



parks and
gardens



sporting
and leisure
facilities

information
services

POPULATION HEALTH PROFILE

safe
food

arts and
culture



street
trees



libraries



emergency
management

City of Salisbury

youth
development

community
centres
and halls

safe
roads

events

climate change
management

urban
planning



volunteering



safe
water

street
lighting

walking
trails

economic
development


partnerships



immunisation



Copyright

Except as otherwise noted, this work is © Public Health Information Development Unit, under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Australia licence. 

Excluded material owned by third parties may include, for example, design and layout, text or images obtained under licence from third parties and signatures. We have made all reasonable efforts to identify material owned by third parties.

You may copy, distribute and build upon this work. However, you must attribute PHIDU as the copyright holder of the work in compliance with our attribution policy available at

<http://phidu.torrens.edu.au/help-and-information/about-our-data/licensing-and-attribution-of-phidu-content>.

The full terms and conditions of this licence are available at

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/au/legalcode>.

This report was produced by the Public Health Information Development Unit (PHIDU), Torrens University, for the Local Government Association of South Australia.




The views expressed in this report are solely those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Local Government Association of South Australia.





Prepared by



July 2019

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Why is data important for local government in public health planning?.....	1
Purpose of this profile.....	1
The SA Public Health Indicator Framework.....	2
Report content.....	2
Map 1: The City of Salisbury and its respective PHAs	3
Data quality	4
Nomenclature.....	4
Terminology	4
Table 1: Selected indicators of population health and its determinants, the City of Salisbury compared with Metropolitan Adelaide	5
1.  The age structure of the population	7
2.  Population profile	9
2.1. People born overseas in predominantly non-English speaking countries: country of origin.....	9
2.2. People born overseas and reporting poor proficiency in English.....	10
2.3. Migration Program and Humanitarian Program.....	11
2.4. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	15
2.5. Disability or long-term illness, and care provided	16
2.6. Summary measure of disadvantage: IRSD	18
3.  Employment	19
3.1. People receiving unemployment benefits.....	19

4.		Education.....	21
4.1.		Young people aged 16 years and not participating in full-time secondary education.....	21
4.2.		School leavers enrolling in higher education.....	22
4.3.		Children whose mother has low educational attainment.....	23
4.4.		Young people learning or earning.....	24
5.		Income and wealth.....	25
5.1.		Children in low income, welfare-dependent families.....	25
5.2.		Recipients of Age and Disability Support Pensions, and Concession Card holders.....	26
5.3.		Household crowding.....	29
5.4.		Housing stress and rent relief.....	30
5.5.		No motor vehicle.....	34
6.		Early life and childhood.....	35
6.1.		Total fertility rate.....	35
6.2.		Women smoking during pregnancy.....	36
6.3.		Childhood immunisation.....	37
6.4.		Obesity: males and females aged 2 to 17 years of age.....	38
6.5.		Daily fruit consumption at ages 4 to 17 years.....	39
6.6.		Infant death rate.....	39
6.7.		Children and young people who are clients of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service.....	40
6.8.		Early childhood development.....	41
7.		Personal health and wellbeing.....	42
7.1.		Self-assessed health as fair or poor.....	42
7.2.		High or very high levels of psychological distress.....	43
7.3.		Type 2 diabetes.....	44
7.4.		Mental health problems.....	45
7.5.		Tobacco smoking.....	46
7.6.		Obesity.....	47
7.7.		Physical inactivity.....	48

7.8.	Daily fruit consumption by adults	49
7.9.	Median age at death.....	50
7.10.	Premature mortality.....	51
7.11.	At ages 15 to 24 years	52
7.12.	Suicide.....	53
7.13.	Hospital admissions	54
7.14.	Difficulty accessing healthcare	56
7.15.	Home and Community Care Program	56
7.16.	Community mental health services.....	58
7.17.	Availability of residential aged care	59

8.  **Community connectedness60**

8.1.	People able to get support in times of crisis.....	60
8.2.	Disagree/strongly disagree with acceptance of other cultures.....	61
8.3.	Government support as main source of income in last two years.....	62
8.4.	Accessed the Internet at home in the past 12 months.....	63

9.  **Personal and community safety64**

9.1.	Feel very safe/safe walking in local area after dark.....	64
------	---	----

Appendix65

References67

Notes on the data75

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

In partnership with SA Health, the LGA has commissioned updates to the Population Health Profiles to support a council or group of councils to prepare their Regional Public Health Plans (RPHPs) under Section 51 of the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011* (the Act).

The Act provides a framework for state and local governments to plan for current and emerging public health issues. Mirroring requirements for state government under s.50(3)(a), the Act requires RPHPs to “*comprehensively assess the state of public health in the region*” (s.51(8)(a)). Access to appropriate and relevant data, indicators and evidence-based research is key to effectively making this assessment.

The data contained in population health profiles provide information about a broad range of social, economic and environmental issues that are important to the work of local government as well as local communities.

Why is data important for local government in public health planning?

Having access to useful and meaningful data can help councils provide more appropriate and higher quality services for their local communities. Data and indicators are important in helping us to understand what is happening in our society and ensure that policies and decisions are based on the best evidence.

These profiles aim to provide a basis for informed and integrated council planning and policy making and to be useful tool for local government policy and planning staff, including senior management, elected members and non-government organisations that operate in the relevant regions as well as the local community.

Good use of data can improve councils’ knowledge, effectiveness, accountability and responsiveness by providing a basis for informed, evidence-based and more comprehensive reporting. They can provide a context for conversations with key partners and stakeholders when developing strategies and actions. This benefits both the council and the community by delivering meaningful result-focused outcomes.

Purpose of this profile

This population health profile has been prepared to support the City of Salisbury in the preparation of its RPHP under s.51 of the Act. The profiles contain a selection of indicators of public and population health and their determinants, drawn largely from data published for Local Government Areas (LGAs) and Population Health Areas (PHAs) by the Public Health Information Development Unit (PHIDU), as part of the Social Health Atlases series available online at http://atlasesaustralia.au/LGASA/LGA_PH_Act.html.

The indicators selected are consistent with the approach outlined in the updated State Public Health Plan 2019-2024.

A review of the population profile provided to all councils for the first cycle of RPHP (2013-2018) was undertaken in February 2018, in consultation with councils. Consequently, some modifications have been made for the 2019 profiles.

The revised Population Health Profile can be used as a policy tool to guide evidence-based planning and action to address public health issues as well as a reporting tool to track progress towards agreed goals and outcomes in the longer term. It may even be useful as a tool for wider community use, for example it may assist a local community group in submitting a grant application.

It is acknowledged that the profiles do not present a complete picture, nor will they be representative of the entirety of information available on which to base a comprehensive assessment of public health for a council area or region. Councils have in-depth knowledge of the needs and issues facing their communities and have access to data at catchment levels not routinely captured by much larger survey instruments.

Councils also routinely collect their own data which has relevance to public health planning and can be used to complement the information in this profile. These Profiles have been utilised by councils across SA to inform planning requirements for the first cycle of RPHP, making it a strong foundation on which to build (and compare) a public health-informed picture of key population health issues and trends.

The SA Public Health Indicator Framework

In 2018, SA Health released the South Australian Public Health Indicator Framework. It is anticipated that these indicators will contribute to monitoring (to inform planning, action and reporting), the public health evaluation framework and any research activity. Data from the Framework inform the biennial Chief Public Health Officer's Report for South Australia.

The Framework and the CPHO Report can assist councils in tracking and/or incorporating state-wide indicators should a council or group of council's wish to expand on the content of their population health profiles or supplement existing RPHP indicators.

Report content

This report comprises statistics for the City of Salisbury. The first section presents charts (population pyramids) depicting the age structure in the Local Government Area (LGA) of Port Salisbury and providing comparisons with the age structure in Metropolitan Adelaide¹ and between the six Population Health Areas (PHAs – see Box) in the LGA, namely Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka, Ingle Farm, Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains², Para Hills/ Salisbury East³, Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie, Salisbury/ Salisbury North.

A comparison of the age profile in the LGA is also provided by Indigenous status.

The remainder of the report is comprised of commentary on a table of selected population health indicators (Table 1 – pages 5 and 6). The table is structured so as to highlight differences in the percentage, rate or other measure for the indicator value in the City of Salisbury from that in Metropolitan Adelaide by means of shading. Cells shaded in green indicate a relatively good outcome, whereas cells in shades of black indicate a relatively poor outcome, or a possible challenge for local government authorities. Note that indicators are only shaded in one colour and that some indicators are not shaded at all.

The commentary consists of a statement as to the value of the indicator for regional public health planning, with reference to its value for work by Local Government under the Public Health Act 2011. This is followed by the definition of the indicator and a description of the variation in the percentage, rate or other measure, for each indicator in Table 1, between the geographic areas mapped. In many cases comment is made on changes in the data since the first report was produced.

¹ Metropolitan Adelaide refers to the area from Gawler in the north, southwards down the Mt Lofty Ranges to Sellicks Beach and including Mount Barker; it is consistent with the Greater Adelaide area, as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

² Note the values represented in this report for Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains are for the whole PHA, although only 10.9% of the population of the PHA falls within the Salisbury LGA.

³ Note the values represented in this report for Para Hills/ Salisbury East are for the whole PHA, although only 93.4% of the population of the PHA falls within the Salisbury LGA.

This PDF copy is supported up by an online atlas, a workbook comprising the data presented in Table A1 including the numbers (numerator and denominator) associated with the percentages shown in the table, and detailed notes on the data (data sources, etc.).


Updates will be included in the online version as they become available. Indicators for which updated data are expected in 2019 are the Australian Early Development Census (2018); estimates of diseases and risk factors (to 2017/18); and hospital admissions (to 2017/18)

Population Health Areas

Population Health Areas (PHAs) are geographical areas based on suburbs (in cities and larger towns) and localities (in regional and remote areas) as published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics as Statistical Areas Level 2 (SA2s). PHAs are comprised of either whole SA2s or multiple (aggregates of) SA2s.

A list of PHAs in each council area can be found [here](#) and is also shown in Table 1.

Map 1: The City of Salisbury and its respective PHAs



Data quality

The data for a majority of the indicators published in this report were provided to PHIDU at the Statistical Areas Level 2 (SA2) or Population Health Area (PHA) level. In many instances the boundaries of these areas do not coincide with the boundaries of LGAs. In order to produce data for LGAs from the SA2 or PHA data, PHIDU has used correspondence files from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) to allocate whole or part SA2s and PHAs to LGAs. As these correspondences are based on the total population in each SA2 or PHA part which falls within an LGA, their application to other data (e.g., immunisations, income support payments, women smoking during pregnancy) does not necessarily provide an accurate result for the LGA. The indicators likely to be affected are listed in Table A1, in the Appendix.

In addition, some PHAs are relatively large and cover two or three LGAs. As a result, the data for these PHAs are split across multiple LGAs, which further complicates the issue: the affected areas in this case are Para Hills/ Salisbury East and Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains; of particular note is Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains, as only 10.9% of the population of the PHA falls in the Salisbury LGA. We leave it to the reader to decide when the PHA data provide useful information for their LGA.

PHIDU is working to improve the quality of the LGA data, a process which is largely reliant on data custodians coding data to the ABS Statistical Areas Level 1, as these areas more closely align with LGA boundaries.

Nomenclature

South Australian LGA Status

In South Australia each incorporated area has an official status. In the 2016 ASGC edition, the various LGA status types currently in use are;

- Cities (C)
- Rural Cities (RC)
- Towns (T)
- Municipalities/Municipal Councils (M)
- District Councils (DC)
- Regional Councils (RegC)
- Aboriginal Councils (AC)

Terminology

In discussing the extent to which percentages or rates vary from the Regional SA figure, the rate ratio, the following terms are used:

- “Notable”, referring to a rate ratio from 1.10 to <1.20 (a difference of from 10% to <20%), or from 0.90 to <0.80 (a difference of from -10% to <-20%);
- “Marked”, referring to a rate ratio from 1.20 to <1.50 (a difference of from 20% to <50%), or from 0.80 to <0.50 (a difference of from -20% to <-50%);
- “Substantial”, referring to a rate ratio of 1.50 or above (a difference of 50% or more), or of 0.50 and below (a difference of greater than -50%).

Table 1: Selected indicators of population health and its determinants, the City of Salisbury compared with Metropolitan Adelaide

Indicators	Salisbury (C)	Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka	Ingle Farm	Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains	Para Hills/ Salisbury East	Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie	Salisbury/ Salisbury North	Metro Adelaide	Regional SA	South Australia	Australia
Population Profile, 2016 (Per cent, Index)											
Born overseas in predominantly non-English speaking countries	23.1	31.3	20.9	27.7	15.3	25.1	24.1	17.1	4.7	14.3	17.9
- country 1 of top three for LGA - India	2.6	4.5	3.7	5.4	1.7	3.3	1.2	2.0	0.3	1.6	1.9
- country 2 of top three for LGA - Vietnam	2.6	0.6	1.1	1.5	0.7	4.0	2.5	1.1	0.1	0.9	0.9
- country 3 of top three for LGA - Afghanistan	1.6	1.8	1.2	0.9	1.3	2.2	1.6	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.2
Born overseas & reports having poor proficiency in English	5.4	5.8	3.0	3.9	2.9	6.9	7.9	2.8	0.6	2.3	2.9
<i>Permanent migrants entering Australia under the Humanitarian Program</i>	4.5	2.8	2.4	2.4	3.2	4.0	8.2	1.4	0.2	1.2	0.9
- arrived between 2000 and 2006	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.5	1.4	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.3
- arrived between 2007 and 2011	1.8	0.9	0.7	0.6	1.5	1.4	3.4	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.3
- arrived between 2012 and 9th August 2016	1.4	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.6	1.1	3.3	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.2
<i>Permanent migrants entering Australia on a Family stream visa</i>	3.5	4.3	2.6	2.9	2.1	4.4	3.9	2.2	0.8	1.8	2.8
- arrived between 2000 and 2006	1.0	1.2	0.8	0.9	0.5	1.2	1.1	0.7	0.3	0.6	1.1
- arrived between 2007 and 2011	1.2	1.6	1.1	1.0	0.7	1.6	1.3	0.8	0.2	0.6	1.0
- arrived between 2012 and 9th August 2016	1.3	1.5	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.7	1.5	0.7	0.2	0.6	0.7
<i>Permanent migrants entering Australia on a Skill stream visa</i>	5.1	10.7	5.9	11.3	3.1	5.0	2.8	5.7	1.2	4.6	5.1
- arrived between 2000 and 2006	1.4	3.1	1.6	3.3	0.9	1.3	0.8	1.6	0.4	1.3	1.9
- arrived between 2007 and 2011	2.6	4.8	3.2	5.8	1.8	2.9	1.3	2.6	0.6	2.1	2.1
- arrived between 2012 and 9th August 2016	1.1	2.9	1.1	2.1	0.5	0.8	0.6	1.5	0.2	1.2	1.1
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	2.4	1.4	2.4	2.8	1.9	2.7	3.2	1.7	5.0	2.5	3.3
People who provide unpaid assistance to others	12.2	10.4	12.8	11.2	12.9	12.1	12.4	12.2	12.2	12.2	11.3
People with a profound or severe disability and living in the community: all ages	6.1	4.0	6.3	5.2	5.9	6.1	7.4	5.2	5.6	5.3	4.7
People with a profound or severe disability and living in the community: 0 to 64 yrs	4.4	2.6	4.4	3.7	4.1	4.7	5.5	3.4	3.8	3.5	2.9
People with a profound or severe disability and living in the community: 65 yrs & over	16.7	16.5	13.6	13.3	15.0	18.0	19.2	14.1	12.3	13.6	14.3
Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage	917	1000	948	989	961	901	833	989	945	979	1000
Employment, June 2017 (Per cent)											
Unemployment beneficiaries: total	9.4	4.9	8.1	5.9	8.3	9.8	13.4	6.3	8.6	6.8	5.2
Unemployment beneficiaries: six months or longer	8.1	4.2	7.0	4.9	7.0	8.5	11.7	5.4	7.5	5.8	4.3
Unemployment beneficiaries: young people	5.6	3.1	5.2	4.1	5.4	5.9	7.2	3.8	5.9	4.2	3.4
Education (Per cent)											
Aged 16 years and not participating in full-time secondary education, 2016	15.5	14.2	12.0	8.6	14.8	14.3	19.0	12.0	17.1	13.3	15.9
School leavers admitted to university, 2018	26.3	29.0	27.7	35.9	22.2	25.1	28.6	32.2	18.1	28.9	22.2
Children whose mother has low educational attainment, 2016	24.0	14.0	17.2	12.3	21.2	26.2	32.0	13.6	16.8	14.3	17.0
Young people learning or earning, 2016	82.4	87.8	85.1	83.1	84.2	82.0	77.3	86.6	80.3	85.3	84.3
Income and wealth (Per cent)											
Children in low income, welfare-dependent families, June 2017	35.2	23.1	26.1	22.0	29.4	37.3	47.7	23.0	27.6	24.0	20.9
Age Pension recipients, June 2017	81.1	75.8	82.7	74.6	77.5	79.1	83.0	67.9	69.9	68.5	63.6
Disability Support Pension recipients, June 2017	7.5	4.3	7.7	6.8	7.2	7.3	10.0	6.3	8.6	6.7	5.3
Pensioner Concession Card holders, June 2017	27.6	17.4	32.4	23.5	27.5	25.5	33.1	23.4	30.3	25.0	20.3
Health Care Card holders, June 2017	11.0	8.0	10.0	8.4	9.6	11.5	14.1	8.4	9.0	8.5	7.3
Household crowding, 2016	4.4	3.7	3.1	3.0	2.9	5.5	5.9	2.8	1.9	2.6	3.7
Mortgage stress, 2016	12.6	9.8	12.5	9.1	10.2	14.4	14.8	8.5	9.4	8.7	9.3
Rental stress, 2016	32.4	26.4	31.6	27.9	32.8	31.4	36.1	29.7	26.7	29.0	27.3
Rented social housing, 2016	7.2	4.2	8.2	9.2	4.8	7.7	10.0	6.4	6.1	6.3	4.2
Recipients of rent relief from Centrelink, June 2017	19.2	16.1	13.7	16.3	15.1	17.9	27.4	15.7	15.6	15.7	16.2
No motor vehicle, 2016	7.1	5.7	7.2	6.5	5.7	5.5	10.3	8.0	5.7	7.5	7.5

Table 1: Selected indicators of population health and its determinants, the City of Salisbury compared with Metropolitan Adelaide...cont

