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|  |
| --- |
| Attachment tables |
| Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this chapter by a ‘16A’ prefix (for example, table 16A.1). A full list of attachment tables is provided at the end of this chapter, and the attachment tables are available from the Review website at www.pc.gov.au/gsp. |
|  |

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/s to make amends for his or her offence/s.

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

* all jurisdictions now reporting ‘group conferencing outcomes’ by Indigenous status compared with seven previously
* seven jurisdictions now reporting on ‘absconds from unescorted leave’ (although rates are still unavailable for some jurisdictions as the number of periods of unescorted leave data remain incomplete) compared with six previously
* seven jurisdictions now reporting on ‘assaults in custody’ compared with six previously (although data by Indigenous status are still unavailable for some jurisdictions)
* six jurisdictions now reporting on ‘case plans prepared’ for community-based orders compared with five previously and seven jurisdictions for detention-based orders compared with six previously
* all jurisdictions now reporting on ‘completion of community-based orders’ compared with seven previously.

## 16.1 Profile of youth justice services

### Service overview

Youth justice systems are responsible for attending to young people who have committed or allegedly committed an offence while considered by law to be a juvenile (predominantly aged 10–17 years). 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 of their behaviour 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 2013‑14 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, WA, SA, and Tasmania). In NSW, the ACT and the NT, 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 was previously a sub-group of the Standing Council on Community and Disability Services Advisory Council (SCCDSAC). Decisions by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in late 2013 led to the dissolution of the SCCDSAC and consequently changes in AJJA’s governance. Currently, AJJA is in the process of determining governance arrangements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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 complete national data are yet to become 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 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 2012-13, 10 940 young people aged 10–17 years experienced youth justice supervision in Australia (AIHW 2014). Nationally, 85.5 per cent of young people aged 10–17 years who were supervised by youth justice services on an average day during 2012-13 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 centres**a** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.1 Daily average proportion of youth justice clients aged 10-17 years supervised in the community and in detention centres  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Refer to table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes. |
| *Source*: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2014, *Youth justice in Australia 2012–13,* Bulletin 120, Canberra; 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 819 to 789 between 2011-12 and 2012-13 (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 36.4 per 100 000 in 2011-12 to 34.9 per 100 000 in 2012-13, 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** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.2 Daily average rate of detention of young people aged 10-17 years, per 100 000 young people aged 10-17 years  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Refer to table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes. |
| *Source*: AIHW 2014, *Youth justice in Australia 2012–13,* Bulletin 120, Canberra; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.4. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, on an average day, females comprised 10.5 per cent of the total population of youth justice detention centres during 2012-13, while males comprised 89.5 per cent of the youth justice detention population (table 16A.7).

##### 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 5124 to 4681 between 2011-12 and 2012-13 (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 226.8 per 100 000 in 2011‑12 to 207.2 per 100 000 in 2012-13, 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** |
| |  | | --- | | 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  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Refer to table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes. |
| *Source*: AIHW 2014, *Youth justice in Australia 2012–13,* Bulletin 120, Canberra; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.4. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, on an average day, females comprised 19.4 per cent of the total population of young people supervised in the community during 2012-13, while males comprised 80.6 per cent (table 16A.8).

##### Numbers and rates of young Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people subject to youth justice supervision

The daily average number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged   
10–17 years detained in youth justice detention centres was 454 in 2012‑13, compared with 329 non‑Indigenous people aged 10–17 years (table 16A.9). Nationally, the daily average detention rate for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged 10–17 years in 2012‑13 was 364.4 per 100 000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged   
10–17 years, compared with 15.4 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 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander youth, has worsened (Commonwealth of Australia 2011). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people are far more likely to come into contact with the criminal justice system and to be incarcerated than non‑Indigenous young people. The over‑representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people   
aged 10–17 years in detention across jurisdictions in 2012-13 is shown in figure 16.4.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.4 Average daily rate of detention of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people and non‑Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years, per 100 000 young people aged 10‑17 years, 2012–13**a, b** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.4 Average daily rate of detention of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people and non Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years, per 100 000 young people aged 10 17 years, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Data should be interpreted with caution, particularly for jurisdictions with small Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander 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 2014, *Youth justice in Australia 2012–13,* Bulletin 120, Canberra; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.9. |
|  |
|  |

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people are also over-represented in community-based supervision (figure 16.5). The daily average number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people aged 10–17 years supervised in the community was 1975 in 2012-13, compared with 2506 non-Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years (table 16A.10). Nationally, the daily average rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people aged 10–17 years subject to community-based supervision in 2012-13 was 1585.7 per 100 000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people aged 10–17 years, compared with 117.4 per 100 000 non-Indigenous young people aged 10–17 years (table 16A.10).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.5 Average daily rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people and non‑Indigenous young people aged  10–17 years subject to community supervision, per 100 000 young people aged 10–17 years, 2012‑13**a, b** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.5 Average daily rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people and non Indigenous young people aged  10–17 years subject to community supervision, per 100 000 young people aged 10–17 years, 2012-13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Data should be interpreted with caution, particularly for jurisdictions with small Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-Indigenous rate ratio in table 16A.11 should also be taken into account. b Refer to table 16A.10 for detailed footnotes. |
| *Source*: AIHW 2014, *Youth justice in Australia 2012–13,* Bulletin 120, Canberra; 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 $673 million across Australia in 2013-14. Detention‑based supervision accounted for the majority of government expenditure (60.8 per cent, or $409 million). Nationally, in 2013-14, recurrent expenditure on youth justice services per child in the population aged   
10–17 years (as distinct from per youth justice client, which is reported as a performance indicator in section 16.3) was $297 (figure 16.6).

