



Submission to
***The value of a justice reinvestment
approach to criminal justice
in Australia***

March 2013

Contact for this submission:

Martin Thomas

General Manager, Social Advocacy and Public Affairs

Mission Australia

Mission Australia is a national, not for profit organisation that has been transforming the lives of Australians in need for more than 150 years. Our vision is to see a fairer Australia by enabling people in need to find pathways to a better life. The breadth and diversity of our programs reflects that vision – from early learning and youth services, extensive family support and homelessness initiatives, employment and skills development, to the provision of affordable housing.

In 2011-12 our 326 Community Services (including our Early Learning Services) assisted 110,389 individuals and 5,732 families. MA Housing grew its housing management portfolio in that year to 1,418 dwellings, substantially increasing the number of people we have been able to support into stable accommodation. Our Employment Solutions division, one of Australia's largest not-for-profit providers of government-funded employment services, offered ten programs that helped 165,000 individuals and assisted 15,850 people move into sustainable employment¹.

Part of our service delivery involves working with a diverse range of young people across Australia in a variety of settings and we deliver a range of programs that are purposely designed for young people. In 2011-12, our 78 youth services helped 15,109 individuals and supported 164 families². We also assisted a significant number of young people through our homeless, employment and training services. The holistic nature of our work is reflected in our *Outcomes Hierarchy for Pathways through a Successful Youth*³.

Our criminal justice experience

Much of Mission Australia's experience in the criminal justice sector has, to date, focused on the delivery of preventative, early intervention and post-release services for young people⁴. Our general approach to working with young people who have come to that attention of the criminal justice system is to work with the person, their families and on some occasions their peers. When working with young people we work across all the life domains (education, health, daily living, personal and social skills) given their offending behaviour is almost invariably associated with poor outcomes in one or more of these areas.

Mission Australia has also periodically conducted evaluations of our programs targeted at young people in contact with the justice system to determine their efficacy in improving the lives of young people and in reducing rates of recidivism. We will release a further report on our Tasmanian diversionary program, *U-Turn*, later this year. *U-Turn* is a diversionary program for young people who are at risk of being, or have been involved in vehicle theft. The program includes a 10-week car maintenance and body work course with restored cars presented to victims of auto theft and worked with 80 students in 2011-12. Up to two years of post-course support is also offered in the form of case management which supports the young people after their completion of the course.

We also offer a limited number of pre- and post-release support programs to adult offenders and accommodate many individuals who have recently been released from custody in our homelessness

¹ Mission Australia (2012) *Annual Report 2012*. Mission Australia: Sydney.

² *Ibid*

³ Available from <http://www.missionaustralia.com.au/document-downloads/category/4-annual-report-2009#>

⁴ An overview of some of these services is provided at Appendix One.

services – including a program to address homelessness among women recently released from prison. It is our intention to extend our service profile to include more work with individuals who are or have been involved in the criminal justice sector because of the level of disadvantage suffered by this group and their over-representation amongst those who are homeless, for example.

Our response

Mission Australia believes diversionary programs that detect and address signs of ‘problem behaviour’ and help people (particularly young people) to negotiate challenges in their life before they offend are a far better alternative than detention. Most evidence suggests that this is much more effective way to reduce crime and hence increase community safety, and it also far more efficient. To capture our views we have developed a policy position statement on youth justice that calls for justice reinvestment to be adopted into policy in Australia⁵. We believe that justice reinvestment could provide an overarching framework for a more comprehensive approach than would be possible through individual programs alone.

We are also members of the working group for the *Justice Reinvestment for Aboriginal Young People Campaign* which advocates for the need to address the over-representation of Aboriginal young people in custody in NSW⁶. We therefore welcome the opportunity to contribute to the *Inquiry into the value of a justice reinvestment approach to criminal justice in Australia*. It is a combination of our direct service experience and our research that informs our response to specific elements of the inquiry.

Our response to specific aspects of the Inquiry

In our view there are a number of areas raised by the Inquiry that are well understood by both academics and those working in the community and justice sectors – as these groups are better placed to address these issues we will not attempt to do so.

The drivers behind the past 30 years of growth in the imprisonment rate, while complex, show clear links between changes to sentencing, bail, and crime legislation as well as changes in social supports, such as the de-institutionalisation of mental health services. Data collected by organisations including: the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare; the Australian Institute of Criminology; various state based crime statistics organisations; and also from jurisdictions own justice departments; demonstrates quite unequivocally the over-representation of vulnerable groups. These include Aboriginal Australians, people from some culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities, those with cognitive disabilities and/or mental health problems and people with a history of physical and sexual abuse.