Indicators	Salisbury (C)	Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka	Ingle Farm	Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains	Para Hills/ Salisbury East	Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie	Salisbury/ Salisbury North	Metro Adelaide	Regional SA	South Australia	Australia
Early life and childhood (Per cent, Rate)											
Total fertility rate, 2013-15	2.02	1.89	1.93	1.99	1.85	2.12	2.21	1.79	2.19	1.85	1.88
Women smoking during their pregnancy, 2012-14	16.5	7.7	14.0	9.3	20.2	17.2	20.3	12.3	21.1	14.1	10.8
Immunisation at 1 yr of age, 2017	95.4	95.9	97.1	94.4	94.4	96.7	94.4	94.0	94.9	94.3	94.0
Immunisation at 5 yrs of age, 2017	94.3	92.7	92.7	92.8	95.2	96.2	93.5	93.6	94.5	93.8	94.0
Obesity: males aged 2-17, 2014-15	8.3	6.9	7.6	7.1	6.7	9.1	9.9	6.6	7.0	6.7	6.7
Obesity: females aged 2-17, 2014-15	8.5	6.8	7.9	7.1	6.9	9.3	10.1	6.7	7.2	6.8	8.4
Fruit consumption: children aged 4 to 17 years, 2014-05	62.2	65.9	67.2	61.9	62.5	60.3	60.0	65.3	66.4	65.6	66.3
Infant death rate, 2011-15	1.7	2.6	3.9	2.9	3.5
Children and young people who are clients of CAMHS, 2015/16-2017/18	1,487.2	1,161.3	1,469.9	1,163.6	1,341.3	1,330.7	1,941.8	1,303.9	2,380.9	1,553.1	n.a.
AEDC: Children developmentally vulnerable on one or more domains, 2015	29.5	20.4	22.2	21.5	29.2	30.3	38.5	23.0	25.3	23.5	22.0
Personal health and wellbeing (Per cent, Rate)											
Self-assessed health as fair, or poor, 2014-15	18.9	15.5	18.0	18.5	16.7	20.4	22.0	15.6	17.0	15.9	14.8
High/ Very high levels of psychological distress, 2014-15	18.1	12.8	18.2	14.0	14.7	20.8	22.4	13.9	13.0	13.7	11.7
Type 2 diabetes, 2014-15	5.4	4.7	5.3	4.9	4.8	5.9	6.1	4.3	4.7	4.4	4.4
Mental health problems: males, 2014-15	17.6	14.0	16.9	16.6	16.4	18.5	20.4	16.8	19.3	17.3	15.8
Mental health problems: females, 2014-15	18.9	15.6	18.9	18.9	18.1	19.4	21.3	19.0	21.2	19.4	19.2
Smoking, 2014-15	17.4	11.8	17.0	15.4	15.5	19.0	21.8	14.2	18.0	15.0	16.1
Obese males, 2014-15	31.8	28.6	30.2	26.7	30.2	33.7	34.6	26.6	34.2	28.2	28.4
Obese females, 2014-15	35.5	32.4	34.2	30.2	33.8	37.7	38.1	29.9	38.1	31.6	27.5
Physical inactivity, 2014-15	73.0	68.8	71.0	67.3	68.3	76.7	77.9	67.0	73.2	68.2	66.3
Fruit consumption: adults, 2014-15	46.6	47.6	50.7	48.6	48.1	44.2	44.8	49.0	46.2	48.5	49.9
Median age at death: males, 2010-14 [†]	76.0	77.0	79.0	77.0	74.0	72.0	77.0	80.0	78.0	79.0	78.0
Median age at death: females, 2010-14 [†]	82.0	84.5	85.0	83.0	80.0	81.0	82.0	85.0	84.0	85.0	84.0
Premature mortality: males, 2011-15	326.9	261.7	335.8	378.2	308.4	309.4	384.4	288.0	332.3	301.1	293.9
Premature mortality: females, 2011-15	222.0	160.6	248.4	264.7	168.0	213.9	299.0	181.4	197.9	186.3	182.2
Premature mortality: 15 to 24 yrs, 2011-15	41.7	..	106.1	43.4	44.2	29.4	56.2	34.6	37.4
Premature mortality from suicides, 2011-15	13.0	5.0	9.9	12.0	16.5	10.9	18.3	12.5	14.0	12.9	11.5
Admissions to hospital: total, 2016/17	35,283.0	35,243.5	41,194.3	34,158.6	34,109.2	32,572.2	36,377.4	36,465.0	34,457.8	35,977.6	39,628.3
Admissions to hospital: potentially avoidable conditions, 2016/17	3,226.8	2,672.7	3,273.1	3,024.5	2,875.4	3,320.4	3,800.0	2,891.6	3,190.9	2,965.0	2,988.4
Difficulty accessing healthcare, 2014	1.3	1.0	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.2	2.0
HACC clients living alone, 2014/15	28.4	27.4	28.6	36.6	30.2	28.0	27.0	37.4	31.3	35.8	37.1
HACC: Non-English speaking clients, 2014/15	25.1	27.9	20.4	21.5	19.2	28.3	28.5	19.4	11.4	17.4	14.7
Clients of community mental health services, 2015/16-2017/18	1,804.9	1,241.2	1,864.7	2,154.2	1,739.7	1,436.0	2,507.9	1,892.9	3,104.6	2,178.7	n.a.
Residential aged care places per 1,000 population aged 70 yrs & over, June 2016	93.1	77.3	147.9	187.7	40.0	64.3	139.6	95.4	81.5	91.7	82.6
Community connectedness (Per cent, Rate)											
Able to get support in times of crisis, 2014	93.3	93.6	93.4	93.5	93.3	93.7	92.6	93.9	94.1	93.9	94.3
Disagree/strongly disagree with acceptance of other cultures, 2014	5.1	3.8	6.3	5.2	4.7	5.3	5.6	4.6	6.6	5.0	4.5
Government support as main source of income in last 2 years, 2014	39.7	30.5	38.0	35.7	33.8	41.8	49.7	31.0	36.8	32.3	27.1
Accessed the Internet at home in the past 12 months, 2016	80.6	86.8	80.2	83.2	81.9	82.1	75.2	82.3	75.0	80.6	83.2
Personal and community safety, 2014 (Rate)											
Feel very safe/safe walking alone in local area after dark	37.5	48.5	39.7	43.8	41.7	31.1	31.2	49.7	57.6	51.3	52.4

[†]Median age is shown in years

*Note the values represented here are for the entire Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains PHA although only 10.9% of the population of the area falls within the Salisbury LGA

**Note the values represented here are for the entire Para Hills / Salisbury East PHA although only 93.4% of the population of the area falls within the Salisbury LGA

Details of abbreviations, calculations etc. are included in the Notes on the data.

Note: Shading for the IRSD has been reversed, with low scores (greater disadvantage) in darker shades.

The indicators for 'Born overseas in predominantly non-English speaking countries', 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people' and 'Total Fertility Rate' have not been highlighted in this table.


Good outcome	50% or more above metropolitan average	30-49% above metropolitan average	10-29% above metropolitan average	within +/- 10% of metropolitan average	10% or more below metropolitan average
Poor outcome	50% or more above metropolitan average	30-49% above metropolitan average	10-29% above metropolitan average	within +/- 10% of metropolitan average	10% or more below metropolitan average

1. The age structure of the population

The City of Salisbury has a similar population age profile to that of Metropolitan Adelaide, although with more people in the 0 to 9 and 20 to 39 age groups, and slightly less in the 50+ age groups (Figure 1).

The Aboriginal population (of 2,746 people, as recorded at the 2016 Census) has a markedly different profile to that of the non-Indigenous population, with more children, young people and young adults and fewer people at all ages from the 30 to 34 age group, most notably at the oldest ages (Figure 1). The greatest difference is in the age group 65 years and over. Note: See the indicator 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people', below, for details of the estimated resident population of Aboriginal people – a larger number than the Census figure, but for which age group data are not available.

Figure 1: Age profile comparisons of total population (Salisbury LGA and Metropolitan Adelaide) and population by Indigenous status (Port Adelaide Enfield LGA), 2016



The age profile of Salisbury/ Salisbury Northmost closely the City of Salisbury age profile, followed by Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (however with slightly more children and young people aged, and less in the 65+ age groups).

The PHA of Para Hills/ Salisbury East had an older age profile when compared to the City of Salisbury with more persons in the 45+ age groups and less in the younger age groups. This older age profile was also evident in the PHA of Ingle Farm however the largest difference was now in the 65+ age group when compared to the City of Salisbury with less persons in the younger age groups with the exception of males aged 40-44 years which was slightly higher.

In the PHA of Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains there were fewer children and young persons aged 5-19 years, and more persons aged 35-44 years there were also slightly fewer people over the age of 45 when compared to the City of Salisbury age profile with the exception of the 70-74 age group where there was slightly more persons.

Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka had a similar younger age profile to Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains when compared with the City of Salisbury however the differences were more pronounced, there were more persons aged 20-35 years and less in the 50+ age groups (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Age profile comparisons, PHAs in Salisbury LGA, 2016



Age pyramids for these and other areas can be viewed on the PHIDU [website](#).

A selection of indicators of population health and its determinants follows.

2. Population profile

2.1. People born overseas in predominantly non-English speaking countries: country of origin

Rationale

Australia's population has been and continues to be shaped by international migration. However, for many who arrive without proficiency in English, the combination of economic struggle with adjustment to a new language and a new cultural milieu can be expected to give rise to considerable stresses. Although a relatively small group, they also pose special challenges for deliverers of health, education, welfare and other community services.⁹ Despite common experiences including those relating to migration and dislocation, this population is far from a homogeneous group. There is great diversity in language, culture, religion, socioeconomic status, education and age structure.⁹ Initially, most of these migrants were born in countries in North-West Europe, and they were then followed by large numbers of migrants born in Southern and Eastern Europe following the end of World War II. In the 1970s, many migrants arrived from South-East Asia and, in recent migration streams, a number of Asian countries made a large contribution, along with African and Middle Eastern countries.⁵ Similarly, South Australia's population and demographic profile has historically been influenced by immigration, particularly from the post-war period.

In 2016, over 40% of the South Australian population is an immigrant or has at least one parent who was born overseas; and 17.4% of the population speak a language other than English at home.^{6,10} International migration has been a key feature in South Australia's population growth and, since 2004, South Australia has experienced an immense change in this area, chiefly as a result of policy changes.^{7,8}

Indicator definition:

People born (overseas) in predominantly non-English speaking countries as a percentage of the total population (Census 2016). Predominantly non-English speaking countries include all except the following countries: Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom and the United States of America

Our council

There were 31,817 people in the City of Salisbury who were born overseas in a predominantly non-English speaking country, 35% above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

The highest proportions were in the PHAs of Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (31.3%, substantially (83%) above the level in the metropolitan area), Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (25.1%) and Salisbury/ Salisbury North (24.1%); and the lowest was in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (15.3%, markedly below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide).

Of this group, people born in India and Vietnam comprised 2.6% of the total population of the City of Salisbury, and those born in Afghanistan comprised 1.6%. In each case these proportions were above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide, with rate ratios of 1.29, 2.39 and 3.62, respectively. There

were relatively large numbers of people born in these countries in each of the PHAs, with the largest number (3,207) in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie.

Note that there are people living in the City of Salisbury who have come from many other countries where English is not the predominant language.

2.2. People born overseas and reporting poor proficiency in English

Rationale

For migrants born in predominantly non-English-speaking countries, the rate at which they adapt to live in the host country is directly related to the rate at which they achieve proficiency in English. Their proficiency in English has profound implications for the ease with which they are able to access the labour market, develop social networks, become aware of and utilise services, and participate in many aspects of Australian society. Those people who are not proficient in spoken English are less likely to be in full-time employment and more likely not to be employed.¹⁸

In 2016, over 40% of the overseas born population spoke only English at home and, of those who arrived in the past 25 years, 11% did not speak English well or at all; this was lower (8.3%) for earlier migrants who arrived prior to 1991.¹⁹

Just over half (53%) of longer-standing migrants and 76% of recent arrivals reported in the Census that they spoke a language other than English at home.²⁰ This no doubt reflects the different countries of birth of these two groups, and also the amount of time spent in Australia. However, this does not provide an indication of their ability to speak English. Over half (53%) of longer-standing migrants reported speaking English very well, while 2.5% reported not speaking English at all. For recent arrivals, 39% reported speaking English very well and the proportion who reported not speaking English at all was 4.7%.²⁰

From a Local Government viewpoint, the size and location of this population group is relevant for the provision of support services for newly arrived children, youth, and families; and for older people, who may never developed English language skills (especially females who were not employed outside the home), or have returned to using the language of their birthplace as they have aged (both females and males).

Our council

There were 6,996 people aged five years and over in the City of Salisbury who were born overseas and reported having poor proficiency in English, 5.4% of the population in that age group, and approaching twice the Metropolitan Adelaide average (2.8%).

The largest number of this population group were living in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (7.9%, nearly three times the metropolitan area average), followed by the neighbouring suburbs of Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (6.9%) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (5.8%), both with more than twice the proportion in the metropolitan area.

Lower proportions were found in Ingle Farm (3.0%) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (2.9%) although both were slightly higher than in Metropolitan Adelaide.

Indicator definition:

People born in overseas countries who reported speaking English 'not well' or 'not at all' as a percentage of the population aged 5 years and over (Census 2016).

2.3. Migration Program and Humanitarian Program

Rationale

Alongside the USA, Canada and New Zealand, Australia is regarded as one of the world's leading immigration destinations. At June 2016, 28.5% of the estimated resident population in Australia was born overseas; one of the highest proportions across all OECD countries.¹¹ The UK and more broadly Europe have traditionally been the leading contributors to the overseas born population in Australia. However, this pattern has changed markedly with Asian countries such as China and more recently India surpassing the UK as the top source country for permanent migrants in Australia.¹²

The Migration Program for skilled and family entrants and the Humanitarian Program for refugees and those in refugee-like situations make up the two formal programs that facilitate the arrival of permanent migrants into Australia. Since 2012-13, the migration planned intake figure has been capped at 190,000 places with the majority allocated to the skill stream, emphasising the focus on skilled migrants who can help address the skill shortages in Australia.¹¹

Migrants other than those under the Humanitarian Program generally have better health than the Australian born population in terms of mortality, hospitalisation rates and prevalence of health risk factors associated with lifestyle. While this is largely attributed to the 'healthy migrant effect' - an eligibility requirement for migrants to be in good health in their migration application - this advantage is said to decline over time to levels similar to the Australian born population. Nonetheless, the health status of migrants can vary depending on birthplace country, age, socioeconomic background, English language proficiency, education and income level.¹³

Migrants can present higher or lower patterns of diseases compared with their Australian born counterparts, thus enjoying advantage as well as disadvantage for particular conditions. Those from non-English speaking backgrounds could be prevented from accessing information and services relating to health due to language and cultural barriers resulting in lower health literacy rates. This is not too dissimilar for elderly migrants who also require culturally and linguistically appropriate services.¹⁴

Of the 135,304 permanent migrants who have arrived in Australia since 2000 and were recorded in the 2016 Australian Census and Migrants Integrated Dataset as resident in South Australia, 15.3% had migrated under the permanent Humanitarian visa stream, with 60.6% under the Skill and 24% under the Family visa stream.¹⁶²

Note: Details of the period of arrival (2000 to 2007, 2007 to 2011 and 2012 to 2016) are available in Table 1 and the workbook available online.

2.3.1. Humanitarian Program

Rationale

The Humanitarian Program is comprised of the offshore (UNHCR referred and the Special Humanitarian Program) and the onshore component (protection provided to onshore refugees). Apart from 2012-13, which saw a 30% increase to 20,000 places under this program, planning levels have hovered between 12,000 and 13,750 places since 1995-96.¹⁵ In 2016-17, 21,968 visas were granted under the Humanitarian Program, the largest intake since 1980-81. This intake included the additional 12,000 places allocated to those displaced by conflicts in Syria and Iran.¹⁶

Results from the Building a New Life in Australia (BNLA) longitudinal study of humanitarian migrants show that overall 15% of respondents reported (under the General Health item from the SF-36) that their health had been 'very poor' or 'poor'.¹⁶⁷ Proportions were higher among females than males, but lower among those aged 15 to 19 years than older age groups.¹⁶⁷ Further, the proportion of BNLA participants reporting poor or very poor health is higher than the general Australian population in 2007-08 (3%).¹⁶⁸ Poor or very poor self-rated health was associated with a greater number of financial hardships and not feeling welcomed in Australia, after adjusting for age, sex, marital status, education, country of origin, visa subclass, time in Australia and experience of traumatic events.¹⁶³

Indicator definition:

People (permanent entrants) entering Australia under the Offshore Humanitarian Program, including those who were granted permanent protection post-arrival in Australia, as a percentage of the total population (Census 2016).

Our council

The 6,213 people in the City of Salisbury who arrived under the Humanitarian Program represented over three times the number in Metropolitan Adelaide (4.5% and 1.4%, respectively of the population).

All of the PHAs had rates that were substantially higher than the metropolitan area rate, with the lowest found in Ingle Farm (2.4%), and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (2.8%) followed by Para Hills/ Salisbury East (3.2%), which was over twice the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide overall. The highest rates were found in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (4.0%), and Salisbury/ Salisbury North (8.2%) which was approaching six times the metropolitan area rate.

Although in most PHAs the number arriving has declined (from the highest numbers in the earliest period to lower numbers in subsequent periods), some 40% of humanitarian migrants now living in Salisbury/ Salisbury North arrived between 2012 and the 9th of August 2016, eight and a half times (8.50) the level in Metropolitan Adelaide, and a similar number in the second period, between 2007 and 2011.

2.3.2. Family stream

Rationale

The family stream of the Migration Program is designed for the migration of immediate family members of Australian citizens, permanent residents of New Zealand citizens. Family stream migrants need to be sponsored by an Australian citizen, permanent resident or eligible New Zealand citizen; apart from the necessary health and character requirements, they are not required to undergo skills testing or language requirement.¹⁷ In 2016-17, the top 3 source countries receiving a Family stream visa were China, India and the UK. The leading visa in the Family stream was the Partner (85.1%) followed by the Parent visa (13.5%); the main recipients of both these categories were from China.¹⁶

Indicator definition:

People (permanent entrants) entering Australia on a Child, Partner, Parent or Other Family stream visa, as a percentage of the total population (Census 2016). These migrants are selected on the basis of their family relationship (spouse, de facto partner, intent to marry, child, parent, other family) with their sponsor who is an Australian citizen, permanent resident, or eligible New Zealand Citizen.

Our council

There were 4,876 people in the City of Salisbury who arrived under the Family stream, at 3.5% of the population substantially (63%) above the metropolitan average (2.2%).

The highest proportions were in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (4.4%, over twice the level in the metropolitan area), followed by Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (4.3%) and Salisbury/ Salisbury North (3.9%). proportions were lower in Ingle Farm (2.6%) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (2.1%).

2.3.3. Skill stream

Rationale

The reported outcomes under the Migration Program includes both the primary applicant and secondary applicants (i.e., dependants of the primary applicant). While the majority of places under the Migration Program are allocated to skilled migrants, it is important to note that in recent decades, there has been an increasing emphasis on the skilled stream away from the family stream. In 1996-97, skilled migrants comprised 47% of the Migration Program which increased to 67% in 2008-09; and has remained at that level since.¹⁷ In 2016-17, the top three source countries granted a Skilled migration visa were India, China and the UK.

Indicator definition:

People (permanent entrants) entering Australia on a Skill stream visa, as a percentage of the total population (Census 2016). The Skill stream consists of a number of categories for prospective migrants where there is demand in Australia for their particular skills. They could be nominated by an employer or State/Territory Government, apply under points based Skilled Migration, have outstanding talents or demonstrated business skills.

Our council

In 2016, there were estimated to be 7,086 people living in the City of Salisbury who entered Australia on a Skill stream visa, representing 5.1% of the total population, compared with 5.7% in the metropolitan area overall.

There was considerable variation across the PHAs with the highest proportion being found in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (10.7%) which was substantially (89%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

Proportions were lower in Ingle Farm (5.9%, although generally consistent with the level in Metropolitan Adelaide), followed by Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (5.0%). The lowest proportions were in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (3.1%) and Salisbury/ Salisbury North (2.8%).

2.4. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

Rationale

In the 2016 Census of Population and Housing, 34,181 people (or 2% of the total South Australian population) identified as being of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander origin²¹ a slight increase of 0.1% since the 2011 Census; and reflects natural population increase (the excess of births over deaths) and other factors, including improvements in data collection methods especially in rural and remote areas, and people newly identifying as Indigenous in the Census.