The population of all children aged 10–17 years is used in figure 16.6 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 approximately 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, 2013-14**a** |
| |  | | --- | | 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, 2013-14  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| 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 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander 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 2015 Report. For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability and data completeness 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 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander 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 2015 Report can be found at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015.

|  |
| --- |
| 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 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 * complete for the current reporting period. All required 2013-14 data were available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2013-14, 92.9 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, 2013-14**a, b, c** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.8 Proportion of young people who receive group conferencing and reach an agreement, by Indigenous status, 2013-14  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Victoria counts 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. b  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. |
| 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. |
|  | (continued on next page) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.5 (continued) | |
| 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 to assess outcomes. Youth Justice delivers two state-wide offence-focused programs to young offenders in regional service centres throughout Queensland and in youth detention. The programs are Changing Habits and Reaching Targets (CHART) and Aggression Replacement Training (ART). Additionally, Queensland’s two youth detention centres and 17 youth justice service centres deliver a range of tailored programs to young offenders. This includes programs targeted at improving offender health and wellbeing, adventure interventions, cultural and spiritual programs; and reintegration and transition programs, such as financial literacy, parenting skills and driver education program programs. The programs delivered to young people align with the Queensland Youth Justice Intervention Framework. This framework details an evidence-based process for the development, implementation and evaluation of programs. Under the framework, youth justice supervises court orders and conditional bail programs, provides offence-focused programs, and delivers needs-based case management and referral to education, health and other support services which are delivered primarily through government and non‑government organisations. As part of ongoing renewal of Queensland’s youth justice system, programs will continue to be subject to review and/or new programs developed to maintain evidence-based responses for reducing offending and re-offending by young people. |
| 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. |
|  | (continued on next page) |
| Box 16.5 (continued) | |
| SA | SA’s youth justice system provides rehabilitation and treatment programs for young people through Youth Justice Psychology Services (YJPS). These are integrated with case management services. Specific services include the provision of clinical/forensic psychological assessments to assist case planning and case management and the delivery of individual therapeutic intervention and group‑based rehabilitation programs. The PLUS+ program is an intensive, group‑based, criminogenic treatment program based upon cognitive-behavioural principles delivered by YJPS. The primary objective of the program is to help young people acquire, develop and apply a series of social problem-solving, interpersonal, and self-control skills that will enable them to better manage potential difficulties in their lives and to avoid future reoffending. YJPS prioritises young people who are at high risk of re-offending and who have been convicted of serious offences. A range of rehabilitation and support programs are offered to young people who are under the supervision of either community-based or custodial Youth Justice. Rehabilitation programs currently offered include Ignition, Changing Habits and Reaching Targets (CHART), Systematic Training for Anger Reduction (STAR), and drug and alcohol intervention through Drug and Alcohol Services SA (DASSA). In collaboration with sector and community partners Youth Justice offers a range of developmental, health and social integration programs including D-Stress and the Step Out Mentoring Program. SA acknowledges the important role culture plays in the positive growth and development of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people within their family, cultural community and wider community. Aboriginal young people and their families are provided with access to a range of cultural support services and Aboriginal programs delivered by Aboriginal-specific service providers including Metropolitan Aboriginal Youth and Family Services (MAYFS) Warpulaiendi programs and Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services’ (CAMHS) Journey to Respect program. |
| Tas | Tasmania utilises the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory risk assessment tool and the Changing Habits and Reaching Targets (CHART) 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. 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 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. |
|  | (continued on next page) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.5 (continued) | |
| 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 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander 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, or 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 2013-14 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 98.8 per cent of young people of compulsory school age in detention were attending an education course in 2013-14, while 99.8 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, 2013-14**a** |
| |  | | --- | | **(a) Proportion of young people of compulsory school age in detention attending an accredited education or training course**  Figure 16.9 Proportion of young people in detention attending an accredited education or training course, by Indigenous status, 2013-14  (a) Proportion of young people of compulsory school age in detention attending an accredited education or training course  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.  **(b) Proportion of young people not of compulsory school age in detention attending an accredited education or training course**  Figure 16.9 Proportion of young people in detention attending an accredited education or training course, by Indigenous status, 2013-14  (a) Proportion of young people not of compulsory school age in detention attending an accredited education or training course  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a 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 2013-14 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

