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Youth justice services aim to assist individuals and families who are in crisis or experiencing difficulties that hinder personal or family functioning, to promote community safety, and to reduce youth offending.

This chapter reports on:

* *Community-based youth justice supervision —* community-based youth justice supervision is an alternative to detention, where a sentenced order or unsentenced order (such as conditional bail) are served in the community. Most young people under youth justice supervision are supervised in the community.
* *Detention-based youth justice supervision* *—* detention-based youth justice supervision involves young people serving their sentence in a custodial environment.
* *Group conferencing —* group conferences are decision-making forums that aim to minimise the progression of young people into the youth justice system, and provide restorative justice. Typically, a group conference involves the young offender(s) and victim(s) and their families, police, and a youth justice agency officer, all of whom attempt to agree on a course of action required of the young offender to make amends for his or her offence(s).

Improvements to the reporting of youth justice services in this edition include:

* the addition of two new efficiency indicators, ‘cost per young person subject to community‑based supervision’ and ‘cost per young person subject to detention‑based supervision’
* the inclusion of new outcome indicator concepts in the youth justice performance indicator framework (‘secure housing’, ‘education and employment readiness’, and ‘repeat offending’)
* six jurisdictions reporting for the measure ‘assaults in custody’ compared to five previously, and seven jurisdictions reporting for the measure ‘serious assaults in custody’ compared to five previously
* seven jurisdictions reporting for the indicator ‘group conferencing outcomes’ compared to six previously
* seven jurisdictions reporting for the indicator ‘self-harm and attempted suicide in custody’ compared to six previously.

## 16.1 Profile of youth justice services

### Service overview

Youth justice systems are responsible for attending to young people (predominantly aged 10–17 years) who have committed or allegedly committed an offence while considered by law to be a juvenile. In so doing, youth justice systems aim to promote community safety and reduce youth offending, by assisting young people to address their offending behaviour and take responsibility for the effect their behaviour has on victims and the wider community.

The youth justice system in each State and Territory comprises:

* police, who are usually a young person’s first point of contact with the system, and are typically responsible for administering the options available for diverting young people from further involvement in the youth justice system
* courts (usually a special children’s or youth court), where matters relating to the charges against young people are heard. The courts are largely responsible for decisions regarding bail, remand and sentencing
* statutory youth justice agencies, which are responsible for the supervision and case management of young people on a range of legal and administrative orders, and for the provision of a wide range of services intended to reduce and prevent crime
* non-government and community service providers, who may work with youth justice agencies to provide services and programs for young people under supervision.

The majority of young people who come into contact with the youth justice system do not become clients of statutory youth justice agencies. Instead, young people are diverted through a range of mechanisms, including contact with police (who have the authority to issue warnings, formal cautions and infringement notices for minor offences) and the courts (which can issue non-supervised orders for minor offences).

This chapter reports on services provided by statutory youth justice agencies that are responsible for the supervision and case management of young people who have committed or allegedly committed an offence.

### Roles and responsibilities

Responsibility for the provision of youth justice services in Australia resides with State and Territory governments. The relevant department in each State and Territory responsible for funding and/or providing youth justice services in 2012‑13 is listed in box 16.1. Each jurisdiction has its own legislation that determines the policies and practices of its youth justice system. While this legislation varies in detail, its intent is similar across jurisdictions.

Legislation in all jurisdictions (except Queensland) requires that the offence giving rise to youth justice involvement be committed while a young person is aged between 10–17 years (in Queensland, it is 10–16 years). However, youth justice agencies might continue their involvement with these young people after they reach adulthood, for example, where young people turn 18 years of age while on an order. In five jurisdictions, there is no upper age limit for youth justice involvement (Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, South Australia, and Tasmania). In New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory, the upper age limits for youth justice involvement are 21.5 years, 21 years, and 18 years, respectively.

The Australasian Juvenile Justice Administrators (AJJA) is responsible for national coordination of youth justice services and is a sub-group of the Children, Youth and Community Services Policy Research Working Group (CYCSPRWG), which is a standing committee of the Standing Council on Community and Disability Services Advisory Council (SCCDSAC).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.1 Government departments responsible for the delivery of youth justice services | |
| *NSW* | Department of Attorney General and Justice |
| *Vic* | Department of Human Services |
| *Qld* | Department of Justice and Attorney-General |
| *WA* | Department of Corrective Services |
| *SA* | Department for Communities and Social Inclusion |
| *Tas* | Department of Health and Human Services |
| *ACT* | Community Services Directorate |
| *NT* | Department of Correctional Services |
|  | |
|  | |

#### Diversion of young offenders

In all jurisdictions, police have responsibility for administering options for diverting young people who have committed (or allegedly committed) relatively minor offences from further involvement in the youth justice system. Diversionary options include warnings (informal cautions), formal cautions, and infringement notices. Responsibility for administering the diversionary processes available for more serious offences lies with youth justice authorities, courts and in some cases, other agencies. Comparable and extensive national data are not yet available to illustrate the nature or level of diversion undertaken by Australian jurisdictions. However, Police services (chapter 6) provides data on the number of young people who are diverted by police, as a proportion of all young offenders formally dealt with by police (table 6.2).

### Size and scope

#### Youth justice data sources

Data in the following section of the chapter are sourced from the Juvenile Justice National Minimum Data Set (JJ NMDS), which is maintained by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and contains information on all young people under youth justice supervision. For consistency across jurisdictions, the following section sources JJ NMDS data for young people under supervision aged 10–17 years. The remaining information in the chapter is sourced directly from State and Territory governments and reports on all young people subject to youth justice supervision (that is, including those young people 18 years and older who remain on an order).

#### Clients of youth justice agencies

Most young people who are supervised by youth justice agencies are on community-based orders, which include supervised bail, probation and parole. During 2011-12, 13 830 young people aged 10–17 years experienced youth justice supervision in Australia (AIHW 2013). Nationally, 86.2 per cent of young people aged 10–17 years who were supervised by youth justice services on an average day during 2011-12 were in the community, with the remainder in detention (figure 16.1). These data do not include young people aged 10–17 years who were supervised in the adult correctional system or young people over 17 years of age who continue to be supervised by youth justice agencies.

Figure 16.1 **Daily average proportion of youth justice clients aged 10–17 years** supervised **in the community and in detention centresa**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Refer to table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: AIHW 2013, *Youth justice in Australia 2011–12: an overview,* Canberra: AIHW; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.4.

##### Youth justice detention

The daily average number of young people aged 10–17 years in youth justice detention centres decreased from 862 to 819 between 2010-11 and 2011-12 (table 16A.4). The daily average rate of detention of young people aged 10–17 years per 100 000 in the population aged 10–17 years decreased from 38.3 per 100 000 in 2010-11 to 36.5 per 100 000 in 2011-12, with rates varying across jurisdictions (figure 16.2).

Figure 16.2 Daily average rate of detention of young people aged 10–17 years, per 100 000 young people aged 10–17 years**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Due to rounding, Australian totals may differ from the combined totals of all jurisdictions. b Refer to table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: AIHW 2013, *Youth justice in Australia 2011–12: an overview,* Canberra: AIHW; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.4.

Nationally, on an average day, females comprised 9.6 per cent of the total population of youth justice detention centres during 2011-12, while males comprised 90.0 per cent of the youth justice detention population (table 16A.7). These proportions do not add to 100 per cent as the sex of a small number of young people in detention was not reported.

##### Community-based supervision

As outlined above, the majority of young offenders are supervised in the community. Nationally, the daily average number of young people aged   
10–17 years supervised in the community decreased from 5429 to 5108 between 2010-11 and 2011-12 (table 16A.4). The daily average rate of young people aged 10–17 years supervised in the community per 100 000 in the population aged   
10–17 years decreased from 241.6 per 100 000 in 2010-11 to 227.5 per 100 000 in 2011-12, with rates varying across jurisdictions (figure 16.3).

Figure 16.3 Daily average rate of community-based supervision of young people aged 10–17 years, per 100 000 young people aged 10–17 years**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Due to rounding, Australian totals may differ from the combined totals of all jurisdictions. b Refer to table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: AIHW 2013, *Youth justice in Australia 2011–12: an overview,* Canberra: AIHW; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.4.

Nationally, on an average day, females comprised 19.6 per cent of the total population of young people supervised in the community during 2011-12, while males comprised 80.0 per cent (table 16A.8). These proportions do not add to 100 per cent as the sex of a small number of young people under community-based supervision was not reported.

