

Allison Scott

Subject: FW: Youth Justice Reforms in Tasmania

From: John Jessop [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, 11 July 2023 13:50

To: Rosemary Armitage <rosemary.armitage@parliament.tas.gov.au>; Jane Howlett <Jane.Howlett@parliament.tas.gov.au>; Tania. Rattray <tania.rattray@parliament.tas.gov.au>; Rob Valentine <rob.valentine@parliament.tas.gov.au>; Meg Webb <meg.webb@parliament.tas.gov.au>; Josh Willie <Josh.Willie@parliament.tas.gov.au>

Subject: Youth Justice Reforms in Tasmania

Hi

I am a citizen with considerable experience of working with young offenders since 1979. I have delivered just about every funded program and delivered programs that engage and divert young people from crime. I worked at Ashley Home in the mid 80's - before it was a youth prison and when it was considered the best facility in the country.

I was busy writing a new program and tender for the Tasmanian Aboriginal Corporation when your enquiry about Youth Detention was calling for submissions and I just missed the whole thing.

I have been working to bring back to Tasmania a highly successful, and proven 40-year-old Australian program Youth Insearch. The program diverts 85% of participants back to school and away from offending. In NSWs and QLD it is there main diversion program. The Commonwealth is about to fund them to go national. Rotary Tasmania is on board to support the program's return to Tasmania as are the Neighbourhood Houses. The YJ Reform Team is working with them.

The current reform process is far from adequate and it is a big mistake to change little and just build 5 new youth prisons.

I have expressed my concerns in the attached paper which I hope you will find useful.

I have called 32 organisations and people together later in July to form a group I would describe as a "community of expertise" in an attempt to have real dialogue with the government about what needs to change.

I am free to have a chat at any time.

Regards

John Jessop

[REDACTED]

A positive vision to address youth offending in Tasmania

Let's face it if ALL young people would just go to school, play sport, not hang out on the streets – basically as we were once taught “seen but not heard” then there would be no youth offending - reallyⁱ.

Therefore, any young person who offends is either aberrant or very naughty. The majority of Tasmanian's still probably think that the best thing to do is to isolate and punish these young people until they behave normally, particularly when there is a risk to community safety. A system of punishment is also meant to act as a deterrent. A common threat from Mum to many a Tassie teenage boy has for a long time been “ifyah don't behave I'll send'ya to ashleees”.

From the mid 1980's to 1990's Tasmania's response to young people who were being insufficiently parented – leading to neglect, abuse, or offending was a leader in the countryⁱⁱ. That does not mean it was perfect, but it was therapeutic for its day.

So, what went wrong and what are the attitudes and approaches we should avoid or promote going forward?

We want and need a positive vision and model of intervention and care – not more of the same dressed up to look caring.

A Brief Look Backwards

Tasmania used to deal with the young offenders from a welfare perspective. It was the Department of Child Welfare, and Ashley was a 'home' with no fence. In the 90's due to political pressure from mostly lawyers and rights activists the view was accepted by Government that those young offenders had the right to be treated like adult offenders. This particularly related to how offenders were to be 'punished'. This resulted in the Youth Justice Act 2000, which shaped the Youth Justice model and service we have todayⁱⁱⁱ. The principal difference was that previously a young offender would be dealt with under the child welfare code not a sentencing system. Bail was rarely used as an option by the courts – it was straight into community supervision, or remand for observation, or care until things were sorted out.

Under the child welfare code young offenders were placed in 'the care of the director' who then, based on the court order, the assessment of the child's needs, their family situation, and the risk to the community would determine where that young offender was placed^{iv}. By the mid 80's placements options included: family, kinship placements, foster care, family group homes, Special Contract Care^v, Wybra Hall, and Ashley Home. At the time this wide range of placement options meant that only the most challenging or dangerous young people ended up at Wybra Hall or Ashley Home. Wybra Hall and Ashley Home were the State's only youth detention centres. Ashley Home was considered the best and most therapeutic centre in the country, and we had the lowest population of detained youth nationally – both by number and as a % of the whole population.