No young people died while in the legal or physical custody of an Australian youth justice agency in 2013-14 (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 and the NT for 2013-14 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/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, there were 8 escapes from youth justice detention in 2013-14, which was equivalent to 0.2 escapes per 10 000 custody nights in 2013-14 (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, 2013-14**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust | | **Number of escapes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | 1.0 | – | – | – | – | – | 4.0 | 5.0 | | Non-Indigenous | – | – | – | – | – | 3.0 | – | – | 3.0 | | Unknown | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | | Total | – | 1.0 | – | – | – | 3.0 | – | 4.0 | 8.0 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | 1.6 | – | – | – | – | – | 2.4 | 0.3 | | Non-Indigenous | – | – | – | – | – | 7.6 | – | – | 0.2 | | Unknown | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | | Total | – | 0.2 | – | – | – | 7.0 | – | 2.3 | 0.2 | |
| 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 8 escapes from escorted movements in 2013-14, which was equivalent to 12.9 escapes per 10 000 escorted movements in 2013-14 (table 16A.16). The number of escapes from escorted movements varied across jurisdictions.

##### 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. 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).

|  |
| --- |
| 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. Denominator data for 2013-14 for this indicator (number of periods of unescorted leave) were not available for SA.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

No young people absconded from unescorted leave in 2013-14 (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). The extent to which jurisdictions include counts of minor injuries in the assaults measure differs.  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 2013-14 data were not available for WA for any measure and NSW was unable to disaggregate staff injuries data by Indigenous status.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 9 detainees were reported as injured in custody due to a serious assault in 2013‑14 (table 16.2). Nationally, 1 staff member was reported as injured due to a serious assault in 2013‑14 (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, 2013-14**a, b** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of young people injured as a result of a serious assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | – | 1.0 | na | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | – | 6.0 | 1.0 | na | – | – | 1.0 | – | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | na | – | | Total | – | 6.0 | 2.0 | na | – | – | 1.0 | – | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | – | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | – | 1.3 | 0.4 | na | – | – | 2.5 | – | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | – | 1.1 | 0.3 | na | – | – | 1.7 | – | |
| a Data were not available for WA. b SA data should be used with caution due to manual extraction. **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, 2013‑14**a, b** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of staff injured as a result of a serious assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | – | – | – | na | 1.0 | – | – | – | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | – | – | – | na | 1.0 | – | – | – | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | – | – | – | na | 0.9 | – | – | – | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | – | – | – | na | 0.5 | – | – | – | |
| a Data were not available for WA. b SA data should be used with caution due to manual extraction. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.18. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 112 detainees were reported as injured in custody due to an assault (excluding serious assaults) in 2013-14 (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, 2013‑14**a, b, c, d, e** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of detainees injured as a result of an assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 8.0 | 3.0 | 12.0 | na | 7.0 | 2.0 | – | 11.0 | | Non-Indigenous | 3.0 | 23.0 | 11.0 | na | 11.0 | 11.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | | Unknown | 6.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 17.0 | 26.0 | 23.0 | na | 18.0 | 13.0 | 2.0 | 13.0 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 1.5 | 4.8 | 2.8 | na | 7.1 | 57.1 | – | 6.6 | | Non-Indigenous | 0.5 | 4.9 | 4.9 | na | 10.1 | 28.0 | 5.1 | 30.2 | | Unknown | 40.0 | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 1.5 | 4.9 | 3.5 | na | 8.6 | 30.3 | 3.4 | 7.5 | |
| 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. **The extent to which variable thresholds across jurisdictions affect comparability of results should be ascertained through further moderatio**n of reported assaults d**ata.** b Data were not available for WA. c SA data should be used with caution due to manual extraction. d **Tasmanian data for assaults in custody include relatively minor injuries, including general soreness and minor marks resulting from physical contact. In addition, Tasmania has only one youth justice detention centre with relatively small numbers in detention and therefore results may fluctuate over time.** e 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, 99 staff were reported as injured due to an assault while supervising detainees in 2013-14 (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, 2013-14**a, b, c, d, e, f** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Staff injured as a result of an assault (no.)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | na | – | 2.0 | na | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | na | – | 22.0 | na | 6.0 | – | 1.0 | – | | Unknown | 17.0 | 29.0 | – | na | – | 10.0 | – | 12.0 | | Total | 17.0 | 29.0 | 24.0 | na | 6.0 | 10.0 | 1.0 | 12.0 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | na | – | 0.5 | na | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | na | – | 9.9 | na | 5.5 | – | 2.5 | – | | Unknown | 1.5 | 5.5 | – | na | – | 23.3 | – | 6.9 | | Total | 1.5 | 5.5 | 3.6 | na | 2.9 | 23.3 | 1.7 | 6.9 | |
| a Data 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 is dependent on relevant incidents having first been documented. **The extent to which variable thresholds across jurisdictions affect comparability of results should be ascertained through further moderatio**n of reported assaults d**ata.** b Data report the Indigenous status of staff who were reported as injured due to an assault. c Data were not available for WA. d SA data should be used with caution due to manual extraction. e **Tasmanian data for assaults in custody include relatively minor injuries, including general soreness and minor marks resulting from physical contact. In addition, Tasmania has only one youth justice detention centre with relatively small numbers in detention and therefore results may fluctuate over time.** f 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 for 2013-14 were not available for WA.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 12 detainees in 17 separate incidents were reported as having self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation in 2013-14. 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, 2013-14**a, b, c** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of detainees who self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 5.0 | – | 1.0 | na | – | – | – | 1.0 | | Non-Indigenous | 3.0 | 2.0 | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 8.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | na | – | – | – | 1.0 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 0.9 | – | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | 0.6 | | Non-Indigenous | 0.5 | 0.4 | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | 0.6 | |