##### Numbers and rates of young Indigenous Australians subject to youth justice supervision

The daily average number of Indigenous Australians aged 10–17 years detained in youth justice detention centres was 442 in 2011‑12, compared with 366 non‑Indigenous Australians aged 10–17 years (table 16A.9). Nationally, the daily average detention rate for Indigenous Australians aged 10–17 years in 2011‑12 was 425.4 per 100 000 Indigenous Australians aged 10–17 years, compared with 17.1 per 100 000 non-Indigenous young people (table 16A.9).

In 2011, the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs released the report *Doing Time — Time for Doing: Indigenous youth in the criminal justice system*, which highlighted that, although 20 years have passed since the *Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody Report* (Commonwealth of Australia 1991), the incarceration rate of Indigenous Australians, including Indigenous youth, has worsened (Commonwealth of Australia 2011). Indigenous young people are far more likely to come into contact with the criminal justice system and to be incarcerated than non‑Indigenous young people, despite Indigenous people representing approximately 2.5 per cent of the Australian population. The over‑representation of Indigenous Australians aged 10–17 years in detention across jurisdictions in 2011-12 is shown in figure 16.4.

Figure 16.4 Average daily rate of detention of Indigenous and non‑Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years, per 100 000 young people aged 10–17 years, 2011–12**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Data should be interpreted with caution, particularly for jurisdictions with small Indigenous populations. The Indigenous and non-Indigenous rate ratio in table 16A.11 should also be taken into account. b Refer to table 16A.9 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: AIHW 2013, *Youth justice in Australia 2011–12: an overview,* Canberra: AIHW; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.9.

Indigenous young people are also over-represented in community-based supervision (figure 16.5). The daily average number of Indigenous young people aged   
10–17 years supervised in the community was 2040 in 2011-12, compared with 2814 non-Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years (table 16A.10). Nationally, the daily average rate of Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years subject to community-based supervision in 2011-12 was 1961.7 per 100 000 Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years, compared with 131.4 per 100 000 non-Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years (table 16A.10).

Figure 16.5 Average daily rate of Indigenous and non‑Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years subject to community supervision, per 100 000 young people aged 10–17 years, 2011‑12**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Refer to table 16A.10 for detailed footnotes. b Data should be interpreted with caution, particularly for jurisdictions with small Indigenous populations. The Indigenous and non-Indigenous rate ratio in table 16A.11 should also be taken into account.

*Source*: AIHW 2013, *Youth justice in Australia 2011–12: an overview,* Canberra: AIHW; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.10.

### Funding

The youth justice expenditure data included in this Report are based on the total costs incurred by governments in supervising young offenders of any age, where the offence giving rise to youth justice supervision was committed while the young person was aged 10–17 years. Total recurrent expenditure on detention-based supervision, community‑based supervision and group conferencing was approximately $663.2 million across Australia in 2012-13. Detention‑based supervision accounted for the majority of government expenditure (60.4 per cent, or $400.5 million). Nationally, in 2012-13, recurrent expenditure on youth justice services per child in the population aged 10–17 years (as distinct from per youth justice client) was $294 (figure 16.6).

The population of all children aged 10–17 years is used in figure 16.4 to calculate a per head of population cost, as this age range notionally represents the potential population of youth justice agencies’ clients. The 10–17 year age range is considered the potential population of youth justice agencies’ clients, as legislation in all jurisdictions (except Queensland) requires that the offence giving rise to youth justice involvement be committed while a young person is aged between   
10–17 years (in Queensland, it is 10–16 years). However, youth justice agencies often continue their involvement with young people after they reach adulthood; for example, where young people turn 18 years of age while on a supervision order. This is particularly so in Victoria, where young people aged 18 years or older are detained in youth justice facilities through the dual track system and comprise 47 per cent of the total youth justice client cohort.

It is an objective of the Steering Committee to report comparable estimates of costs. Ideally, the full range of costs to government would be determined on a comparable basis across jurisdictions. Where full costs cannot be calculated, costs should be estimated on a consistent basis across jurisdictions. It is expected that the quality and comparability of youth justice expenditure data will be improved over time. At present, there are differences across jurisdictions in the calculation of youth justice expenditure. Tables 16A.1 to 16A.3 identify the level of consistency across jurisdictions. Table 16A.1 provides an overview of total government expenditure on youth justice services. Table 16A.2 provides more detailed information on the various components of government expenditure (for example, expenditure on salaries, overheads and capital costs).

Figure 16.6 Recurrent expenditure on youth justice services (comprising detention-based and community-based supervision and group conferencing), per young person aged 10–17 years in the population, 2012-13**a**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Refer to tables 16A.1 to 16A.3 for detailed footnotes and explanations of the consistency of expenditure data across states and territories.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.1.

## 16.2 Framework of performance indicators for youth justice services

The performance indicator framework for youth justice services is based on a set of shared government objectives (box 16.2).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.2 Objectives for youth justice services |
| Youth justice services aim to contribute to a reduction in the frequency and severity of youth offending, recognise the rights of victims and promote community safety. Youth justice services seek to achieve these aims by:   * assisting young people to address their offending behaviour and take responsibility for the effect their behaviour has on victims and the wider community * enabling the interests and views of victims to be heard * contributing to the diversion of young offenders to alternative services * recognising the importance of the families and communities of young offenders, particularly Indigenous communities, in the provision of services and programs * providing services that are designed to rehabilitate young offenders and reintegrate them into their community.   Youth justice services should be provided in an equitable, efficient and effective manner. |
|  |
|  |

The performance indicator framework provides information on equity, efficiency and effectiveness, and distinguishes the outputs and outcomes of youth justice services (figure 16.7). The performance indicator framework shows which data are comparable in the 2014 Report. For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (section 1.6).

The Report’s statistical context chapter contains data that may assist in interpreting the performance indicators presented in this chapter. These data cover a range of demographic and geographic characteristics, including age profile, geographic distribution of the population, income levels, education levels, tenure of dwellings and cultural heritage (including Indigenous and ethnic status) (chapter 2).

The performance data that follow report on all young people under the supervision of youth justice agencies, including those aged 18 years and over where the offence that gave rise to youth justice involvement was committed while the young person was aged 10–17 years (or 10–16 years in Queensland).

Data quality information (DQI) is being progressively introduced for all indicators in the Report. The purpose of DQI is to provide structured and consistent information about quality aspects of data used to report on performance indicators. DQI in this Report cover the seven dimensions in the ABS’ data quality framework (institutional environment, relevance, timeliness, accuracy, coherence, accessibility and interpretability) in addition to dimensions that define and describe performance indicators in a consistent manner, and note key data gaps and issues identified by the Steering Committee. All DQI for the 2014 Report can be found at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014.

Figure 16.7 Youth justice services performance indicator framework

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.7 Youth justice services performance indicator framework  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

## 16.3 Key performance indicator results for youth justice services

### Outputs

Outputs are the services delivered (while outcomes are the impact of these services on the status of an individual or group) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

#### Equity and access

Equity and access indicators are a key area for further development in future reports. These will be indicators of governments’ objective to ensure that all clients have fair and equitable access to services on the basis of relative need and available resources. These indicators are under development.

#### Effectiveness

##### Diversion — group conferencing outcomes

‘Group conferencing outcomes’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to divert young people from the youth justice system and address their offending needs (box 16.3).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.3 Group conferencing outcomes |
| ‘Group conferencing outcomes’ is defined as the number of young people who receive group conferencing and who as a result reach an agreement, as a proportion of all young people who receive group conferencing.  Typically, a group conference involves the young offender and victim (or victims) and their families, police and a youth justice agency officer, all of whom attempt to agree on a course of action required of the young offender to make amends for his or her offence. Group conferences are decision-making forums that aim to minimise the progression of young people into the youth justice system, and provide restorative justice.  Data for this indicator should be interpreted with caution as the provision of group conferencing differs across jurisdictions in relation to: (a) its place in the court process (for example, whether young people are referred by police before court processes begin, or by the court as an alternative to sentencing), (b) the consequences for young people if they do not comply with the outcome plans of a conference, and (c) eligibility.  A high or increasing rate for this indicator is desirable.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions * incomplete for the current reporting period. All required 2012‑13 data were not available for Victoria and WA. Victoria could not disaggregate these data by Indigenous status, and no data were available for WA.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2012-13, 95.0 per cent of all concluded group conferences resulted in an agreement, with proportions varying across jurisdictions (figure 16.8).

Figure 16.8 Proportion of young people who receive group conferencing and reach an agreement, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b, c, d**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Victoria cannot disaggregate group conferences by Indigenous status. b Data were not available for WA. c Queensland and Victoria count the number of group conferences resulting in an agreement, as a proportion of all concluded group conferences, as distinct from young people who receive group conferencing and reach an agreement. d Refer to table 16A.13 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.13.