The Aboriginal population is considerably younger than the non-Indigenous population, reflecting higher fertility and lower life expectancy. In 2016, the median age for this population was 23.0 years, 17 years less than the state's median age of 40.0 years.²¹

About one in three (33.4%) Aboriginal people were aged less than 15 years, while just 4.6% were aged 65 years and over.²¹ The Aboriginal population predominantly lives in South Australia's most populous areas, with 53.8% living in the Greater Adelaide area, and 45.4% living in the rest of the State.²¹

The Aboriginal population is disadvantaged across all domains of wellbeing compared to non-Aboriginal South Australians.²² Thus, it is important for local government to know the size of its Aboriginal population, and to work with them to improve wellbeing and identify needs, if they are to address existing inequalities in health.

Indicator definition:

People identifying in the Census as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander as a percentage of the total population (ABS Estimated Resident Population, June 2016).

Our council

As noted above, there were 2,746 people who reported in the 2016 Census that they were of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander descent. Following the Census, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) has estimated that there were 3,346 people of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander descent resident in the City of Salisbury at 30 June 2016, markedly (39%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (1.7%).

All but one PHA had higher proportions of their population who were Aboriginal people when compared with the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

The highest proportions were in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (3.2%), and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (2.7%), both substantially (85% and 57%, respectively) higher than the level in Metropolitan Adelaide. Lower proportions were found in Ingle Farm (2.4%, 41% above the metropolitan average), Para Hills/ Salisbury East (1.9%, 9% above) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (1.4%, 21% below).

2.5. Disability or long-term illness, and care provided

2.5.1. People who provide unpaid assistance to others: those with a disability, a long-term illness or problems related to old age

Rationale

Unpaid activities undertaken by individuals represent a significant contribution to society and the economy. This includes caring for the aged, those with a long-term illness, or those with a disability. In Australia, it is estimated that over 21.4 billion hours of unpaid care work were undertaken in the 2009-10 financial year.^{23,24} The unpaid care provided by South Australians not only reduces the strain on the health care system but has substantial flow-on benefits to the individuals and families receiving care.

While there are benefits from the care economy to society at large, unpaid care can affect one's ability to fully participate in paid employment.²⁵ Women tend to have lower labour force participation than men and also more likely to be undertaking part-time work. However, for many, low labour force participation is likely to be due in part to caring duties.²⁵

Indicator definition:

People aged 15 years and over who, in the two weeks prior to Census Night, spent time providing unpaid care, help or assistance to family members or others because of a disability, a long-term illness or problems related to old age, as a percentage of the population aged 15 years and over (Census 2016).

Our council

Almost one in eight people (12.2%) in the City of Salisbury aged 15 years and over reported that they spent time providing unpaid care, help or assistance to family members or others because of a disability, a long-term illness or problems related to old age, consistent with the Metropolitan Adelaide rate.

There was little variation between the PHAs, other than for the lower proportion in Dry Creek - North/Pooraka (10.4%).

2.5.2. People with a profound or severe disability and living in the community

Rationale

In Australia, almost one in five (18.3%) Australians report living with a disability. The likelihood of living with disability increases with age. The disability rate among 15-24 year olds was 8.2% and the rate was higher for successively older age groups, with 16.4% of 45-54 year olds, and 23.4% and 31.5% of 55-59 and 60-64 year olds living with disability respectively.²⁶

In 2015, most people (77.4%) with disability (and living in the community, rather than in institutional care) participated in physical activities, visited public places and engaged with friends and family, although rates of social participation for people with disability declined with age.¹⁶⁴ People with disability are more likely to face challenges than those without a disability, further, they have generally lower participation rates in various aspects of life.²⁷

However, rates of social participation for people with a disability were lower than for those without such limitations; and for those with profound or severe limitation were lower than for those with moderate or mild limitation.¹⁶⁴ In 2015, many people with a disability did not leave home as much as they would have like due to their disability or condition.²⁷

Personal networks for people with profound or severe disability are particularly important in supporting their integration into the wider community, thereby enhancing their individual wellbeing, as well as the social fabric of the wider community.¹⁵

Local Government plays an important role in the development of disability-accessible public places and provides community-based services which can increase the social participation of community members living with disability, and their families.

Indicator definition:

People with a profound or severe disability and living in the community as a proportion of the population (all ages, 0 to 64 years and 65 years and over, Census 2016). People with profound or severe limitation need help or supervision always (profound) or sometimes (severe) to perform activities that most people undertake at least daily, that is, the core activities of self-care, mobility and/or communication, as the result of a disability, long-term health condition (lasting six months or more), and/or older age. Note that this indicator excludes people living in long-term supported accommodation, in residential accommodation in nursing homes, accommodation for the retired or aged (not self-contained), hostels for those with a disability and psychiatric hospitals.

Our council

There were 8,087 people in the City of Salisbury with a profound or severe disability and living in the community, 6.1% of the total population; this was notably above the metropolitan average (5.2%). There was considerable variation between the PHAs; Salisbury/ Salisbury North (7.4%) had the highest proportion (some 43% above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide), with the lowest in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (4.0%, 24% below the level in the metropolitan area).

The younger age group (0-64 years) of people with a profound or severe disability and living in the community comprised a markedly (31%) larger proportion (4.4% of the population aged 0-64 years) than in Metropolitan Adelaide (3.4%). Rates were highest in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (5.5%) and was substantially (63%) higher than the metropolitan rate, with the lowest rate in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (2.6%) which was markedly (24%) lower than in Metropolitan Adelaide.

Of the population in the City of Salisbury aged 65 years and over, 16.7% had a profound or severe disability and were living in the community, a notably higher proportion than in Metropolitan Adelaide (14.1%). Again, the highest proportion was in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (19.2%), with the lowest in Ingle Farm (13.6%, and just below the metropolitan average).

2.6. Summary measure of disadvantage: IRSD

Rationale

The ABS Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage (IRSD) is a powerful indicator of the socioeconomic disadvantage faced by numerous sub-population groups across Australia. It is based on the social and economic characteristics of the population in each area, and is a useful summary measure, reflecting the patterns of disadvantage seen in many individual indicators of social inequality.¹⁶⁰

Indicator definition:

The IRSD for the area of analysis, derived by ABS from 2016 Census data. The Index has a base of 1000 for Australia: scores above 1000 indicate relative lack of disadvantage and those below indicate relatively greater disadvantage.

Our council

The IRSD score for the City of Salisbury (917) was below that in Metropolitan Adelaide (989).

There was little variation between the PHAs, other than for the higher score in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (1000) and the lower score in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (833).

3. Employment

3.1. People receiving unemployment benefits

Rationale

Although the relationship between unemployment and health is complex and varies for different population groups, there is consistent evidence from research that unemployment is associated with adverse health outcomes; and that unemployment has a direct effect on physical and mental health over and above the effects of socioeconomic status, poverty, risk factors, or prior ill-health.²⁸⁻³⁰ These effects may impair a person's ability to find further employment.

Unemployment and its accompanying health effects are not distributed evenly through the population. Youth unemployment rates are generally higher, a trend that is more pronounced since the Global Financial Crisis, with young people faring relatively poorly.³¹ In South Australia, unemployment rates are highest among young people aged less than 25 years,³² and are generally higher in rural and remote areas than in urban areas.³³ This can be the result of limited employment opportunities outside the Metropolitan Adelaide area, changes in regionally-based industries, economic policy, and demographic shift.

Local government plays an important role in attracting new industries to their regions, supporting existing industries and facilitating employment opportunities. Community-based services can assist in preventing health problems among unemployed people, and supporting return to work or re-training and skills development.

Indicator definition:

Unemployment beneficiaries are people in receipt of an 'unemployment benefit' - the Newstart Allowance or Youth Allowance (other) paid by the Department of Human Services - as a proportion of the eligible population aged 16 to 64 years (June 2017).

Our council

There were 8,714 unemployment beneficiaries in the City of Salisbury, comprising 9.4% of the population aged 16 to 64 years, nearly 50% above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

The PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (13.4%), and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (9.8%) had proportions substantially higher than in the metropolitan area, with proportions in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (8.3%) and Ingle Farm (8.1%) notably higher.

Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (4.9%) had the lowest rate, some 22% below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

Our council

The majority (85%) of those in receipt of unemployment benefit in the City of Salisbury had been receiving it for six months or more, representing 8.1% of the population aged 16 to 64 years, almost fifty per cent above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (5.4%).

As seen for the previous indicator, the highest proportions were found in the neighbouring PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (11.7%), and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (8.5%), both substantially above the level in the metropolitan area.

Although lower, the 7.0% in both Para Hills/ Salisbury East and Ingle Farm was still markedly (29%) greater than the metropolitan average.

The PHA of Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (4.2%) had the lowest proportion, some 23% lower than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

Indicator definition:

Long-term unemployment beneficiaries are people in receipt of an unemployment benefit (as above) for more than 182 days (approximately six months) as a proportion of the eligible population aged 16 to 64 years (June 2017).

Our council

In the City of Salisbury 5.6% of persons aged 16 to 24 years were in receipt of an unemployment benefit, markedly (48%) more than in the Metropolitan area overall (3.8%).

As with other unemployment measures the highest proportion was in the PHA of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (7.2%), nearly twice the level in the metropolitan area), and the lowest was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (3.1%, notably (17%) lower). With the exception of Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka the other PHAs had rates above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

Indicator definition:

Youth unemployment beneficiaries are young people (aged 16 to 24 years) in receipt of an unemployment benefit (as above) as a proportion of the eligible population aged 16 to 24 years (June 2017).

4. Education

4.1. Young people aged 16 years and not participating in full-time secondary education

Rationale

In South Australia, students are required to continue their education until the age of 17, either at school or through some combination of vocational training and employment.³⁴ This policy recognises the need for higher levels of education and skill in the modern globalised economy. It reflects the policy intent expressed in the 2008 Melbourne Declaration that, to maximise their opportunities for healthy, productive and rewarding futures, Australia's young people must be encouraged not only to complete secondary education, but also to proceed into further training or education.³⁵

The indicator for 16 year old children not participating in full-time secondary education is not intended as an indicator of educational participation; it is included because young people completing Year 12 (and who would be still at school at age 16) are more likely to make a successful initial transition to further education, training and work than early school leavers.

The key to achieving positive change, especially at the local level, is the way in which sectors, institutions, organisations and agencies work together to assist young people to prepare for and make their transition to the world of work and adulthood.³⁶ Local communities rely on a well-trained, local labour force, and Local Government may be able to assist young people who live in their region by also supporting vocational training and apprenticeship opportunities.

Indicator definition:

Young people aged 16 years not in full-time secondary school education, as a proportion of the population aged 16 years (Census 2016).

Our council

There are 265 people in the City of Salisbury aged 16 years who were not participating in full-time secondary education, markedly (29%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (15.5% and 12.0%, respectively of those aged 16).

The main variation at the PHA level was between Salisbury/ Salisbury North (with the highest proportion, of 19.0%, substantially (58%) above the level in metropolitan area) and Ingle Farm (with the lowest, of 12.0%, which was the same as in the metropolitan area overall). The other PHAs had between 14% and 15% of those aged 16 not participating in full-time secondary education.

4.2. School leavers enrolling in higher education

Rationale

Higher education refers to education which usually results in the granting of a bachelor's degree or higher qualification. Higher education contributes to South Australia's intellectual, economic, cultural and social development, and the long term prosperity of the State will be influenced by the future activities of higher education graduates.³⁷ Participation in higher education increases opportunities for choice of occupation and for income and job security, and also equips people with the skills and ability to control many aspects of their lives – key factors that influence wellbeing throughout the life course. A higher education qualification can allow a person to gain an advantage in a competitive labour market and open up new professional opportunities, especially for careers where a qualification is required for employment or practice. On average, graduates earn more than other workers and the unemployment rate for graduates is lower than for the rest of the population.³⁷ Despite the Global Financial Crisis and the end of the mining boom impacting on the earning of early career graduates, degree holders continue to enjoy a significant income premium over Year 12 holders³⁸. For students not enrolling in higher education, there remain other opportunities for training and skills development and pathways to future employment.

Indicator definition:

School leavers enrolling in higher education are those who attained a Year 12 qualification in 2017 and were enrolled at a South Australian university at 31 March 2018, as a proportion of the population aged 17 years, at 30 June 2017.

Our council

In the City of Salisbury, 26.3% of the population aged 17 years who had left school in 2017 were admitted to a university in 2018, notably (18%) below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

None of the PHAs had numbers of their school leavers enrolled at a university comparable with the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall. The highest proportions were in the Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (29.0%), Salisbury/ Salisbury North (28.6%) and Ingle Farm (27.7%) with lower rates in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (25.1%), and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (22.2%, which was nearly a third below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide).

4.3. Children whose mother has low educational attainment

Rationale

Strong relationships between education and health outcomes exist in many countries, favouring the survival and health of children born to educated parents, especially mothers; but the pathways are culturally and historically complex and vary between and within countries.^{39,40} A lack of successful educational experiences of parents may lead to low aspirations for their children; and may be related to parents' attitudes, their ability to manage the complex relationships which surround a child's health and education, and their capacity to control areas of their own lives.⁴⁰⁻⁴² Parents may also struggle to offer guidance with school work and career choices, and children can be further impacted by the lack of role models in their extended family network helping to influence job and study choices.⁴²

Sustainable communities need individuals to be able to take up new educational opportunities, adapt career trajectories, contribute economically and reach their potential regardless of their social status, background or income in order to achieve wider productivity and participation goals.⁴²

Indicator definition:

Children aged less than 15 years living in families where the female parent's highest level of schooling was year 10 or below, or where the female parent did not attend school, as a proportion of all children aged less than 15 years (Census 2016).

Our council

There were 6,543 children (24.0% of children aged less than 15 years) in the City of Salisbury whose mother had low educational attainment, substantially (77%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (13.6%).

There was considerable variation between the PHAs, all of which had relatively more children in these families than in the metropolitan area overall. The highest proportions were found in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (32.0%), Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (26.2%), and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (21.2%), all substantially above the level in the metropolitan area (and, in the case of Salisbury/ Salisbury North, over twice the metropolitan average). The lowest proportions were in Ingle Farm (17.2%) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (14.0%).

4.4. Young people learning or earning

Rationale

Levels of participation in education and the labour market are indicators of the wellbeing of young people.⁴³

Research suggests that young people who are not fully engaged in education or work (or a combination of both) are at greater risk of school failure, unemployment, cycles of low pay, employment insecurity in the longer term, social exclusion, economic and social disadvantage⁴⁶, and poorer health and wellbeing.⁴⁴ The experience of unemployment harms a young person's financial and psychological wellbeing, and these effects are felt more severely by those who experience long-term unemployment.¹⁶¹ Furthermore, those who experience unemployment while young are more likely to be unemployed, have poor health and have lower educational attainment when they are older, than those who are not affected by unemployment while young.¹⁶¹

Participation in education and training and engaging in work locally are also considered important aspects of developing individual capability and building socially inclusive local communities.^{42,45}

Indicator definition:

Young people aged 15 to 24 years engaged in school, work or further education/training as a proportion of the population aged 15 to 24 years (Census 2016).

Our council

Just over four out of five (82.4%) people in the City of Salisbury aged 15 to 24 years were engaged in learning or earning, just below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (86.6%).

In the PHAs, proportions ranged from their highest in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (87.8%, and consistent with the level in Metropolitan Adelaide) to their lowest in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (77.3%, notably (11%), and below the metropolitan average).

5. Income and wealth

5.1. Children in low income, welfare-dependent families

Rationale

Children living in families either solely or largely dependent on government for their income have the least access to financial and other resources and are more likely to have lower achievements in education and poorer health outcomes than their more advantaged peers. In particular, extreme stressful events, such as homelessness, victimisation or abuse, can have long-term effects on children's outcomes.⁴⁷

Low income families are less likely to have sufficient economic resources to support a minimum standard of living; and low income limits the opportunities parents can offer their children.^{41,48} This can affect children and young people in the family through reduced provision of appropriate housing, heating, nutrition, medical care and technology.⁴⁹

Children and young people from low income families can be more prone to psychological or social difficulties, behavioural problems, lower self-regulation and elevated physiological markers of stress.⁵⁰ Research indicates that a primary concern of children and young people in economically disadvantaged families is being excluded from activities that other children and young people appear to take for granted, and the embarrassment this can cause.⁵¹

Having access to this information is important in ensuring that children and families living in low income households are supported in terms of their education, employment, recreation, physical and emotional health, and social inclusion, in addition to having their material needs met.

Indicator definition:

Children aged less than 16 years living in families with incomes under \$36,515 p.a. in receipt of the Family Tax Benefit (A) (whether receiving income support payments or not), as a proportion of all children aged less than 16 years (June 2017). The families these children are living in would all receive the Family Tax Benefit (A) at the maximum level.

Our council

Over a third (35.2%) of all children under the age of 16 years in the City of Salisbury were part of a low income, welfare-dependent family, substantially (53%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (23.0%).

The highest proportions were found in the neighbouring PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (47.7%, over twice the level in the metropolitan area) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (37.3%, some 62% above).

The lower proportions in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (29.4%) and Ingle Farm (26.1%) were both above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide, whereas the proportion in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (23.1%) was consistent with that in Metropolitan Adelaide.

5.2. Recipients of Age and Disability Support Pensions, and Concession Card holders

5.2.1. Recipients of the Age Pension

Rationale

Although older people today are, on average, wealthier than they were in previous generations, these averages mask significant variation in economic circumstances. There are large differences in the distribution of income, wealth and home ownership between older people, with the most disadvantaged being those who live alone and do not own their own home. Those people who enter older age as renters, low paid workers, or who have been out of the labour market for long periods of time (due to unemployment, disability or family responsibilities among other reasons) are the most likely to be exposed to financial vulnerability in older age. Financial limitations may lead to social exclusion, which can result in reduced quality of life, preventable illness and disability, premature institutionalisation and death.⁵²

Local Government can support older people who are pension recipients through the provision of in-home services, and transport, social and other opportunities which allow them to continue to be participating members of the community.

Indicator definition:

People in receipt of an Age Pension from Centrelink or a Service Pension (Age) from the Department of Veterans' Affairs, as a proportion of the population aged 65 years and over (June 2017). An Age Pension is a restricted income paid by the Australian Government to those who generally do not have (or do not have much) income from other sources and who have reached the qualifying age, with the amount paid subject to income and asset tests.

Our council

There were 15,864 recipients of the Age Pension in the City of Salisbury, comprising 81.1% of all people aged 65 years and over, which is markedly above the metropolitan average (67.9%).

There was little variation between the PHAs, with the highest proportions of the population receiving the Age Pension living in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (83.0%) and Ingle Farm (82.7%); the lowest proportion was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (75.8%). All of these proportions were above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

5.2.2. Recipients of the Disability Support Pension

Rationale

Disability Support Pensions (DSPs) are designed to give people an adequate means of support if they are unable to work for at least 15 hours per week at or above the relevant minimum wage, independent of a program of support, due to a permanent physical, intellectual or psychiatric impairment.⁵³ There has been a steady increase in the number of people receiving the Disability Support Pension since its introduction, however a range of has seen a decrease in the number of DSP recipients in recent years. For close to a decade, the proportion of working age people receiving the DSP was relatively stable (5.3% at June 2004 to 5.5% at June 2012)⁵⁴; however, as a result of changes to policy, assessment processes and workforce participation requirements, DSP recipients as a share of the working age population has declined in recent years to 4.7% in 2016-17; similar to levels in 1998-1999.⁵⁵ At June 2017, there were 73,365 DSP recipients in South Australia.⁵⁶

In 2013-14, about half of new DSP recipients moved directly from other income support benefits to DSP.⁵⁷ Receipt of the DSP is strongly age-related, mainly because the incidence of disability rises with age.⁵⁵ In 2016, 2.7% of people aged 16 to 20 received DSP, but this rose with age to 10.3% of people aged 25 to 34, 24.7% of people aged 45-54 and 37.3% of people aged 55-64 years.⁵⁸ Disability rises further with increasing age over 65 years, but after 65, most people are entitled to an Age Pension and the DSP is currently no longer relevant.⁵⁹

Indicator definition:

People aged 16 to 64 years in receipt of a Disability Support Pension from the Department of Human Services or a Service Pension (Permanently Incapacitated) from the Department of Veterans' Affairs, as a proportion of the population aged 16 to 64 years (June 2017).