A common order for young offenders, particularly older young people, serious crimes, or repeat offenders was Remand For Observation. The court made this order after guilt was established but before any verdict or sentence was determined. It was a 3-month order to the care of the Director of Welfare to determine what was going wrong and what was the best way to prevent further offending, it also took them out of harm's way and further offending.

This forced the young person to deal with their issues if they were going to get out of detention, because, what happened next would be based on their end of Remand For Observation progress and report. This psychological accessibility was key to developing a relationship and progressing, through therapeutic methods, to solutions.

Richard needs to go home to Queenstown to visit his dying grandmother. As a prisoner we need permission form the Director. Richard was prone to violence and sexual offences and a high risk.

Time was short so in great trepidation we called Dennis Daniels the Director for verbal permission. Dennis took the call immediately, he totally surprised me by asking about Richard and it was clear he knew the case and the lad. He then asked by name about Richard's mum and sister and how the family was travelling.

This is the level of care a single purposed, small, and focused department was able to provide. It is doubtful today that anyone in senior management would know any of their Wards of State to that degree.

What happened

Some years back politicians thought there was mileage to be made from demonising young offenders and implementing 'tough on crime' policies. This approach is still alive and well and is only just under the 'political surface' of the current policy initiatives nationally and even in Tasmania. Take Western Australia and Queensland's current approaches and recent events.

The "tough on youth offending" policy response from successive governments since the mid 90's was introduced supposedly due to young people being out-of-control and an ever-increasing risk to society. However, youth offending has not changed significantly since the 1950's as a percentage of population or as a percentage of the overall crime rate. Over the 5 years from 2017–18 to 2021–22, the number of young people aged 10 and over who were under supervision on an average day fell by 18%^{vi}. The adult offending rate is twice that of the youth offending rate. What's happened is we have created a rift between young offenders and what we see as civilised society.

This 'tough on crime' approach has or is failing. Productivity Commission data that found for children given detention, probation, bail or parole, 56.8% reoffended within a year.^{vii} This should be unacceptable and a clear sign of the need to change direction.

The News screams "Teenage Gangs" terrorising our suburbs. Well whilst there may be some teenage gangs a considerable amount of actual crime directed at the public (robbery, theft, car stealing) are adult gangs, crime families, or the parent(s) who recruit 10- to 13-year-olds to do their bidding. They are generally too young to charge.

This is well known to the authorities. However, the same authorities readily brand these crimes on youth gangs and over the years have done little to stop the recruitment and grooming of these young people by adult criminals.

By the time they enter detention the young people are already highly criminalised and often set on a trajectory of criminality.

Given that part of the transition from child to adult is to make oneself ugly to those around you (or at least that is often the consequence of the young person's feelings of disconnection and confusion) it is easy to see why adults and young people do not necessarily relate well to each other. Add to this a young person's lack of political power or collective voice, then young people become easy targets for news outlets and politicians looking to capitalise on the "fear they are all thugs". Of course, the more the fear is generated the greater the benefit to those pushing the story.

After 2000 when a young person was found guilty of a crime they were sentenced under the Youth Justice Act and given a release date. On arriving at AYDC there was now no motivation to act anything other than as a prisoner, as you had a set sentence and no motivation to "let your guard down" to explore the reasons why you have ended up here and what is the best way out of the system.

What therefore resulted was an adversarial environment focused on serving your punishment as easily as you could and in many cases being as ugly as you could be to the staff. Staff could no longer take a therapeutic approach and we had inadvertently created a prison.

In recent times

Recently it has become politically unpalatable to abuse children in State care so things have to change. This is a real driver of the current youth justice reforms. This effort is being driven by intersecting forces including:

- A more trauma informed society with the evidence to suggest that cognitive maturation does not occur till ones mid 20's – young people are not fully formed adults
- The adoption of the Tasmanian Child and Youth Wellbeing Framework to guide young people's development
- The State's desire to adhere to the National Principles for Child Safe Organisations
- The stated desire to develop 'a service continuum that addresses the complex causes of youth offending, improves outcomes for vulnerable children and young people, and increases community safety'.