##### Rehabilitation — offending‑specific programs completed

‘Offending-specific programs completed’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide program interventions that are designed to rehabilitate young offenders and reintegrate them into their community (for example, the Changing Habits and Reaching Targets program, drug counselling programs and sex offender treatment programs) (box 16.4).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.4 Offending-specific programs completed |
| ‘Offending-specific programs completed’ is defined as the percentage of young people who completed an offending-specific program while completing a supervised sentenced order (whether a community-based order or a detention order) as a proportion of all young people completing a supervised sentenced order who were assessed as requiring an offending-specific program to address their criminogenic behaviour.  A high or increasing rate of offending-specific programs completed is desirable.  Data are not yet available for this indicator. This indicator has been identified for development and reporting in future. |
|  |
|  |

Box 16.5 provides information regarding offending-specific programs in operation in each jurisdiction.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.5 Offending-specific programs | |
| *NSW* | NSW uses the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) risk assessment tool and the Changing Habits and Reaching Targets (CHART) offending behaviour program on a state-wide basis. NSW also provides specific offence-based intervention programs. The Violence Offender Program (VOP) addresses the criminogenic needs of violent offenders, thereby reducing their offending behaviours, contact with the justice system and rates of recidivism. The Sexual Offending Program (SOP) provides comprehensive, individualised assessment for adolescents convicted of offences of a sexual nature, as well as individual and group interventions. The Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Program aims to address the needs of clients whose pattern of alcohol and other drug use is related to their offending behaviour. ‘DthinaYuwali’ is an Aboriginal-specific staged AOD program based on the relationship between substance use and pathways to offending. The Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) focuses on juveniles who commit serious and/or repeat offences, or whose severe antisocial behaviour increases their likelihood of offending. ISP is based on the Multisystemic Therapy Model that has delivered significant reductions in the long-term rates of re-offending in WA, New Zealand, the United States, Canada and nine countries throughout Europe. ‘Our Journey To Respect’ is a tertiary violence prevention program for Aboriginal young offenders aimed at motivating and helping young people to make changes to violent behaviours. |
|  | (Continued on next page) |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.5 (Continued) | |
| *Vic* | Victoria offers a range of offending-specific programs in conjunction with a comprehensive individualised case planning framework (including assessment and client service planning). ‘Changing Habits and Reaching Targets’ (CHART) is a structured intervention program which challenges offending behaviour. CHART is used as part of casework intervention with individuals or in small groups. The ‘Male Adolescent Program for Positive Sexuality’ is an intensive individual, group and family treatment program for young people found guilty of sexual offences. Victoria has introduced a new violence reduction program aimed at reducing the likelihood of future violent offending by young people. The Adolescent Violence Intervention Program (AVIP) is a multi-modular Cognitive Behavioural Therapy intervention that targets factors that research consistently shows are associated with violence in young people. The ‘Motor Vehicle Offending Program’ is provided in conjunction with the Transport Accident Commission and Road Trauma Support Unit. It addresses specific behaviours related to motor vehicle offences. |
| *Qld* | In the Queensland youth justice system, a young person’s risk, needs and protective factors are assessed using the Youth Level of Service Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI) to determine both suitability for programs and outcome efficacy. Youth justice staff throughout Queensland deliver two offence-focussed programs to young offenders in regional service centres and in youth detention — Changing Habits and Reaching Targets (CHART) and Aggression Replacement Training (ART). Additionally, Queensland’s two youth detention centres and 16 youth justice service centres deliver tailored offending-specific programs that address individual and local needs and align with the Queensland Youth Justice Intervention Framework. This framework details an evidence-based process for the development, implementation and evaluation of programs. To ensure the provision of holistic and effective responses to young offenders, the framework encompasses the delivery of offence-focussed and developmental interventions and support services alongside the supervision of court orders. |
|  | (Continued on next page) |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.5 (Continued) | |
| *WA* | WA offers a range of offending-specific programs to address the needs of young offenders. Programs are run on an as needs basis according to suitability criteria for specific programs. Examples of the offending-specific programs provided in WA include: ‘Healthy Relationships’, which explores adolescent relationships and issues such as sexism, stereotypes and consent; ‘Protective Behaviours’, which examines safety warning signs and discusses who young people can turn to for help; ‘Drumbeat’, a therapeutic program which incorporates music; and other conflict, parenting and sex education programs. These programs can be conducted in community settings, but are most commonly conducted in custodial settings. |
| *SA* | SA offers offending-specific programs in addition to individualised case management programs to address assessed client risk and need. ‘Systematic Training for Anger Reduction’ (STAR) is based on principles of cognitive behaviour therapy. The program seeks to assist young people to develop awareness about anger and skills of self-control. The ‘Problem‑solving: Learning Usable Skills’ program (Plus+) employs cognitive‑behavioural methods of problem solving, skill-training and self‑management, which have been shown to be effective in reducing juvenile offending. The Victim Awareness program raises awareness of the effects of crime on individuals and the community. The ‘Alcohol and Other Drug’ (AOD) program explores the risks of offending while under the influence of AOD. Moral Reconation Therapy (Little and Robinson 1988), which seeks to develop concern for social rules and others, is also used. The SA Police Safe Driving program targets ‘high speed’ drivers with the aim of reducing motor vehicle crime. |
| *Tas* | Tasmania utilises the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory risk assessment tool and the Changing Habits and Reaching Targets offending behaviour program. The tools support a modular and structured approach to working with young people who are at a high risk of reoffending. Tasmania also sources expertise from a range of government, non-government and private services to provide offending-specific programs to young people based on their assessed risk and need. The community-based Targeted Youth Support Service provides intensive case management and interventions for vulnerable young people and their families. The target groups for this service are young people identified as having significant and/or multiple risk issues and without intensive support, young people known to child protection, and young people at risk of entry and/or escalation within the youth justice system. |
| (Continued on next page) | |
|  | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.5 (Continued) | |
|  | U-Turn is a motor vehicle offending program which involves engaging participants with a history of motor vehicle theft in ‘hands on’ mechanical training while addressing life skills and personal development. Save the Children runs the Transition from Remand and Detention Program to assist young people to reintegrate back into the community in Southern Tasmania as well as the Supporting Young People on Bail Program which supports young people placed on Court Bail in Southern Tasmania. |
| *ACT* | The ACT’s main offending-specific program is Changing Habits and Reaching Targets (CHART), which is designed specifically for young people assessed as moderate to high-risk of re‑offending. This behaviour program is used by youth justice staff as part of their casework intervention either with individuals or with small groups of two to three clients. CHART is evidence-based and is informed by the ‘What Works’ approach to offender rehabilitation. This approach is characterised by the application of five basic principles of good practice for effective interventions: risk, needs, responsiveness, program integrity and professional discretion. |
| *NT* | The NT provides a number of offending-specific programs to assist young people and inmates in contact with the criminal justice system. Programs offered in the NT include: sex offender treatment programs; violent offender treatment programs; the Safe, Sober, Strong Program; and the Family Violence Program. These programs are offered to inmates in adult correctional centres and youth detention centres. The programs are facilitated by psychologists and social workers with experience in these areas. The Intensive Alcohol and Drug Program is facilitated and run by non-government organisations. In addition, individual treatment programs are provided to inmates and young people with an identified need for specific treatment programs. The programs are based on cognitive behavioural therapy. A ‘hands on’ approach, as distinct from a ‘classroom style’ approach, has been adopted in facilitating these programs to reflect cultural differences, language difficulties and lower literacy levels which inmates or youth detainees in these programs may experience. The NT adult correctional and youth justice systems have a disproportionately high number of Indigenous people in custody or detention. Accordingly, input has been provided by an Indigenous Torres Strait Islander Consultative Committee and from Indigenous employees attached to the Offender Services, Programs and Indigenous Affairs Division to ensure programs are relevant and appropriate. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished). | |
|  | |

##### Rehabilitation — education and training attendance

‘Education and training attendance’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide program interventions in education and training to rehabilitate young offenders and increase their chances of successfully re-integrating into the community (box 16.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.6 Education and training attendance |
| ‘Education and training attendance’ is defined by two measures:   * the number of young people of compulsory school age in detention attending an education course, as a percentage of all young people of compulsory school age in detention * the number of young people not of compulsory school age in detention attending an education or training course, as a percentage of all young people not of compulsory school age in detention.   Compulsory school age refers to specific State and Territory governments’ requirements for a young person to participate in school, which are based primarily on age (see chapter 4 School education for further information). Education or training course refers to school education or an accredited education or training course under the Australian Qualifications Framework.  A high or increasing percentage of young people attending education and training is desirable.  Exclusions include young people not under youth justice supervision (for example, in police custody) and young people whose situation might exclude their participation in education programs (including young people who are: on temporary leave such as work release, medically unable to participate, in isolation, and on remand or sentenced for fewer than 7 days).  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 97.2 per cent of young people of compulsory school age in detention were attending an education course in 2012-13, while 98.1 per cent of young people in detention notof compulsory school age were attending an accredited education or training course (figure 16.9). Proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 16.9 Proportion of young people in detention attending an accredited education or training course, by Indigenous status 2012-13**a**

|  |
| --- |
| **(a) Proportion of young people of compulsory school age in detention attending an accredited education or training course**  **(b) Proportion of young people not of compulsory school age in detention attending an accredited education or training course** |

a The low rates for WA for 2012-13 can be attributed to the combination of a number of factors such as building projects, the amalgamation of Rangeview Remand Centre and Banksia Hill Detention Centre, shortage of custodial staff, a serious disruption at Banksia Hill Detention Centre during January 2013 resulting in the transfer of most detainees to Hakea Juvenile Security. Consequently, young people did not have the same education hours and opportunities as in past years. The situation has considerably improved with the return of young people to Banksia Hill Detention Centre and the employment of more youth custodial officers. Therefore, WA expects to see an improvement in the rates for 2013-14. b Refer to table 16A.15 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.15.

