 = Occasionally (requires monitoring but not regular supervision)

2 = Intermittently (requires monitoring for recurrence then supervision on a less than daily basis)

3 = Extensively (requires monitoring for recurrence and supervision on a daily basis)

Verbally disruptive or noisy behaviours – includes abusive language and verbalised threats directed at a care recipient, visitor or member of staff.

0 = Not applicable (does not require monitoring)

1 = Occasionally (requires monitoring but not regular supervision)

2 = Intermittently (requires monitoring for recurrence then supervision on a less than daily basis)

3 = Extensively (requires monitoring for recurrence and supervision on a daily basis)

Physically aggressive – includes any physical conduct that is threatening and has the potential to harm a care recipient, visitor or member of staff.

0 = Not applicable (does not require monitoring)

1 = Occasionally (requires monitoring but not regular supervision)

2 = Intermittently (requires monitoring for recurrence then supervision on a less than daily basis)

3 = Extensively (requires monitoring for recurrence and supervision on a daily basis)

Please turn over and continue on the next page

Emotional or psychological symptoms – This question includes active and passive resistance (other than physical aggression), attention seeking and manipulative behaviour, and depressive symptoms such as withdrawal and loss of sense of self.

0 = Not applicable (does not require monitoring)

1 = Occasionally (requires monitoring but not regular supervision)

2 = Intermittently (requires monitoring for recurrence then supervision on a less than daily basis)

3 = Extensively (requires monitoring for recurrence and supervision on a daily basis)

Danger to self or others– covers high risk behaviour requiring supervision or intervention and strategies to minimise the danger.

0 = Not applicable (does not require monitoring)

1 = Occasionally (requires monitoring but not regular supervision)

2 = Intermittently (requires monitoring for recurrence then supervision on a less than daily basis)

3 = Extensively (requires monitoring for recurrence and supervision on a daily basis)

Other behaviour– covers behaviour not already covered in the above questions 6.22 – 33 which require staff to spend time and effort in addition to support for daily activities.

0 = Not applicable (does not require monitoring)

1 = Occasionally (requires monitoring but not regular supervision)

2 = Intermittently (requires monitoring for recurrence then supervision on a less than daily basis)

3 = Extensively (requires monitoring for recurrence and supervision on a daily basis)

Source: Adapted from the Resident Classification Scale (items 9–14), Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing.

Caregiver Strain Index

Here is a list of things that other people have found to be difficult when caring for someone who needs support. Please circle **YES** if they apply to you or **NO** if they do not apply to you.

1.	My sleep is disturbed (e.g. because the person I care for is in and out of bed or wanders around all night).	YES / NO
2.	It is inconvenient (e.g. because helping takes so much time or it's a long drive over to help)	YES / NO
3.	It is a physical strain (e.g. because of lifting in and out of chair; effort of concentration is required)	YES / NO
4.	It is confining (e.g. helping restricts my free time or I cannot go visiting)	YES / NO
5.	There have been family adjustments (e.g. because helping has disrupted routine; there has been no privacy)	YES / NO
6.	There have been changes in personal plans (e.g. had to turn down a job; could not go on holiday)	YES / NO
7.	There have been other demands on my time (e.g. from other family members)	YES / NO
8.	There have been emotional adjustments (e.g. because of severe arguments)	YES / NO
9.	Some behaviour is upsetting (e.g. incontinence, trouble remembering things, or accusing people of taking things)	YES / NO
10.	It is upsetting to find the person I care for has changed so much from his/her former self (e.g. he/she is a different person than he/she used to be)	YES / NO
11.	There have been work adjustments (e.g. because of having to take time off)	YES / NO
12.	It is a financial strain	YES / NO
13.	Feeling completely overwhelmed (e.g. because of worry about the person I care for; concerns about how I will manage)	YES / NO
Total score (count YES responses):		

Transfer total score to section B.6 as indicated on the Client Profile and Assessment Form for Baseline, Interim and Final Assessments

Source: Robinson BC 1983. Validation of a caregiver strain index. Journal of Gerontology 38(3): 344–48.

General Health Questionnaire–28

The GHQ–28 was used to record carer self-reported psychological wellbeing. The AIHW obtained permission to use and purchased forms and manuals from the Australian Council for Educational Research, the authorised distributor in Australia (www.acer.edu.au).