

Health system performance information and reporting framework

Submitted online on 1 February 2017 via
<https://www.healthperformanceframeworksreview.com.au/overview-of-this-website>

Mental Health Australia is pleased to provide comments to the Nous Group on the recommendations and implementation process for the proposed framework for health system performance and reporting.

The comments below are made in response to the five questions in the public consultation paper and on the consultation website.

The proposed framework for whole of health system performance information and reporting

What are your views on the proposed framework for health system performance and reporting, including the recommendations on what should be included in the framework? Is there anything missing from the proposed framework?

Mental Health Australia agrees with recommendation 1.

In respect of recommendation 2 the framework should include analysis of data from the social system performance and reporting on the impact of the social determinants of health.

The social determinants are well understood in the health sector, and are highlighted in Figure 4 in the discussion paper as being important to health status and the performance of the health system. While the paper recognises the need to link data from within and outside the health sector (page 15), this should be formalised in the framework.

For example, in the mental health sector community-based psychosocial support assists people with severe mental illness to recover and lead contributing lives. These services are considered by the mental health sector to be integral to the mental health system, and a cost effective way of avoiding downstream costs of acute care. However, mental health reform has meant that at least some of these



services now sit in the disability sector and not the health sector. As such the proposed health system framework will exclude a very important piece of information relevant to how the health system performs in respect of the mental health of Australians.

What are your views on the recommended principles for indicator selection?*

*Note: The review has recommended principles for the selection of indicators. A review of the indicators themselves was not in the scope of this review.

An additional principle for indicator selection should be to ***include specific indicators of determinants of health for key populations***. This will enrich the monitoring and analysis of the impact of policies and programs to address the determinants of health on the health system itself.

Further, all indicators should ***be accompanied by appropriate targets***. Targets set a standard for health policy and provide a basis for assessing the capacity of the health system to achieve the policy intent. They also demonstrate when adjustments need to be made when and where the system is not meeting the needs of consumers and carers.

The proposed model for the collection, supply and use of health data

What are your views on the proposed model for health data collection, supply and use, including the recommendations on what should be included in the model? Is there anything missing from the model?

The model is sound, but as the consultation paper highlights, there are age old barriers to establishing a framework that can support the future development of the health system.

It will take strong leadership to encourage organisations to relinquish their established systems in the interests of a truly national system that is supported by common data standards.

It will take appropriate and sustained investment to establish a national model and system for data collection, supply and use.

In particular, a critical enabler will be the teaching, training and capacity development for private and NGO providers of mental health services to contribute to the national health data system. The framework should give a greater emphasis to this part of the sector.

Finally, the model does not include Primary Health Networks who now have a very significant role in the health system.



What are your views on the proposed tiered reporting framework for health data?

A tiered approach to the level of detail of the data in the reporting framework seems appropriate. However, the use of the term “public” at the apex of the triangle implies that all data below that level will not be made public. This should not be the case and should be made clear in the framework.

The proposed recommendations for implementation

What are your views on the recommendations for implementation? Is there anything else that should be considered?

We do not agree that Health Ministers through the COAG Health Council should lead the framework. Given the impact of the health of Australians on the community and the economy, and the determinants of health across governments, leadership of First Ministers is needed to understand the investment in health that needs to be made and therefore to drive improvements to the health system informed by performance information and reporting.

Providers of private and NGO services should be included in Figure 8 as key stakeholders to be engaged as