##### Safe and secure environment — deaths in custody

‘Deaths in custody’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure that youth justice agencies provide a safe and secure environment for young people in custody (box 16.7).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.7 Deaths in custody |
| ‘Deaths in custody’ is defined as the number of young people who died while in custody.  A zero or decreasing deaths in custody rate is desirable.  The scope of this indicator is restricted to those young people who died while in the legal and/or physical custody of a youth justice agency and those who died in, or en route to, an external medical facility as a result of becoming ill or being injured in custody (even if not escorted by youth justice agency workers).  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

No young people died while in the legal or physical custody of an Australian youth justice agency in 2012-13 (table 16A.14).

##### Safe and secure environment — escapes

‘Escapes’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure that youth justice agencies provide a safe and secure environment for young people in custody, and the community (box 16.8).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.8 Escapes |
| ‘Escapes’ is defined by two measures:   * the number of escapes from a youth justice detention centre, as a proportion of all young people in custody * the number of escapes during periods of escorted movement, as a proportion of all periods of escorted movement.   An escape from a youth justice detention centre is defined as a breach of a secure perimeter or defined boundary of a youth justice detention centre by a young person under the supervision of the centre.  A period of escorted movement is defined as a period of time during which a young person is in the custody of the youth justice agency while outside a detention centre. The period of escorted movement ends when the young person is returned to the detention centre, or is no longer in the legal or physical custody of the youth justice agency. An escape from an escorted movement is defined as the failure of a young person to remain in the custody of a supervising youth justice worker or approved service provider during a period of escorted movement. An escape is counted each time a young person escapes. For example, if a young person escapes three times in a counting period, three escapes are recorded. If three young people escape at the same time, three escapes are recorded.  A zero or decreasing escape rate is desirable.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * incomplete for the current reporting period. Data for WA were not available for the measure ‘escapes during periods of escorted movement’.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, there were 4 escapes from youth justice detention in 2012-13, which was equivalent to 0.1 escapes per 10 000 custody nights in 2012-13 (table 16.1). The number of escapes from detention varied across jurisdictions.

Table 16.1 Number and rate of escapes from youth justice detention centres, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust |
| **Number of escapes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | – | – | – | 2.0 | – | – | – | 2.0 | 4.0 |
| Non-Indigenous | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| Total | – | – | – | 2.0 | – | – | – | 2.0 | 4.0 |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | – | – | – | 0.4 | – | – | – | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| Non-Indigenous | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| Total | – | – | – | 0.3 | – | – | – | 1.1 | 0.1 |

a Refer to table 16A.16 for detailed footnotes. – Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.16.

Nationally, there were no escapes from escorted movements in 2012-13, although data were not available for WA (table 16A.16).

##### Safe and secure environment — absconds from unescorted leave

‘Absconds from unescorted leave’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to appropriately manage young people while they are in the legal custody of a youth justice detention centre (box 16.9). Management of young people includes the provision of appropriate assessment, planning and supervision to enable young people to undertake unescorted temporary leave from detention centres. Unescorted leave may be undertaken for the purposes of providing rehabilitation interventions and activities such as education, training and employment.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.9 Absconds from unescorted leave |
| ‘Absconds from unescorted leave’ is defined as the number of young people who have unescorted temporary leave and fail to return to custody, as a proportion of all young people who have unescorted temporary leave.  A zero or low, or decreasing rate of absconds from unescorted leave is desirable.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * incomplete for the current reporting period. Denominators for this indicator (number of periods of unescorted leave) were not available for SA and the NT.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

No young people absconded from unescorted leave in 2012-13 (table 16A.17).

##### Safe and secure environment — assaults in custody

‘Assaults in custody’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide a custodial environment that is safe and secure in order to rehabilitate young offenders and reintegrate them into their community (box 16.10).

Youth justice agencies have a heightened duty of care to young people in detention, because of their age and vulnerability. The duty of care required for young people is greater than might be the case in adult custodial facilities. In discharging their duty of care to young people in detention, youth justice agencies aim to create safe and secure environments in which typical adolescent development can occur and in which young people can socialise with others in a positive and constructive way prior to their release back into their families and communities.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.10 Assaults in custody |
| ‘Assaults in custody’ is defined by two measures:   * the rate of detainees and staff (by Indigenous status) who are seriously assaulted (that is, sustain an injury that requires overnight hospitalisation and any act of sexual assault) due to an act perpetrated by one or more detainees, as a proportion of the number of detainees in custody * the rate of detainees and staff (by Indigenous status) who are assaulted (that is, sustain an injury, but do not require hospitalisation) due to an act perpetrated by one or more detainees, as a proportion of the number of detainees in custody.   Injuries resulting from a range of actions are captured as part of reporting for this indicator. Types of injuries include bruises, cuts or lacerations, open wounds, fractured or broken bones or teeth, burns or scalds, poisoning, dislocations and sprains, and concussions. Types of actions that constitute assaults include intentional acts of direct infliction of force and violence (for example, fist fights) and intentional acts of indirect and non‑confrontational force or violence (for example, administering illicit drugs or poison, spiking food or drink, and setting traps).  A zero or low, or decreasing assaults in custody rate is desirable.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within some jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions or over time for other jurisdictions (see caveats in attachment tables for specific jurisdictions) * incomplete for the current reporting period. All required data were not available for the following jurisdictions: no data were available for WA and data for assaults were not available for Victoria.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 5 detainees were reported as injured in custody due to a serious assault in 2012-13 (table 16.2). Nationally, 4 staff were reported as injured due to a serious assault in 2012-13 (table 16.3). The proportions of young people and staff injured in custody due to a serious assault varied across jurisdictions.

Table 16.2 Number and rate of young people injured as a result of a serious assault, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT |
| **Number of young people injured as a result of a serious assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | – | na | 1.0 | na | – | – | – | – |
| Non-Indigenous | – | 4.0 | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | – | 4.0 | 1.0 | na | – | – | – | – |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | – | na | 0.3 | na | – | – | – | – |
| Non-Indigenous | – | 0.7 | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | – | 0.7 | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | – |

a Data were not available for WA. b Refer to table 16A.18 for detailed footnotes. **na** Not available.   
– Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.18.

Table 16.3 Number and rate of staff injured as a result of a serious assault, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT |
| **Number of staff injured as a result of a serious assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Non-Indigenous | – | – | 1.0 | na | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | – | 3.0 | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | – | 3.0 | 1.0 | na | – | – | – | – |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Non-Indigenous | – | – | 0.5 | na | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | – | na | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | – | 0.5 | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | – |

a Data were not available for WA. b Refer to table 16A.18 for detailed footnotes. **na** Not available.   
– Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.18.

Nationally, 83 detainees were reported as injured in custody due to an assault in 2012-13 (table 16.4). Proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Table 16.4 Number and rate of detainees injured as a result of an assault, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b, c**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT |
| **Number of detainees injured as a result of an assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 8.0 | na | 10.0 | na | 7.0 | – | – | 6.0 |
| Non-Indigenous | 4.0 | na | 8.0 | na | 26.0 | 12.0 | 2.0 | – |
| Unknown | – | na | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 12.0 | na | 18.0 | na | 33.0 | 12.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 1.3 | na | 2.6 | na | 7.4 | – | – | 3.5 |
| Non-Indigenous | 0.7 | na | 4.1 | na | 21.6 | 18.6 | 4.1 | – |
| Unknown | – | na | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 1.0 | na | 3.1 | na | 15.1 | 17.8 | 3.1 | 3.3 |

a Data reported for this indicator are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution. Methods of data collection vary across jurisdictions (for example, manual case file review compared to the collation of electronic incident reports) and jurisdictions’ ability to report on this measure is dependent on relevant incidents having first been documented. b Data were not available for Victoria and WA. c Refer to table 16A.19 for detailed footnotes. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.19.

