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This chapter reports on the performance of youth justice services across Australia. Youth justice services aim to assist young people and their families who are in crisis or experiencing difficulties, promote community safety, and reduce youth offending.

This chapter reports on:

* Community-based youth justice supervision
* Detention-based youth justice supervision
* Group conferencing (see section 16.5 for definitions).

All abbreviations used in this Report are available in a complete list in volume A: Approach to performance reporting.

## 16.1 Profile of youth justice services

### Service overview

Youth justice systems are responsible for administering justice to young people who have committed or allegedly committed an offence while considered by law to be a juvenile (predominantly aged 10–17 years). These 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[[1]](#footnote-1)
* 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 2014‑15 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Box 16.1 Government departments responsible for the delivery of youth justice services in 2014-15 | |
| NSW | Department of 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, chapter 6 in this Report (Police services) 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 profile 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 2013-14, 10 441 young people aged 10–17 years experienced youth justice supervision in Australia (AIHW 2015). Nationally, 85.1 per cent of young people who were supervised by youth justice services on an average day during 2013-14 were in the community, with the remainder in detention (figure 16.1).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.1 Daily average proportion of youth justice clients aged  10-17 years supervised in the community and in detention centres**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2015, *Youth justice in Australia 2013-14,* Bulletin 127, Canberra; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.4. |
|  |
|  |

##### Youth justice detention

The daily average number of young people in youth justice detention centres decreased from 810 to 794 between 2012-13 and 2013-14, continuing what has been a relatively consistent pattern for most jurisdictions of decreasing numbers in detention over the past five years (table 16A.4). Nationally, the daily average rate of detention of young people aged 10–17 years decreased from 35.9 per 100 000 in 2012‑13 to 35.0 per 100 000 in 2013-14, with rates varying across jurisdictions (figure 16.2).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.2 Daily average rate of detention of young people (rate per 100 000 people aged 10–17 years)**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: AIHW 2015, *Youth justice in Australia 2013–14,* Bulletin 127, Canberra; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.4. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2013-14, on an average day, around nine in ten young people in detention were male (89.4 per cent of the total population of youth justice detention centres) (tables 16A.5 and 16A.7).

##### Community-based supervision

Nationally, the daily average number of young people aged 10–17 years supervised in the community decreased from 4701 in 2012-13 to 4459 in 2013-14 (table 16A.4). The daily average rate of young people aged 10–17 years supervised in the community decreased from 208.1 per 100 000 in 2012‑13 to 196.7 per 100 000 in 2013-14, with rates varying across jurisdictions (figure 16.3).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.3 Daily average rate of community-based supervision of young people (rate per 100 000 people aged 10–17 years)**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See table 16A.4 for detailed footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: AIHW 2015, *Youth justice in Australia 2013-14,* Bulletin 127, Canberra; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.4. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2013-14, on an average day, around eight in ten young people supervised in the community were male (79.5 per cent) (tables 16A.6 and 16A.8).

##### 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 463 in 2013‑14 (table 16A.9). Nationally, the daily average detention rate for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged 10–17 years was 371.2 per 100 000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people, 24 times the rate for non-Indigenous young people (15.2 per 100 000) (figure 16.4).

In 2011, the 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 young people, 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. Historical data for 2009-10 are available in table 16A.9

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.4 Average daily rate of detention of young people, by Indigenous status, 2013-14 (rate per 100 000 people aged 10‑17 years)**a, b** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See table 16A.9 for detailed footnotes and caveats. b Refer to table 16A.11 for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-Indigenous rate ratio. |
| *Source*: AIHW 2015, *Youth justice in Australia 2013–14,* Bulletin 127, Canberra; WA and NT governments (unpublished); table 16A.9. |
|  |
|  |

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people are also over-represented in community-based supervision. The daily average number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people aged 10–17 years supervised in the community was 1910 in 2013‑14. Nationally, the daily average rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people aged 10–17 years subject to community-based supervision in 2013-14 was 1531.3 per 100 000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people, 14 times the rate for non-Indigenous young people (110.3 per 100 000 (figure 16.5).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.5 Average daily rate of young people subject to community supervision, by Indigenous status, 2013-14 (rate per 100 000 people aged 10–17 years)**a, b** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See table 16A.10 for detailed footnotes and caveats. b Refer to table 16A.11 for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-Indigenous rate ratio. |
| *Source*: AIHW 2015, *Youth justice in Australia 2013-14,* Bulletin 127, 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 $698 million across Australia in 2014-15, with detention‑based supervision accounting for the majority of this expenditure (62.8 per cent, or $438 million) (table 16A.1).