| a Data were not available for WA. b SA data should be used with caution due to manual extraction. 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 16.7 Number and rate of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2013-14**a, b, c** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of incidents of self‑harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 6.0 | – | 3.0 | na | – | – | – | 2.0 | | Non-Indigenous | 4.0 | 2.0 | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 10.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | na | – | – | – | 2.0 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 1.1 | – | 0.7 | na | – | – | – | 1.2 | | Non-Indigenous | 0.7 | 0.4 | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | na | – | – | – | 1.2 | |
| a Data were not available for WA. b SA data should be used with caution due to manual extraction. 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. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 53 detainees were reported as having self-harmed or attempted suicide in 71 separate incidents during 2013-14, 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, 2013-14**a, b, c, d** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of detainees who self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 9.0 | – | 7.0 | na | 4.0 | – | 2.0 | 12.0 | | Non-Indigenous | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | na | 2.0 | – | 2.0 | 3.0 | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 14.0 | 4.0 | 10.0 | na | 6.0 | – | 4.0 | 15.0 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 1.7 | – | 1.6 | na | 4.1 | – | 10.3 | 7.2 | | Non-Indigenous | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.3 | na | 1.8 | – | 5.1 | 45.2 | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.5 | na | 2.9 | – | 6.8 | 8.6 | |
| a Data 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. b Data were not available for WA. c SA data should be used with caution due to manual extraction. d 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, 2013-14**a, b, c, d** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of incidents of self‑harm or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 20.0 | – | 7.0 | na | 4.0 | – | 2.0 | 14.0 | | Non-Indigenous | 7.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | na | 4.0 | – | 2.0 | 4.0 | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 27.0 | 4.0 | 10.0 | na | 8.0 | – | 4.0 | 18.0 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 3.7 | – | 1.6 | na | 4.1 | – | 10.3 | 8.4 | | Non-Indigenous | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.3 | na | 3.7 | – | 5.1 | 60.3 | | Unknown | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 2.4 | 0.8 | 1.5 | na | 3.8 | – | 6.8 | 10.4 | |
| a Data 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 SA data should be used with caution due to manual extraction. d 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 2013-14 data were not available for WA and SA for community-based orders and SA for detention-based orders.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 90.1 per cent of case plans were prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced community-based order in 2013-14 (figure 16.10(a)). Nationally, 96.9 per cent of case plans were prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced detention order in 2013-14 (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,  2013-14**a, b, c, d** |
| |  | | --- | | (a) Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced  community-based order  Figure 16.10 Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing sentenced detention orders and sentenced community-based orders, by Indigenous status,  2013-14  (a) Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced community-based order   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. (b) Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced  detention order  Figure 16.10 Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing sentenced detention orders and sentenced community-based orders, by Indigenous status,  2013-14  (b) Proportion of case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced detention order   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Data were not available for WA or SA for community-based case plans. b Data were not available for SA for detention-based case plans. 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 * complete for the current reporting period. All required 2013-14 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 79.6 per cent of community-based orders were successfully completed in 2013‑14. 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, 2013-14**a, b** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.11 Proportion of community-based orders successfully completed, by Indigenous status, 2013-14  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a 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. All required 2013-14 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2013-14, the cost per day, per young person subject to community‑based supervision on an average day was $104. 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, 2013-14**a, b, c** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.12 Cost per day, per young person subject to community-based supervision on an average day, 2013-14  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Data 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. All required 2013-14 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2013-14, the cost per day, per young person subject to detention‑based supervision was $1207. 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, 2013-14**a, b, c** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.13 Cost per day, per young person subject to detention-based supervision on an average day, 2013-14  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| a Data 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. Development work for this indicator is underway. |
|  |
|  |

##### 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 2013-14 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2015. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 74.3 per cent of centre capacity (that is, permanently funded beds) was utilised in 2013-14. Proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 16.14).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.14 Centre utilisation rate**a** |
| |  | | --- | | Figure 16.14 Centre utilisation rate  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. | |
| 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 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 of their behaviour 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 is also to be expected 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. |
|  |
|  |

