## Data quality information - Youth justice services, chapter 16

|  |
| --- |
| Data quality information |
| Data quality information (DQI) was prepared for the first time for the 2011 Report on Government Services. DQI provides information against the seven Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data quality framework dimensions, for a selection of performance indicators in the Youth justice services chapter. DQI for additional indicators will be progressively introduced in future reports.  Technical DQI has been supplied or agreed by relevant data providers. Additional Steering Committee commentary does not necessarily reflect the views of data providers. |
|  |
|  |

DQI are available for the following performance indicators:

Effectiveness, diversion — Group conferencing outcomes 2

Effectiveness, rehabilitation — Education and training attendance 3

Effectiveness, safe and secure environment — Deaths in custody 5

Effectiveness, safe and secure environments — Escapes 6

Effectiveness, safe and secure environment — Absconds from unescorted leave 8

Effectiveness, safe and secure environments — Assaults in custody 9

Effectiveness, safe and secure environments — Self-harm and attempted suicide in custody 11

Effectiveness, statutory responsibilities — Completion of community‑based orders 13

Effectiveness, statutory responsibilities — Case plans prepared 14

Efficiency, input per output unit — Cost per young person subject to community-based supervision 15

Efficiency, input per output unit — Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision 17

Efficiency, input per output unit — Centre utilisation 19

### YOUTH JUSTICE SERVICES

### Effectiveness, diversion — Group conferencing outcomes

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — Diversion |
| **Indicator** | Group conferencing outcomes |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  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.  Numerators:  Total number of young people who receive group conferencing and who reach an agreement throughout the reference year.  Denominators:  Total number of young people who receive group conferencing throughout the reference year.  Computation:  Expressed as a percentage. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator) x 100. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the proportion of group conferences resulting in an agreement. Group conferences are decision-making forums that aim to minimise the progression of young people into the youth justice system and provide restorative justice. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | These data are affected by comparability issues across jurisdictions. Group conferencing differs as to its place in the court process (i.e., referral by police before court processes begin, or referrals by courts as an alternative to sentencing), the consequences for young people if they do not comply with the outcome plans of group conferences, and eligibility for group conferencing. |
| **Coherence** | The data items used to construct this performance indicator are affected by comparability issues as noted above. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * 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. |

### 

### Effectiveness, rehabilitation — Education and training attendance

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — rehabilitation |
| **Indicator** | Education and training attendance |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  The number of young people in detention of all ages who are attending appropriate and accredited education or accredited training courses as a proportion of all eligible young people in detention.  Numerator:  Total number of young people in detention of compulsory school age attending an education course.  Total number of young people in detention not of compulsory school age attending an accredited education or training course.  Denominator:  Total number of young people in detention of compulsory school age who are eligible to attend an education course.  Total number of young people in detention not of compulsory school age who are eligible to attend an accredited education or training course.  Computation:  Expressed as a percentage. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator) x 100. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the proportion of young people in detention attending education and training. Attending education and training is recognised by government as a means of rehabilitating young offenders and increasing their chances of successfully re-integrating into the community. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | Data are reported as comparable across jurisdictions. ‘Compulsory school age’ is the age at which a young person is legally required to attend school as defined in the relevant jurisdiction. There is some variation across jurisdictions in the age to which children are compulsorily required to attend school. ‘Non-compulsory school age’ is an age at which a young person is not legally required to be at school (that is, older than the compulsory school age). For this indicator, age in years is used to determine whether the young person is of compulsory school age.  An accredited education or training course is that which is included in the Australian Qualification Framework (AQF). The AQF comprises national qualifications issued in: the secondary schools sector; the vocational education and training sector (TAFE and registered private providers); and the higher education sector (mainly universities).  The denominator extends to all eligible young people in detention. Young people in detention will be excluded from this count (i.e., be ineligible for education and training attendance) in circumstances such as the following:   * temporary leave or work release * medically unable to participate * in isolation * a risk assessment has resulted in exclusion from education * attending court * on remand or sentenced for less than 7 days.   These data are supplied by states and territories using one of two methods: (1) using daily data averaged over the number of school days in the financial year, or (2) averaging the number of young people as at the second last day of each school term or an alternative day as required. |
| **Coherence** | Data are comparable across jurisdictions. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * It might be beneficial for the CPYJWG to consider outcomes reporting on an education measure for youth justice. |