The 10–17 year age range is considered the potential population of youth justice agencies. 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 and sentenced in adult courts are detained in youth justice facilities through the dual‑track system and comprise approximately 55 per cent of the total youth justice client cohort sentenced to detention.

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.

Nationally, in 2014-15, 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 $306, with the majority of expenditure on detention (figure 16.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.6 Recurrent expenditure on youth justice services, per young person aged 10–17 years in the population, 2014-15**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See tables 16A.1 to 16A.3 for detailed footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.1. |
|  |
|  |

## 

## 16.2 Framework of performance indicators

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 complete and comparable in the 2016 Report. For data that are not considered directly comparable, text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability and data completeness from a Report-wide perspective (section 1.6).

In addition to section 16.1, 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 (chapter 2).

|  |
| --- |
| 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

Different delivery contexts, locations and clients can affect the equity, effectiveness and efficiency of youth justice services.

Data quality information (DQI) is included where available for performance indicators in this Report. The purpose of DQI is to provide structured and consistent information about quality aspects of data used to report on performance indicators, in addition to material in the chapter or sector overview and attachment tables. All DQI for the 2016 Report can be found at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016.

Performance indicator results may differ from similar data included in some jurisdictions’ annual reports due to different counting rules applied for these jurisdictional reports.

### 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). Output information is also critical for equitable, efficient and effective management of government services.

### Equity

Equity 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 are reported by Indigenous status.  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 2014-15 data were available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2014-15, 93.3 per cent of all concluded group conferences resulted in an agreement, with 90.8 per cent of concluded group conferences for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people resulting in an agreement (figure 16.8). These patterns have been broadly consistent over the past five years (table 16A.13).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.8 Proportion of young people who receive group conferencing and reach an agreement, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See box 16.3 and table 16A.13 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *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. |
|  |
|  |

To date, it has not been possible to source reliable and comparable data across jurisdictions to enumerate this indicator. As a first step in developing reporting for this indicator, jurisdictions have reviewed services and programs available to support young offenders. Attachment table 16A.26 provides summary information about these programs in each jurisdiction.

#### 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 16.5).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.5 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.   Data are reported by Indigenous status.  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) in this Report for further information]. Education or training course refers to school education or an accredited education or training course under the Australian Qualifications Framework. Data are based on averaged quarterly attendance counts.  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 2014-15 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2014-15, 98.8 per cent of young people in detention and of compulsory school age were attending an education course and 97.9 per cent of young people in detention notof compulsory school age were attending an accredited education or training course. Most jurisdictions recorded 100 per cent for both measures, including for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people. These data have been relatively consistent over the past five years (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 16.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.6 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.  Data are reported by Indigenous status.  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 2014-15 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

No young people died while in the legal or physical custody of an Australian youth justice agency in 2014-15. Historical data are available back to 2010-11 in table 16A.14 and show one death in custody over this period (in 2010-11).

#### 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 16.7).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.7 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.   Data are reported by Indigenous status.  An escape from a youth justice detention centre is defined as a breach of a secure perimeter or defined boundary of a 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 * complete for the current reporting period.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, there were 14 escapes from youth justice detention in 2014-15 (table 16.1). These data tend to fluctuate across jurisdictions and over time (table 16A.16).

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.1 Number and rate of escapes from youth justice detention centres, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust | | **Number of escapes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 12 | 12 | | Non-Indigenous | – | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 | | **Total** | **–** | **2** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **12** | **14** | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 8.3 | 0.7 | | Non-Indigenous | – | 0.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | 0.1 | | **Total** | **–** | **0.4** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **7.9** | **0.4** | |
| a See box 16.7 and table 16A.16 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 16A.16. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, there were 7 escapes from escorted movements in 2014-15 (table 16.2). These data tend to fluctuate across jurisdictions and over time (table 16A.16).