The significantly higher costs of imprisonment, particularly in comparison to other community based programs, are also well known because the bulk of these services come from government and costs are reported through the normal budget processes.

⁵ This statement is provided for your information at Appendix Two.

⁶ More information about the campaign is available at <http://justicereinvestmentnow.net.au/>

There are others, including the *Justice Reinvestment for Aboriginal Young People Campaign*, who will more effectively report on the wealth of evidence available about the implementation and effectiveness of justice reinvestment in other countries, including the USA; we have therefore only used information on overseas programs in relation to other elements of the inquiry as presented below.

(d) The cost, availability and effectiveness of alternatives to imprisonment, including prevention, early intervention, diversionary and rehabilitation measures;

Mission Australia provides a number of services across the spectrum of prevention to rehabilitation however the coverage of these programs in different states is patchy. Also as programs are often dependent on the justice policy of the jurisdiction they are frequently funded for a period but then suffer from subsequent changes in policy.

The *U-turn* program in Tasmania (mentioned earlier) is a case in point. While it has demonstrated success over a number of years and has the support of the Tasmanian police, it is currently under a funding cloud as the Tasmanian government has indicated it will not be in a position to pay for the program beyond September this year.

Similarly, whilst the NSW government has recently announced it will invest in additional early intervention services through the *Youth on Track* and other programs, other state governments have expressed a desire for 'scared straight' style programs despite these programs being contrary to available evidence on effective service models. Effective models do exist.

Mission Australia was at the forefront of developing the *Pathways to Prevention* program, a universal early intervention, crime prevention program working with children aged 0-12 years and their families. The program works to improve family, children and schools family relationships, to reduce crime in the area and to improve life choices for individuals by establishing healthy and respectful relationships between children, their careers, peers and their schools⁷. The program was a forerunner to the successful Commonwealth-funded *Communities for Children* services and has been assessed and evaluated in conjunction with Griffith University.

We also currently operate the philanthropically funded *Youth Crime Prevention Program* in South Western Sydney. The program provides crime intervention/prevention strategies and welfare services to at risk youth and their families. It also provides educational, training and employment opportunities, whilst promoting pro-social behaviours within the community to young people aged between 10 and 18 years at risk of developing further criminal behaviours. Further, the program supports family members of referred individuals by providing remediation work between the young person and their parents/guardians.

⁷ More information about the program is available from <http://www.griffith.edu.au/criminology-law/key-centre-ethics-law-justice-governance/research/prevention-developmental-pathways/the-pathways-to-prevention-project> and <http://www.missionaustralia.com.au/component/content/article/99-ma-community-services/community-services-listing/588-pathways-to-prevention-qld>

Similarly, *Triple Care Farm* is an internationally recognised rehabilitation program located in the Southern Highlands of New South Wales. The program provides holistic residential rehabilitation and treatment program for a period of 12 weeks and continuing aftercare support for a further 6 months. Young people are referred from a range of sources including juvenile justice, probation and parole. We also provide diversionary programs, youth drug and alcohol programs, pre and post release support including employment skilling programs.

It is important to note that the services themselves do not represent a justice reinvestment framework. However, depending on the needs of an individual community, any one of these programs could form part of the response that underpins the community's 'reinvestment'.

(e) The methodology and objectives of justice reinvestment;

Justice reinvestment represents an opportunity to provide more meaningful and effective interventions through the redirection of money that would previously have been spent on detention. This money is spent on programs and services that enhance the ability of community, educational and employment sectors to build the capacity of key people and organisations in young people's lives, including families, peers, educational institutions, as well as social, recreational and cultural associations. In doing so, key people and organisations are better able to identify the various stages and dimensions of social disengagement among young people and take preventative action. It also provides a framework that promotes justice, human services and other agencies to work together towards the same goal.

The rationale for justice reinvestment is that diverting human and financial resources to disadvantaged communities and vulnerable people to address the underlying causes of crime will produce better value for money⁸ and long term economic benefits. This is partly because diversion is more effective in reducing recidivism, which in turn reduces the cost to the community through reduced incarceration costs, reduced damage to property, reduced health care costs, and hopefully increased taxes as these young people move into the workforce. Consequently justice reinvestment can both increase community safety at the same time as decreasing the costs to government associated with incarcerating people. Mission Australia therefore sees justice reinvestment as an approach that could reduce incarceration rates generally but reduce the imprisonment rates of young people in particular, including those who are over-represented in the criminal justice system⁹. We would therefore recommend increased investment in evidence-based diversionary programs that have vastly superior cost effectiveness and proven outcomes compared to incarceration.