### Effectiveness, safe and secure environment — Deaths in custody

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — safe and secure environment |
| **Indicator** | Deaths in custody |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  The number of deaths in youth justice custody.  Numerator:  Total number of young people who died in custody.  Denominator:  Na (data are reported as whole numbers rather than rates due to very small numbers).  Computation:  Expressed as a number. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerator:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  Na |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the number of young people who died in custody as a measure of the safety of young people in custody. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | Data are reported by all jurisdictions and are comparable across jurisdictions.  Deaths in youth justice custody include young people who died:   * while in the custody of a youth justice remand or detention centre * in the process of or as the result of escaping or attempting to escape from a youth justice remand or detention centre * where there is an apparent unnatural death clearly resulting from an event that took place at the centre, wherever it occurs * where there is an death from apparently natural causes * while on escorted leave. |
| **Coherence** | Data are comparable across jurisdictions. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * No deaths in custody suggests a relatively safe custodial environment for young people. However, these data should be interpreted in conjunction with other safety performance measures. |

### Effectiveness, safe and secure environments — Escapes

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — Safe and secure environment |
| **Indicator** | Escapes |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  (1) The rate of escapes from a youth justice detention centre, as a proportion of all young people in custody.  (2) The rate of escapes during periods of escorted movement, as a proportion of all periods of escorted movement.  Numerators:  (1) The number of escapes from youth justice detention centres throughout the reference year.  (2) The number of escapes from periods of escorted movement throughout the reference year.  Denominators:  (1) Total number of custody nights in detention.  (2) Total periods of escorted movement.  Computation:  Expressed as a rate per 10 000. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator) x 10000. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the rate of escapes from detention and escorted movement. Both of these measures assess the extent to which youth justice agencies provide a safe and secure environment for young people and the community. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | These data are reported as comparable. An escape from a youth justice detention centre is defined as the 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 in 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. |
| **Coherence** | These data are comparable. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * These data are a robust count of the rate of escapes from detention and the rate of escapes during periods of escorted movement. * Data for WA are not available for the number of periods of escorted movement. |

### Effectiveness, safe and secure environment — Absconds from unescorted leave

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — safe and secure environment |
| **Indicator** | Absconds from unescorted leave |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  The number of absconds from unescorted leave as a proportion of all periods of unescorted leave.  Numerator:  Total number of absconds from unescorted leave.  Denominator:  Total number of periods of unescorted leave.  Computation:  Expressed as a rate per 1000. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator) x 1000. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the proportion of unescorted leaves where young people abscond. This information 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 them 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.  Unescorted leave is leave for a young person held in custody that is authorised in writing and does not require the young person to be escorted by a youth justice worker. An abscond is a failure to return from leave, and occurs when the youth justice agency advises police of the young person’s failure to return to custody. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | Data are comparable across jurisdictions. |
| **Coherence** | Data are comparable across jurisdictions. However, not all jurisdictions permit unescorted leave to be undertaken. Therefore, for these jurisdictions this indicator in not applicable. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * For jurisdictions in which unescorted leave is undertaken, a low or decreasing rate of absconds from unescorted leave is desirable. |

### Effectiveness, safe and secure environments — Assaults in custody

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — Safe and secure environment |
| **Indicator** | Assaults in custody |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  (1) The rate of detainees 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.  (2) The rate of staff 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.  (3) The rate of detainees 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.  (4) The rate of staff 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.  Numerators:  (1) Number of detainees 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.  (2) Number of staff 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.  (3) Number of detainees who are assaulted (that is, sustain an injury, but do not require hospitalisation) due to an act perpetrated by one or more detainees.  (4) Number of staff who are assaulted (that is, sustain an injury, but do not require hospitalisation) due to an act perpetrated by one or more detainees.  Denominators:  Total number of custody nights in detention throughout the reference year.  Computation:  Expressed as a rate per 10 000. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator) x 10000. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the rate of assaults in detention centres. These measures assess the extent to which youth justice agencies provide a safe and secure environment for young people and staff within detention centres. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | These data are affected by comparability issues. Specifically, there are differences in recording practices across jurisdictions, which contribute to differences in reported rates (including a practice in some jurisdictions to record ‘substantiated’ assaults only). Further, there might also be differences in the threshold for recording an assault across jurisdictions. For the purpose of this indicator, an injury is defined as: bruises; cuts or lacerations; open wounds; fractured or broken bones or teeth; burns or scalds; poisoning; dislocations and sprains; and concussions. |
| **Coherence** | These data are affected by comparability issues as noted above. In addition, data are not provided by all states and territories. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * Data are not complete across states and territories. Data were not available for WA. * 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 moderation of reported assaults data. * The ACT has only one youth justice detention centre with relatively small numbers in detention. Data are not converted to a rate per 10 000 custody nights for the periods 2009-10 to 2010-11 due to the small number of detainees in the ACT. |

