Australian Health Workforce Policy and Person-Centred Care

Posted on October 28, 2019

Abstract

Person-centred care requires health services to respect each patient's goals, preferences, culture, circumstances, and right to participate in decisions. In Australia, the capacity to deliver such care is strongly influenced by the size, distribution, composition, and working conditions of the health workforce. Rural and remote communities experience persistent difficulties accessing doctors, nurses, allied health professionals, and specialist services. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples may also encounter institutional racism, inadequate cultural safety, and care models that do not reflect community priorities. This paper examines how Australian workforce policy affects person-centred care. It evaluates geographic maldistribution, rural training pathways, generalist practice, multidisciplinary teams, telehealth, workforce wellbeing, continuity, and Indigenous workforce development. It argues that increasing the number of clinicians is necessary but insufficient. Workforce policy supports person-centred care only when it places appropriately skilled and supported practitioners where communities need them, enables continuity and team-based practice, and makes cultural safety and patient participation central to service design.

Introduction

Person-centred care is frequently presented as a clinical communication principle: practitioners should listen to patients, explain options, and involve them in decisions. These practices are important, but the ability to provide person-centred care also depends on workforce policy. A clinician cannot offer adequate time, continuity, or choice when staffing is insufficient. A rural patient cannot participate meaningfully in care if the relevant service is hundreds of kilometres away. A culturally diverse community cannot receive genuinely responsive care when the workforce lacks cultural knowledge, language capacity, or trusted local relationships.

Australia has a highly developed health system, but access is not evenly distributed. Large metropolitan areas contain a greater concentration of medical specialists and services, while regional, rural, and remote communities often face shortages, turnover, long travel distances, and limited after-hours care. The Australian Government's National Medical Workforce Strategy 2021–2031 identifies geographic and specialty maldistribution, fragmented planning, changing models of care, workforce wellbeing, and the underrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander doctors as major challenges (Australian Government Department of Health, 2022).

This paper argues that workforce policy should be judged not merely by headcounts but by its contribution to functional access and person-centred outcomes. Effective policy aligns workforce supply with population need, supports rural recruitment and retention, strengthens multidisciplinary and generalist models, improves cultural safety, and protects the wellbeing required for clinicians to sustain compassionate care.

Meaning of Person-Centred Care

Person-centred care treats the patient as a partner rather than a passive recipient. It recognizes that clinical evidence must be interpreted alongside the person's values, preferences, social circumstances, family responsibilities, culture, health literacy, and tolerance of risk. Shared decision-making, informed consent, respectful communication, coordinated care, and continuity are practical expressions of this approach.

The Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care places partnering with consumers within the national safety and quality framework. The purpose is not to transfer all responsibility to patients or to assume that every patient wants the same level of participation. It is to ensure that care is designed and delivered with, rather than merely to, the people affected (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care [ACSQHC], 2021).

Person-centred care also has a structural dimension. A patient may prefer a female practitioner, an interpreter, an Aboriginal health worker, treatment near home, or continuity with a known clinician. Whether those preferences can be respected depends on workforce availability and service organization. Workforce policy therefore shapes the practical limits of person-centredness.

Geographic Maldistribution and Rural Access

Australia's population is geographically dispersed, and health professionals are not distributed in proportion to need. Rural and remote communities often have older populations, higher burdens of chronic disease, greater injury risk, and poorer access to preventive and specialist services. Distance increases the financial and personal cost of care. Travel may require time away from employment, accommodation, childcare, and separation from community support.

Maldistribution affects person-centred care in several ways. First, shortages reduce choice. A patient may accept the only available appointment rather than select a practitioner who understands the condition or cultural context. Second, high turnover disrupts continuity. Patients must repeatedly explain their histories and may be reluctant to disclose sensitive information. Third, workforce gaps can shift services from prevention to crisis response because clinicians have insufficient capacity for follow-up and coordinated planning.

Simple national ratios can conceal these inequalities. A country may have an adequate number of

doctors overall while specific regions and specialties remain underserved. Workforce planning must therefore use detailed data on location, scope of practice, working hours, population health needs, service use, and projected demand.

Rural-Origin Selection and Distributed Medical Education

One important policy approach is to recruit students from rural backgrounds and provide substantial training in rural settings. Evidence has consistently shown that rural origin and meaningful rural clinical exposure are associated with a greater likelihood of later rural practice, although neither factor guarantees long-term retention (Playford et al., 2020).