In a renewed effort to curtail offending and to prevent re-offending Tasmania along with many other Australian jurisdictions and other countries is questioning recent past practice and looking to adopt a therapeutic model of

intervention and care. BUT this is not due to a new enlightened understanding of youth offending and unless we call for this, we will NOT achieve significant re-design in how the State deals with young offenders.

Tasmania has undertaken some research, investigations, and consultations which has led to a blueprint of how a new therapeutic youth justice system would work. However the review's focus is predominantly on the "sharp end" – the processes involved in locking up young people – and not on reforming the whole system – from child protection to education to the police to the courts. The whole lot should be subject to re-design.

The Tasmanian YOUTH JUSTICE BLUEPRINT 2022 has established '*principles (that) encapsulate these messages and will guide us in the development and implementation of the policies, programs and initiatives that sit within the Blueprint.*' The very first principle is: '*Children and young people thrive within well supported families and communities. We support children, young people, and their families through a shared whole of government, whole of community approach.*' The blueprint is short on substance and theory and does not address key issues. It has heavily leant on Victoria's plan, without the passion, depth, or debate.

Will there be significant gain from the reform process if there is no struggle or real consultation when it is being devised?

Decisions that are being made now about how the new Youth Justice system will work, however it appears the focus is on achieving the political agenda of replace the AYDC by 2025. A focus on 'bricks and mortar' over what is needed to make a successful integrated therapeutic response will be detrimental to achieving reform.

As a society we will not achieve the outcomes we want until we meld the intentions and desires of the Tasmanian Child and Youth Wellbeing Framework to the workings of the youth justice system. For example, fewer children would be exposed to crime and have less opportunity of offending if they were able to attend school. Yet the very children who are at risk are currently and often being systematically excluded from education^{viii}.

In the mid 80's a 13 yo male robbed the Brighton Post Office. He stopped beating the 69yo Post Mistress with an iron bar because he thought she was dead. So horrible a crime and so 'crazy' the offender he was placed in a psychiatric ward for the criminally insane at New Norfolk. Dept Child Welfare staff heavily protested and petitioned for him to be sent to Ashley. At 17 he was released but re-offended at 19 and ended being declared too dangerous to release. He was only recently released after 6 appeals over many years into secure care.

In the mid 10's an almost identical child was at age 13 heading in the same direction. By 15 he had bashed, burnt, or destroyed numerous residential facilities and was not wanted by any residential service provider. NEXUS to their credit took him on and supported his development until he was 18. He now lives independently. He still is a 'slippery & shady character' but he is no longer seriously dangerous or a high risk.

These two were amongst some of Tassie's most challenging offenders.

Most recently the government has released details of its plans to build five new youth justice facilities. This seems premature especially as they are all secure (to varying degrees) – so closer to being prisons than therapeutic centres.

No plans on how to respond to 10 to 13-year-old youth offenders seem to be detailed in the current plans – which is disturbing.

There is insufficient evidence that the design steps needed to implement a 'whole of government and whole of community' response are being undertaken and assumptions have already been made. There is a risk that decisions behind closed doors will not be based on evidence of their validity but on political expediency.

There have been insufficient consultations with the community of citizens who work with and seek to engage young people especially young offenders. We will not achieve system change without involving those with the most knowledge.

It may be that the process of the Youth Justice Reform needs to be reset to fully undertake the necessary design steps and to fully engage with the whole of government and the community.

What needs to happen

The government should not wait until new facilities are built to introduce a therapeutic youth justice approach. The presence of AYDC should be irrelevant – it's about how we work with young offenders.

To achieve a therapeutic approach, it is recommended that:

1. A therapeutic youth justice model of care be developed as a priority, which will define operational approaches and the attitudes, attributes, and skills needed by the staff. This should cover all stages in the process of responding to young offenders. We need evidenced based therapeutic youth justice care modelling and we should be looking at what is being done in the USA and UK^{ix}. This model must accommodate the whole cohort of young offenders. It is highly recommended that this model be developed through broad input from both practitioners and young people – not designed only by a consultant working to complete a government contract.
2. Given that between 35 and 55% of the youth justice cohort at any one time is Aboriginal. Therefore the State could:
 - Do its best by continuing to be sympathetic but not adapted to Aboriginal people's needs and culture
 - Separate out Aboriginal young people into a separate program. Fine in theory but we would therefore not have enough non-Aboriginal young people to fill our 5 new detention centres
 - Fund two concurrent programs – does not seem feasible given the low numbers and the resultant high cost