Our council

Of all the population in the City of Salisbury aged 16 to 64 years, 7.5% were recipients of the Disability Support Pension, a higher proportion than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (6.3%).

There was considerable variation across the PHAs, with the highest rate found in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (10.0%, substantially (60%) higher than in the metropolitan area overall). Ingle Farm (7.7%), Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (7.3%), and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (7.2%) had proportions of 7.7%, 7.3% and 7.2%, respectively, all of which were above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide. The 4.3% in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka was markedly (30%) below the level in the metropolitan area.


5.2.3. People who hold a Pensioner Concession Card

Rationale

Entitlement to an Australian Government Pensioner Concession Card (PCC) is used here as a proxy for socioeconomic disadvantage, although it is not universally so. People who hold a PCC include those in receipt of a range of pension and benefit types, with the largest group being those receiving the Age Pension. Other groups include people with disabilities, carers, the unemployed and sole parents.

In general, people who have a Pensioner Concession Card or Health Care Card are likely to have poorer health. In 2003, it was reported that these populations were more likely to suffer chronic health problems (most chronic diseases and poorer oral health), including psychosocial problems (such as sleep disturbances, anxiety and depression), have more medications prescribed and receive less preventive care. Female card holders were less likely to have had a sexual health check (including Pap smear).⁶⁰⁻⁶¹

As PCC cardholders have some of the lowest incomes, they are also likely to have poorer health. Compared with those who have social and economic advantages, disadvantaged Australians are more likely to have shorter lives, experience higher levels of disease risk factors and use fewer preventive health services.⁶²



Our council

In the City of Salisbury over a quarter (27.6%) of the population aged 15 years and over were Pensioner Concession Card holders, notably (18%) more than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (23.4%).

Mirroring the previous income-related measures, the highest proportion was found in Salisbury/Salisbury North (33.1%, markedly (42%) above the metropolitan average), and the lowest was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (17.4%, notably (26%) below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide).

5.2.4. People who hold an Australian Government Health Care Card

Rationale

The Australian Government Health Care Card (HCC) is issued to recipients of certain social security benefit or allowance payments to provide access to health concessions, including cheaper pharmaceutical medicines. Also see the note above re holders of a Pensioner Concession Card (PCC), noting that holders of the HCC are generally financially better off than those holding a PCC.

Our council

There were 13,529 Health Care Card holders in the City of Salisbury, representing 11.0% of the population aged 0 to 64 years, almost a third above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (8.4%).

The highest proportion was in the PHA of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (14.1%, substantially (69%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide), and the lowest was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (8.0%, or slightly below that in Metropolitan Adelaide).

Indicator definition:

People in receipt of a Health Care Card from the Department of Human Services as a proportion of the population aged 0 to 64 years (June 2017).

5.3. Household crowding

Rationale

Adequate and affordable housing is an important determinant of health. An aspect of housing suitability now measured in Australia provides an indication of crowding. Household crowding is defined according to the Canadian National Occupancy Standard, a widely-used guideline for assessing whether a household has a sufficient number of bedrooms for household members. This variable, which is new in the 2016 Census of Population and Housing, can be used to identify if a dwelling is either under or over utilised. The indicator published is of the number of dwellings requiring extra bedrooms, taking into account a series of household demographics, such as the number of usual residents, their relationship to each other, age and sex.⁶³

At the 2016 Census of Population and Housing, 3.7% of dwellings were assessed as requiring extra bedrooms. The proportion of dwellings varies widely around this measure, with proportions of over 50% in parts of the Northern Territory. In South Australia, 2.6% of dwellings were assessed as requiring extra bedrooms, with again a wide variation at the small area level.

Indicator definition:

Private dwellings requiring extra bedrooms as a proportion of all occupied private dwellings.

Our council

Household crowding affected 2,180 households in the City of Salisbury, comprising 4.4% of all households; this was over one and a half times the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (2.8%).

Household crowding was at its most severe in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (5.9%, just over twice the metropolitan rate), followed by Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (5.5%, just under twice that level).

Although lower, the 3.7% in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka was 31%, and the 3.1% in Ingle Farm was 1% above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide. The lowest proportion was found in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (2.9%, and only slightly above the level in the metropolitan area).

5.4. Housing stress and rent relief

5.4.1. Low income households under mortgage stress

Rationale

A family or individual is considered to be in mortgage stress if they are in a low income bracket and pay more than 30% of their income on mortgage repayments. In 2017, approximately 18.7% of households paying mortgages in South Australia experienced mortgage stress.⁶⁴

Increasing numbers of families are experiencing mortgage stress, and are at risk of homelessness, and poorer wellbeing.⁶⁵ Housing stress is rising due to low investment in public housing, demographic shifts and increases in the number of households including through family breakdown; and a tendency for more affluent people to want to live in the inner city, which increases rents and forces low income earners out of even relatively low standard housing.⁶⁶ A

household that is in stress is less likely to contribute to or participate in community life due to financial constraints. This issue can further manifest in other ways such as restricting one to live in lower priced areas thus minimising employment opportunities, delay family formation or cause family breakdown.⁶⁷

Indicator definition:

Households in the bottom 40% of the income distribution (those with less than 80% of median equivalised income), spending more than 30% of their income on mortgage repayments as a proportion of mortgaged private dwellings. See Notes on the data for more details.

Our council

There were 49% more low-income households in the City of Salisbury experiencing mortgage stress (12.6% of all low-income households) than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (8.5%).

There was considerable variation between the PHAs; the highest proportions were in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (14.8%) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (14.4%) being both substantially higher than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall, at 74% and 70% higher, respectively. The proportion in Ingle Farm (12.5%) was 48% above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide, and the lowest levels of mortgage stress, in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (10.2%), and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (9.8%), were still above the level in the metropolitan area.

5.4.2. Low income households under rental stress

Rationale

A family or individual is considered to be under rental stress if they are in a low income bracket and pay more than 30% of their income on rent. In 2016, Census data showed that more than one quarter of Australian households (29.4%) rented their home from a private landlord. In 2017, approximately 60% of South Australian households experiencing house stress were renters and over one in three households (35.8%) paying rent spent more than 30% of their income on rent.⁶⁴

As it is almost impossible for all but the most disadvantaged families to access public housing, renting privately has become the only housing option for low income households. For many low income households who rent, shortages of affordable rental housing, rising rents and stagnant rent relief, and tight vacancy rates are factors that exacerbate their position and move them closer to the poverty line.⁶⁵ This situation can also negatively affect their health and wellbeing. Younger people and older people in private rental, lone-parent and single person households, women, people born in a non-English speaking country, and unemployed people are groups most likely to be living in unaffordable housing.⁶⁶ A household that is in stress is less likely to contribute or participate in community life due to financial constraints. This issue can further manifest in other ways such as restricting one to live in lower priced areas thus minimising employment opportunities, delay family formation or cause family breakdown.⁶⁷

Indicator definition:

Households in the bottom 40% of the income distribution (as above), spending more than 30% of their income on rent as a proportion of rented private dwellings. See Notes on the data for more details.

Our council

There were 9% more low income households in the City of Salisbury who experienced rental stress (under this measure) when compared to Metropolitan Adelaide overall, with 7.2% and 6.4% respectively.

The PHA with the highest level of rental stress was Salisbury/ Salisbury North (36.1%, markedly (22%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide), with slightly lower levels in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (32.8%), Ingle Farm (31.6%) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (31.4%). The lowest level, and the only proportion below the metropolitan average, was found in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (26.4%).

5.4.3. Rented social housing

Rationale

Housing plays an important role in the health and wellbeing of South Australians and, in doing so, promotes positive health, education, employment and security for individuals.⁸³

Social housing includes rental housing owned and managed by Housing SA or a housing co-operative, community or church group; social housing rents in general are set below market levels and determined by household income.⁶⁹ The social housing services system seeks to provide low income people with access to housing assistance; supporting their wellbeing and contributing to their social and economic participation by providing services that are timely and affordable, safe, appropriate (meeting the needs of individual households), high quality and sustainable.⁷⁰ The distribution of social rental housing remains an indicator of socioeconomic disadvantage, with tenants increasingly welfare-dependent (especially single parents; those who are unemployed, aged or with a disability; and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people).

It is of note that the number of houses available for rental through Housing SA, the main provider of social housing, has declined substantially since 1996.

Waiting lists for social housing are long, with 394,300 households in Australia's main social housing programs in 2015-16 which comprise public rental housing, state owned and managed Indigenous housing and mainstream community housing. In 2007-08 to 2015-16, there was a 103 percent increase in the number of households in community housing, from around 35,700 to 72,400.⁷⁰ Moreover, housing affordability has declined in Australia as increases in median income has not kept pace with growth in median mortgage and rental payments. In 2001-2011, median mortgage and rental payments increased by 100 percent whereas median household income increased by only 60 percent.⁷¹

Indicator definition:

Occupied private dwellings rented from Housing SA, a housing co-operative, community or church group as a proportion of all occupied private dwellings in 2016.

Our council

In the City of Salisbury 7.2% of all dwellings were rented from Housing SA, a housing co-operative, community or church group, notably above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (6.4%).

There was considerable variation across the PHAs with the highest number and proportion of these dwellings found in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (10.0%, substantially (57%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide). Rates were lower in Ingle Farm (8.2%), and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (7.7%), although both were markedly higher than in the metropolitan area overall.

The lowest proportions were in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (4.8%) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (4.2%), both with markedly fewer of these dwellings than in Metropolitan Adelaide.

5.4.4. Recipients of rent relief

Rationale

Affordable, secure and safe housing is fundamental to one's health and wellbeing, employment, education and other life opportunities. Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) assists low income people in housing need. It is a subsidy paid largely to people who receive social security or other income-support benefits from the Commonwealth Government, and who rent in the private rental market, in community housing, and in other renting situations. Most recipients of rent assistance would be paying more than 30% of their gross income on rent if rent assistance was not available – a situation referred to as 'housing stress'.⁷²

In 2017, 54% of all CRA recipients were single with no dependent children. Sole parent families represented 21% of the total rent assistance population. If not for CRA received, nearly 7 in 10 CRA recipients (68%) would have been in rental stress.⁷³ In South Australia, there were 100,518 CRA recipients of whom 42.3% were single with no dependent children. In terms of age distribution, one quarter (25%) of all CRA recipients were in the 60 years and over age group, followed by 22.7% in the 30-39 years age group.

Indicator definition:

Renters receiving Commonwealth Rent Assistance from the Department of Human Services (June 2017) as a proportion of all occupied private dwellings (Census 2016).

Our council

Nearly a fifth (19.2%) of all households in the City of Salisbury were recipients of rent relief from Centrelink, markedly (22%) more than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (15.7%).

The highest proportion was in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (27.4%, substantially (74%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide), and the lowest was in Ingle Farm (13.7%, which was notably (13%) lower than in Metropolitan Adelaide.

5.5. No motor vehicle

Rationale

Ready access to transport provides a link with social and work-related activities. While public transport can adequately provide this link for some households, for others such access can only be achieved through owning a car. Planned land use and the transition to private motor vehicles after World War II led to private motor vehicles as the dominant form of transport, resulting in a high level of dependency on cars in Australia. A number of social groups are more vulnerable to transport disadvantage, particularly the young, aged, poor and disabled.⁷⁴

People living in households without a car face many disadvantages in gaining access to jobs, services and recreation, especially if they are in low-density outer suburbia, or in rural or remote areas, or in a country town. The ability to afford to run and maintain a vehicle in reliable condition to meet their transport needs, and the costs of registering and insuring a vehicle, are other important factors.⁷⁵

Not all South Australians are able to drive, have access to, or own a passenger vehicle. In the 2016 Census, 47,848 householders in South Australia reported having no motor vehicle at the dwelling (7.5% of occupied private dwellings in South Australia).¹⁰ While some of these may be more affluent households living in inner- and near-city areas, the majority are more likely to be disadvantaged households. For the latter, a city which is car-dependent may restrict their access to services, employment, shops, social and other activities.⁷⁵ Transport services, which may be provided by local councils, can provide much needed assistance, especially for older residents.

Indicator definition:

Occupied private dwellings with no motor vehicle garaged or parked there on Census night, as a proportion of all occupied private dwellings (Census 2016).

Our council

In the City of Salisbury, 7.1% of households reported in the 2016 Census that they did not have a motor vehicle at their dwelling; this was a notably lower proportion than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (8.0%).

Similarly low rates were found in all of the PHAs with the exception of Salisbury/ Salisbury North, where the proportion of these households (10.3%) was markedly (28%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

6. Early life and childhood

6.1. Total fertility rate

Rationale

Fertility is an important component of population change (particularly population age-structure), and low fertility has implications for a population's ability to sustain itself.⁷⁶ Fertility levels vary between population groups, areas with different socioeconomic conditions, and between metropolitan and regional areas. Differences may exist for a variety of reasons, such as culture, social norms, employment, the economy, and socioeconomic status.⁷⁶

The Australian TFR in 2017 stood at 1.74 children per woman, the lowest since 2001⁷⁷ and well below the population replacement level of 2.1 children per woman. In South Australia, the TFR declined from 1.9 in 2007 to 1.6 children per woman in 2017 and the lowest rate of all states and territories.⁷⁷ Sustained periods of fertility below the replacement level are major drivers of population ageing. Given the potential economic impacts of an ageing population⁷⁸, fertility is of particular interest to local planners and policy-makers.

Indicator definition:

Total fertility rate per woman, calculated from age-specific fertility rates (total live births as a rate for all women aged 15 to 49 years). The total fertility rate (TFR) represents the average number of children that a woman could expect to bear during her reproductive lifetime: it is calculated from details of the age of the female population, the number of births and the age of the mother at birth.

Our council

The total fertility rate in the City of Salisbury (a rate of 2.02) was 13% higher than the Metropolitan Adelaide rate (1.79).

At the PHA level, the highest rates were in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (2.21) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (2.12).

Lower rates were found in Ingle Farm (1.93), Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (1.89), and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (1.85), although all were above the total fertility rate in Metropolitan Adelaide.

6.2. Women smoking during pregnancy

Rationale

Maternal smoking during pregnancy carries a higher risk of adverse outcomes for the baby before and after delivery, which include low birthweight, premature birth, miscarriage and perinatal death, poor intra-uterine growth, placental complications and Sudden Infant Death Syndrome.⁷⁹ Smoking during pregnancy can also lead to other problems such as a higher risk of disability and developmental delay, childhood cancers, decreased lung function, increased respiratory illness, high blood pressure, and obesity which may affect children through to adulthood.⁷⁹

In 2016, 9.4% of all women in South Australia reported to be smokers at their first antenatal visit, a considerable decline from 21.9% in 2001. The proportion of Aboriginal women who smoked during pregnancy at the time of their first antenatal visit was significantly higher, at 43.9% compared with 8.1% of non-Aboriginal women. Some Aboriginal women (4.9%) reported that they quit smoking prior to their first ante-natal visit; this compared with 2.4% for non-Indigenous women.⁸⁰

Indicator definition:

Women who reported that they smoked during a pregnancy, as a proportion of the total number of pregnancies over the time period (three years: 2012 to 2014).

Our council

In the City of Salisbury, 16.5% of pregnant woman smoked during pregnancy, over a third more than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (12.3%).

There was considerable variation across the PHAs, with the highest rates of smoking found in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (20.3%) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (20.2%), 66% and 64%, respectively above the rate in the metropolitan area. Rates in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (17.2%) and Ingle Farm (14.0%) were 40% and 14%, respectively above the metropolitan rate. The lowest rate proportion of women smoking while pregnant was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (7.7%), almost a third below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

6.3. Childhood immunisation

Rationale

If sufficiently large proportion of children in a community is immunised against a particular infectious disease, then the potential for that disease to spread is greatly reduced. Another important implication of immunisation is the decrease in human suffering, disability and cost of health care and economic loss through preventing an infectious disease and its consequences.

Immunisation data are collected by Medicare Australia, which has maintained the Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) since 1996. The ACIR provides information on the immunisation status of children under seven years of age in Australia.

6.3.1. At one year of age

Our council

The rate of full immunisation at one year of age in the City of Salisbury (95.4%) was marginally above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (94.0%), with little variation in coverage between the PHAs.

6.3.2. At five years of age

Our council

As with full immunisation at age one, the level of full immunisation at five years of age in the City of Salisbury (94.3%) was consistent with the Metropolitan Adelaide average (93.6%).

Again, there was little variation in coverage between the PHAs.

Indicator definition:

Fully immunised at 1 year means that a child aged 12 months to less than 15 months received three doses of a diphtheria, tetanus and whooping cough-containing vaccine, three doses of polio vaccine, two or three doses of Haemophilus influenzae type b vaccine (dependent of the type of vaccine used), three doses of hepatitis B vaccine, and three doses pneumococcal vaccine, all prior to the age of 1 year. See Data notes for more information.

Indicator definition:

Fully immunised at 5 years means that a child aged 60 to less than 63 months received four doses of a diphtheria, tetanus and whooping cough-containing vaccine, four doses of polio vaccine, and two doses of a measles, mumps and rubella-containing vaccine, all prior to the age of 5 years. See Data notes for more information.

6.4. Obesity: males and females aged 2 to 17 years of age

Rationale

Obesity in childhood can cause a range of physical and emotional health problems, and obesity increases the risk in adulthood of premature illness, a range of chronic diseases, disability and premature death. While there are specific genetic disorders that give rise to overweight and obesity, recent epidemiological trends indicate that the rise in overweight and obesity is a result of environmental and behavioural changes.⁸¹

In 2017-18, it is estimated that more than one in four (28.4%) children and young people aged 5-17 years in South Australia were overweight or obese, comprised of 17.8% overweight and 9.9% obese.^{8a2} This is an increase on the proportions in 2014-15 (23.7%) and 2011-12 (24.1%).^{82b}

Overweight and obesity in the South Australian population is not a simple matter of overindulgence or lack of physical activity.⁸¹ There are numerous environmental and societal factors that combine to generate an 'obesogenic' environment; i.e., one that promotes increased energy intake (in food and beverages) and/or reduced energy expenditure (physical activity).

The urban environment is becoming gradually less conducive to supporting active leisure, particularly where young children are concerned, with fears for their personal safety and a lack of child-appropriate play space.⁸³ Local Government has an important role in developing resources which support greater opportunities for physical activity for children and their families.

6.4.1. Males

Our council

It was estimated that 8.3 obese males per 100 males aged 2 to 17 (8.3%) in the City of Salisbury were classed as obese, markedly (26%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (6.6%).

The highest rate of obesity was estimated for Salisbury/ Salisbury North (9.9%, substantially (51%) higher than the Metropolitan Adelaide rate). Lower rates were found in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (9.1%), and Ingle Farm (7.6%), although they were still above the metropolitan rate.