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.2 Number and rate of escapes from escorted movement, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust | | **Number of escapes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | 4 | 6 | | Non-Indigenous | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | 1 | | **Total** | **2** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **5** | **7** | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 14.2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | 45.3 | 20.6 | | Non-Indigenous | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 172.4 | 2.9 | | **Total** | **6.7** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **53.1** | **10.9** | |
| a See box 16.7 and table 16A.16 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 16A.16. |
|  |
|  |

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

‘Absconds from unescorted leave’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to appropriately manage young people while they are in the legal custody of a youth justice detention centre. 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 activities such as education, training and employment (box 16.8).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.8 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.  Data are reported by Indigenous status.  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 * complete for the current reporting period.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

No young people absconded from unescorted leave in 2014-15. Historical data are available back to 2010-11 in table 16A.17, and show one abscond over this period (in 2011-12).

#### 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 16.9).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.9 Assaults in custody |
| ‘Assaults in custody’ is defined by two measures:   * the rate of young people and 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 young people, as a proportion of the number of young people in custody * the rate of young people and staff who are assaulted (that is, sustain an injury, but do not require hospitalisation) due to an act perpetrated by one or more young people, as a proportion of the number of young people in custody.   Data are reported by Indigenous status (of young people who were injured as a result of an assault and of staff who were injured as a result of an assault).  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 minor injuries are included in the assaults count differs across jurisdictions.  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 2014-15 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 different thresholds for recording an assault across jurisdictions affects the comparability of results should be further examined through moderatio**n of these d**ata. This is an area for ongoing data development.**  Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Because of their age and vulnerability, the duty of care required for young people in detention 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.

Nationally in 2014-15, five young people were reported as injured in custody due to a serious assault (table 16.3) and one staff member was reported as injured due to a serious assault (table 16A.4). These data tend to fluctuate across jurisdictions and over time.

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.3 Number and rate of young people injured as a result of a serious assault, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 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 | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | 1 | | Non-Indigenous | – | 4 | – | na | – | – | – | – | | **Total** | **–** | **4** | **–** | **na** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **1** | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | 0.7 | | Non-Indigenous | – | 0.9 | – | na | – | – | – | – | | **Total** | **–** | **0.8** | **–** | **na** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **0.7** | |
| a See box 16.9 and table 16A.18 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 16A.18. |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.4 Number and rate of staff injured as a result of a serious assault, by Indigenous status, 2014‑15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 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 | – | – | 1 | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | – | – | 1 | na | – | – | – | – | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | – | – | – | na | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | – | – | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | – | – | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | – | |
| a See box 16.9 and table 16A.18 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 16A.18. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2014-15, 85 young people were reported as injured in custody due to an assault (excluding serious assaults) (table 16.5) and 77 staff were reported as injured due to an assault while supervising young people (table 16.6). Proportions varied across jurisdictions. These data tend to fluctuate across jurisdictions and over time (table 16A.19).

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.5 Number and rate of young people injured as a result of an assault, by Indigenous status, 2014‑15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of young people injured as a result of an assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 7 | 2 | 10 | np | 2 | 2 | – | 8 | | Non-Indigenous | 6 | 18 | 8 | np | 13 | 7 | – | 1 | | Unknown | 1 | – | – | np | – | – | – | – | | Total | 14 | 20 | 18 | np | 15 | 9 | – | 9 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 1.3 | 2.3 | 2.5 | np | 2.3 | 36.2 | – | 5.6 | | Non-Indigenous | 1.2 | 4.1 | 3.6 | np | 14.7 | 21.8 | – | 13.0 | | Unknown | 10.8 | – | – | np | – | – | – | – | | Total | 1.3 | 3.9 | 2.9 | np | 8.6 | 24.0 | – | 5.9 | |
| a See box 16.9 and table 16A.19 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **np** Not published. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 16A.19. |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.6 Number and rate of staff injured as a result of an assault, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Staff injured as a result of an assault** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | na | – | 1 | np | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | na | 6 | 17 | np | 4 | – | – | – | | Unknown | 29 | – | – | np | 2 | 9 | – | 9 | | Total | 29 | 6 | 18 | np | 6 | 9 | – | 9 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | na | – | 0.2 | np | – | – | – | – | | Non-Indigenous | na | 1.2 | 2.8 | np | 2.3 | – | – | – | | Unknown | 2.8 | – | – | np | 1.1 | 24.0 | – | 5.9 | | Total | 2.8 | 1.2 | 2.9 | np | 3.4 | 24.0 | – | 5.9 | |
| a See box 16.9 and table 16A.19 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **np** Not published. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 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 16.10).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.10 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 young people who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation * the number of young people who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation.   Data are reported by Indigenous status.  An incident of self-harm or attempted suicide is counted each time a young person self-harms or attempts suicide. Therefore, the number of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide and the number of young people who self-harm or attempt suicide will differ when one young person has self-harmed on two or more occasions in the reporting period, 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 2014-15 were not available for WA.   Data for this indicator are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution. Methods of data collection vary across jurisdictions (for example, manual case file review, the collation of electronic incident reports) and jurisdictions’ ability to report on this measure is dependent on relevant incidents having first been documented.  Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2014-15, 11 young people in 14 separate incidents were reported as having self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation. Proportions varied across jurisdictions (tables 16.7 and 16.8). These data tend to fluctuate across jurisdictions and over time (table 16A.20).