Nationally, 76 staff were reported as injured due to an assault while supervising detainees in 2012-13 (table 16.5). Proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Table 16.5 Number and rate of staff injured as a result of an assault, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b, c, d**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT |
| **Number of staff injured as a result of an assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | na | na | 6.0 | na | 1.0 | – | – | – |
| Non-Indigenous | na | na | 16.0 | na | 18.0 | – | – | 3.0 |
| Unknown | 21.0 | na | – | na | 1.0 | 10.0 | – | – |
| Total | 21.0 | na | 22.0 | na | 20.0 | 10.0 | – | 3.0 |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | na | na | 1.5 | na | 1.1 | – | – | – |
| Non-Indigenous | na | na | 8.2 | na | 15.0 | – | – | 30.9 |
| Unknown | 122.3 | na | – | na | 24.8 | na | – | – |
| Total | 1.8 | na | 3.8 | na | 9.1 | 14.8 | – | 1.7 |

a Data reported for this indicator are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution. Methods of data collection vary across jurisdictions (for example, manual case file review compared to the collation of electronic incident reports) and jurisdictions’ ability to report on this measure is dependent on relevant incidents having first been documented. b Data report the Indigenous status of staff who were reported as injured due to an assault. c Data were not available for Victoria and WA. d Refer to table 16A.19 for detailed footnotes. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.19.

##### Safe and secure environment — self-harm and attempted suicide in custody

‘Self-harm and attempted suicide in custody’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide a custodial environment that is safe and secure in order to rehabilitate young offenders and reintegrate them into their community (box 16.11).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.11 Self-harm and attempted suicide in custody |
| ‘Self-harm and attempted suicide in custody’ is defined by four measures:   * the number of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation * the number of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation * the number of detainees who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation * the number of detainees who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation. |
| An incident of self-harm or attempted suicide is counted each time a young person self‑harms or attempts suicide. For example, if one young person self-harms or attempts suicide three times in a counting period, three incidents are recorded. Therefore, the number of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide and the number of detainees who self-harm or attempt suicide will differ when one detainee has self‑harmed on two or more occasions, as each occasion will be counted as a separate incident.  Types of self-inflicted incidents that constitute self-harm include poisoning by drugs, alcohol, gases and vapours, hanging, strangulation, suffocation, drowning or submersion in water, burning, cutting, jumping from a high place, jumping or lying in front of a moving object, and electrocution.  A zero or low, or decreasing self-harm and attempted suicide in custody rate is desirable.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within some jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions or over time for other jurisdictions (see caveats in attachment tables for specific jurisdictions) * incomplete for the current reporting period. Data were not available for WA.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, seven detainees in eight separate incidents were reported as having self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation in 2012-13. Proportions varied across jurisdictions (tables 16.6 and 16.7).

Table 16.6 Number and rate of detainees who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT |
| **Number of detainees who self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 5.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 1.0 |
| Non-Indigenous | 1.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | na | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 6.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 1.0 |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 0.8 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 0.6 |
| Non-Indigenous | 0.2 | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | na | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 0.5 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 0.6 |

a Data were not available for WA. b Refer to table 16A.20 for detailed footnotes. **na** Not available.   
– Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.20.

Table 16.7 Number and rate of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT |
| **Number of incidents of self‑harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 6.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 1.0 |
| Non-Indigenous | 1.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | na | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 7.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 1.0 |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 1.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 0.6 |
| Non-Indigenous | 0.2 | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Unknown | na | – | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 0.6 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 0.6 |

a Data were not available for WA. b Refer to table 16A.20 for detailed footnotes. **na** Not available.   
– Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.20.

Nationally, 99 detainees were reported as having self-harmed or attempted suicide in 127 separate incidents during 2012-13, which did not require hospitalisation (tables 16.8 and 16.9). Proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Table 16.8 Number and rate of detainees who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b, c**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT |
| **Number of detainees who self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 23.0 | na | 5.0 | na | 6.0 | 2.0 | – | 19.0 |
| Non-Indigenous | 12.0 | na | 6.0 | na | 10.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
| Unknown | – | 5.0 | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 35.0 | 5.0 | 11.0 | na | 16.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 21.0 |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 3.8 | na | 1.3 | na | 6.3 | 64.1 | – | 11.2 |
| Non-Indigenous | 2.1 | na | 3.1 | na | 8.3 | 9.3 | 6.1 | 20.6 |
| Unknown | – | na | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 3.0 | 0.8 | 1.9 | na | 7.3 | 11.9 | 4.6 | 11.7 |

a Data were not available for WA. b Data reported for this indicator are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution. Methods of data collection vary across jurisdictions (for example, manual case file review, the collation of electronic incident reports) and jurisdictions’ ability to report on this measure is dependent on relevant incidents having first been documented. c Refer to table 16A.20 for detailed footnotes. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.20.

Table 16.9 Number and rate of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b, c**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT |
| **Number of incidents of self‑harm or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 23.0 | na | 5.0 | na | 8.0 | 2.0 | – | 29.0 |
| Non-Indigenous | 12.0 | na | 13.0 | na | 18.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Unknown | – | 5.0 | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 35.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 | na | 26.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 32.0 |
| **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 3.8 | na | 1.3 | na | 8.5 | 64.1 | – | 17.1 |
| Non-Indigenous | 2.1 | na | 6.7 | na | 15.0 | 9.3 | 6.1 | 30.9 |
| Unknown | – | na | – | na | – | – | – | – |
| Total | 3.0 | 0.8 | 3.1 | na | 11.9 | 11.9 | 4.6 | 17.9 |

a Data reported for this indicator are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution. Methods of data collection vary across jurisdictions (for example, manual case file review compared to the collation of electronic incident reports) and jurisdictions’ ability to report on this measure is dependent on relevant incidents having first been documented. b Data were not available for WA. c Refer to table 16A.20 for detailed footnotes. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.20.

##### Statutory responsibilities — case plans prepared

‘Case plans prepared’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure that youth justice agencies support young people to minimise the likelihood of re‑offending by addressing their offending-related needs (box 16.12).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.12 Case plans prepared |
| ‘Case plans prepared’ is defined as the number of eligible young people who had a documented case plan prepared or reviewed within 6 weeks of commencing:   * a sentenced detention order, as a proportion of all young people commencing a sentenced detention order * a sentenced community-based order, as a proportion of all young people commencing a sentenced community-based order.   An eligible young person is one who is serving a sentenced order that requires case management.  A high or increasing rate of case plans prepared is desirable.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * incomplete for the current reporting period. All required data were not available for the following jurisdictions: SA and Tasmania. In addition, WA could not disaggregate community‑based case plans by Indigenous status.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 82.8 per cent of case plans were prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced community-based order in 2012-13 (figure 16.10(a)). Nationally, 97.8 per cent of case plans were prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced detention order in 2012-13 (figure 16.10(b)). Proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 16.10 Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing sentenced detention orders and sentenced community-based orders, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b, c, d**

|  |
| --- |
| (a) Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced  community-based order  (b) Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced  detention order |

a For community-based case plans, WA could not disaggregate the numerator by Indigenous status. Therefore, a proportion is only calculated for the total number of case plans prepared in WA. b Data were not available for SA and Tasmania. c In the NT, case plans for young people on community-based orders are prepared within 8 weeks of order commencement. Community-based data for the NT have been manually collated and data integrity cannot be assured. d Refer to table 16A.22 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.22.

##### Statutory responsibilities — completion of community-based orders

‘Completion of community-based orders’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to rehabilitate young offenders (box 16.13).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.13 Completion of community-based orders |
| ‘Completion of community-based orders’ is defined as the proportion of sentenced community-based supervision orders successfully completed. An order is counted as successfully completed where the earliest order expiry date or the order termination date is reached and breach is neither pending nor finalised.  A high or increasing proportion of orders successfully completed is desirable. However, where offenders are non-compliant and pose a risk, breach action (an unsuccessful completion) may be warranted. As a result, a completion rate less than 100 per cent may not necessarily indicate poor performance, and may reflect appropriate supervision of young people on community-based supervision orders.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * incomplete for the current reporting period. All required data were not available for the ACT.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 80.0 per cent of community-based orders were successfully completed in 2012-13. The proportion of community-based orders successfully completed varied across jurisdictions (figure 16.11).

Figure 16.11 Proportion of community-based orders successfully completed, by Indigenous status, 2012-13**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Data were not available for the ACT due to information system limitations. b Refer to table 16A.21 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.21.