#### State and Territory approaches to youth justice service outcomes reporting

As a first step in developing outcomes reporting for youth justice services, the CPYJWG, with the expert assistance of the JJ RIG and the AJJA, has reviewed local approaches to outcomes measurement for concepts equivalent to those agreed for national reporting purposes. The types of youth justice outcome measurement underway in each jurisdiction are summarised in box 16.21.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.21 State and Territory measurement of youth justice service outcomes | |
| NSW | The NSW Department of Attorney General and Justice annual report provides information on young people exiting youth justice who are ‘living in safe and appropriate accommodation’, ‘participating in education, training or employment’ and ‘participating in community activities’. These dimensions are assessed by the relevant Juvenile Justice Officer at the time the young person exits youth justice supervision. The annual report also provides information on juvenile re-offending rates. These data are sourced from the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. Re-offending rates are based on the number of young people who receive a subsequent conviction or conference within 12 months of their first appearance. These data are disaggregated by group conference, community‑supervision order and detention order. |
| Vic | The Victorian Department of Human Services annual report provides information on the proportion of young people in detention who participate in community re‑integration activities. Repeat offending, housing, and education and employment measures are not presently reported. |
| Qld | Queensland is introducing a youth justice renewal strategy that will implement a range of practice and service reforms to the system that aim to effectively reduce offending and reoffending. A new youth justice performance framework has been introduced that covers all aspects of youth justice service delivery, targeting clients along a continuum of children and young people at risk of entering the criminal justice system through to recidivist young offenders with long periods of involvement in the criminal justice system. Measures of re-offending are being developed to enable Queensland to monitor the effectiveness of youth justice intervention and specific rehabilitation programs.  The reforms also prioritise strong collaborative partnerships with other agencies that include more effective and coordinated responses to the housing, education, employment and training needs of young offenders, together with the development of measures to assess the effectiveness of these partnerships and activities. |
| WA | The WA Department of Corrective Services annual report provides information on the rate of return to detention. The rate of return to detention is defined as the proportion of young people who return to sentenced detention within two years of release from sentenced detention. All returns to sentenced detention are counted, including those where a supervised release order has been cancelled or suspended. Housing and education and employment measures are not presently reported, nor does WA presently report on repeat offending for community-based supervision. |
|  | (continued on next page) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.21 (continued) | |
| SA | SA reports on four outcome indicators through its agency statement as part of the State Government budget reporting process:   * number of youth justice clients who had one or more community based orders issued * number of youth justice clients who had one or more secure youth training centre admissions * number of 10−12 year olds admitted to a secure youth training centre * number of Aboriginal young people who had one or more admissions to a secure youth training centre. |
| Tas | Tasmania links its youth justice data collection with other health and community services data collections. Tasmania links child protection and youth justice data to review common clients across these services, including analysing these clients’ education attendance, living arrangements and hospital admissions. Tasmania is also undertaking a pilot project on critical incidents that links youth justice custodial data with data on hospital involvement. This project has the capacity to investigate hospital involvement prior to, during and after youth justice custodial involvement. Tasmania is keen to link youth justice data to data from other sectors (for example, offence data from courts and involvement with adult corrections), but has to date been unable to proceed with this type of data linkage due to a lack of clarity regarding the legality of linking information for these clients.  For internal reporting purposes, Tasmania measures the following outcomes:   * returns to custody: a retrospective count of young people admitted to Ashley Youth Detention Centre in the past 12 months * returns to supervision: a prospective count of young people who commenced a new statutory order, in the 12 months following completion of a statutory order. |
|  | (continued on next page) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.21 (continued) | |
| ACT | The ACT Community Services Directorate aims to improve outcomes by providing support services to young people at risk, and support and supervision of young offenders. The ACT prepares two local reports on youth justice performance for internal reporting against budget items and for reporting to the Justice and Community Safety Directorate for inclusion in the Criminal Justice Statistical Profile, which is a historical collection of crime data containing data from ACT Policing, ACT Law Courts, ACT Corrective Services, Restorative Justice Unit, Galambany Court, Office of Children, Youth and Family Support, and Victims Support ACT. The ACT’s local performance indicators have been developed to ensure consistency with national reporting.  The following outcome indicators are used to report against ACT budget items:   * recidivism of sentenced young people in custody — measured as the number of young people who have been subject to more than one final period of sentenced detention during the current and/or previous reporting year, expressed as a percentage of the total number of young people who received a period of detention within the current financial year * recidivism of sentenced young people on community-based orders — measured as the number of young people who have been subject to more than one final supervised community-based order during the current and/or previous reporting year. This measure reflects the number of young people who received a supervised community based order within the financial year, expressed as a percentage of the total number of young people who received a supervised community based order within the financial year.   Housing and education and employment measures are not presently reported. |
| NT | The NT currently reports on youth justice outcomes in the NT Department of Correctional Services Annual Statistics report, which includes information on the number of detainees held in custody and their demographic profile, offence types, and some performance information such as numbers of escapes. Repeat offending, housing, and education and employment measures are not presently reported. As part of the NT Youth Justice Framework development, the NT is looking to develop a new local performance reporting structure. |
|  | |
|  | |

## 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 over time. 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. Preliminary work is underway to develop the ‘offender-to-staff ratio’.