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.7 Number and rate of young people who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of young people who self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 4 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 2 | | Non-Indigenous | 3 | 1 | 1 | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 7 | 1 | 1 | na | – | – | – | 2 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 0.7 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 1.4 | | Non-Indigenous | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.5 | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | 1.3 | |
| a See box 16.10 and table 16A.20 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 16A.20. |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.8 Number and rate of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 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 | 5 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 3 | | Non-Indigenous | 3 | 2 | 1 | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 8 | 2 | 1 | na | – | – | – | 3 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 0.9 | – | – | na | – | – | – | 2.1 | | Non-Indigenous | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | na | – | – | – | – | | Total | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | na | – | – | – | 2.0 | |
| a See box 16.10 and table 16A.20 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 16A.20. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2014-15, 49 young people were reported as having self-harmed or attempted suicide in 75 separate incidents, which did not require hospitalisation (tables 16.9 and 16.10). Proportions varied across jurisdictions.

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.9 Number and rate of young people who self-harmed or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | | **Number of young people who self‑harmed or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 9 | – | 13 | na | 2 | – | – | 3 | | Non-Indigenous | 13 | – | 4 | na | 3 | 2 | – | – | | Total | 22 | – | 17 | na | 5 | 2 | – | 3 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 1.6 | – | 3.3 | na | 2.3 | – | – | 2.1 | | Non-Indigenous | 2.7 | – | 1.8 | na | 3.4 | 6.2 | – | – | | Total | 2.1 | – | 2.8 | na | 2.9 | 5.3 | – | 2.0 | |
| a See box 16.10 and table 16A.20 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 16A.20. |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 16.10 Number and rate of incidents of self-harm or attempted suicide in custody not requiring hospitalisation, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 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 | 12 | – | 18 | na | 2 | – | – | 12 | | Non-Indigenous | 18 | – | 7 | na | 3 | 3 | – | – | | Total | 30 | – | 25 | na | 5 | 3 | – | 12 | | **Rate per 10 000 custody nights** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander | 2.2 | – | 4.5 | na | 2.3 | – | – | 8.3 | | Non-Indigenous | 3.7 | – | 3.2 | na | 3.4 | 9.4 | – | – | | Total | 2.9 | – | 4.1 | na | 2.9 | 8.0 | – | 7.9 | |
| a See box 16.10 and table 16A.20 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.12 and 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 16.11).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.11 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.   Data are reported by Indigenous status.  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) 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 2014-15 data were not available for WA.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 90.6 per cent of eligible young people had a case plan prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced community-based order in 2014-15 (figure 16.9(a)). Nationally, 97.2 per cent of eligible young people had a case plan prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced detention order in 2014-15 (figure 16.9(b)). Proportions varied across jurisdictions.