The lowest rates were in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (6.9%) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (6.7%) both slightly above the Metropolitan Adelaide rate.

6.4.2. Females

Our council

The estimated rate of obesity in females (8.5%) in the City of Salisbury aged 2 to 17 was similar to that for males and was similarly 26% higher than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (6.7%).

The PHAs show a similar pattern to the males, with the highest rates in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (10.1%, substantially (51%) higher than the metropolitan rate) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (9.3%, 39% higher) and the lowest in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (6.8%).

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of males or females aged 2 to 17 years who were assessed as being obese, based on their measured height and weight. These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

6.5. Daily fruit consumption at ages 4 to 17 years

Rationale

The consumption of adequate daily amounts of fresh fruit and vegetables is associated with good nutrition and better health. Diets high in vegetables and fruit are associated with lower rates of many cancers, coronary heart disease, stroke, hypertension, cataracts and macular degeneration of the eye, and type 2 diabetes. The 2013 Australian Dietary Guidelines recommend a minimum number of serves of fruit and vegetables each day for children and young people, depending on their age and sex, to ensure good nutrition and health.⁸² In 2014-15, two thirds (66.6%) of children aged 2 to 18 years in South Australia were estimated to have met the guidelines for recommended daily serves of fruit, with girls more likely than boys to meet the recommended intake.⁸²

The current recommended intake of fruit in the 2013 NHMRC Australian Dietary Guidelines is 1.5 serves for children aged 4 to 8 years and two for persons aged 9 years and over.⁸²

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of children aged 4 to 17 years who had an adequate fruit intake meeting the 2013 National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Australian Dietary Guidelines (see above). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

Our council

Some 62.2% of children and young people aged 4 to 17 were estimated to have met the recommended daily requirement for fruit consumption in the City of Salisbury, slightly (5%) below the Metropolitan Adelaide rate (65.3%).

There was little variation between the PHAs, with the highest rate in Ingle Farm (67.2%) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (65.9%), and the lowest in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (60.0%) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (60.3%).

6.6. Infant death rate

Rationale

The survival of infants in their first year of life is viewed as an indicator of the general health and wellbeing of a population.⁸⁴ Infant mortality refers to deaths of infants under one year of age and is measured by the infant mortality rate (IMR), the rate of infant deaths per 1,000 births in a calendar year. The IMR for Aboriginal infants is significantly higher than that for non-Indigenous infants, indicating their overall poorer health and wellbeing and the levels of socioeconomic disadvantage of their families, much of which represent the legacy of colonisation, cultural dispossession, discriminatory policies and social exclusion.⁸⁵

Indicator definition:

Infant death rate per 1,000 live births: deaths that occurred before 12 months of age as a proportion of all births expressed as a rate per 1,000 live births per calendar year (over five years: 2011 to 2015).

Our council

The infant death rate of 1.7 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in the City of Salisbury was almost two thirds of the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide (2.6 infant deaths per 1,000 live births), although it was based on a small number of deaths (17 deaths over a five-year period).

Numbers for Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka, Ingle Farm, Para Hills/ Salisbury East, and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie were suppressed to maintain confidentiality as they were very small. The only rate that could be shown was for the PHA of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (2.6 infant deaths per 1,000 live births), a rate which was consistent with that in the metropolitan area.

6.7. Children and young people who are clients of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service

Rationale

Mental health problems affect significant numbers of children and young people each year.

Approximately 14% of 12-17 year olds and 27% of 18-25 year olds experience such problems each year; and 75% of mental health problems emerge before the age of 25.⁵⁴ Mental health problems in childhood and adolescence can have far reaching effects on the physical wellbeing, educational, psychological and social development of individuals. When early signs of difficulty are not addressed, mental health problems may become more serious and develop into mental disorders.

The Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) provides services for children and young people with emotional, behavioural or mental health problems, and their families. Services are provided by child and family specialists including psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, nurses, occupational therapists and speech pathologists. CAMHS staff also offer a range of prevention, early intervention and mental health promotion programs.

Indicator definition:

Children and young people aged 0 to 19 years who are clients of the government-funded CAMHS (data over three years: 2015/16 to 2017/18), expressed as an indirectly age-standardised rate per 100,000 population aged 0 to 19 years.

Our council

There were 1,608 children and young people in the City of Salisbury who were clients of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service over the three years to 2017/18, an annual rate of 1,487.2 clients per 100,000 population aged 0 to 19 years. This rate was notably (14%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (1,303.9 clients per 100,000 population aged 0 to 19 years).

Rates varied between the PHAs with the highest rates found in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (1,941.8 clients per 100,000 population aged 0 to 19 years, markedly (49%) above the metropolitan rate) and Ingle Farm (1,469.9 clients per 100,000 population aged 0 to 19 years, which was 13% higher).

Rates were lower in Para Hills/ Salisbury East and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie, both generally consistent with the metropolitan rate, but with a lower rate in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (1,161.3 clients per 100,000 population aged 0 to 19 years, notably below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall).

6.8. Early childhood development

Rationale

The Australian Early Development Census (AEDC) measures the development of children in their first year of full-time school. It provides a picture of early childhood development outcomes and was conducted nationwide in 2009, 2012, 2015 and 2018 (results from the 2018 survey are not yet available). In the 2015 data collection, information was collected on 302,003 Australian children (98.1% of the estimated population) in their first year of full-time school.⁸⁵

The results from the AEDC provide communities, schools, government and non-government agencies and policy makers with information about how local children have developed by the time they start school across five areas of early childhood development: physical health and wellbeing, social competence, emotional maturity, language and cognitive skills (schools-based), and communication skills and general knowledge. The AEDC domains have been shown to predict later health, wellbeing and academic success.⁸⁵

Indicator definition:

The number of children in their first year of school in 2015 who were considered to be 'developmentally vulnerable' (with a score in the lowest 10%) on one or more domains of the AEDC, as a proportion of all children assessed.

Our council

Over one quarter (29.5%) of children in the City of Salisbury in their first year of school, were assessed as being developmentally vulnerable on one or more domains under the AEDC, some 28% above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (23.0%).

The PHA of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (38.5%) had the highest proportion, substantially (67%) above the level in the metropolitan area. Proportions were lower in the neighbouring PHAs of Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (30.3%) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (29.2%) although both were still markedly above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall. The lowest proportions were in Ingle Farm (22.2%) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (20.4%), with the latter being notably lower than in the metropolitan area.

7. Personal health and wellbeing

7.1. Self-assessed health as fair or poor

Rationale

Self-assessed health status is commonly used as a proxy measure of actual health status; and how people rate their health is strongly related to their experience of illness and disability.^{87, 88} This measure is therefore an important indicator of key aspects of quality of life.⁸⁹

Australians generally consider themselves to be healthy. In 2017–18, over half (56.4%) of Australians aged 15 years and over rated their health as 'very good' or 'excellent', while only 3.7% rated it as 'poor'.⁹⁰ Older Australians generally rated themselves as having poorer health than younger people, with persons aged 75-84 years and 85 years and over recording the highest proportions of fair or poor health, at 30.9% and 35.8% respectively.

⁹⁰ There was little difference in the way men and women assessed their overall health, with men slightly more likely to report their health as fair or poor other than at ages 85 years and over, where almost one third more women than men reported poorer health.⁹⁰

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 15 years and over reporting their health as 'fair' or 'poor' (and not 'good', 'very good' or 'excellent') expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 15 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

Our council

It was estimated that, in 2014–15, almost one fifth (18.9%) of the population of the City of Salisbury assessed their health as 'fair', or 'poor', rather than as 'good', 'very good', or 'excellent'; this rate was 21% above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (15.6%).

The highest rates of people reporting their health in this way were found in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (22.0%), and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (20.4%), both markedly higher than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall. Lower rates, although still above the metropolitan average, were found in Ingle Farm (18.0%) and, Para Hills/ Salisbury East (16.7%). The lowest rate, in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (15.5%), was consistent with the metropolitan rate.

7.2. High or very high levels of psychological distress

Rationale

Mental health is fundamental to the wellbeing of individuals, their families and the population as a whole. One indication of the mental health and wellbeing of a population is provided by measuring levels of psychological distress using the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale-10 items (K10). The K10 questionnaire was developed to yield a global measure of psychological distress, based on ten questions about people's level of nervousness, agitation, psychological fatigue and depression in the four weeks prior to interview, asked of respondents 18 years and over.⁹¹ Based on previous research, a very high K10 score may indicate a need for professional help.⁹²

In 2017-18, 13.5% of South Australians experienced 'high' or 'very high' levels of psychological distress, compared with 13.7% in 2014-15, 11.3% in 2011-12. Proportionally more females than males experienced 'high' or 'very high' psychological distress in 2017-18 (14.9% and 12.0% respectively).⁹³

Indicator definition:

Estimated population aged 18 years and over assessed as having a high or very high level of psychological stress under the K10 expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

Our council

Using the K10 measure of psychological distress, it was estimated that 18.1% of the population of the City of Salisbury aged 18 years and over had high or very high levels of psychological distress, markedly (30%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (13.9%).

The PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (22.4%) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (20.8%) had the highest rates, with over one fifth of their adult populations estimated to have had high or very high levels of psychological distress (61% and 49%, respectively above the Metropolitan Adelaide rate). The lowest rates of high or very high psychological distress were estimated for adults in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (12.8%, and some 8% below the rate in the metropolitan area).

7.3. Type 2 diabetes

Rationale

Diabetes is a serious complex condition which can affect the entire body. Diabetes requires daily selfcare and, if complications develop, can have a significant impact on quality of life and can reduce life expectancy. Diabetes mellitus is a chronic disease characterised by high blood glucose levels resulting from defective insulin production, insulin action or both.⁹⁴ There are a number of different forms of diabetes, which can cause a number of serious complications, especially cardiovascular, eye and renal diseases.^{95,96}

The main types of diabetes include, type 1, type 2 and gestational diabetes. In 2017-18, it was estimated in the National Health Survey that 92,000 South Australians (5.6%) aged 18 years and over had diabetes mellitus.⁹³ The prevalence of diabetes tripled between 1989-90 and 2014-15 with males, the elderly, Indigenous Australians and those in remote areas or socioeconomically disadvantaged areas at a higher risk of developing this condition and have much greater hospitalisation and death rates from diabetes than other Australians. Further, diabetes prevalence was almost twice as high in the lowest socioeconomic group compared to those in the highest socioeconomic group. Indigenous Australians are also four times as likely than the non-Indigenous population to have diabetes.⁹⁵

The combination of massive changes to diet and the food supply, combined with massive changes to physical activity with more sedentary work and less activity, means most populations are seeing more type 2 diabetes.¹⁶⁵ Control of modifiable risk factors (such as overweight, obesity and physical inactivity) through lifestyle modification is key to arresting prediabetes and preventing type 2 diabetes and reducing complications such as heart diseases, stroke, kidney disease, blindness, nerve damage, leg and foot amputations, and death.⁹⁷⁻⁹⁹

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people with type 2 diabetes mellitus as a long-term condition, expressed as a rate per 100 total population (indirectly age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

Our council

The proportion of the population of the City of Salisbury estimated to have type 2 diabetes (5.4%) was markedly (25%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (4.3%).

Rates in the PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (6.1%), Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (5.9%) and Ingle Farm (5.3%) were all markedly above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide. Diabetes prevalence was lower in the PHAs of Para Hills/ Salisbury East (4.8%) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (4.7%), although in both instances were still above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

7.4. Mental health problems

Rationale

Good mental health is a state of wellbeing where one is able to cope with the normal stresses of life, work productively and contribute to their community.¹⁰⁰ Mental illness can have negatively impact on individuals, families and carers severely and with far reaching influence on social issues such as poverty, unemployment and homelessness. Further, those with mental illness may also face isolation discrimination and stigma.¹⁰¹

In 2011, mental and substance use disorders accounted for 12.1% of the total disease burden in Australia, the third highest group of diseases behind cancer and cardiovascular diseases (AIHW 2016).¹⁰² There were an estimated 4.0 million Australians (17.5%) who reported having a mental and behavioural condition¹⁰³ in 2014-15, an increase from 13.6% in 2011-12, 11.2% in 2007-08 and 9.6% in 2001.¹⁰⁴ The most common mental illnesses are anxiety related (11.2%) and mood affective disorders (9.3%). Women (19.2%) are more likely than men (15.8%) to have mental and behavioural conditions.¹⁰³

Of the 20% of Australians (3.8 million people) with a mental illness in any one year, 11.7% with a mental disorder also reported a physical disorder. Further, 5.3% reported 2 or more mental disorders and 1 or more comorbid physical conditions. The onset of mental illness is typically around mid-to-late adolescence, and Australian youth (18-24 years old) have the highest prevalence of mental illness than any other age group¹⁰⁵. Almost one in two (45%) Australians are estimated to experience a mental illness in their lifetime, equating to 8.6 million people based on the 2016 population.¹⁰⁶

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of males/females with current, long-term mental and behavioural problems expressed as a rate per 100 males/females (indirectly age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

7.4.1. Males

Our council

Mental health problems were estimated to have affected 17.6% of males in the City of Salisbury, slightly more than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (16.8%).

The highest prevalence was estimated for males in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (20.4%) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (18.5%), and the lowest for males in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (14.0%).

7.4.2. Females

Our council

Some 18.9% of females were affected by mental health problems in the City of Salisbury, consistent with the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide (19.0%).

As with males, the highest rates were in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (21.3%) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (19.4%), and the lowest was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (15.6%). The rate estimated for Ingle Farm and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (of 18.9% and 18.1%) were below the metropolitan rate.

7.5. Tobacco smoking

Rationale

Smoking is the leading preventable cause of death and disease in Australia. Around 2 out of three deaths among current smokers is linked to smoking; and in the 50 years from 1960 to 2010 it is estimated to have killed 821,000 Australians.^{107,108} The Australian Burden of Disease Study in 2011 found that tobacco use was one of the single leading risk factors to death and disease as it accounted for 9% of the total burden¹⁰², being linked with a wide range of diseases such as heart disease, diabetes, stroke, cancer, renal disease, eye disease and respiratory conditions.¹⁰⁹

In 2017-18, the National Health Survey estimated that just under one in seven (13.1%) or 169,100 South Australian adults were daily smokers; while a further 1.4% of people also reported smoking, they did so on a less than daily basis.⁹⁰ The negative effects of passive smoking indicate that the risks to health of smoking affect more than just the smoker. Passive smoking increases the risk of heart disease, asthma, and some cancers. It may also increase the risk of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome and may predispose children to allergic sensitisation.¹⁶⁶ Rates of smoking differ between males and females and across age groups; and between 2001 and 2017-18, overall rates of smoking decreased for both males and females. In 2017-18, 16.6% of males and 12.3% of females aged 18 years and over were current smokers (includes daily smokers and other smokers).⁹⁰

For the period 2004-05, tobacco smoking was estimated to cost \$31.5 billion annually in health care, lost productivity and other social costs.¹¹⁰ Further, the economic impact of long-term lost productivity to smoking was estimated to cost \$388 billion.¹¹¹ The prevalence of smoking is also significantly higher among lower socioeconomic groups, particularly those facing multiple personal and social challenges.^{112,113} However, the prevalence of smoking in Australia is one of the lowest in the world and has greatly declined from 2001 with 20% of adults who smoke on a daily basis to 13% in 2016.^{108,112}

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 18 years and over who reported being a current smoker, expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

Our council

There were an estimated 18,783 smokers in the City of Salisbury aged 18 years and over (17.4 male smokers per 100 males aged 18 years and over, or 17.4%), markedly (23%) more than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (14.2%).

In the PHAs, the highest rates were in the neighbouring PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (21.8%, a substantially (53%) higher rate than in the metropolitan area), followed by Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (19.0%, 34% higher), Ingle Farm (17.0%, 19% higher) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (15.5%, 9% higher). The lowest rate was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (11.8%) and was notably lower than the metropolitan rate.

7.6. Obesity

Rationale

Overweight and obesity which refers to an accumulation of excessive fat, is a major health issue in Australia as it presents a number of health risks. The fundamental cause of a sustained energy imbalance results from consuming calories greater than the energy expended through physical activity. A range of factors such as an individual's biological and genetic traits, lifestyle factors and their obesogenic environment (i.e., physical, economic, political and sociocultural factors) play a part in their energy balance.^{114,115}

Being overweight or obese increases one's likelihood of developing a range of serious or chronic conditions such as cardiovascular disease, some cancers, musculoskeletal conditions, diabetes, chronic kidney disease, dementia, asthma, gallbladder and bile duct disease¹¹⁶; however, there are greater health risks being obese compared with those who are overweight but not obese.¹¹⁷

In 2017–18, over a third (35.6%) of South Australians 18 years and over were overweight and a further 30% were obese.⁹⁰ Substantially more men than women were overweight (44.1% of men compared with 27.6% of women); for obesity, the gap was much smaller, at 30.0% compared with 28.7%). The proportion of Australians who are obese has increased across all age groups over time, up from 18.7% in 1995 to 30.8% in 2017-18.

Variation in rates of overweight or obesity can also be seen by remoteness area and socioeconomic group with higher prevalence in areas outside of major cities and for those in lower socioeconomic groups. Indigenous adults were also 1.2 times more likely than non-Indigenous adults to be overweight.

There are also significant health and financial impacts relating to obesity. In 2011-12, the direct and indirect cost of obesity to the Australian economy was estimated at \$8.6 billion, however, this is projected to rise to \$87.7 billion in additional costs over a 10-year period (2015-16 to 2024-25) if obesity continues to grow at its current rate.¹¹⁸

Males

Our council

It was estimated that nearly a third (31.8%) of males in the City of Salisbury aged 18 years and over were obese, 19% more than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (26.6%).

The rates were highest in the PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (34.6%) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (33.7%), with slightly lower rates in Ingle Farm and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (both 30.2%). The lowest rate was estimated for adult males in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka, with 28.6 obese males per 100 males, a rate that was again above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of males/females aged 18 years and over reporting their height and weight at levels assessed as being obese, expressed as a rate per 100 males/females aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

Females

Our council

The rate of obesity among adult females in the City of Salisbury (35.5%) was estimated to be 12% above the level for males; however, as for males, the female rate was 19% above the Metropolitan Adelaide average (29.9%).

As for males, rates were highest in the PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (38.1%) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (37.7%), with slightly lower rates in Ingle Farm (34.2%) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (33.8%). The lowest rate was estimated for adult females in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka, with 32.4 obese females per 100 females, a rate that was again above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

7.7. Physical inactivity

Rationale

According to the World Health Organization, physical inactivity is the fourth leading risk factor for global mortality.¹¹⁹ Physical activity is an important determinant of health and wellbeing and regular exercise can play a role in not only reducing risk in chronic conditions associated with physical inactivity such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, dementia, cancer, musculoskeletal health and osteoporosis, but also other disease risk factors such as overweight and obesity and high blood pressure.¹¹⁶ Physical activity can also reduce stress and symptoms of mental health conditions such as anxiety and depression.¹²⁰

Physical inactivity is a major risk factor for poor health in Australia. In 2017-18, self-reported data from the National Health Survey indicate that 50% of South Australians aged 18 years and over were not sufficiently active and failed to meet current Australian Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviour Guidelines. Levels of physical inactivity also increases with age (due to prevalence of chronic conditions) and can vary by gender. Just over half (52%) of adults aged 18 - 64 years did not undertake sufficient physical activity compared with 75% of adults aged 65 years and over. In general, women across all age groups were more likely to be insufficiently active compared with men. Further variations are evident by remoteness area and by socioeconomic group as those living outside Major cities, and in lower socioeconomic groups more likely to not meet physical activity guidelines.¹²¹

By increasing walkability and providing safe and accessible areas in the neighbourhood built environment for active recreation and bicycle paths, Local councils can contribute to improving opportunities for their residents to be less physically inactive.