### Effectiveness, safe and secure environments — Self-harm and attempted suicide in custody

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — Safe and secure environments |
| **Indicator** | Self-harm and attempted suicide in custody |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  (1) The rate of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation  (2) The rate of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody that did not require hospitalisation  (3) The rate of detainees who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody and required hospitalisation  (4) The rate of detainees who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody but did not require hospitalisation.  Numerators:  (1) The number of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation  (2) The number of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody that did not require hospitalisation  (3) The number of detainees who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody and required hospitalisation  (4) The number of detainees who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody but did not require hospitalisation.  Denominators:  Total number of custody nights in detention throughout the reference year.  Computation:  Expressed as a rate per 10 000. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator) x 10000. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the rate of self-harm and attempted suicide in detention centres. These measures assess the extent to which youth justice agencies provide a safe and secure environment for young people in detention. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | These data are affected by comparability issues. An incident occurs when a young person: expresses an intent to self-harm or commit suicide; attempts to self-harm or commit suicide; or commits self-harm. Self-harm occurs when a young person purposely self-inflicts poisoning or injury. An attempt to self-harm or suicide occurs where a young person intends to purposely self-inflict poisoning, injury or death and is prevented from doing so. An intention to self-harm or commit suicide occurs when a young person (a) expresses an intent to inflict harm or death upon him or herself to staff or an apparently reliable witness, or (b) demonstrates self-destructive behaviour that indicates a risk of self-harm or suicide and that is witnessed by staff or an apparently reliable witness. There might be differences in recording practices across jurisdictions and thresholds for recording attempts and actual incidents of self-harm, which contribute to differences in reported rates. |
| **Coherence** | These data are affected by comparability issues as noted above. In addition, data are not provided by all states and territories. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * Data are not available for WA. * 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 ACT has only one youth justice detention centre with relatively small numbers in detention. Data are not converted to a rate per  10 000 custody nights for the periods 2009-10 to 2010-11 due to the small number of detainees in the ACT. |

### Effectiveness, statutory responsibilities — Completion of community‑based orders

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — safe and secure environment |
| **Indicator** | Completion of orders |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  The number of sentenced community-based orders successfully completed.  Numerator:  Total number of sentenced community-based orders successfully completed.  Denominator:  Total number of sentenced community-based orders unsuccessfully completed.  Computation:  Expressed as a percentage. Calculation is: Numerator / (Numerator + Denominator) \* 100. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the proportion of sentenced community-based orders successfully completed. An order is considered to be successfully completed where the earliest order expiry date or the order termination date is reached and breach is neither pending nor finalised. An order is unsuccessfully completed where a court has decided that an order was breached, irrespective of the court-ordered outcome. For example, if the court decided that the order was breached but ordered the young person to continue serving the order, the order is still considered to be an unsuccessful completion. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | Data are reported as comparable across jurisdictions. |
| **Coherence** | Data are reported as comparable across jurisdictions. However, data are not reported by all jurisdictions. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * 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. |

### Effectiveness, statutory responsibilities — Case plans prepared

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Effectiveness — statutory responsibilities |
| **Indicator** | Case plans prepared |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  The number of eligible young people who had a documented case plan prepared or reviewed within six 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.   Numerator:  Total number of case plans prepared or reviewed within six weeks of commencing a sentenced community-based order.  Total number of case plans prepared or reviewed within six weeks of commencing a sentenced detention order.  Denominator:  Total number of sentenced community-based orders commenced.  Total number of sentenced detention orders commenced.  Computation:  Expressed as a percentage. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator) x 100. |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the proportion of case plans prepared in a timely fashion. Case plans are tools to assist in case management. They are formal written plans that assess a young person’s risks and needs for general safety and rehabilitation for specific offending behaviours. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | Data are reported as comparable across jurisdictions. |
| **Coherence** | Data are reported as comparable across jurisdictions. However, data are not reported by all jurisdictions. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * In 2014-15, data were not available for WA for community-based orders. * In the NT, case plans are prepared within 8 weeks of commencing a sentenced community-based order. |