Rural clinical schools, regional training hubs, bonded programs, scholarships, and distributed campuses seek to create a pipeline from education to practice. These initiatives can support person-centred care because practitioners trained within a community are more likely to understand referral pathways, resource limitations, local industries, travel conditions, and the social context of illness.

However, selection policies must avoid treating rural students merely as instruments for filling shortages. Students require educational quality, supervision, career flexibility, and fair support. Rural training must also connect to postgraduate positions and specialist pathways; otherwise, graduates may be forced to return to cities to progress professionally.

Recruitment Is Not the Same as Retention

Financial incentives can attract practitioners to underserved areas, but retention depends on a broader employment and community environment. Clinicians are more likely to remain where workloads are manageable, professional supervision is available, housing and education are accessible, partners can find employment, and practitioners can maintain social and family connections.

Professional isolation is a major concern. A rural clinician may carry a wider scope of responsibility with fewer nearby colleagues. Access to continuing education, locum relief, specialist advice, peer networks, and reliable digital systems can reduce isolation and improve safety. Retention policies should also recognize that some practitioners will contribute through planned rotations or extended placements rather than permanent relocation.

Continuity is central to person-centred care. Stable teams develop knowledge of patients and communities that cannot be fully captured in records. Long-term relationships can improve trust, earlier help-seeking, and the coordination of chronic disease management. Retention should therefore be treated as a quality-of-care objective, not only a workforce efficiency measure.

Generalist and Multidisciplinary Models

Rural and remote care often requires broad clinical capability. Rural generalists may provide primary care, emergency care, hospital services, procedural work, maternity care, anaesthetics, or mental health support depending on training and community need. The National Medical Workforce Strategy identifies generalist capability as a priority because narrowly organized specialty pathways may not match the requirements of smaller communities (Australian Government Department of Health, 2022).

Person-centred care also benefits from multidisciplinary teams. Nurses, nurse practitioners, midwives, pharmacists, physiotherapists, psychologists, occupational therapists, social workers, paramedics, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health workers, and community workers contribute different forms of expertise. Team-based care can address the medical, functional, psychological, and social dimensions of a person's health.

Policy should enable practitioners to work to their full scope while maintaining clear accountability, communication, and referral systems. Expanding scope without staffing, training, or support can simply transfer pressure. Effective teams require shared records, defined roles, regular communication, and respect across professions.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Workforce and Cultural Safety

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples experience health inequities produced by colonization, dispossession, racism, socioeconomic exclusion, and unequal access to culturally safe services. Workforce policy must therefore go beyond geographic redistribution. It should increase Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participation across medicine, nursing, allied health, leadership, research, and community-controlled care.

Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Services demonstrate the importance of governance by communities. These services integrate clinical care with cultural knowledge, prevention, family support, and advocacy. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health workers and practitioners can strengthen communication and trust, but cultural safety is not their responsibility alone. Every organization and clinician must examine institutional practices, power imbalances, and racism.

Cultural safety is determined by the person receiving care, not by the provider's intention. A service may believe it is respectful while patients experience dismissal or stereotyping. Workforce education should therefore include reflective practice, community partnership, anti-racism, and accountability rather than a superficial list of cultural customs.

Telehealth and Hybrid Models of Care

Telehealth can reduce travel, support specialist consultation, and connect rural clinicians with larger teams. It can improve continuity when patients alternate between local and distant services. Remote monitoring may also support chronic disease management.

However, telehealth is not a complete substitute for a local workforce. Physical examination, procedures, emergency care, and many forms of relational communication require in-person services. Digital exclusion can affect older people, low-income households, people with disability, and communities with poor connectivity. Privacy may be difficult when a patient lacks a confidential space.

A person-centred hybrid model uses telehealth when it increases convenience and choice, not when it merely shifts costs to the patient. Patients should be able to choose appropriate modes, receive technical support, and access face-to-face care when clinically necessary. Local practitioners remain essential for continuity and coordination.

Workforce Wellbeing and the Capacity to Care

Burnout, moral distress, fatigue, and excessive workload affect both clinicians and patients. A workforce that is chronically understaffed may become task-focused because practitioners lack time for explanation, shared decision-making, and emotional support. Errors and turnover can increase, further weakening continuity.