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 2013-14, Juvenile Justice NSW saw consistently lower numbers of young people in custody, from an average of 324 per day in 2012-13 to 314 per day in 2013-14.  The agency continued to work to improve its response to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people’s over-representation through the development and implementation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Respect Framework, the second round of the Aboriginal Staff Mentoring Program and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Staff Recruitment and Retention Strategy 2011-15.  Juvenile Justice’s remand reduction (bail) services have continued to keep the numbers of young people who are on remand because they are unable to meet their bail conditions low (52 in 2013-14).  Changes to the *Bail Act 2013* introduced new reporting mechanisms under Section 28 which requires regular reporting back to the court by Juvenile Justice or FACS on the placement of young people granted bail with accommodation conditions.  Youth on Track was launched 1 July 2013 in Newcastle, Mid North Coast and Blacktown Local Area Commands. The Newcastle site was expanded to Lake Macquarie Local Area Command in April 2014. In the first 12 months of operation, 223 young people were referred to Youth on Track for case management and offending focused interventions.  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 pilot program in partnership with Victim’s counselling services has been introduced to two centres providing young people with access to victims services counsellors while in custody.  Quality Assurance reviews were completed on all Juvenile Justice Centres and community offices, including Youth Justice Conferencing and court logistics. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Victorian Government comments | **”** |
| Victoria’s youth justice initiatives and achievements for 2013-14 include:   * The establishment of Parkville College to provide a flexible curriculum that meets the individual learning needs of all young people in youth justice centres. In 2013-14 the college was extended from Parkville Youth Justice Precinct to Malmsbury Youth Justice Centre and is delivering thirty to forty hours of education per week. * The Youth Health Rehabilitation Service (YHaRS) was appointed in January 2014 to deliver streamlined health and rehabilitation programs and services to young people supervised by the youth justice service. YHaRS provides services across the two custodial centres in Victoria, secure welfare services and those young people supervised on community based orders. Rehabilitation programs include sex offender programs, violence reduction programs and individual counselling. * A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Youth Justice and Corrections Victoria has been developed to improve the management of young people under the supervision and custody of Youth Justice and Corrections Victoria. The MoU enhances the exchange of information to inform assessment of suitability, clarifies respective and joint responsibilities, strengthens and supports collaboration between Youth Justice and Corrections Victoria and protects the safety and wellbeing of an individual transferred between the systems. * Commencing the development of a ‘best interests’ case practice for use across the youth justice service to ensure consistent service delivery and the engagement of families and communities to assist in supporting young people. The youth justice case management model is also being reviewed and the youth justice case practice manual is being updated. * 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 which identified ways to further strengthen the service. * The 2012-13 Victorian State Budget provided $54.5 million over three years to address capacity and infrastructure issues within youth justice centres. A new visitors’ centre and administration building at the Parkville Youth Justice Precinct were completed in late 2013. Work is underway on the construction of a new 45 bed centre at Malmsbury Youth Justice Precinct, due for completion in 2015. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Queensland Government comments | **”** |
| To reduce youth offending and achieve better outcomes for young offenders, victims and the community, the Queensland Government has made a commitment to reform the youth justice system. The Government’s key objectives under this reform include preventing youth crime, intervening early and changing entrenched criminal behaviour. The strategies to support these objectives will focus on:   * Systemic responses to reduce youth offending * Reducing over-representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people in the youth justice system * Investment in resources and delivery of youth justice practice and programs that address the causes of crime and change the lives of young offenders * Responding to current and emerging trends and demands on the system; and * Developing a competent and motivated workforce and service provider network.   Several key initiatives are currently being developed or underway to support this reform:   * Implementation of the Family Action Plan initiative which is a holistic response model to case manage young offenders and their families. The Plans enable a comprehensive and timely response from participating agencies and local organisations to identified issues negatively impacting on young offenders’ and their families’ lives. Early outcomes for young people and families have included decreases in substance misuse, increased engagement with education and training and improvements in attitudes and behaviour of young offenders as well as reduced contact with the justice system. * Youth Justice service centres and detention centres working more seamlessly with existing adventure based learning facilities and associated adventure intervention programs. Enhancement of the three current programs will focus on transitional support, education and employment for young offenders. * Renewal of Youth Justice funding to ascertain value for government investment. This includes ensuring funded agencies achieve relevant objectives and clear and quantifiable outcomes related to reducing offending and re-offending and addressing the causes of offending. * Development of a standard risk assessment tool which will allow for better assessment of young people at risk of offending and re-offending. The tool will be suitable for use by government and non-government organisations delivering youth justice services. * Realignment of the youth justice conferencing program to increase victim engagement across the spectrum of youth justice services. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Western Australian Government comments | **”** |
| The Department of Corrective Services administers the *Young Offenders Act 1994* (YOA) through its Youth Justice Services (YJS). The primary focus of YJS 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, in line with the YOA principles that detention should only be used as a last resort.  The State’s daily average detention population decreased from 181.4 to 155.5 in 2013-14, which was a decrease of 14.3 per cent compared with 2012-13. The daily average Aboriginal detainee population decreased from 127.2 to 120.9, a drop of 6.3 or 4.9 per cent. The non-Aboriginal population decreased from 54.2 to 34.6, a drop of 19.6 or 36.2 per cent.  In 2013-14, 1,786 young people were managed in the community, including 1080 Aboriginal young people and 699 non-Aboriginal young people (7 were unknown). The daily average population for young people being managed decreased by 159.0 or 12.4 per cent in 2013-14 compared to 2012-13. The decrease for both the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cohorts was similar.  A key achievement for 2013-14 was the establishment of the Youth Justice Board. The Board, which meets quarterly, is an advisory body that was established to help steer the formulation of a new approach to youth justice in Western Australia. Inaugural Board members were selected because their broad range of expertise and experience is needed to bring new and innovative approaches to the complex challenge of reducing youth offending. Under the guidance of the Board, the Department has commenced a review of the *Young Offenders Act 1994.* The review will specifically include the consideration of new and innovative mechanisms for the management of young people who come to the attention of the justice system.  2013-14 also saw the expansion of the Department’s At Risk Management System to cover young people at the Banksia Hill Detention Centre. The At Risk Management System, which was previously in place at WA’s adult prisons, improves the identification and management of young people who may be at risk of self-harm and/or suicide. It allows for the recording and monitoring of risk management plans and welfare checks to ensure that appropriate supports are put in place in a timely fashion.  The Department continues to provide Regional Youth Justice Services (RYJS) to the Midwest Gascoyne, Goldfields, Kimberley and Pilbara regions. These are aimed at diverting young people who offend away from the criminal justice system. Its Juvenile Justice Teams target young people in the early stages of offending to divert them from the formal justice system. The service also offers an extended hours bail program to locate suitable adults or alternative short term accommodation if required for young people eligible for bail in addition to providing education and counselling services and managing young people on statutory orders. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | South Australian Government comments | **”** |