The proportions of eligible young people who had a case plan prepared within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced community-based order and within 6 weeks of commencing a sentenced detention order have increased over the past five years (table 16A.22).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.9 Proportion of young people with case plans prepared within 6 weeks of commencing sentenced orders, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a, b** |
| |  | | --- | | (a) Sentenced community-based order  (b) Sentenced detention order | |
| a See box 16.11 and table 16A.22 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. b Data were not available for WA for community-based case plans. |
| *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 16.12).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.12 Completion of community-based orders |
| ‘Completion of community-based orders’ is defined as the proportion of sentenced community‑based supervision orders successfully completed. Successful completion is where the earliest order expiry date or the order termination date is reached and breach is neither pending nor finalised.  Data are reported by Indigenous status.  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.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 78.6 per cent of community-based orders were successfully completed in 2014‑15. The proportion of community-based orders successfully completed varied across jurisdictions (figure 16.10). Nationally, the proportion of community-based orders successfully completed has been broadly consistent over the past five years.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.10 Proportion of community-based orders successfully completed, by Indigenous status, 2014-15**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See box 16.12 and table 16A.21 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *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 16.13).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.13 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.  (continued) |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.13 (continued) |
| However, efficiency indicators cannot be interpreted in isolation and should be considered in conjunction with other 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 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 2014-15 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution.  Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2014-15, the cost per day per young person subject to community‑based supervision on an average day was $113 (figure 16.11).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.11 Cost per day, per young person subject to community-based supervision on an average day, 2014-15**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See box 16.13 and table 16A.23 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.23 and 16A.28. |
|  |
|  |

#### 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 16.14).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.14 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 other 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 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 2014-15 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data are not comparable and need to be interpreted with caution.  Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2014-15, the cost per day, per young person subject to detention‑based supervision was $1391. This cost varied across jurisdictions (figure 16.12).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.12 Cost per day, per young person subject to detention-based supervision on an average day, 2014-15**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See box 16.14 and table 16A.24 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 16A.24 and 16A.28. |
|  |
|  |

#### Offender-to-staff ratio

‘Offender-to-staff ratio’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide youth justice services in an efficient manner (box 16.15).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.15 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 16.16).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.16 Centre utilisation |
| ‘Centre utilisation’ is defined as the number of young people in all detention centres as a proportion of the number of permanently funded beds.  Detention centres operating at higher or increasing capacities is desirable. 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 from those who have been sentenced). In order to accommodate these provisions, 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 2014-15 data are available.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2016. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 67.9 per cent of centre capacity (that is, permanently funded beds) was utilised in 2014-15 — a decrease from 77.4 per cent in 2010-11. Proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 16.13).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 16.13 Centre utilisation rate**a** |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| a See box 16.16 and table 16A.25 for detailed definitions, footnotes and caveats. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 16A.25. |
|  |
|  |

### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (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 16.17).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.17 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 16.18).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.18 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).  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).  Note that data on the numbers of young people in detention participating in education and training are reported earlier in the chapter. Data are not yet available for this indicator to report on engagement with and readiness for education or work at the conclusion of youth justice supervision. 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 16.19).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16.19 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.  Data are not yet available for this indicator. This indicator has been identified for development and reporting in future. |
|  |
|  |

As a first step in developing outcomes reporting for youth justice, jurisdictions have 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 attachment table 16A.27.

## 16.4 Future directions in performance reporting

The Steering Committee will continue to improve the appropriateness and completeness of the performance indicator framework. Future work on indicators will focus on:

* developing equity indicators for youth justice services
* developing a measure of offending-specific programs completed
* developing reporting for youth justice outcome indicators

The Australasian Juvenile Justice Administrators (AJJA) is responsible for national coordination of youth justice services and is overseeing several research projects to develop including a review of national performance indicators. The Steering Committee will review this work for its relevance to indicator development for this Report.

## 16.5 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) is 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. |

## 16.6 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/rogs/2016).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 16A.1** | State and Territory government real recurrent expenditure on youth justice services, (2014-15 dollars) |
| **Table 16A.2** | State and Territory government recurrent expenditure on youth justice services,  2014-15 |
| **Table 16A.3** | Comparability of government recurrent expenditure — items included, 2014-15 |
| **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, (2014-15 dollars) |
| **Table 16A.24** | Cost per young person subject to detention-based supervision, (2014-15 dollars) |
| **Table 16A.25** | Centre utilisation |
| **Table 16A.26** | Offending-specific programs |
| **Table 16A.27** | State and Territory measurement of youth justice service outcomes |
| **Table 16A.28** | General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (index) |
| **Table 16A.29** | Population data, young people aged 10-17 years ('000), December quarter |
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1. Chapter 7 in this Report reports on the performance of courts in Australia, and contains information on the different courts in each State and Territory and the allocation of cases to each court level. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)