### 

### Efficiency, input per output unit — Cost per young person subject to community-based supervision

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Efficiency — Inputs per output unit |
| **Indicator** | Cost per young person subject to community-based supervision |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  Total expenditure on community-based supervision per day, divided by the number of young people subject to community-based supervision on an average day.  Numerators:  Total expenditure on community-based supervision throughout the financial year.  Denominators:  Total number of young people subject to community-based supervision on an average day.  Computation:  Expressed as a dollar figure/average unit cost. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator). |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the average unit cost of community-based supervision. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | These data are comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions.  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. |
| **Coherence** | These data are comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions.  The number of young people under community-based supervision on an average day is calculated by summing the number of days each young person spends under supervision during the year (irrespective of age) and dividing this total by the number of days in the financial year. To derive the average daily cost per young person under community-based supervision on an average day, total recurrent expenditure on community-based supervision is divided by 365.25. This figure is then divided by the average daily number subject to community-based supervision.  Time series financial data are adjusted to today’s dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manuals ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’ and ‘*Youth justice financial data manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * Unit costs presented in the Report are not necessarily comparable to local unit costs reported in jurisdiction-specific annual reports due to different methods of calculation. * Youth justice expenditure data and youth justice average unit cost data are relatively new additions to the Report. As per usual Review processes, the Steering Committee anticipates that the CPYJWG and relevant parallel groups will continue to refine and improve the collection over time. |

### Efficiency, input per output unit — Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Efficiency — Inputs per output unit |
| **Indicator** | Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  ‘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.  Numerators:  Total expenditure on detention-based supervision throughout the financial year.  Denominators:  Total number of young people subject to detention-based supervision on an average day.  Computation:  Expressed as a dollar figure/average unit cost. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator). |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the average unit cost of detention-based supervision. |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. |
| **Accuracy** | These data are comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions.  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. |
| **Coherence** | These data are comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions.  The number of young people under detention-based supervision on an average day is calculated by summing the number of days each young person spends under supervision during the year (irrespective of age) and dividing this total by the number of days in the financial year. To derive the average daily cost per young person under detention-based supervision on an average day, total recurrent expenditure on detention-based supervision is divided by 365.25. This figure is then divided by the average daily number subject to detention-based supervision.  Time series financial data are adjusted to today’s dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator. |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manuals ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’ and ‘*Youth justice financial data manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * Unit costs presented in the Report are not necessarily comparable to local unit costs reported in jurisdiction-specific annual reports due to different methods of calculation. * Youth justice expenditure data and youth justice average unit cost data are relatively new additions to the Report. As per usual Review processes, the Steering Committee anticipates that the CPYJWG and relevant parallel groups will continue to refine and improve the collection over time. |

### Efficiency, input per output unit — Centre utilisation

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Child Protection and Youth Justice Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Efficiency — Inputs per output unit | |
| **Indicator** | Centre utilisation | |
| **Measure (computation)** | Definition:  The rate of detainees in all detention centres as a proportion of the number of permanently funded beds.  Numerators:  Total average nightly population in detention centres throughout the reference year.  Denominators:  Total number of permanently funded beds.  Computation:  Expressed as a percentage. Calculation is: (Numerator ÷ Denominator) x 100. | |
| **Data source/s** | Numerators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems.  Denominators:  State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. | |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | | |
| **Institutional environment** | Data are sourced from State and Territory governments’ administrative data systems. | |
| **Relevance** | Data are reported by State and Territory governments to provide information on the rate of centre utilisation. This indicator partially measures both efficient and effective performance. | |
| **Timeliness** | The most timely data (i.e., data for the most recent financial year) are reported. | |
| **Accuracy** | These data are comparable across jurisdictions. Detention centres operating at higher 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. These factors require utilisation rates that are below full capacity. For these reasons, the indicator is described as possessing both efficiency and effectiveness components. | |
| **Coherence** | These data are comparable across jurisdictions. | |
| **Accessibility** | Data are published in the SCRGSP’s Report on Government Services. | |
| **Interpretability** | Further technical details are available in the data manual ‘*Youth justice key performance indicators: Data collection manual for the Report on Government Services*’*.* | |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | | |
| **Key data gaps/issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following issues:   * These data are a robust count of the extent to which detention centre beds are utilised. However, it is important to consider this indicator in the context of other youth justice indicators. | |