#### Efficiency

##### Cost per young person subject to community-based supervision

‘Cost per young person subject to community-based supervision’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide youth justice services in an efficient manner (box 16.14).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.14 Cost per young person subject to community-based supervision |
| ‘Cost per young person subject to community-based supervision’ is defined as total expenditure on community-based supervision per day, divided by the number of young people subject to community-based supervision on an average day.  A low or decreasing unit cost is desirable as it suggests more efficient resource management.  However, efficiency indicators cannot be interpreted in isolation and should be considered in conjunction with effectiveness indicators. A low cost per young person subject to community-based supervision could reflect less investment in rehabilitation programs to address a young person’s offending needs, or less intensive case management of young people on community-based supervision orders. Unit costs are also affected by differences in the profile of young offenders, geographic dispersion and other factors that limit opportunities to reduce overheads through economies of scale.  The average daily costs of supervising young offenders are significantly higher than the equivalent unit costs for adult offenders. This is likely to be explained by more extensive supervision requirements when working with minors and the more limited opportunity for economies of scale in smaller youth justice systems.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2012-13, the cost per day, per young person subject to community‑based supervision on an average day was $98. The cost per day, per young person subject to community‑based supervision on an average day varied across jurisdictions (figure 16.12).

Figure 16.12 Cost per day, per young person subject to community-based supervision on an average day, 2012-13**a, b, c**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Data reported for this indicator are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution. b Unit costs presented in this Report are not necessarily comparable to local unit costs reported in jurisdiction-specific annual reports due to different methods of calculation. c Refer to table 16A.23 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.23.

##### Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision

‘Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide youth justice services in an efficient manner (box 16.15).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.15 Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision |
| ‘Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision’ is defined as total expenditure on detention-based supervision per day, divided by the number of young people subject to detention-based supervision on an average day.  A low or decreasing unit cost is desirable as it suggests more efficient resource management.  However, efficiency indicators cannot be interpreted in isolation and should be considered in conjunction with effectiveness indicators. A low cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision could reflect less investment in rehabilitation programs to address a young person’s offending needs, or less intensive case management of young people on detention-based supervision orders. Unit costs are also affected by differences in the profile of young offenders, geographic dispersion and other factors that limit opportunities to reduce overheads through economies of scale.  The average daily costs of supervising young offenders are significantly higher than the equivalent unit costs for adult offenders. This is likely to be explained by more extensive supervision requirements when working with minors and the more limited opportunity for economies of scale in smaller youth justice systems.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2012-13, the cost per day, per young person subject to detention‑based supervision was $1117. The cost per day, per young person subject to detention‑based supervision varied across jurisdictions (figure 16.13).

Figure 16.13 Cost per day, per young person subject to detention-based supervision on an average day, 2012-13**a, b, c**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Data reported for this indicator are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution. b Unit costs presented in this Report are not necessarily comparable to local unit costs reported in jurisdiction-specific annual reports due to different methods of calculation. c Refer to table 16A.24 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.24.

##### Offender-to-staff ratio

‘Offender-to-staff ratio’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide youth justice services in an efficient manner (box 16.16).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.16 Offender-to-staff ratio |
| ‘Offender-to-staff ratio’ is defined by two measures:   * the number of young people requiring community-based supervision relative to the number of community‑based staff * the number of young people in detention relative to the number of detention centre staff.   The number of offenders relative to the number of staff provides a measure of efficient resource management by youth justice agencies. A high or increasing ratio (that is, a higher number of offenders per staff member) suggests more efficient resource management. However, this indicator needs to be interpreted with caution, as a low or decreasing offender-to-staff ratio may result in more effective performance, particularly with high risk young offenders who possess significant offence-related needs. Further, in some cases, efficiencies may not be possible due to remote geographic locations that limit opportunities to reduce overheads through economies of scale.  Data are not yet available for this indicator. This indicator has been identified for development and reporting in future. |
|  |
|  |

##### Centre utilisation

‘Centre utilisation’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide youth justice services in an efficient manner (box 16.17).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.17 Centre utilisation |
| ‘Centre utilisation’ is defined as the number of detainees in all detention centres as a proportion of the number of permanently funded beds.  Detention centres operating at higher or increasing capacities is desirable from an efficient resource management perspective. However, detention centres operating at or above capacity might be ineffective due to the consequences for rehabilitation when centres are overcrowded. Centres also need to make provision for separately detaining various classes of young offenders (for example, males and females, offenders requiring different security levels, offenders of different ages, and young people on remand and young people who have been sentenced). In order to make provision for separately detaining various classes of young people, detention centres require utilisation rates that are below full capacity.  Centre utilisation also reflects the efficient use of publicly funded resources. Centres that are built at a point in time need to be able to justify significant under use, if that occurs in future years, where that under use cannot reasonably be explained by the need to make provision for detaining different classes of young offenders.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 78.7 per cent of centre capacity (that is, permanently funded beds) was utilised in 2012-13. Proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 16.14).

Figure 16.14 Centre utilisation rate**a**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a Refer to table 16A.25 for detailed footnotes.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.25.

### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

Selected outcome indicator concepts for youth justice services have been identified. Data are not yet available to enumerate these concepts. However, over time, definitions and counting rules will be developed for these concepts, for reporting in future.

##### Secure housing

‘Secure housing’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide services that are designed to rehabilitate young offenders and reintegrate them into their community (box 16.18).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.18 Secure housing |
| ‘Secure housing’ is defined as the proportion of young people who exit youth justice detention to a stable, permanent housing arrangement.  Ensuring young people have suitable, stable accommodation is a critical factor in preventing offending and reoffending. Accommodation is vital for young people to maintain attendance at school, gain employment, engage with health services and benefit from programs to address their offending needs. Securing stable housing is a core component of reintegrating young people into the community post-detention. Lack of suitable housing options can contribute to overuse of custodial supervision orders (Supervised Release Review Board, Western Australia, 2012; Patel, 2004).  Data are not yet available for this indicator. This indicator has been identified for development and reporting in future. |
|  |
|  |

##### Education and employment readiness

‘Education and employment readiness’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide services that are designed to rehabilitate young offenders and reintegrate them into their community (box 16.19).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.19 Education and employment readiness |
| ‘Education and employment readiness’ is defined as a young person’s readiness for education or work at the conclusion of youth justice supervision.  Research has shown that effectively helping young people involved in the youth justice system to be self-sufficient and productive community members post-supervision requires strategies to address young people’s developmental needs, including equipping them with life skills, such as education and an attachment to the workforce (O’Sullivan et al., 2001). While many young offenders will exit the system with the desire to accomplish basic developmental tasks such as finishing school, embarking on further education or training, and finding employment, these goals can be difficult to achieve.  Participation in employment and career-focused programs while under youth justice supervision can help to prepare young offenders to transition from youth justice supervision to further education and training, and the workforce (Fields and Abrams 2010). Engagement with education or training, and employment, can assist a young person’s re-entry into the community and reduce the likelihood of further youth justice involvement (Nally et al. 2012).  Data are not yet available for this indicator. This indicator has been identified for development and reporting in future. |
|  |
|  |

##### Repeat offending

‘Repeat offending’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to reduce the frequency and severity of youth offending, assist young people to address their offending behaviour and take responsibility for the effect their behaviour has on victims and the wider community, and to provide services that are designed to rehabilitate young offenders and reintegrate them into their community (box 16.20).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.20 Repeat offending |
| ‘Repeat offending’ is defined as the extent to which young offenders have repeat involvement with the youth justice system following a period of youth justice supervision.  Reducing youth offending and reoffending is a key goal of Australian State and Territory youth justice systems (Richards 2012). However, the measurement of repeat offending, sometimes called recidivism, is complex. Repeat offending, or recidivism, is defined as the reversion of an individual to criminal behaviour after he or she has been convicted of a prior offence. Repeat offending can be measured using a range of data elements along the youth justice continuum, including, rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration (Richards 2012).  Measures of repeat offending should be considered in the context of other youth justice outcome indicators, as in isolation, repeat offending is an imperfect measure of youth justice system performance. Many factors are likely to influence youth offending patterns, including a young person’s family environment and social circumstances. In addition, as factors that give rise to offending vary from region to region, direct comparisons of recidivism rates should not be made in isolation from the broader social context of each region.  Further, adolescence has been identified as a ‘crime prone’ time. As Richards (2012) notes, numerous studies have indicated that offending behaviour escalates during early adolescence, before peaking in late adolescence, and declining in early adulthood. Therefore, notwithstanding interventions provided by youth justice agencies, some degree of repeat offending is quite likely within this age group. It also stands to reason that the typical rate of youth repeat offending would be higher than that of adult offenders.  Data are not yet available for this indicator. This indicator has been identified for development and reporting in future. |
|  |
|  |

## 16.4 Future directions in youth justice performance reporting

Further development of the youth justice performance indicator framework and reporting for indicators included in the framework is being undertaken overtime. Data for 12 performance indicators are included in this Report. The remaining performance indicators in the youth justice performance indicator framework will be developed for inclusion in future Reports.