The National Medical Workforce Strategy explicitly recognizes doctor wellbeing as a cross-cutting priority. Similar concerns apply to nurses and other professions. Rostering, psychological safety, access to leave, supportive leadership, fair employment, and protection from violence are not separate from patient-centred care. They create the conditions in which staff can remain attentive and compassionate.

Policies that rely on professional commitment to compensate indefinitely for structural shortages are unsustainable. Workforce resilience should not mean expecting individuals to tolerate preventable harm. It should mean designing systems that can absorb pressure while protecting staff and patients.

How Workforce Policy Influences Person-Centred Care

Workforce policy area	Potential contribution	Risk if poorly designed
Rural-origin recruitment	Builds a pipeline of practitioners familiar with rural life	Students may be burdened with expectations without adequate support
Rural training pathways	Develops local competence and professional networks	Training may not connect to postgraduate careers
Financial incentives	Supports initial recruitment	Short placements and turnover if workplace conditions remain poor
Generalist training	Matches broad community needs	Unsafe workload without supervision and referral support
Multidisciplinary teams	Addresses clinical and social needs comprehensively	Fragmentation when roles and communication are unclear
Indigenous workforce development	Strengthens trust, representation, and culturally responsive care	Tokenism or unequal burden when institutions avoid wider reform
Telehealth	Extends specialist access and reduces travel	Digital exclusion and replacement of essential local services
Wellbeing initiatives	Supports retention and attentive care	Individual “resilience” programs that ignore unsafe systems

Policy Priorities

First, workforce planning should be based on population need and functional access rather than national headcounts. Data should identify service gaps by geography, profession, specialty, hours worked, and community characteristics. Planning should include patients, local services, professional bodies, universities, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organizations.

Second, governments should strengthen end-to-end rural pathways. Recruitment, undergraduate education, internship, vocational training, specialist support, and employment must connect. Isolated interventions are less effective when the next career stage requires relocation.

Third, retention should receive at least as much attention as recruitment. Investment in housing, supervision, locum cover, continuing education, partner employment, safe workplaces, and community integration can produce more stable services.

Fourth, policy should support team-based models and full scope of practice while preserving quality and coordination. Funding arrangements should reward continuity, prevention, and collaboration rather than fragmented activity alone.

Finally, cultural safety and community governance must be treated as core measures of quality. Increasing representation is essential, but institutions must also change how they design services, respond to racism, and share authority.

Conclusion

Australian workforce policy has a direct influence on whether person-centred care is possible. Geographic maldistribution, shortages, turnover, and professional isolation restrict choice, continuity, access, and shared decision-making. Rural-origin selection and distributed education can improve workforce supply, but recruitment must be connected to postgraduate pathways and long-term retention. Generalist and multidisciplinary models can respond effectively to community needs when they are adequately supported.

Person-centred care also requires cultural safety and meaningful Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leadership. Telehealth can expand access but should complement, not replace, local services. Workforce wellbeing is equally important because exhausted and unsupported clinicians cannot indefinitely provide attentive, relational care.

The central policy question is therefore not simply how many practitioners Australia has. It is whether the workforce has the right distribution, skills, relationships, support, and accountability to enable people to receive care that reflects their needs and values. A sustainable workforce and person-centred care are not competing goals; each depends on the other.

References

Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. (2021). *National safety and quality health service standards* (2nd ed., Version 2).

Australian Government Department of Health. (2022). *National Medical Workforce Strategy 2021–2031*.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2024). *Rural and remote health*. Australian Government.

Durey, A., & Thompson, S. C. (2012). Reducing the health disparities of Indigenous Australians: Time

to change focus. *BMC Health Services Research, 12*, 151. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-12-151

Playford, D., Ngo, H., Puddey, I. B., & Intemann, K. (2020). The long-term rural distribution of medical graduates from a rural clinical school. *BMC Health Services Research, 20*, 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4856-3

Wakerman, J., Humphreys, J. S., Russell, D. J., Guthridge, S., Bourke, L., Dunbar, T., Zhao, Y., Ramjan, M., Murakami-Gold, L., & Jones, M. P. (2019). Remote health workforce turnover and retention: What are the policy and practice priorities? *Human Resources for Health, 17*, 99. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-019-0432-y

World Health Organization. (2021). *WHO guideline on health workforce development, attraction, recruitment and retention in rural and remote areas*.