Our council

Of the adult population in the City of Salisbury, almost three quarters (73.0%) were estimated to have undertaken no, or a low level of physical activity (excluding workplace physical activity), 9% above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (67.0%).

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 15 years and over who reported being physically inactive (undertaking no, or a low level of physical activity), expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

The highest rate was in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (77.9%), notably (16%) higher than the metropolitan rate, with 76.7% in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie. The lowest was in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (68.8%), which was marginally above the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

7.8. Daily fruit consumption by adults

Rationale

Fruits and vegetables are rich in vitamins, minerals and fibre. Regular daily consumption of fruit and vegetables is linked to lower rates of cancer, cardiovascular disease, stroke, hypertension, cataracts and macular degeneration of the eye, and type 2 diabetes but also reduce obesity, assist in weight management and promote gastrointestinal health.¹²² The minimum recommended intake of fruit for adults is at least 2 serves a day.¹²³ In 2017-18, fewer than half (48.7%) of South Australian adults met the recommended guideline.

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 18 years and over with a usual daily intake of two serves of fruit, expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014–15 National Health Survey (see Notes).

Our council

Fewer than half (46.6%) the population aged 18 years and over living in the City of Salisbury were estimated to have met the recommended daily requirement for fruit consumption, slightly less than in Metropolitan Adelaide (49.0%).

Similar rates were found in the PHAs, with the exception of the highest rate in Ingle Farm (50.7%) and the lowest rates in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (44.2%) and Salisbury/ Salisbury North (44.8%).

7.9. Median age at death

Rationale

The median age at death is the age at which exactly half the deaths registered (or occurring) in a given time period were deaths of people above that age and half were deaths below that age. In 2014, the median age at death for South Australians was 79 years for males and 85 years for females. Median age at death values are influenced to some extent by the age structure of a population. The Aboriginal population has a younger age structure than the non-Indigenous population and this is reflected in the median age at death of the two populations.¹²⁵

Indicator definition:

Median age at death, 2010 to 2014: the age at which exactly half the deaths registered in the period 2010 to 2014 were deaths of people above that age, and half were deaths below that age.

7.9.1. Males

Our council

The median age at death over the five-year period for males in the City of Salisbury was 76 years, four years lower than in Metropolitan Adelaide (80 years).

The highest median age at death for males was in Ingle Farm (79 years) followed by Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka and Salisbury/ Salisbury North (both 77 years). The median age at death for males was slightly lower in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (74 years), and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (72 years), with the latter being eight years below the metropolitan area median age at death for males.

7.9.2. Females

Our council

In the City of Salisbury, the median age at death for females (82 years) was six years above the age for males and was closer to the Metropolitan Adelaide median age than shown for males, at 82 years compared to 85 years.

Ingle Farm (85 years) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (84.5 years) had the highest the median age at death for females, with a lower median age in the three remaining PHAs of Para Hills/ Salisbury East (80 years), Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (81 years) and Salisbury/ Salisbury North (82 years).

7.10. Premature mortality

Rationale

Premature mortality refers to deaths that occur early, before the age of 75 years. Between 1907 and 2013, the premature mortality rate in Australia decreased by 71% for males and 78% for females. In Australia in 2013, about one third of all deaths (34%) occurred among people under the age of 75 years; a considerable improvement from 43% in 1997. Males accounted for 62% of premature deaths and the vast majority of premature deaths occurred in the 45-74 years age group. Coronary heart disease and lung cancer were the leading causes of premature mortality across all states and territories in Australia. Premature mortality rates increased with remoteness.

The premature mortality rate among people living in Remote areas was 1.6 time as high than those in Major cities and 2.2 time as high in Very remote areas. Those living in lowest socioeconomic areas also had a premature mortality rate that was 2 times as high than those living in the highest socioeconomic areas. Deaths at ages earlier than expected, given life expectancies, imply an economic, personal and social loss for families and for the community.¹²⁶

Indicator definition:

Deaths of males and of females aged 0 to 74 years, 2011 to 2015 (expressed as an age-standardised rate per 100,000 population).

7.10.1. Males

Our council

The premature mortality rate over the five-year period 2011 to 2015 for males in the City of Salisbury (326.9 deaths per 100,000 males aged 0 to 74 years) was 14% above the Metropolitan Adelaide rate for males (288.0 deaths per 100,000 males).

There was considerable variation between the PHAs, from the highest rate in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (384.4 deaths per 100,000 males, markedly (34%) above the metropolitan rate) to the lowest in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (261.7 deaths per 100,000 males, 9% below the metropolitan rate).

Rates in the other PHAs were above the metropolitan average: in Ingle Farm (335.8 deaths per 100,000 males, 17% above), Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (309.4 deaths per 100,000 males, 7% above) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (308.4, also 7% above).

7.10.2. Females

Our council

The premature mortality rate for females in the City of Salisbury (222.9 deaths per 100,000 females aged 0 to 74 years) was almost two thirds of that for males; however, it was markedly (22%) above the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide (181.4 deaths per 100,000 females).

There was considerable variation between the PHAs, from the highest rate in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (299.0 deaths per 100,000 females, substantially (65%) above the level in the metropolitan area), to the lowest rates in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (160.6 deaths per 100,000 females, 11% below the metropolitan rate) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (168.0 deaths per 100,000 females, 7% below).

Rates in Ingle Farm (248.4 deaths per 100,000 females) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (213.9 deaths per 100,000 females) were 37% and 18%, respectively above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

7.11. At ages 15 to 24 years

Rationale

In 2012, there were 1,203 deaths among young Australians aged 15-24 years. This age group had the greatest reduction in premature mortality in 1997-2012 from 74 deaths per 100,000 population in 1997 to 39 deaths per 100,000 population in 2012; a 47% decrease. About three-quarters (76%) of deaths of young people in this age group were potentially avoidable, this includes the top 5 leading causes of deaths for this age group. In 2010-2012, suicide was the leading cause of death accounting for 26% of all deaths for this age group, followed by land transport accidents (25.3%), accidental poisoning (5.1%), and assault (3.0%).¹²⁷

In 2015, there were 76 deaths among young people in the 15-24 years age group in South Australia; 34.8 deaths per 100,000. Over one-quarter (27.6%) of these deaths were due to suicide, followed by land transport accident (22.4%).¹²⁸

Indicator definition:

Deaths from all causes, persons aged 15 to 24 years, 2011 to 2015 (expressed as an age-standardised rate per 100,000 population).

Our council

The rate of deaths of young people aged 15 to 24 years in the City of Salisbury (41.7 deaths per 100,000 population at these ages) over the five-year period 2011 to 2015 was markedly (42%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide (29.4 deaths per 100,000 population at these ages).

The highest rate was in Ingle Farm (with ten deaths producing a rate of 106.1 deaths per 100,000 population at these ages, over three and a half times the metropolitan rate). The remaining PHAs of Salisbury/ Salisbury North (44.2 deaths per 100,000 population at these ages) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (43.4 deaths per 100,000 population at these ages) also had substantially higher rates when compared to the metropolitan area (higher by 50% and 48%, respectively), and both had the same number of deaths (11 persons aged 15 to 24 years).

As there were fewer than five deaths at these ages in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka and Para Hills/ Salisbury East, the numbers were suppressed to maintain confidentiality.

7.12. Suicide

Rationale

Suicide is a major social and public health issue.^{129,130} While such deaths can occur for many reasons, and many complex factors might influence a person's decision to suicide, these preventable deaths point to individuals who may be less connected to support networks.¹²⁹ For instance, they may be less inclined to seek help or may be less intimately connected to people who might otherwise be aware of problems or step in to assist.

In 2010-12, suicide was the third leading cause of deaths (4.5%) among people under the age of 75; in particular 92% of suicide deaths were among people less than 75 years old is indicative how unlike chronic diseases, suicide deaths are more prevalent among younger age groups.¹²⁷

Reducing suicides and the impact they have on individuals, families and the state needs a whole-of-community approach, through awareness, prevention, intervention and support for those affected by suicide.¹³⁰ Local Government can play a role in developing safe communities and healthy neighbourhoods that are strong and supportive, resilient in adversity and that work together in times of need.

Indicator definition:

Deaths from suicide and self-inflicted injuries, people aged 0 to 74 years, 2011 to 2015 (expressed as an age-standardised rate per 100,000 population).

Our council

There were 83 deaths from suicide at ages 0 to 74 years in the City of Salisbury (13.0 deaths per 100,000 population) over the five-year period 2011 to 2015, slightly above the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (12.5 deaths per 100,000 population).

Rates varied considerably between the PHAs, with the highest found in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (18.3 deaths per 100,000 population, markedly (46%) above the metropolitan rate) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (16.5 deaths per 100,000 population, 32% above).

The lowest rate was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (5.0 deaths per 100,000 population, 60% below the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide overall). Other rates of premature mortality from suicide that were relatively low when compared with the level in Metropolitan Adelaide were recorded for Ingle Farm (9.9 deaths per 100,000 population, 21% below) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (10.9 deaths per 100,000 population, 13% below).

7.13. Hospital admissions

Rationale

Admission to hospital is a formal process, and follows a decision made by an accredited medical practitioner at that hospital that a patient needs to be admitted for appropriate management or treatment of their condition, or for appropriate care or assessment of needs.¹³¹

Patients are usually admitted to hospital either as an emergency or as a booked admission. Emergency admission patients are usually admitted through the Accident and Emergency Department: these are seriously injured or ill patients who need immediate treatment. Most patients receive hospital-based services as a booked (elective) admission, either as a same-day patient or an inpatient. A same-day patient comes to hospital for a test or treatment and returns home the same day. An overnight admission is recorded where a patient receives hospital treatment for a minimum of 1 night (that is, the patient is admitted to and separated from the hospital on different dates) or longer in the hospital.

The majority of people who have had an episode of care in a hospital express satisfaction with the service when they leave.¹³² However, admission to hospital carries with it a risk of harm. In Australia rates of serious adverse medical events are similar to those found in studies in the United States, with 0.3% of hospital admissions associated with an iatrogenic (medically caused) death and 1.7% associated with major iatrogenic disability.¹³³ Admission to hospital per se also carries a risk of adverse events, in addition to those related to any medical treatment undertaken. These include a risk of cross-infection, injury, or rarely, death.

Indicator definition:

Admissions to public acute and private hospitals in South Australia in 2016/17, excluding same day admissions for renal dialysis (expressed as an age-standardised rate per 100,000 population).

Our council

The rate of admission to hospital of people living in the City of Salisbury was slightly below the rate for Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

The highest rate in the PHAs was found in Ingle Farm (41,194.3 per 100,000 population, notably (13%) higher than the metropolitan rate), and the lowest was in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (32,572.2 per 100,000 population, notably (11%) lower).

7.13.1. Potentially avoidable hospitalisations

Rationale

Potentially preventable hospitalisations represent a range of conditions for which admission to hospital should be able to be avoided because the disease or condition has been prevented from occurring, or because individuals have had access to timely and effective primary healthcare.¹³⁴ There are 22 conditions that fall under 3 broad potentially preventable hospitalisations categories, they are vaccine-preventable conditions, acute conditions and chronic conditions.

Vaccine-preventable conditions are diseases that can be prevented by vaccination, they include influenza and measles. Acute conditions are conditions that would have avoided hospitalisation if adequate and timely care and intervention was received, they include urinary tract infections and cellulitis. Chronic conditions are

conditions that can be preventable through modifications and changes to lifestyle and behaviour, and through effective and timely care and disease management, they include chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and cardiac failure.¹³⁵

In 2016-17, there were over 715,000 potentially preventable hospitalisations. The majority of these hospitalisations were for chronic conditions (47%), followed by acute conditions (46%) and vaccine-preventable conditions (8%).¹³⁶ There are many factors that can influence rates of potentially preventable hospitalisation such as age, lifestyle risk factors, chronic diseases, ability to afford care and remoteness.¹³⁵

Indicator definition:

Admissions to hospital for potentially avoidable conditions (from ambulatory care-sensitive conditions, 2016/17) (expressed as an age-standardised rate per 100,000 population).

Our council

The rate of admission to hospital for conditions deemed to be potentially avoidable was 12% higher for people living in the City of Salisbury than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

Rates in the PHAs of Ingle Farm and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie were similarly above the metropolitan rate, with the rate in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (2,875.4) consistent with, and that in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (2,672.7 per 100,000 population) 8% lower than, in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

The highest rate was recorded for people living in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (3,800.0 per 100,000 population), with almost a third more of these admissions than the metropolitan area overall.

7.14. Difficulty accessing healthcare

Rationale

The inability to access services when needed may lead to adverse impacts on an individual, particularly when the services relate to personal health or wellbeing. In Australia in 2014, of those who experienced barriers to health care, 30.8% reported that access to doctor/GP was the leading type of healthcare that was inaccessible, followed by medical specialist (25.6%) and dental professionals (19.6%). The cost of service (34.9%) and lengthy waiting time/lack of appointments (34.1%) were cited as main reasons for not being able to access healthcare.¹³⁸

Access to healthcare varied between population groups. For example, those with a mental health condition (38%) reported greater difficulty than those without a mental health condition (22%) when accessing healthcare and other services. Similarly, people with disability (11%) were more likely than those without (2.8%) to experience a barrier in accessing healthcare. Over half of people in single parent families (54%) also reported difficulty accessing healthcare, citing cost of service as the main reason. They also experienced barriers accessing other services such as Commonwealth income support (54%), telecommunication services (22%) and dentists (22%).¹³⁸

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 18 years and over who had difficulty accessing healthcare, expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014 General Social Survey (see Notes).

Our council

It was estimated that 1.3% of persons aged 18 years and over had difficulty accessing healthcare in the City of Salisbury; although the rates are small, the rate in the City of Salisbury was above the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide (1.2%).

There was some variation in the PHAs with the highest rate estimated for Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (1.5%) and the lowest estimated for Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (1.0%).

7.15. Home and Community Care Program

Rationale

The Commonwealth Home and Community Care (HACC) Program which merged into to the Commonwealth Home Support Programme (CHSP) in July 2015¹³⁹ was a joint Commonwealth, State and Territory initiative, it funded services that supported people who were frail, aged and younger people with a disability (and their carers), who lived at home and whose capacity for independent living was at risk or who were at risk of premature or inappropriate admission to long-term residential care. The broad aim was to offer maintenance and support services to assist frail older people and younger people with disabilities to continue living in their communities.¹⁴⁰

HACC services were offered in the home or local community by a HACC agency, community health centre or local council. Services include centre-based and other respite; social support and counselling; personal care; home modification and maintenance; transport; meals and other food services; information, advocacy and assessment; support for carers; allied health services; domestic assistance; and community nursing.¹⁴⁰

7.15.1. Clients living alone

Our council

In the City of Salisbury 28.4% of all HACC clients were living alone in 2014/15, notably (24%) fewer than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (37.4%).

There was little variation between the PHAs, with all rates below average; the greatest variation was from 30.2% in Para Hills/ Salisbury East to 27.0% in Salisbury/ Salisbury North.

Indicator definition:

Number of Home and Community Care Program clients whose status is recorded as living alone at the date of most recent assessment, as a proportion of the total client population (2014/15).

7.15.2. Non-English speaking clients

Our council

One quarter (25.1%) of all HACC clients in the City of Salisbury in 2014/15 did not speak English as the main language at home, a proportion markedly (29%) above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (19.4%).

The lowest proportion was found in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (19.2%), at level consistent with the metropolitan rate; the highest proportions were in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (28.5%), Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (28.3%) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (27.9%), rates which were 40% or more above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

Indicator definition:

Number of Home and Community Care Program clients whose main language spoken at home at the date of most recent assessment is not English, as a proportion of the total client population (2014/15).

7.16. Community mental health services

Rationale

Public mental health services in South Australia work in collaboration with private sector health providers and non-government organisations. Services to assist adults aged 18 to 64 years with mental health issues are provided by community mental health services; public hospitals; non-government organisations; general practitioners; allied health professionals providing Medicare-funded and private fee for service allied mental health services (for example psychologists, social workers, occupational therapists); and psychiatrists (working privately on a fee for service basis).⁷³

Older persons' community teams provide initial mental health assessment, treatment, care planning, and short term follow-up for people aged 65 and over, Indigenous consumers aged 45 years and over, or younger people who do not fall within the aged care criteria but who have an illness related to mental health and ageing with challenging behaviours. These services are geared specifically towards the care needs of older persons. The nature of the intervention is similar to those offered by general community mental health services.⁷³

These data refer to all clients of community-based mental health services, who were aged 15 years and over.

Indicator definition:

People aged 15 years and over who were clients of government-funded community mental health services (2015/16 to 2017/18), expressed as an indirectly age-standardised rate per 100,000 population aged 15 years and over.

Our council

The number of people living in the City of Salisbury who were clients of a community mental health service was slightly (5%) below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall.

There was considerable variation between the PHAs; the highest rate was in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (2,507.9 clients per 100,000 population, being nearly a third higher than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall) and the lowest rates were in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (1,241.2 clients per 100,000 population, 34% fewer clients) and Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (1,436.0 clients per 100,000 population, 24% fewer). Rates in Ingle Farm (1,864.7 clients per 100,000 population) and Para Hills/ Salisbury East (1,739.7 clients per 100,000 population) were closer to the metropolitan rate.

7.17. Availability of residential aged care

Rationale

Residential Aged Care facilities provide accommodation, personal care and nursing services to people who can no longer manage to live in their own home due to increased care need (permanent residential aged care) or short-term accommodation (respite residential aged care) for people or carers who need a break from their usual living arrangements.¹⁴⁴ In 2017-18, residential aged care is the main contributor (67.3%, \$12.4 billion) on overall spending on aged care services. In this period, 234,798 older people were in permanent care (58.4 per 1000 older people) and 60,278 in respite care (15 per 1000 older people).¹⁴⁵ The expenditure on aged care has quadrupled since 1975 and with the projected increase of older people, spending on aged care is estimated to almost double as a share of the economy by 2055. Expenditure on aged care (based on 'proposed policy' scenario) is projected to increase from 0.9% of the GDP in 2014-15 to 1.7% of GDP in 2054-55; from \$620 to \$2,000 in real spending on aged care per person.⁷⁸

Indicator definition:

Residential aged care places, including both residential high-level and low-level care places, expressed as a rate per 1,000 population aged 70 years and over (June 2016).

Our council

There were 1,169 residential aged care places in the City of Salisbury in June 2016, a rate of 93.1 places per 1,000 population aged 70 years & over, consistent with the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (95.4 places per 1,000 population aged 70 years & over).

There was considerable variation between the PHAs; the highest rates were in Ingle Farm (147.9 places per 1,000 population over 70 years and over, over one and a half times the Metropolitan Adelaide average), followed by Salisbury/ Salisbury North (139.6 places per 1,000 population over 70 years and over, which was 46% above the metropolitan rate).

Rates below the Metropolitan Adelaide average were found in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (40.0 places per 1,000 population aged 70 years & over, 58% below the average rate), Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (64.3 places per 1,000 population aged 70 years & over, 33% below) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (77.3 places per 1,000 population aged 70 years & over, 19% below).