| Youth Justice in SA 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).  The vision for DCSI, Youth Justice is that *Children and young people in the justice system are inspired to change and positively participate in their community*. Our Mission is to *Contribute to community safety by leading collaborative and evidence informed statutory services to children and young people in the justice system to reduce re-offending and acknowledge victims of crime*.  DCSI, Youth Justice supervises young people on a range of both sentenced and non-sentenced community based orders, including those on Home Detention. In addition, information and assessment reports are provided by DCSI, Youth Justice to the SA Youth Courts.  DCSI, Youth Justice operates the Adelaide Youth Training Centre (AYTC), a two campus one centre model. The AYTC accommodates young people serving a sentence and those awaiting their next court appearance. DCSI, Youth Justice works collaboratively with a range of stakeholders to provide onsite services to residents, including the Department for Education and Child Development and SA Health. The Department for Education and Child Development provides on-site and in-classroom education programs as well as external education and training opportunities. Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), SA Dental Service and Youth Health Service, provide health and dental services within a centre-based service hub.  Youth Justice Psychology Services is a specialist state-wide service providing psychological assessment and targeted intervention to identify and address offending behaviours of young people who are subject to a Youth Justice mandate. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Tasmanian Government comments | **”** |
| A number of initiatives during 2013-14 have been planned and/or implemented to improve practice and service provision in the youth justice system in Tasmania.  The Tasmanian Government has completed a major review of the Continuum of Care relating to youth offending and re offending. This review has considered all of the primary, secondary and tertiary intervention options that operate across the broader service system in Tasmania. A final report has been generated which includes recommendations that will assist in the development of short, medium and long term strategies to strengthen intervention options. This report is before Cabinet for consideration and is expected to be endorsed by the end of 2014.  Community Youth Justice South has developed an innovative equine therapy program, affectionately termed ‘Pat the Pony’ by the students of Gagebrook Primary School. This program is the result of collaboration between Community Youth Justice and the Gagebrook Primary School and brings together young people, under the supervision of Community Youth Justice, with at-risk students from Gagebrook. Together they work with the ponies at the school.  For those young people sentenced to Community Service Orders, the program allows them to give something back to the community. They are tasked with grooming and floating the ponies, leading them and even picking up manure. They are placed in a position of leadership where they are required to model appropriate caring behaviour to the younger students. Many of the young people on Community Service Orders are high-end intergenerational offenders who have not had the opportunity to develop pro-social relationships.  Community Youth Justice in Tasmania operates under a Quality Improvement Framework which was developed and conducted initially in 2012-13. The most recent appraisal, *Community Youth Justice Quality Appraisal 2013-14*, has built on the significant achievements and the lessons learned from the previous year’s baseline data. The quality appraisal team worked with local community youth justice staff to ascertain a rating across a number of pre-identified performance and quality indicators.  Other features of the appraisal included client and staff surveys (with statistical validity) and the development of stakeholder management plans for each community youth justice area. A quarterly reporting schedule was undertaken for standard performance indicators with a focus on quality outcomes during the appraisal period.  The *Youth Justice (Miscellaneous Amendment) Act 2012* was passed by both Houses of Parliament in 2013; the majority of these amendments were proclaimed and implemented in early 2014. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Australian Capital Territory Government comments | **”** |
| A number of initiatives were delivered in 2013-14 to improve practice and services and reduce the number of young people coming into contact with the youth justice system in the ACT.  The *Blueprint for Youth Justice in the ACT 2012-22* is a 10-year strategic plan to reform the youth justice system to improve outcomes for young people in the ACT. The focus of work in 2013-14 has been on strengthening prevention and diversion strategies and undertaking policy and program development.  The second Annual Progress Report 2014 was released demonstrating reduced numbers of young people coming into contact with or further involved in the youth justice system. Of the 45 initiatives in the Blueprint’s three-year action plan, 14 are complete, 28 are substantially complete and three are yet to commence.  Several initiatives were delivered including:   * implementation of the Youth Justice Support and Intervention Framework, giving agencies and staff an evidence-based guide for the design and delivery of support, interventions and programs based on an assessment of a young person's risk of re-offending * continued improvements to the single case management model across youth services, including work to strengthen cultural planning for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people on justice orders * ongoing development of an Integrated Management System and online knowledge portal in Youth Justice Case Management to support the supervision of young people on justice orders, either in the community or in custody * continued delivery of the After Hours Bail Support Service to assist young people in police custody by arranging suitable community-based alternatives and assisting them to comply with their bail conditions * redevelopment of the Narrabundah House Indigenous Supported Residential Facility. The new service opened in August 2013 and provides intensive case management and support to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander males, aged 15 to 18 years, who are on community-based justice orders * continued delivery of the Bendora Transition Unit at the Bimberi Youth Justice Centre to support young people to reintegrate successfully into the community. In the 2013-14 Budget, the ACT Government provided an additional $1.96 million to support the operation of the unit over the following two financial years * work to integrate the statutory services of Youth Justice and Care and Protection Services to allow better coordination of services to prevent children and young people who experience trauma, neglect and abuse from escalating to the youth justice system. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Northern Territory Government comments | **”** |
| The development of the Youth Justice Framework (the framework) has continued during the 2013-14 financial year, aided by ongoing collaboration between government, non-government and community stakeholders and the members of the framework steering committee. The framework is a fundamental component of the Department of Correctional Services’ (NTDCS) commitment to the whole-of-government approach to criminal law reform known as the Pillars of Justice.  The framework identifies and articulates key strategic objectives that are to be achieved in a five year period and will provide an innovative opportunity for programs and services to be streamlined for children, young people, and their families in, or at risk of entering, the youth justice system with the aim of reducing youth offending and reoffending in the Northern Territory.  The Northern Territory has continued to roll out the youth boot camp program as an early intervention initiative targeting young people who present with a range of familial, forensic and social factors that place them at risk of entering the youth justice system. Following the evaluation of the pilot program, two providers have been jointly selected to deliver the boot camp program in 2014. Young people participate in the camps within a wilderness environment where avoidant behavioural patterns are challenged. This is followed by wrap-around case management support for participants and their families for up to three months. NTDCS is currently investigating the potential to develop a similar type program for sentenced youth.  The reform of the NT youth detention centres commenced with a review of security issues within youth detention in October 2013. The subsequent development of a new detention centre model is underway which will incorporate changes to operational practices, the staffing model, program and service delivery and facility requirements. So far, progress has included the introduction of a new uniform for youth justice officers, implementation of a pilot sport and recreation program in December 2013, commencement of a permanent youth detention workforce and the development of a Certificate III and a Certificate IV qualification for Youth Justice Officers that will be introduced early 2015.  The *Seek Employment and Education, not Detention* (SEED) strategy has been introduced, which places emphasis on young people in the youth justice system (both in detention and in the community) participating in work experience, traineeship and/or apprenticeship opportunities to develop employability, work readiness and practical skills. The pilot stage has commenced with two detainees engaged in work experience outside the detention centre. The initiative will be further enhanced in late 2014 with the objective of linking young people to rewarding and gainful opportunities that can assist them in achieving change and long term positive results. |