The AJJA is overseeing several research projects to develop national youth justice policy, research and data capabilities. Current priorities include a bail and remand study, development of a Trauma Informed Practice Guide, the development of a linked data collection to report on the relationships between child protection and youth justice, and a recidivism data collection project.

## 16.5 Jurisdictions’ comments

This section provides comments from each jurisdiction on the services covered in this chapter.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | New South Wales Government comments | **”** |
| In 2012-13, the NSW Juvenile Justice agency saw consistently lower numbers of young people in custody, from an average of 353 per day in 2011-12 to 324 per day in 2012-13. The agency continued to work to improve its response to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) over-representation through the development and implementation of the ATSI Cultural Respect Framework, the Aboriginal Staff Mentoring Program and the ATSI Staff Recruitment and Retention Strategy 2011-15.  Juvenile Justice’s remand reduction (bail) services have halved the numbers of young people who are on remand because they are unable to meet their bail conditions (from 124 in 2010-11 to 52 in 2012-13).  NSW launched Youth on Track, an early intervention system designed to coordinate services for 10-17 year old offenders before they become entrenched in the criminal justice system. Young people are referred to a case manager who will work with them and their families to address offending behaviour and reduce their risk of reoffending.  Juvenile Justice launched the revised Joint Support Program, the agency’s new funding program for community service providers. The Program was developed following an extensive review of the specific program needs of each Juvenile Justice region.  The roll out of Changing Habits and Reaching Targets (CHART), a cognitive behavioural therapy program developed specifically for young offenders, has continued with over 80 per cent of young people completing their required components in the program.  A number of research projects were commissioned, including a review of the oral competency of young offenders.  Quality Assurance reviews were completed on all Juvenile Justice Centres and community offices, including Youth Justice Conferencing and court logistics. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Victorian Government comments | **”** |
| The 2012-13 Victorian State Budget committed $54.5 million over three years to address the capacity and infrastructure issues within youth justice centres. Works currently underway include the construction of a new 45 bed centre at Malmsbury Youth Justice Precinct, due for completion in 2015, and a new visitor’s centre and administration building at the Parkville Youth Justice Precinct, due for completion in late 2013.  Other youth justice initiatives include:   * Violence prevention programs – developed and delivered at the Parkville Youth Justice Precinct * Responding to the impact of trauma and cumulative harm – a practice approach to be used across the youth justice service to ensure consistent service delivery and the engagement of families and communities to assist in supporting young people * Education services for young people in youth justice centres – Parkville College provides a flexible curriculum to meet the individual learning needs of all young people in youth justice centres through the provision of 30 - 40 hours of education per week * Employment support services – *WorkOut* has been established to identify suitable training and employment placements for young people leaving youth justice centres and provide post placement support in the community * Post-release support services – the Youth Justice Community Support Service provides individualised intensive support to young people exiting youth justice centres through a consortium of community service organisations who deliver intensive support, employment, education, training, mental health, drug and alcohol, and transitional and housing support services. An evaluation was completed in March 2013 and will be used to identify and prioritise changes and further strengthen the service. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Queensland Government comments | **”** |
| The Queensland Government made a $2 million commitment as part of its Safer Streets Crime Action Plan to trial youth boot camps with the aim of reducing instances of youth offending within the community. Two programs, an early intervention and a sentenced youth boot camp program commenced in January 2013 on the Gold Coast and Cairns, respectively. The early intervention boot camp program targeted young people deemed at-risk of entering the justice system while the sentenced youth boot camp program is targeting young offenders facing a custodial sentence.  As part of its ongoing commitment to reducing crime and as part of seeking community views to shape innovative and effective reform of the youth justice system, the Queensland Government released a Safer Streets Crime Action Plan – Youth Justice Information Paper and Crime Survey. A total of 4184 people completed the survey, with the Government receiving 45 extensive written submissions. Public consultation closed on 30 June 2013, with results of the consultation being used to inform the Government’s development of a Blueprint for the Future of Youth Justice in Queensland (the Blueprint).  The Blueprint, which is due for Cabinet consideration in early 2014, aligns with proposed amendments to the Youth Justice Act 1992 and will include a focus on early intervention to address young people's behaviour and identified circumstances before they become entrenched in the justice system.  Current legislative amendments being explored by the Government include naming and shaming of youth offenders, making it an offence for a young person to breach bail, allowing childhood findings of guilt to be admissible at sentencing as an adult, automatic transfer of young people who reach maturity from youth detention into adult correctional facilities and removal of the principle of detention as an option of last resort for consideration by courts upon sentence.  In November 2012, the Government introduced into Parliament additional legislative amendments to provide for young graffiti offenders to participate in mandatory graffiti clean-up programs as part of their sentence. These amendments aim to assist young people to take responsibility for their actions, understand their consequences and give back to their community. The same Bill also strengthens the maximum penalty for serious graffiti crime from five to seven years.  From 30 January 2013, and following the repeal of legislation, the option for courts to refer young offenders to a youth justice conference was removed. Police referred youth justice conferencing continues without change.  Youth detention facilities have seen further development of behaviour management programs, implementation of a best practice framework to ensure incidents are resolved safely and the continued expansion of the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre (increased capacity from 72 beds to 96 beds upon completion), which provides capacity to accommodate young women north of Rockhampton. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Western Australian Government comments | **”** |
| Through its Youth Justice Services (YJS), the Department of Corrective Services administers the Young Offenders Act 1994 (YOA). Its primary focus is the management of young people sentenced to community orders or detention for offences committed while 10–17 years of age. YJS also works to prevent and divert young people from entering the formal justice system, abiding by the YOA principles of detention as a last resort.  Western Australia’s (WA) daily average detention population decreased by  2.1 per cent in 2012‑13 (from 185 to 181), compared with 2011-12. The daily average Aboriginal detainee population rose by 3 young people or 2.8 per cent, with the non-Aboriginal population falling by 7 young people or 12.0 per cent.  Through 2012-13, 1894 young people were managed in the community, including 1136 Aboriginal young people. The daily average population of young people on community orders decreased by 26 young people or 3 per cent in 2012-13 compared with 2011-12. The non-Aboriginal cohort decreased by 34 young people or 12 per cent.  During 2012-13, YJS established a diversionary program to engage young Aboriginal offenders and consolidated Regional Youth Justice Services in the Pilbara and Kimberley regions. An external review of Youth Psychological Services was completed in June 2013. Through this review, YJS aims to determine the best functional model for psychological programs and services in the future. YJS was successful in securing a remand program provided by Outcare which will assist in young people’s reintegration into the community. YJS was also involved in the Department of Premier and Cabinet’s Aboriginal Expenditure Review, which is designed to better understand current expenditure on Aboriginal services and programs across WA. A submission was made to the Aboriginal Affairs Cabinet Sub-Committee in June 2013 recommending short and long-term measures to reform the youth justice system in WA.  Since March 2013, YJS has contributed to the pilot mental health program in the Perth Children's Court by providing assessments and reports for the court, liaising with other community services and developing individualised plans to support those with mental illness. This is done as an inter-agency service with the Department of the Attorney General and the Mental Health Commission.  The Banksia Hill Detention Centre (Banksia Hill) redevelopment and amalgamation of detainees was completed on 12 October 2012 and a critical incident at the centre was managed in January 2013. The introduction of an additional forty Youth Custodial Officers and a new management structure currently being implemented at Banksia Hill, will ensure that the facility delivers a safe, secure, humane and multifaceted custodial service. Overall the average number of young people in detention in 2012-13 was 181, which was a slight decrease from the previous year.  The challenge for 2013-14 is cultural change and reform at Banksia Hill. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | South Australian Government comments | **”** |
| Youth Justice in South Australia is administered separately to child protection and out-of-home care, and sits as a Directorate within the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (DCSI).  DCSI, Youth Justice is responsible for contributing to building safer South Australian communities. Services within Youth Justice aim to achieve this by supporting children and young people to desist from offending, recognise the impact of their crime on victims and access opportunities to participate safely and productively in the community. DCSI, Youth Justice supervises young people on a range of community-based orders, manages the State’s youth training facilities and provides information to the Youth Court.  In August 2012, the open campus facility began operation at Goldsborough Road, Cavan, creating the Adelaide Youth Training Centre (AYTC) two campus one centre model. This marks a further step in the continuous service delivery improvement process with a priority focus on the safe transitioning of young people into the community. This has also included working closely with partnership agencies, the review of all programs offered to young people and the development of psychological support and intervention services. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Tasmanian Government comments | **”** |
| A number of initiatives during 2012-13 have been planned and/or implemented to improve practice and service provision in the Youth justice system in Tasmania.  Targeted Youth Support Services (TYSS) support young people who are at risk of entering the youth justice or child protection system, or escalating their involvement within it. The services provide intensive case management and therapeutic interventions targeted at vulnerable young people and their families. A state-wide review of the TYSS has been completed and was made available in March 2013. The recommendations of this review have been endorsed with a commitment to continue the funding of these important services for a further three years.  The Tasmanian Government has commenced a major review of the Continuum of Care relating to youth offending and re-offending. The review will consider all primary, secondary and tertiary intervention options that operate across the broader service system in Tasmania. The consultation process for this project has completed and a final report which will include recommendations that will assist in the development of short, medium and long-term strategies to strengthen intervention options is expected by November 2013.  A Youth Justice Management Committee has been established to oversee all Youth Justice projects of significance across Tasmania. This Committee has representation from all major Government stakeholders and streamlines project management by removing the need for a series of smaller committees with similar membership.  A Community Youth Justice Quality Improvement Framework has been developed in line with the AJJA standards. Baseline performance and quality indicators have been established and quality appraisal processes are underway in each Community Youth Justice office in Tasmania. The process includes the gathering of information through stakeholder, client and staff surveys. Staff will conduct self-assessments of over 70 performance and quality indicators across the range of community youth justice activity. The information gathered will be fed into continuous improvement plans, which will be monitored throughout  2013 and form the baseline for the following year.  A continuum of professional development for Community Youth Justice has been developed. Training will be provided for all staff focussing on the special communication needs of young people in the criminal justice system. Work is currently underway in developing Motivational Interviewing training for all Community Youth Justice staff through the University of Tasmania.  The Youth Justice (Miscellaneous Amendment) Act 2012 was passed in the House of Assembly in March 2013 and is expected to be tabled in the Legislative Council later in 2013. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Australian Capital Territory Government comments | **”** |
| The ACT Government has delivered a number of key reforms to improve the youth justice system and outcomes for young people over the past 12 months. The reforms include:   * Implementation of recommendations from the Human Rights Commission report, The ACT Youth Justice System 2011: A Report to the ACT Legislative Assembly. * A major change management program that will embed an Integrated Management System (IMS) at the Bimberi Youth Justice Centre. The IMS supports youth justice staff in their work with young people by connecting every aspect of strategic day-to-day operations at Bimberi. * Release of the Blueprint for Youth Justice in the ACT 2012–22 that sets the strategic reform for the youth justice system over the next 10 years. Focus over the past year has been on a number of actions under the Blueprint to strengthen prevention and diversion strategies. Initial results show that the focus on prevention and diversion is having positive outcomes as fewer young people are becoming involved with the youth justice system. Implementation of a number of initiatives is providing young people with alternative pathways away from the youth justice system, including: * the After-Hours Bail Support Service * the single case management approach in youth justice services * the Bendora Transition Unit at Bimberi Youth Justice Centre that provides intensive and targeted support to young people while in detention to assist them to transition from custody to the community * an early intervention pilot program targeting underage drinking * the restorative justice trials for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people and first time offenders.   Reducing the disproportionate representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people in the ACT youth justice system continues to be a challenge. Under the Blueprint, the ACT Government will continue to focus on early intervention and prevention initiatives alongside intensive services and support that aim to improve outcomes for these young people and their families. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Northern Territory Government comments | **”** |
| Following the Northern Territory general election in 2012, the incoming Government committed to pursuing improvements outlined in the review of the youth justice system to deliver better outcomes for young people.  The Government remains committed to introducing effective law enforcement policy for young people. The Pillars of Justice framework has been established to develop comprehensive strategies built on five fundamental components; police, courts, corrections, youth justice and victims.  The pillar to support youth justice is referred to as Youth Turn. Under the youth turn pillar, a number of opportunities to progress a rejuvenated and effective youth justice system have been identified. These include; the development of a youth justice framework, intervention boot camps, a review of detention centre operations and community-based youth supervision model.  Development of the youth justice framework has commenced with the first meeting of key stakeholders held in October 2013. The working group brings together a diverse range of expertise from across government and the non‑government sector to inform the framework and ensure it will be sufficiently robust to address the challenges that lie ahead.  Intervention boot camps are being piloted in an effort to address offending behaviours that could likely see young people enter the criminal justice system in the future.  Contemporary detention centre modelling is being explored to ensure that young people in detention are in an environment conducive to providing them every opportunity to maximise the productive use of their time in detention and offer a range of skills that will reduce the likelihood of them re-entering the criminal justice system later in life.  The concept of community-based youth supervision is also being considered in a broad range of initiatives aimed at reducing the number of young people held in detention centres. The driving consideration is that young people are more likely to engage in programs if they can be safely undertaken in their own environment.  It is anticipated that this broad range of projects and reform initiatives will have a net positive result in reducing the number of young people in the justice system. This will afford them an enhanced opportunity to become productive and valued members of their communities and society more generally. |