On average of 50% of young offenders are Aboriginal. Which is likely to mean that racism plays a big part in how the Police interact with Aboriginal young people and more are charged than diverted. Therefore, should not our new therapeutic model be culturally safe for Aboriginal young people. Given their numbers should the predominant character of the program be Aboriginal. Given that Aboriginal people did not need prisons to deal with their young people, then we might just devise a more humane approach. A culturally safe approach benefits all minorities within any population.

The State needs to develop an Aboriginal strategy and should seek enlightenment from other first nations jurisdictions. To assume that the Tasmanian Aboriginal community has any significant understanding or specific strategies to deal with youth offending would be a mistake. The Aboriginal Community needs to have the time and support to develop this understanding to then be able to contribute.

3. An engaged workforce re-developmental model of re-design of the Youth Justice be applied. Those cohorts of workers employed by government across different departments that interact with young offenders (pre, during, and after offending behaviours occur) are the ones to re-design the approach they need to take to introduce the new model. The re-design would also involve experts and what might be called the "community of engaged citizens" who are people with either lived experience or who have done or do work in the NFP sector. Collectively if this group of people build it, they will own it, and therefore are more likely to do it. Not only is this a superior approach to simply using a consultant to develop a model and procedures it also fits our small scale. Our State's small scale reduces the capacity to engage enough expertise, or to have enough funds, or to employ enough people to run an expensive high security model.

One evening in 1987 Ashley Home got a call from the Hobart Police. They had just arrested a recently released young car thief with many previous convicts.

What the Police wanted to know is "what's going on at Ashley, he stole this car, did not damage it or wreck it or burn it out but returned it to the place he stole it parked and locked it up – undamaged. He said he needed to get somewhere in a hurry". They were disappointed because they could not "throw the book at him" with multiple charges to secure maximum punishment.

The young fellow had been through the Ashley driver training program – on our own driver training facility we built. Repaired his own 'old farm car' collected from the district, gained his Ashley Car Licence that allowed him to drive his restored car around Ashley.

He had come to respect car ownership and learnt how to respect a car – now he just needed to stop stealing them.

We need to empower the people we have (government, the NFP sector, and the community) and to dramatically reduce the need for incarceration and its associated high costs.

4. A process of reform to ensure that “children and young people are being kept safe at Ashley Youth Detention Centre (AYDC) during the transition period” is underway^x. Its focus seems more on security than it does on how best to implement a therapeutic model of care. The workforce needs to be intimately involved in designing how the place will work therapeutically or change will not occur. Simply adding more security is not the solution^{xi}. It needs to stop being overtly a Youth Prison.

At some point in the workforce re-development the AYDC should be re-branded and a process of reformation with residents and staff be implemented so that Ashley becomes a therapeutic facility as soon as possible. Gone will be AYDC. This new therapeutic custodial care facility^{xii} could be fully operational by the middle of 2025.

This then gives the time needed to build new facilities (that are not simply detention centres) with resources and in locations that better support a therapeutic model. Given the history of new facilities being built (i.e., the Westbury Prison) it could be many years before new facilities are built.

Making the current AYDC therapeutic in its approach as soon as possible needs to be a key priority.

5. Far greater attention needs to be given to the important role of the education system. The Education Department needs to embrace alternatives and work with the community sector to develop and properly fund alternatives. We need to see significant improvement in the educational engagement of offender-risk young people. Too many of these young people (up to 25% of the high school population in some areas) are being systematically excluded by the department.

The Tasmanian Educational Act needs to be brought into line with other States and government needs to accept its responsibility to educate all children^{xiii}. Just as important is the quality of the engagement. Many students have 1 hour, ½ day, or 1 day at school per week – keeping up appearances for the department but achieving little for the young person.

The way teachers are trained needs to be radically overhauled including changes to the degree delivered by UTAS. New teachers are not equipped to deal with challenging young people. The department needs to learn from alternative education providers^{xiv} how to service challenging young people. Currently Tasmania has significant expertise and capacity to develop in this space and this should be treated as a priority.