8. Community connectedness

8.1. People able to get support in times of crisis

Rationale

A strong community is one that is sustainable over generations and resilient in times of crisis; and has assets in the resources, skills and commitment of its members, not only material ones [1].¹⁴⁶ Social participation and involvement in local governance are the hallmarks of strong communities. Forms of social participation, such as volunteering or being a member of a community group, can benefit individuals in areas such as improved health and wellbeing, social inclusion and reduced crime, improved local services and facilities, and better educational outcomes [2].¹⁴⁷

Community strength indicators measure how people feel about aspects of the community in which they live, and their participation in opportunities to shape their community. Healthy communities need a balance between three types of social connection: close personal networks, broader community networks (made through work, school, interest groups, volunteering activities etc.), and governance networks involved in decision-making [3].¹⁴⁸

Examples of having positive personal networks include the ability to access emotional or financial support in times of crisis, as well as being prepared to offer such support to others beyond immediate household members.¹⁴⁹ Those who do not have such supports experience poorer health and wellbeing, greater stress in their lives and a higher risk of poverty and social exclusion.¹⁴⁷ Community members who report fair or poor health or a disability, and who are also financially stressed may delay in seeking medical care, or in purchasing prescribed medication because of the cost. Other barriers which can adversely affect people's health and wellbeing are lack of transport, other difficulties accessing needed services, and feeling unsafe in their local environment.

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 18 years and over who are able to get support in times of crisis from persons outside the household, expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014 General Social Survey (see Notes).

Our council

A large majority (93.3%) of adults in the City of Salisbury were estimated to be able to get support in times of crisis from persons outside the household; this proportion was consistent with the metropolitan average. There was little variation in rates between the PHAs.

8.2. Disagree/strongly disagree with acceptance of other cultures

Rationale

The extent to which adult community members agree or disagree with the statement that 'To what extent do you agree or disagree that it is a good thing for a society to be made up of people from different cultures', gauges acceptance of diverse cultures within the community. Nationally, 83.6% of respondents in the 2014 General Social Survey indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement in 2014.¹⁵¹ Immigration has been critical in building Australia's stock of social capital and has played a significant role in increasing the diversity of recreational and cultural activities for all Australians. Further, it has positively contributed to Australia's national infrastructure through investment in housing, new businesses, transforming urban areas, and bringing new skills and technology. Australia has not only benefited from being exposed to more international cultural and business opportunities associated with migration, but also seen an increase in its capacity for innovation, productive diversity and economic prosperity.¹⁵²

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 18 years and over who disagree/strongly disagree with acceptance of other cultures, expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised); modelled estimates from the 2014 ABS General Social Survey

Our council

In the City of Salisbury, it was estimated that 5.1% of the population disagreed/strongly disagreed with the acceptance of other cultures, a rate notably (11%) higher than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (4.6%).

The highest rate was in Ingle Farm (6.3%), over a third higher than in Metropolitan Adelaide, and the lowest rate was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (3.8%).

8.3. Government support as main source of income in last two years

Rationale

People's standard of living depends on the economic and social resources available to them to support their consumption of goods and services, and their participation in society.¹⁵³ These include the income they receive in wages and salaries, their own businesses or investments, and income support from government.

Australia's income support is derived from government revenues which differs from many other OECD countries where employers and employees contribute to the system. Income support, which is redistributed through the income tax stream, functions as a safety net for those who are unable to adequately support themselves. Eligibility for income support is subject to means testing in order to ensure that assistance is directed to those most in need. The rate of support one receives is dependent on the income and assets tests.^{154,155}

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 18 years and over who had government support as their main source of income in the last two years, expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014 General Social Survey (see Notes).

Our council

In 2014, 39.7% of the City of Salisbury's adult population was estimated to have received government support as their main source of income in the previous two years, markedly (28%) more than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (31.0%).

The highest rate was in the PHA of Salisbury/ Salisbury North, with half (49.7%) of the adult population estimated to have such support, a rate that is substantially (60%) above the rate in the metropolitan area overall. While rates were lower in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (41.8%) and Ingle Farm (38.0%), they were both markedly above the level in Metropolitan Adelaide.

The lowest rates were found in Para Hills/ Salisbury East (33.8%, and 9% above the metropolitan rates) and Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (30.5%, just below the metropolitan rate).

8.4. Accessed the Internet at home in the past 12 months


Rationale

A household can be considered to be disadvantaged if it lacks the resources to participate fully in society.¹⁵⁶

Access to the outside world, through the Internet provides a means of communicating with friends and family, as well as services, employers and schools, thereby increasing educational, employment and other opportunities, including social interaction.¹⁵⁷

The Multipurpose Household Survey for 2016-17 showed that the proportion of households with internet has steadily increased from 56% in 2004-05 to 86% in 2016-17.^{158, 159} Desktop or laptop computers were the most commonly used device (91%) among all connected households alongside mobile phones (91%); other devices used to connect to the internet include, tablets (66%), TVs (27%) and internet connected music or video player devices (19%).¹⁵⁸

In 2016–17, the highest proportion of internet users (98%) were aged 15 to 17 years, compared with 55% of older 65 years and over age group which had the lowest proportion of internet users. Socioeconomic characteristics of households continue to influence the rate of computer and Internet connectivity across Australia. Higher proportion of households with children under 15 years had access to the internet (97%) compared with 82% of households without children under 15 years. Households which do not have children under 15 years, those that are located in non-metropolitan or regional areas of Australia and/or have lower household incomes are less likely to have access to the Internet.¹⁵⁸ These socioeconomic factors also influence the take-up rate of broadband access (as opposed to dial-up access), in addition to the technical issues regarding service availability in certain locations.



Our council

The proportion of dwellings in the City of Salisbury from which someone accessed the Internet (80.6%) was just below the level in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (82.3%).

Rates of access were highest in the PHAs of Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (86.8%) and lowest in Salisbury/ Salisbury North (75.2%).

9. Personal and community safety

9.1. Feel very safe/safe walking in local area after dark

Rationale

Having trust in others to behave according to accepted social values and norms is a fundamental aspect of a well-functioning community.²³ An indirect measure of trust available from the ABS General Social Survey is people's feelings of safety while walking alone in their local area after dark.

While personal experience relating to being a victim of crime may influence an individual's feelings of safety, it is not the only factor. Other factors impacting on people feeling unsafe include, physical features of the local area such as inadequate street lighting and poorly maintained footpaths; crime levels in their local vicinity; relationships with people living nearby; sense of their own strength and capacity to be in control; perceptions of crime levels generally; and their level of trust in their local

community.²³ In the 2014 General Social Survey, there was slight increase (53% from 48%) in the proportion of people more likely to feel safe or very safe when walking alone in their local area than in 2010.¹³⁸

Indicator definition:

Estimated number of people aged 18 years and over who feel very safe/safe walking alone in local area after dark, expressed as a rate per 100 population aged 18 years and over (age-standardised). These data are modelled estimates from the 2014 General Social Survey (see Notes).

Our council

It was estimated that over a third (37.5%) of the population in the City of Salisbury aged 18 and over felt very safe/safe walking alone in the local area after dark, 25% below the rate in Metropolitan Adelaide overall (49.7%).

The lowest rate, at almost a third lower than in Metropolitan Adelaide overall, was in Parafield/ Parafield Gardens/ Paralowie (31.1%), and the highest was in Dry Creek - North/ Pooraka (48.5%) generally consistent with the metropolitan rate.

Appendix

Table A1: LGAs for which data were produced using correspondence files (see notes in Data Quality, p. 4)

Indicator
<i>Population Profile, 2016 (Per cent, Index)</i>
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people
<i>Employment, June 2017 (Per cent)</i>
Unemployment beneficiaries: total
Unemployment beneficiaries: six months or longer
Unemployment beneficiaries: young people
<i>Education (Per cent)</i>
School leavers admitted to university, 2018
<i>Income and wealth (Per cent)</i>
Children in low income, welfare-dependent families, June 2017
Age Pension recipients, June 2017
Disability Support Pension recipients, June 2017
Pensioner Concession Card holders, June 2017
Health Care Card holders, June 2017
Recipients of rent relief from Centrelink, June 2017
<i>Early life and childhood (Per cent, Rate)</i>
Obesity: males aged 2-17, 2014-15
Obesity: females aged 2-17, 2014-15
Fruit consumption: children aged 4 to 17 years, 2014-05
Infant death rate, 2011-15
Children and young people who are clients of CAMHS, 2015/16-2017/18
AEDC: Children developmentally vulnerable on one or more domains, 2015
<i>Personal health and wellbeing (Per cent, Rate)</i>
Self-assessed health as fair, or poor, 2014-15
High/ Very high levels of psychological distress, 2014-15
Type 2 diabetes, 2014-15
Mental health problems: males, 2014-15
Mental health problems: females, 2014-15
Smoking, 2014-15
Obese males, 2014-15
Obese females, 2014-15
Physical inactivity, 2014-15
Fruit consumption: adults, 2014-15
Median age at death: males, 2010-14†
Median age at death: females, 2010-14†
Premature mortality: males, 2011-15
Premature mortality: females, 2011-15
Premature mortality: 15 to 24 yrs, 2011-15
Premature mortality from suicides, 2011-15

Table A1: LGAs for which data produced using correspondence files ...cont

<i>Personal health and wellbeing (Per cent, Rate) ...cont</i>
Admissions to hospital: total, 2016/17
Admissions to hospital: potentially avoidable conditions, 2016/17
Difficulty accessing healthcare, 2014
HACC clients living alone, 2014/15
HACC: non-English speaking clients, 2014/15
Clients of community mental health services, 2015/16-2017/18
Residential aged care places per 1,000 population aged 70 yrs & over, June 2016
<i>Community connectedness, 2014 (Per cent)</i>
Able to get support in times of crisis
Disagree/strongly disagree with acceptance other cultures
Government support as main source of income in last 2 years
<i>Feel very safe/safe walking alone in local area after dark</i>
Feel very safe/safe walking alone in local area after dark

References

1. SA Health. Public Health Act 2011. [Website]. At <http://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/public+content/sa+health+internet/about+us/legislation/public+health+act> (accessed 24 October 2013).
2. SA Health. South Australia: a better place to live (Consultation draft). Adelaide: SA Health, 2013.
3. Kindig D, Stoddart G. What is population health? *Am J Public Health* 2003; 93(3): 380-383.
4. Health Canada. Taking action on population health. Ottawa, Ontario: Health Canada, 1998.
5. National Seniors Australia (NSA) Productive Ageing Centre. The ageing experience of Australians from migrant backgrounds. Canberra: NSA, 2011.
6. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Census of Population and Housing, 2016 - Table Builder.
7. Hugo G, Feist H, Tan G. International migration and regional Australia. Australian Population & Migration Research Centre, Policy Brief 2013; 1(4): April.
8. Hugo G, Australia's state-specific and regional migration scheme: An assessment of its impacts in South Australia. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 2008; (9(2):125-145.
9. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Australia's welfare, 2011. (AIHW Cat. no. AUS 142). Canberra: AIHW, 2011.10.
10. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). 2016 Census QuickStats. URL: http://quickstats.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2016/quickstat/2?opendocument, accessed January 2019.
11. Phillips J and Simon-Davies, J. Migration to Australia: a quick guide to the statistics, 2017. Parliamentary Library, Parliament of Australia, Canberra. URL: https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp1617/Quick_Guides/MigrationStatistics, accessed 8 March 2019.
12. Phillips J and Simon-Davies, J. Migration – Australia migration flows and population, 2016, Research paper series 2015-16, Parliamentary Library, Canberra. URL: https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/BriefingBook45p/MigrationFlows, accessed 8 March 2019.
13. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Australian health inequalities, 2012 (Bulletin no. 2). URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/d99c3ce2-2525-46db-82da-605d16ccf6d9/bulletin02.pdf.aspx?inline=true>, accessed 8 March 2019.
14. Smith L. The health outcomes of migrants: A literature review, 2015. Migration Council Australia. URL: http://migrationcouncil.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/2015_Smith.pdf, accessed 8 March 2019.
15. Phillips J and Karlsen E. Migration and humanitarian programs, 2014. Budget Review 2014-15. Parliamentary Library, Canberra. URL: https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/BudgetReview201415/Migration#_ftn1, accessed 8 March 2019.
16. Department of Home Affairs. Australia's migration trends 2016-17 highlights, 2018. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra. URL: <https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/research-and-stats/files/migration-trends-highlights-2016-17.pdf>, accessed 8 March 2019.
17. Spinks H. Australia's Migration Program, 2010. Parliamentary Library, Canberra. URL: https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/BN/1011/AustMigration, accessed 8 March 2019.
18. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Perspectives on migrants, 2007. (ABS Cat. no. 3416.0). Canberra: ABS, 2008.
19. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Cultural diversity in Australia – Reflecting Australia Stories from the Census, 2016. (ABS Cat no. 2071.0). Canberra: ABS 2016.

20. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Census of Population and Housing, 2016. Table Builder.
21. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Counts of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians – Census of Population and Housing, 2016. (ABS Cat no. 2075.0). Canberra: ABS 2016.
22. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). The health and welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, 2015. (AIHW Cat. no. IHW 147). Canberra: AIHW, 2015.
23. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). General Social Survey: Summary results, Australia, 2010. (ABS Cat. no. 4159.0). Canberra: ABS, 2011.
24. Yap M, Biddle N. Unpaid work, unpaid care, unpaid assistance and volunteering. (CAEPR Indigenous Population Project 2011: Census Papers no. 4/2012). Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR), ANU, 2012.
25. Workplace Gender Equality Agency (WGEA), Unpaid care work and the labour market: Insight paper. 2016. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra. URL: <https://www.wgea.gov.au/data/wgea-research/unpaid-care-work-and-the-labour-market>, accessed 8 March 2019.
26. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia: Summary of findings, 2009. (ABS Cat. no. 4430.0). Canberra: ABS, 2015.
27. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Disability in Australia: Changes over time in inclusion and participation factsheets: Community living, education and employment, 2017. (AIHW Cat. no. IHW 42). Canberra: AIHW, 2011.
28. Mathers CD, Schofield DJ 1998. The health consequences of unemployment: the evidence. *Medical Journal of Australia* 1998; 168(4): 178-182.
29. Dollard MF, Winefield AH. Mental health: overemployment, underemployment, unemployment and healthy jobs. *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health* 2002; 1(3).
30. Comino EJ, Harris E, Chey T, et al. Relationship between mental health disorders and unemployment status in Australian adults. *Aust NZ J Psychiatry* 2003; 37: 230-235.
31. Australian Council of Social Service and Jobs Australia. Faces of unemployment, 2018, Victoria. URL: https://www.acoss.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/ACOSS_JA_Faces-of-Unemployment_14-September-2018_web.pdf, accessed 25 February 2018.
32. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Labour force, Australia, Detailed. (ABS Cat. no. 6291.0.55.001). Canberra: ABS, 2018.
33. Brotherhood of St Laurence. An unfair Australia? Mapping youth unemployment hotspots, 2018. Victoria. URL: http://library.bsl.org.au/jspui/bitstream/1/10573/1/BSL_Unfair_Australia_Mapping_youth_unemployment_hotspots_Mar2018.pdf, accessed 25 February 2018.
34. Government of South Australia. School life: Attendance at school, 2019. URL: <https://www.sa.gov.au/topics/education-and-learning/schools/school-life/attendance-at-school>, accessed 22 February 2019.
35. Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. Melbourne declaration on education goals for young Australians, 2008. Canberra, URL: http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf, accessed 21 February 2019.
36. National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER). Early school leavers and VET. Leabrook: NCVER, 1999.
37. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Australian Social Trends, July 2013. (ABS Cat. no. 4102.0). Canberra: ABS, 2013.
38. Norton A, Cherastidham I, and Mackey W. Mapping Higher Education 2018. Grattan Institute, 2018. Grattan Institute 2018, URL: <https://grattan.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/907-Mapping-Australian-higher-education-2018.pdf>, accessed 22 March 2019.

39. Cleland JG. Maternal education and child survival: further evidence and explanations. In: Caldwell J et al. (eds.), *What we know about the health transition* (Vol. 1). Canberra: Health Transition Centre, The Australian National University, 1990.
40. Considine G, Zappala G. Factors influencing the educational performance of students from disadvantaged backgrounds. In: Eardley T, Bradbury B (eds.), *Competing visions: refereed Proceedings of the National Social Policy Conference 2001*. (SPRC Report 1/02). Sydney: Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, 2002.
41. Ryan C, Sartbayeva S. *Young Australians and social inclusion*. Canberra: Social Policy Evaluation, Analysis, and Research (SPEAR) Centre, Australian National University, 2011.
42. Cassells R, McNamara J, Gong H, Bicknell S, NATSEM. *Unequal opportunities: life chances for children in the 'Lucky Country'*. Sydney: The Smith Family, 2011.
43. Foundation for Young Australians (FYA). *How Young People are Faring 2009*. Melbourne: Foundation of Young Australians, 2009.
44. Pech J, McNevin A, Nelms L. *Young people with poor labour force attachment: a survey of concepts, data and previous research*. Canberra: Australian Fair Pay Commission, 2009.
45. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). *Overview of the Social Inclusion Agenda*. Canberra: DEEWR, 2009.
46. Taylor J. *Stories of early school leaving: pointers for policy and practice*. Fitzroy, Victoria, Brotherhood of St Laurence, 2009.
47. Jones E, Gutnam L, Platt. *Family stressors and children's outcomes*. Report for UK Department for Education, Childhood Wellbeing Research Centre, 2013. London, UK.
48. Taylor J, Fraser A. *Eleven plus: life chances and family income*. Fitzroy, Victoria: The Brotherhood of St Laurence, 2003.
49. Shore R. *Rethinking the brain: new insights into early development*. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute, 1997.
50. Barnett M 2008; Barnett M 2008. *Economic disadvantage in complex family systems: expansion of family stress models*. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 11(3): 145–61.
51. Redmond G 2008. *Children's perspectives on economic adversity: a review of the literature*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, 2008.
52. The Benevolent Society. *A roadmap for ageing well: position paper*. Sydney: The Benevolent Society, 2010.
53. Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA). *Characteristics of Disability Support Pension recipients, June 2011*. Canberra: FaHCSIA, 2012.
54. Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS). *Social security trends: snapshot - April 2014*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: ACOSS; 2014.
55. Parliamentary Budget Office. *Disability support pension: Historical and projected trends – report no. 01/2018*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia 2018.
56. Unpublished data from the Department of Social Services and the Department of Veterans' Affairs, June 2017.
57. Australian National Audit Office (ANAO). *Qualifying for the Disability Support Pension*. ANAO Report No. 18 2015-16, Performance Audit. Commonwealth of Australia 2016. URL: <https://www.anao.gov.au/work/performance-audit/qualifying-disability-support-pension>, accessed 22 February 2019.
58. Whiteford P. *The rise and fall of "welfare dependency" in Australia*. Melbourne: Brotherhood of St Laurence; 2013.
59. Department of Social Services. *DSS Demographics June 2017: DSS; 2018 June*. URL: <https://data.gov.au/dataset/dss-payment-demographic-data/resource/0457422b-f338-4dd8-82b7-35a5d97f798d>, accessed 20 February 2019.