## 16.6 Definitions of key terms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Youth justice centre** | A place administered and operated by a youth justice department, where young people are detained while under the supervision of the relevant youth justice department on a remand or sentenced detention episode. |
| **Youth justice department** | Departments in each State and Territory that are responsible for youth justice matters. |
| **Supervision period** | A period of time during which a young person is continuously under youth justice supervision of one type or another. A supervision period is made up of one or more contiguous episodes. |
| **Police caution** | A police officer administering a caution, or warning, to a child instead of bringing a child before a court for the offence. |
| **Pre-sentence community** | Pre-sentence arrangements where the youth justice department is responsible for the case management or supervision of a young person (such as supervised or conditional bail where the youth justice department is involved with monitoring or supervising a young person). |
| **Pre-sentence detention** | Remanded or held in a youth justice centre or police watch house prior to appearing in court or to being sentenced. |
| **Sentenced community-based supervision** | Includes probation, recognisance and community service orders which are supervised or case managed by the youth justice department. May be supervision with or without additional mandated requirements, requiring some form of obligation or additional element that a young person is required to meet. This obligation could be community work such as a community service order, a developmental activity or program attendance. The youth justice department may or may not directly supervise any additional mandated requirements, but remains responsible for the overall case management of a young person. |
| **Youth justice conference / group conference** | A youth justice conference, or group conference, is a facilitated meeting resulting in a formal agreement to repair the harm caused by the offence. Participants can include the victim(s), offender(s), a youth justice agency officer, police and other key stakeholders. Referrals may be initiated by the police or the courts. |

## 16.7 List of attachment tables

Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this chapter by a ‘16A’ prefix (for example, table 16A.1). Attachment tables are available on the Review website (www.pc.gov.au/gsp).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 16A.1** | State and Territory Government real recurrent expenditure on youth justice services, 2012-13 dollars |
| **Table 16A.2** | State and Territory Government real recurrent expenditure on youth justice services, 2012-13 dollars |
| **Table 16A.3** | Comparability of government recurrent expenditure — items included, 2012-13 |
| **Table 16A.4** | Daily average number and rate of young people aged 10–17 years who were supervised in the community and in detention centres |
| **Table 16A.5** | Daily average number and rate of males and females aged 10–17 years in detention |
| **Table 16A.6** | Daily average number and rate of males and females aged 10–17 years subject to community-based supervision |
| **Table 16A.7** | Males and females as a proportion of the total population aged 10–17 years in detention (per cent) |
| **Table 16A.8** | Males and females as a proportion of the total population aged 10–17 years subject to community based supervision (per cent) |
| **Table 16A.9** | Daily average number and rate of Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years in detention |
| **Table 16A.10** | Daily average number and rate of Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years subject to community-based supervision |
| **Table 16A.11** | Average rates of detention and Indigenous rate ratio, young people aged 10-17 years in juvenile detention, per 100 000 people |
| **Table 16A.12** | Custody nights, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.13** | Proportion of group conferences resulting in an agreement, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.14** | Deaths in custody, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.15** | Young people in detention attending education and training, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.16** | Escapes from detention and escorted movement, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.17** | Absconds from unescorted leave, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.18** | Serious assaults in custody, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.19** | Assaults in custody, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.20** | Self-harm and attempted suicide in custody, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.21** | Completion of community-based orders, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.22** | Case plans prepared/reviewed within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced order, by Indigenous status |
| **Table 16A.23** | Cost per young person subject to community-based supervision |
| **Table 16A.24** | Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision |
| **Table 16A.25** | Centre utilisation |
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