Every young person needs to be engaged in an educational program that produces a valued citizen.

6. The approach of the Police influences the number of young people offending – currently they tend to contribute to the problem by their tough on crime approach. More must be done to change attitudes, build skills, and improve interactions. A 31-week police training program covering a wide range of essential skills is not sufficient to allow time to cover all the skills need to effectively engage with challenging young people. It is opportune for a range of reasons (including the high turnover rate in the force) to review what and how police are trained and to re-build their training program to ensure they gain the skills they need to deal with young people effectively.

The Youth Justice Reform process does not seem to be engaging the Police yet they play a key role in the Youth Justice Act. This hardly seems to be an ‘whole of government approach’. All parties need to be involved in the reform and considerable change to policing need to occur.

7. The State prioritises the implementation of young offenders’ diversion programs in Tasmania. There is an urgent need for an engagement and diversion program like Youth Insearch^{xv}. This 40-year-old proven Australian program, which once ran in Tasmania, is expanding nationally with significant federal assistance. Supporting the re-establishment of Youth Insearch (or something like it) in conjunction with other youth services will lead to higher levels of successful diversions and significant increases in re-engagement in school and other desirable activities. This will also benefit a larger number of at-risk young people and those under achieving. This program also has a significant impact on the success of other youth organisations and their outcomes as well as getting young people back into education. Youth Insearch can be established quickly and at a fraction of the cost of incarceration.

8. The proposed Bail Centres should be abandoned. Many young people who are offending are also homeless and have interactions with Supported Accommodation services. Many young people on bail end up in Youth Shelters. The Youth Justice Blueprint rightly points out that the bail system ideally should NOT be an entry point to the system. So rather than build new youth justice specific bail facilities that are part of the system (where you can be incarcerated) it would be better to fund selected Youth Shelters to provide bail support services. This service could be further enhanced by placing youth justice workers to encourage engagement and discourage negative behaviours. By providing diversion services to plan and commence alternative strategies incarceration can be avoided. A further positive step would be to fund these select shelters to provide medium term accommodation facilities for young people exiting incarceration as a transition service back to society. This is a far cheaper alternative to create and operate than specialised bail only centres - that foreseeably could be empty from time to time.
9. The proposed two-tier support and detention facilities model and location of these services needs to be abandoned. This is recommended for various reasons including:
 - There is clear evidence that location plays a key role in re-integration – so we need to service the State effectively. No services in the NW and only one southern detention centre does not seem to achieve this.
 - Properly caring for a young person who has been placed into custodial care by the State means having the maximum range of service options to allow you to devise and deliver whatever intervention program that is going to work best for that child. Over the course of a period of custodial care these services will change as the plan progresses (or digresses as can happen). The desirable facility must be able to respond to a wide variety of situations and needs. Everything from an isolated secure environment to one where the young person lives semi independently and come and go as they need.
 - Tassie's numbers are small. Having a single facility model allows staff expertise to be applied across all the young offender's cohort and throughout their transition. This should be more appealing to workers, better for young people, less expensive, and more productive.
10. If community alternatives to secure care cannot be developed and some form of custodial care is needed then it is recommended that **youth justice custodial care hubs** be developed. These hubs locate in the one site the full range of Youth Justice services – from having your Youth Justice Officer on site and living independently to secure custodial care.

To cover the State and remain as local as possible there needs to be three regional centres as a large part of the service and the model is likely to involve re-integration into their local communities.

Further it is recommended that these hubs be built co-located, if possible, on Senior Secondary College sites in the North, North West, and South. This allows access to college facilities (mostly after hours) and a stronger connection to education. The new department needs to re-integrate these young people not hid them away.

A Youth Justice Hub would include:

- day-access services and access to youth justice staff – the hubs become the home bases of Youth Justice
- low security risk custodial care and development facilities
- high security risk custodial care facilities
- transitional exit service facilities and services

The Hubs do not all need to be the same with each having specialised roles if required. Young people could be moved between facilities if deemed advantageous or a better option than remaining in his/her location.