60. Charles J, Valenti L, Britt H. GP visits by health care card holders: a secondary analysis of data from Bettering the Evaluation and Care of Health (BEACH), a national study of general practice activity in Australia. *Aust Fam Physician*. 2003;32(1/2):85-88,94.
61. Brennan DS. Oral health of health cardholders attending for dental care in the private and public sectors. (AIHW Cat. no. DEN 196). Canberra: AIHW Dental Statistics Unit; 2009.
62. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Australia's health 2008. (AIHW Cat. no. AUS 99). Canberra: AIHW; 2008.
63. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Housing suitability (HOSD), Canberra: ABS; 2017, accessed 11 August 2017. URL: www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/2900.0~2016~Main%20Features~HOSD%20Household%20Suitability~10123, accessed 30 January 2019.
64. South Australian Council of Social Service. Cost of living update: Housing stress, No. 31, June Quarter 2017. Unley, South Australia. URL: <https://www.sacoss.org.au/no-31-june-qtr-2017-housing-stress>, accessed 20 February 2019.
65. Yates J, Gabriel M. Housing affordability in Australia. Sydney: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, 2006.
66. St Vincent de Paul Society (SVdPS). Don't dream, it's over: housing stress in Australia's private rental market. Canberra: SVdPS, 2007.
67. South Australian Housing Authority. Housing affordability: Demand and supply South Australia, 24 October 2018. Government of South Australia. URL: https://dhs.sa.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/76318/SA-Housing-Authority-Housing-Affordability-demand-and-supply-24-Oct-18.PDF, accessed 19 February 2019.
68. VicHealth. Housing and health: research summary. Melbourne: VicHealth, 2012.
69. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Housing Assistance in Australia 2017. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/housing-assistance/housing-assistance-in-australia-2017/contents/social-housing-tenants>, accessed 5 December 2017.
70. Productivity Commission. Housing and Homelessness in 2017, Report on Government Services, URL: <https://www.pc.gov.au/research/ongoing/report-on-government-services/2017/housing-and-homelessness/housing>, accessed 5 December 2017.
71. Muir K, Moran M, Michaux F, Findlay S, Meltzer A, Mason C, Ramia I. and Heaney R. The opportunities, risks and possibilities of social impact investments for housing and homelessness, AHURI Final Report No.288, 2017. Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
72. Randolph B, Holloway D. Commonwealth rent assistance and the spatial concentration of low income households in metropolitan Australia. AHURI Final Report Series, vol. 101. Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, 2007.
73. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Housing Assistance in Australia 2018. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/housing-assistance/housing-assistance-in-australia-2018/contents/financial-assistance>, accessed 19 February 2018.
74. Dodson J. Transport disadvantage and Australian urban planning in historical perspective: The role of urban form and structure in shaping household accessibility. No way to go: Transport and social disadvantage in Australian communities, eds: Currie G, Stanley J and Stanley J, 2007. Monash University ePress, Clayton, Victoria.
75. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Car nation - Australian Social Trends, July 2013. (ABS Cat. no. 4102.0). Canberra: ABS, 2013.
76. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Year book Australia, 2008. (ABS Cat. no. 1301.0). Canberra: ABS, 2008.
77. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Births, Australia 2017. (ABS Cat. no. 3301.0). Canberra: ABS, 2018.
78. Department of the Treasury. 2015 Intergenerational report: Australia in 2055. Commonwealth of Australia: 2015.

79. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Children's headline indicators 2018, Cat no: CWS 64. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/children-youth/childrens-headline-indicators/contents/indicator-1>, accessed 19 February 2019.
80. SA Health. Pregnancy Outcome in South Australia 2016. Pregnancy Outcome Unit, Prevention and Population Health Branch, 2018. Adelaide, SA Health, Government of South Australia.
81. SA Health. Causes and consequences of overweight and obesity. (Healthy weight fact sheet no. 2), 2006. Adelaide, SA Health, Government of South Australia.
- 82a. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Children's Risk Factors, National Health Survey: First Results, 2017-18. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4364.0.55.001>, accessed 29 March 2019.
- 82b. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Children's Risk Factors, National Health Survey: First Results, 2014-15. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4364.0.55.001>, accessed 4 December 2016.
83. World Health Organization (WHO). Obesity: preventing and managing the global epidemic - Report of a WHO consultation on obesity. Geneva: WHO, 2000.
84. Collison D, Dey C, Hannah G, Stevenson L. Income inequality and child mortality in wealthy nations. *Journal of Public Health Policy* 2007; 29(2): 114-117.
85. Freemantle CJ et al. Patterns, trends, and increasing disparities in mortality for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal infants born in Western Australia, 1980-2001: population database study. *The Lancet* 2006; 367(9524): 1758-1766.
86. Australian Early Development Census (AEDC). Australian Early Development Census national report 2015 (A snapshot of early childhood development in Australia). Canberra: Department of Education and Training; 2016.
87. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Profiles of health, Australia, 2011-13. (ABS Cat. no. 4338.0). Canberra: ABS; 2013.
88. Doiron D, Fiebig DG, Johar M, Suziedelyte A. Does self-assessed health measure health? Sydney, NSW: UTS; 2014.
89. McCallum J, Shadbolt B, Wang D. Self-rated health and survival: a seven-year follow-up study of Australian elderly. *Am J Public Health*. 1994;84(7):1100-5.
90. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). - National Health Survey: First Results, 2017-18. (ABS Cat. no. 4364DO023_20142015). Canberra: ABS, 2018.
91. Coombs T. Australian Mental Health Outcomes and Classification Network: Kessler-10 Training Manual. Sydney: NSW Institute of Psychiatry; 2005.
92. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). National Health Survey: users' guide - electronic publication, 2007-08. (ABS Cat. no. 4364.0). Canberra: ABS; 2009.
93. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) National Health Survey: First results, 2014-15. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4364.0.55.001>, accessed 29 March 2019.
94. World Health Organisation. Diabetes Mellitus, Fact sheet no. 138. URL: <https://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs138/en/>, accessed 28 February 2019
95. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Diabetes: Overview. Canberra: AIHW. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports-data/health-conditions-disability-deaths/diabetes/overview>, accessed 28 February 2019.
96. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Diabetes snapshot, Cat no. CVD 82. Canberra: AIHW. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/diabetes/diabetes-snapshot/contents/how-many-australians-have-diabetes>, accessed 28 February 2019.
97. Khan MU. Lifestyle modification in the prevention of Type II Diabetes Mellitus. *Oman Medical Journal*, 27(2): 170-171.
98. Asif M. The prevention and control the type-2 diabetes by changing lifestyle and dietary pattern. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 3(1).

99. Tuso P. Prediabetes and lifestyle modification: Time to prevent a preventable disease. *The Permanente Journal*, 18(3): 88-93.
100. World Health Organisation. Mental health: a state of well-being. URL: https://www.who.int/features/factfiles/mental_health/en/, accessed 28 February 2019,
101. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Mental Health, Australia's health 2018. Australia's health series no. 16 AUS 221. Canberra: AIHW. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/1838295a-5588-4747-9515-b826a5ab3d5a/aihw-aus-221-chapter-3-12.pdf.aspx>, accessed 28 February 2019.
102. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Australian Burden of Disease Study: impact and causes of illness and death in Australia 2011. Australian Burden of Disease Study series no. 3. Cat. no. BOD 4, 2016. Canberra: AIHW.
103. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Mental and behavioural conditions, National Health Survey: First results, 2014-15. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4364.0.55.001~2014-15~Main%20Features~Mental%20and%20behavioural%20conditions~32>, accessed 4 December 2016.
104. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Mental and behavioural conditions, National Health Survey: First results, 2011-12. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4D709A4E0614C546CA257AA30014BD06?opendocument>, accessed 22 January 2019.
105. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). National Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing 2007: summary of results. ABS cat. no. 4326.0, 2008. Canberra: ABS.
106. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Mental health services: In brief 2018. Cat. no. HSE 211. Canberra: AIHW. Cancer Council Victoria; 2015. U
107. Winstanley, MH & Greenhalgh, EM. 3.0 Introduction. In Tobacco in Australia: Facts and issues. (eds) Scollo, MM and Winstanley, MH. URL: <http://www.tobaccoinaustralia.org.au/chapter-3-health-effects/3-0-background>, accessed 22 February 2019.
108. Banks E, Joshy G, Weber M, Liu B, Grenfell R, Egger S, Paige E, Lopez A, Sitas F and Beral V. Tobacco smoking and all-cause mortality in a large Australian cohort study: findings from a mature epidemic with current low smoking prevalence, *BMC Medicine*, 2015: 13(38).
109. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Smoking, National Health Survey: First results, 2014-15. URL: <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4364.0.55.001~2014-15~Main%20Features~Smoking~24>, accessed 22 January 2019.
110. Collins D, Lapsley HM. The costs of tobacco, alcohol and illicit drug abuse to Australian society in 2004-05. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 2008.
111. Owen A, Maulida SB, Zorner E, Liew D. Productivity burden of smoking in Australia: a life table modelling study. *Tobacco Control*, 2018.
112. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2016: detailed findings. Cat. no. PHE 124. Canberra: AIHW. 2017.
113. Scollo MM, and Winstanley MH. Tobacco in Australia: Facts and issues. 4th edn. Melbourne: Cancer Council Victoria; 2012. URL: https://www.tobaccoinaustralia.org.au/downloads/chapters/Facts_Issues--Fourth_edition/Introduction.pdf, accessed 22 January 2019.
114. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). A picture of overweight and obesity in Australia 2017. Cat. no. PHE 126. Canberra: AIHW. 2017.
115. World Health Organisation (WHO). Obesity and Overweight, Fact Sheets. Geneva, WHO. 2018. URL: <https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight>, accessed 21 February 2019.
116. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Impact of overweight and obesity as a risk factor for chronic conditions: Australian Burden of Disease Study. Australian Burden of Disease Study series no. 11. Cat. no. BOD 12. Canberra: AIHW. 2017.

117. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Mental Health, Australia's health 2016. Australia's health series no. 15, Cat no. AUS 199. Canberra: AIHW. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/9844cefb-7745-4dd8-9ee2-f4d1c3d6a727/19787-AH16.pdf.aspx>, accessed 28 February 2019.
118. PricewaterhouseCoopers. Weighing the cost of obesity: A case for action. URL: <https://www.pwc.com.au/pdf/weighing-the-cost-of-obesity-final.pdf>, accessed 28 February 2019.
119. World Health Organisation (WHO). Physical activity, Fact Sheets. Geneva, WHO. 2018. URL: <https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/physical-activity>, accessed 21 February 2019.
120. Rebar AL, Stanton R, Geard D, Short C, Duncan MJ and Vandelanotte C. A meta-meta-analysis of the effect of physical activity on depression and anxiety in non-clinical adult populations. Health Psychology Review 2015; 9(3):336-378.
121. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Insufficient physical activity, Australia's health 2018. Australia's health series no. 16 AUS 221. Canberra: AIHW. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/2fe90038-73c3-40bd-9273-8f7d3e42a277/aihw-aus-221-chapter-4-8.pdf.aspx>, accessed 28 February 2019.
122. Harvard T.H.Chan, Vegetable and Fruit, The Nutrition Source. n.d. URL: <https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/nutritionsource/what-should-you-eat/vegetables-and-fruits/>, accessed 28 February 2019.
123. Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing. Eat for health: Australian dietary guidelines - Summary. Commonwealth of Australia. 2013. URL: https://www.eatforhealth.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/the_guidelines/n55a_australian_dietary_guidelines_summary_book.pdf, accessed 28 February 2019.
124. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Deaths, Australia 2013. ABS cat. no. 3302.0, 2014. Canberra: ABS. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Previousproducts/3302.0Main%20Features32013?openDocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=3302.0&issue=2013&num=&view=>, accessed February 28 2019.
125. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Deaths, Deaths, Australia 2013. ABS cat. no. 3302.0, 2014. Canberra: ABS. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Previousproducts/3302.0Main%20Features72013?openDocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=3302.0&issue=2013&num=&view=>, accessed February 28 2019.
126. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Premature mortality, Australia's health 2016. Australia's health series no. 15, Cat no. AUS 199. Canberra: AIHW. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/2cea81f2-7de5-4307-85b7-9f84cd12981c/ah16-3-2-premature-mortality.pdf.aspx>, accessed 28 February 2019.
127. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Premature mortality in Australia 1997-2012. Cat no. WEB 87. Canberra: AIHW, 2015. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/life-expectancy-death/premature-mortality-in-australia-1997-2012/contents/deaths-among-young-people-aged-15-24>, accessed 28 February 2019.
128. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Causes of death, Australia 2015. ABS cat. no. 3303.0, 2016. Canberra: ABS. URL: <https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/3303.02015?OpenDocument>, accessed February 28 2019.
129. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Gender indicators, Australia. (ABS Cat. no. 4125.0). Canberra: ABS, 2012.
130. SA Health. South Australian suicide prevention strategy, 2012-2016. Adelaide: SA Health, 2012.
131. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Australian hospital statistics 2012-13. (AIHW Health Services Series no. 54, Cat. no. HSE 145). Canberra: AIHW, 2014.
132. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Patient experiences in Australia: Summary of Findings, 2016-17. ABS; 2017. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4839.0~2016->

17~Main%20Features~Hospital%20admissions%20and%20emergency%20department%20visits~5, accessed 29 February 2019.

133. Runciman WB, Webb RK, Helps SC et al. A comparison of iatrogenic injury studies in Australia and America II: reviewer behaviour and quality of care. *The International Journal of Quality in Healthcare* 2000;12(5):379-88.

134. Page A et al. Atlas of avoidable hospitalisations in Australia: ambulatory care-sensitive conditions. Adelaide: Public Health Information Development Unit, The University of Adelaide, 2007.

135. Falster M and Jorm L. A guide to the potentially preventable hospitalisations indicator in Australia. Centre for Big Data Research in Health, University of New South Wales in consultation with Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care and Australian Institute of Health and Welfare: Sydney; 2017

136. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Potentially preventable hospitalisations in Australia by small geographic areas. (Cat. no. HPF 36). Canberra: AIHW, 2019. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/primary-health-care/potentially-preventable-hospitalisations/contents/overview>, accessed 28 February 2019.

138. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). General Social Survey: Summary results, Australia, 2014. (ABS Cat. no. 4159.0). Canberra: ABS, 2015.

139. Australian Government Department of Health. About the Commonwealth Home Support Programme. URL: <https://agedcare.health.gov.au/programs-services/commonwealth-home-support-programme/about-the-commonwealth-home-support-programme>, accessed 5 March 2019.

140. Home and Community Care (HACC). National Program Guidelines for the Home and Community Care Program. Commonwealth of Australia: 2007. URL: https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/~/_/media/Files/Corporate/general%20documents/HACC/PDF/National%20Program_Guidelines.pdf, accessed 7 March 2019.

141. SA Health. Health Services. URL: <https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/public+content/sa+health+internet/health+services>, accessed 8 March 2019.

142. SA Health. Health Services: Adults' mental health service. URL: <https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/public+content/sa+health+internet/health+services/mental+health+services/adults+mental+health+services>, accessed 8 March 2019.

143. SA Health. Health Services: Older persons mental health service. URL: <https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/public+content/sa+health+internet/health+services/mental+health+services/older+persons+mental+health+services>, accessed 8 March 2019.

144. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Older Australia at a glance. (Cat. no. AGE 87). Canberra: AIHW, 2018. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/older-people/older-australia-at-a-glance/contents/health-aged-care-service-use/aged-care>, accessed 28 February 2019.

145. Productivity Commission. Report on Government Services 2019: Aged care services - Part F, Chapter 14. Australian Government: 2019. URL: <https://www.pc.gov.au/research/ongoing/report-on-government-services/2019/community-services/aged-care-services>, accessed 28 February 2019.

146. The identification and analysis of indicators of community strength and outcomes. (Occasional Paper 3). Canberra, ACT: Department of Family and Community Services; 2001.

147. Pope J. Indicators of community strength: a framework and evidence. Melbourne: Department for Victorian Communities, 2006.

148. Szreter S. The state of social capital: bringing back in power, politics and history. *Theory and Society* 2002; 31(5): 573-621.

149. Arashiro Z. Money matters in times of change: Financial vulnerability through the life course. Melbourne, Victoria: Brotherhood of St Laurence, 2011.

150. Australian Social Inclusion Board (AISB). Social inclusion in Australia: how Australia is faring. Canberra: Office of the Prime Minister; 2010.

151. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). General Social Survey 2014, Survey Table Builder.
152. Carrington K, McIntosh A and Walmsley J. (eds) The social costs and benefits of migration into Australia. Centre for Applied Research in Social Science, University of New England: 2008.
153. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Government pension and allowance recipients - Household Expenditure Survey, Australia: Summary of results, 2009-10. (ABS Cat. no. 6530.0). Canberra: ABS, 2011.
154. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Understanding welfare, Australia's welfare 2017. Australia's welfare series no. 13 AUS 214. Canberra: AIHW, 2017. URL: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/c20ec35c-918a-408f-b2ee-6a7476831977/aihw-australias-welfare-2017-chapter1-3.pdf.aspx>, accessed 28 February 2019.
155. Department of Social Services. Social Security Guide: Income and assets. Guides to Version 1.252 (4 February 2019). Australian Government. URL: <http://guides.dss.gov.au/guide-social-security-law/4>, accessed 6 March 2019.
156. Townsend P. Deprivation. Journal of Social Policy 1987; 16(2): 125-146.
157. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Household Use of Information Technology, Australia, 2010-11. (ABS Cat. No. 8146.0). Canberra: ABS, 2011.
158. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Household Use of Information Technology, Australia, 2016-17. (ABS Cat. No. 8146.0). Canberra: ABS, 2018.
159. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Household Use of Information Technology, Australia, 2004-05. (ABS Cat. No. 8146.0). Canberra: ABS, 2005.
160. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA), 2011. (Technical paper: ABS Cat. no. 2033.0.55.001). Canberra: ABS, 2013.
161. Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL). On the treadmill: young and long-term unemployed in Australia. Melbourne: BSL, 2014.
162. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Understanding Migrant Outcomes - Insights from the Australian Census and Migrants Integrated Dataset, South Australia, 2016. Cat no. 3417.0 Canberra: ABS, 2018.
163. Chen W, Ling L, Renzaho AMN. Building a new life in Australia: an analysis of the first wave of the longitudinal study of humanitarian migrants in Australia to assess the association between social integration and self-rated health. BMJ Open 2017;7:e014313
164. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). - Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia: Summary of Findings, 2015 (ABS Cat. no. 4430.0). Canberra: ABS, 2016. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/4430.0Main%20Features202015>, accessed 22 February, 2019.
165. Diabetes Australia, 2018, What is diabetes?, <<https://www.diabetesaustralia.com.au/what-is-diabetes>>; Accessed 4 March 2019.
166. National Public Health partnership (NPHP). National response to passive smoking in enclosed places and workplaces: a background paper. Canberra: NPHP, 2000.
167. Edwards E, Smart D, De Maoi J, Silbert M, Jenkinson R. Cohort Profile: Building a New Life in Australia (BNLA): the longitudinal study of humanitarian migrants. International Journal of Epidemiology, Volume 47, Issue 1, 1 February 2018
168. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). National Health Survey: Summary of Results, 2007-2008. (ABS Cat. no. 4364.0). Canberra: ABS, 2009.

Notes on the data

Please click [here](#) to access notes on the data.



148 Frome St, Adelaide SA 5000
GPO Box 2693, Adelaide SA 5001
T (08) 8224 2000
F (08) 8232 6336
E lgasa@lga.sa.gov.au

www.lga.sa.gov.au

POPULATION HEALTH PROFILE

sporting
and leisure
facilities



information
services

parks and
gardens



safe
food

street
trees



emergency
management



arts and
culture



libraries



climate change
management

youth
development

community
centres
and halls

safe
roads



urban
planning

events

volunteering



safe
water

street
lighting

walking
trails

economic
development

partnerships



immunisation