## 16.6 Definitions of key terms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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. |
| **Comparability** | Data are considered comparable if, (subject to caveats) they can be used to inform an assessment of comparative performance. Typically, data are considered comparable when they are collected in the same way and in accordance with the same definitions. For comparable indicators or measures, significant differences in reported results allow an assessment of differences in performance, rather than being the result of anomalies in the data. |
| **Completeness** | Data are considered complete if all required data are available for all jurisdictions that provide the service. |
| **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/s to make amends for his or her offence/s. |
| **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. |
| **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. |
| **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 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. |
| **Youth justice department** | Departments in each State and Territory that are responsible for youth justice matters. |

## 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 (2013-14 dollars) |
| **Table 16A.2** | State and Territory government recurrent expenditure on youth justice services, 2013-14 |
| **Table 16A.3** | Comparability of government recurrent expenditure — items included, 2013-14 |
| **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 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people aged 10–17 years in detention |
| **Table 16A.10** | Daily average number and rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people aged 10–17 years subject to community-based supervision |
| **Table 16A.11** | Average rates of detention and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander rate ratio, young people aged 10-17 years in youth justice 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, (2013-14 dollars) |
| **Table 16A.24** | Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision, (2013-14 dollars) |
| **Table 16A.25** | Centre utilisation |
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