Hubs allow staff to keep contact and work with a young person over their journey through the Youth Justice system, making it a much more rewarding job and allowing more flexibility in deployment. Three operationally identical Hubs allows staff to work easily between regional hubs if needed. Specialist staff can work across all three more efficiently. This also means if all the work is in day-access and transitional services then staff who would have been stuck in an empty detention centre can be deployed to other duties till needed in secure care.

Co-locating services allows for greater transparency and a greater likelihood of service maturation as no-one is hidden away, and each is more accountable to the other.

11. The State abandon any notion of contracting youth detention services to the private sector.
12. The State introduce secure foster care facilities across the state to accommodate at-risk young people aged 10 to 13 who have or are offending or just a danger to themselves. Such a service is more highly supported and resourced and is able to keep a young person securely safe^{xvi}. The only facility we can current contain a young person is the AYDC.

In Conclusion

It is hoped that this paper informs and encourages fellow Tasmania's to take an active interest in these reforms and results in a much improved system.

Tasmania has a real chance of breaking the back of youth offending and more importantly assisting offender-risk young people not just to avoid a life of crime but to become valued citizens.

The current reform process is not got off to a good start. What seems to be lacking is a clear, agreed, whole of government and community therapeutic approach and a strong commitment to not lockup our children.

John Jessop

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Authors background

I have numerous qualifications including BSc. and Grad Dip of Management and extensive experience from working with young people in a wide range of situations. Regularly recognised for high achieving and successful program delivery with young people.

The table below details my background.

job	detail	outcomes
Process Worker	Food – large to small processing. Timber products – small runs	Achieved targets
Sales Person	Food, marine, wholesale, retail, services, training, charities	Achieve targets
Youth Worker	Since 1975. Numerous settings – community, church, NFP, government. Street, Centres, Crisis, D&A, Mental Health, Residential, Detention, Alternative Education, Training, Employment	Youth Insearch Ashley – changed approach Breaking the Cycle – 60 jobs TOOL – good outcomes
SAAP Worker	35 family network, refuge, 2 flats – intake, placement, support	Aver 11 young people & 14 wks care
Shelter Worker	Crisis, medium term, President DYAS	Well run shelters
Site Manager	Various drop-ins, employment centres, youth centres	Well run sites
Residential Officer	Detention Centre Young Offenders – 12 to 18 male and female	All aspects, good results
Child Welfare Officer	Support Team – wards and foster parents	Secondment
Assist Superintendent	2IC, Program Management. Lead to new role at Ashely Home	All went well
Wood Worker	Wood Turner, Toy Maker (commercial), cabinetry	Introduced new products
Joinery Manager	Small scale interiors, furniture, craft – training focus	Ran 2 years
Construction Worker	A competent carpenter have built numerous things and worked on residential and commercial construction sites. Competent plumbing, electrical, painting, glazing, roofing, carpentry, concreting (simple)	Three residential renovations, 9 Training centres. Currently dong 4 strata development
Employment Consultant	Every role and type of approach and all types of job seekers. Delivered most programs since early 1980's	Still working in employment & training
RTO management	At all levels and in all systems. Designed RTO Man Sys	Ran four successful RTOs
Vocational Trainer	Numerous: Construction, Woodwork, Plastering, Craft, Painting, Sales, Welfare work, Counselling, administration	Still training
Work Skills Trainer	Work Skills, JST, Personal Development, Men's Stuff, Communication	Still training
Job Creation	Many workforce projects across many sectors. Helped created Enterprise Centres. President TLEIN, Beacon CEO. Worked across 13 training packages and signed over 3000 apprentices	Ongoing – recent Tas AOD and Aboriginal Employment
General Manager/CEO	All aspects – planning, financial, administration, leadership, HR, operational management, sales, staff development	15 years' experience, good growth and structured outcomes
Facilitator	Small to large projects and groups - \$1.8M ShowSkills to Nursing Mothers. Some ran over a year others 1.5 hours. All types	Groups from 3 to 300
Consultant	Wide range – government, private, NFP, community jobs ranging from waste management to youth work	12 years' experience All jobs completed

