



# Who Cares? Who Pays?

## Future Social Services Institute

RMIT, 10 May 2018

Sara Charlesworth

Centre for People,  
Organisation & Work



# Who Cares? Who Pays?

## Who cares? Focus on Home Care Workers (HCWs)

- Their work & working conditions underpin the quality of aged care community-based services
- Underpinning themes:
- Profound historical gendered undervaluation of paid care work
- Shifts along the 'formalisation continuum' in full recognition of home care work 'as work'
- Differences in government & non-government employment

## Presentation

- Overview of provision of home care in Victoria
- Crucial role of local government
- Current challenges: increasing complexity of care work; poor pay & working conditions; consumer directed care, outsourcing
- Looking forward: investing in care infrastructure, collaborative advocacy

# Growing recognition & formalization of Home Care work

- Home care historically undertaken by family members
- Post WW 2 charities & others providing HC services →
- State & local governments started to assume responsibility particularly in Victoria

## Towards formalisation:

- By 1970s HCW inc in govt industry awards - HCWs lowest paid in awards & only 1 pay level (reflecting gendered undervaluing of care work esp HCW)
- 1986 Australian Industrial Relations Commission recognized additional skills required by HCWs in Vic LG → additional (personal care) skill level (this later built on in 1990s via award restructuring into 3 skills classification + a supervisory one)
- 1991 first SACS award (NSW) covering HCWs in non-govt employment– some flow on from govt awards to SACS awards

## Towards informalisation?

- 1990s Compulsory Competitive Tendering inc in LG →HCW outsourced
- 1990s & 2000s low rates of pay underpinned by state & fed govts reluctance to fund wage increases
- 2009 award 'modernisation' – reduced 23 SACS awards to 1 - poorer conditions cf predecessor awards: Social Community Home Care & Disability Services Award
- Lack of union action in predecessor & SCHCDS awards on ↑work value in HCW –remain on bottom of award – not part of SACS equal pay win in 2012

# Home Care Workers & Home Care Work

## Who are they? (NACWCS)

- Female: 89%
- Median age: 52 years (recent hires = 46 years)
- Born overseas: 36% (2016 Census)

## Conditions of work? (NACWCS)

- HC Ownership: 70% NFP; 9% FP; 20% govt
- Part time: 79% - but over 10,000 HCWs in non-direct employment – labour hire & self employment
- Want more hours of work: 40%
- Hold more than one job: 16%
- Low pay: 60% earn < 2/3rds of Australian weekly median earnings

## Increased complexity of clients & work

- ↑ in older frail aged clients with cognitive impairment & high needs ↑ ‘bodily intrusion’ work eg bowel management; peg feeding; cathertisation & changing colostomy, drainage bags, wound dressings

## Shift to consumer directed care

- Taylorisation of care ‘tasks’, cuts to time to care, ↑ demands for PT worker ‘flexibility’

# HCW & Government Outsourcing

In 1985, under the *Home & Community Care Act 1985* federal, state & territory governments agreed to jointly fund the Home & Community Care (HACC) programme

## Victoria

- In Victoria LG became primary provider of HC replacing disparate home care services
- While the Fed/State funding share supposed to be 60/40%, funding inadequate and Vic LG 'subsidised' HC services by an average of 21% (Vella 2008)
- Slow movement to start outsourcing HC services particularly in regional areas – this is now gathering steam once again

## NSW

- 2014 NSW Govt decided to outsource Home Care Services of NSW – 4500 HCWs & 50,000+ clients
- Union campaign against outsourcing and then for single NFP provider
- 2015 Australian Unity won tender to deliver these services
- Existing workers covered for 2 years by transition provisions. Now new EBA extended NSW HCS conditions to all Australian Unity's HCWs in NSW

# HCW Pay Rates & Key Working Time Conditions: December 2017

Conditions	SCHCDS Award	City of Greater Dandenong EBA (2015 – 2018)	Australian Unity HCS EBA (NSW) (2017-2019)
<i>Hourly pay rates:</i>	Level 1: \$19.68  Level 2 (PP1-2): \$20.86-\$21.01  Level 3 (PP1-2): \$21.29-\$21.94.	Band 1 (A-D) \$26.86-\$27.64  Band 2 (A-C): \$28.03-\$28.74  Band 3 (A-D): \$29.09-\$30.94	Grade 1: \$22.39  Grade 2: \$23.51  Grade 3: \$25.43
<i>Minimum engagements</i>	Casual – 1 hour PT - none	Casual 2 hours PT - 2 hours	Casual 2 hours PT - 2 hours
<i>Spread of hours</i>	6am-8pm M-Sun	6am-6pm M-F	6am-6.30pm M-F
<i>Travel time Between clients</i>	No	YES	YES

# Who Pays? Investing in the Care Economy

Case for public investment in care infrastructure (UK Women's Budget Group 2016) inc home care

- Includes workforce providing care services, its skills & facilities in which they work

Based on:

- Public sector /NFP provision + improved training & conditions for workers
- Providing paid care for those with unmet care needs
- Shifting some care from unpaid family care to paid care sectors

Findings for Australia:

- 2% GDP direct investment in care industries
  - Would create 600,000 new jobs, 4% rise in emp rates
  - Would address care deficit with increased female LF participation (↑3.7%)
  - Decrease gender gap in employment & in care
  - Improve working conditions in care sector – incentivise men?
  - Increase options for juggling paid work and caring
  - Improved care quality

# Who cares? Collaborative Advocacy

Many conditions of HCW , esp under SCHCDS Award, unacceptable in Australian context

- Historical undervaluing + needs for increased level of skill & responsibility
- Fragmentation of employment and porous minimum labour standards
- Limited success thru NFP & FP EBAs & thru Modern Award Review process

→ New approach needed to address conditions of HCW work to underpin sustainable provision of community-based aged care

Extended social dialogue/collaborative advocacy: a New Zealand example

- Momentum began with 2012 Human Rights Commission Inquiry into Aged Care – links made between decent jobs and quality care & sustainable aged care system
- Post Inquiry collaborative dialogue between Human Rights Commission, advocacy groups, unions (E tū & PSA), employer peaks and NZ government - agreement the NMW rate far too low
- Outcomes inc equal pay settlement, 'regularised' hours & (fully funded) paid travel time; ongoing collaboration between all stakeholders



# Useful links

## Investing in the Care Economy

[https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/care\\_economy\\_en.pdf](https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/care_economy_en.pdf)

See also: [http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---inst/documents/presentation/wcms\\_565112.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---inst/documents/presentation/wcms_565112.pdf)

## NZ Human Rights Commission Inquiry: Caring Counts

[https://www.hrc.co.nz/files/1214/2360/8576/Caring\\_Counts\\_Report.pdf](https://www.hrc.co.nz/files/1214/2360/8576/Caring_Counts_Report.pdf)

## Decent Work & Good Care: International Approaches to Aged Care

<https://decentworkgoodcare.com/>