Footnotes

- ⁱ Egyptian tablets 2000 BC lament the public vandalism and misbehaviour of young people. Our societal challenges with this developmental period in a person's life are not new.
- ⁱⁱ This sounds like 'overreach' and is hard to prove as little data and no records from this time exist today. I and a number of co-workers worked in the system over these years and before and beyond this period. During this period Ashley Home was regularly visited by world leading experts in youth justice systems (often staying for an extended time as they were delivering a training program) and other contractors who had also had worked in other state's systems. Repeatedly we were told that what we were doing in Tasmanian was best practices and therapeutic. A common observation from these visitors to Ashley was that it did not function as a youth prison and the young people were 'happy' and felt safe and cared for.
- ⁱⁱⁱ The decision to treat a teenager as an adult was made prior to the level of understanding we have today about the affects of trauma and the fact that the brain takes much longer to mature. The male brain taking on average till age 25 to be considered fully developed. If we had this knowledge back then, we might have ended up with a very different Youth Justice Act.
- ^{iv} A child could be processed either through the Child Welfare system of orders or charged under the Criminal Code as an adult offender. Criminal charges were reserved for serious offences – rape, murder. A child as young as 10 could be charged under the criminal code. Most children under 16 charged under the criminal code would still be placed into the care of director of welfare and would likely end up in Ashley Home.
- ^v Special Contract Care was short to medium term fostering of young people with challenging behaviours including offending. The Carers were trained to a more advanced level and both Carers were paid. Like the "new" PPI program now being implemented in NSW.
- ^{vi} <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-welfare/youth-justice>
- ^{vii} <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/jan/25/australians-urged-to-ditch-tough-on-mindset-for-youth-justice-as-it-does-not-work#:~:text=On%20Tuesday%2C%20the%20Courier%2DMail,56.8%25%20reoffended%20within%20a%20year.>
- ^{viii} The TOOLUP program ran on the Eastern Shore of Hobart from 2009 to 2015. It was contracted by DoE to provide an engagement, intervention, and educational service to young people in Years 8 to 10 who were not going to school. It helped about 200 students a year complete a 10-week program and to gain a Cert I in Work Preparation. At that time DoE reported to us that 17% of high school students were not at school at any given time and 80% of these never. The number of children missing their end of high school education maybe as high as 25% and a major contributor to ongoing poverty, ill-health, crime, homelessness, and despair.
- ^{ix} A Systematic Review of the Juvenile Justice Intervention Literature: What It Can (and Cannot) Tell Us About What Works With Delinquent Youth Michelle Evans-Chase Crime & Delinquency 2012 The Future of Youth Justice: A Community Based Alternative to the Youth Prison Model McCarthy, Patrick; Schiraldi, Vincent N.; Shark, Miriam Columbia University 2016
- ^x Keeping Kids Safe DECYP 2022
- ^{xi} The current plan to improve AYDC has a high focus on 'threat' and 'risk' and next to no focus on 'care' and 'development'. The current approach seems (and this is also reflected in the design of the new facilities) to be if we keep them all in their own little area (called quaintly 'units' as opposed to a 'cell') and watch everything they do then the place will be safe. This seems to lead to more time alone in a room – up to 20 hrs a day. Engaging, developing, diverting a young offender is risky business. Our focus should be 'what do we need to develop in this young person' not how do we best lock them up.
- ^{xii} Custodial Care Centres as a name to replace the use of detention centre was proposed by Noetic in their report to the State about Youth Justice options in 2016. This terminology is closer to what is needed and better than using detention.
- ^{xiii} The Tasmanian Act does not require the State to educate a child, so if you are excluded well tough luck. Students are excluded in a number of ways – rarely are they openly expelled.
- ^{xiv} Such as the Indie Schools and the Flexible Learning Centers
- ^{xv} www.youthinsearch.org.au
- ^{xvi} Under the current plans there appears NO service for under 13-year-olds. None of the three new Youth Justice facilities will take children under 13 years old. So where does the 11-year-old murder go? Risdon Prison – unfortunately most likely. There are regular cases of children as young as 8 in residential or foster care escaping this care to cause harm to themselves and others and we have no way of 'keeping them in'. A Secure Foster Care service needs to be implemented sooner than later.