Mission Australia believes justice reinvestment should include leveraging and expanding locally-based community programs that recognise the non-linear path to desistance and focus on a broader range of outcomes related to the underlying causes of social disengagement, including structural factors, rather than just short-term recidivism outcomes. This view sits favourably with the principle that justice reinvestment seeks to identify communities with high levels of crime and to develop

⁸ McClelland R (2011) *Vigilance against injustice in the justice system*. 25th Lionel Murphy Lecture, Australian National University, 7 September 2011, Canberra.

⁹ Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner (2010) *Social Justice Report 2009*. Australian Human Rights Commission: Canberra. http://www.humanrights.gov.au/social_justice/sj_report/sjreport09/pdf/sjr_2009_web.pdf

programs and services in partnership with those communities to support people at risk of involvement with the criminal justice system.

Based on the models of justice reinvestment implemented overseas, it appears that justice investment involves the following five steps:

Step 1 – Collect and analyse criminal justice data

Collection and analysis of criminal justice data is essential to the implement of justice reinvestment. The data is used to identify areas of need, calculate the associated criminal justice costs of that community/area and identify where savings can be made. In the USA, 'states and localities engaging in justice reinvestment collect and analyse data on drivers of criminal justice populations and costs, identify and implement changes to increase efficiencies, and measure both the fiscal and public safety impacts of those changes¹⁰.

Step 2 – Identify cost saving public safety strategies

The data collected and analysed in Step 1 is usually derived from the six points in the criminal justice process in which agencies, policies, practices, and individual actors influence the local corrections population. These are arrest, pre-trial, case processing, sentencing, discharge, and community supervision. Data should be used to identify costs and savings across multiple agencies so key stakeholders must agree where resources will be reinvested and must agree upfront how savings will be tracked, what portion of the savings will be reinvested and where. There is some suggestion that communities may have their own additional data sources as well that could be useful to add to the broader suite of outcomes that are achievable through this approach.

Understanding where resources should be reinvested is the final component of local justice reinvestment. Resources should be reinvested in the community and the criminal justice system in a manner that improves the quality and quantity of services and resources where individuals involved in the local criminal justice system reside. This investment can have a direct impact on public safety, improving outcomes for individuals involved in the criminal justice system, as well as those at risk of becoming involved¹¹.

This requires a place-based approach which is a genuine partnership between government and the community, based on consultation with community at all stages of the development of any justice reinvestment approach. According to the Australian Social Inclusion Board place or location-based initiatives¹² should be based on five key elements:

1. A clear connection between economic and social strategies;
2. A framework for providing integration of effort across governments;
3. A level of devolution that allows significant and meaningful local involvement in determining the issues and solutions;
4. Capacity development at both local level and in government, without which greater community engagement or devolution of responsibility will be impossible; and

¹⁰ More detail is available at the Bureau of Justice Assistance https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program_ID=92

¹¹ Lachman, P. & Neusteter, S. (2012) *Tracking Costs and Savings through Justice Reinvestment*. Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center. <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412541-Tracking-Costs-and-Savings-through-Justice-Reinvestment.pdf>

¹² The Australian Social Inclusion Board suggest these initiatives are in the scale of 5000 people or less although acknowledge that location-based initiatives can focus on a much larger range of population sizes.

5. Funding, measurement and accountability mechanisms that are designed to support the long term, whole of government and community aims for the initiative, rather than attempting to build an initiative around unsuitable measurement and accountability¹³.

Given one of the objectives of justice reinvestment is to reduce costs in the longer term then it is indicated that any commitment must be made in such a way that it enables costs and potential savings to be quantified. The costs and savings should include both the costs of imprisonment and the broader costs of contact with the criminal justice system - including police, courts, and victims' services. Where net savings cannot be identified then it is argued that justice reinvestment should not occur¹⁴.

Step 3 – Implement cost saving public safety strategies

Once strategies are agreed it is obviously important to verify that the strategies and any accompanying policies are implemented effectively. In the USA, jurisdictions are able to receive “targeted technical assistance and are eligible for seed funding to support the implementation of justice reinvestment strategies including the implementation of new programs or policies, translating the new policies into practice, and ensuring related programs and system investments achieve projected outcomes”. The assistance they receive includes “developing implementation plans with state and local officials and keeping policymakers apprised through frequent progress reports, and testimony to relevant legislative committees”¹⁵. (See step 5 below for more detail about the role of centralised agencies).

Step 4 – Document savings and public safety impact

As justice reinvestment aims to reduce costs in the longer term and improve community safety it is necessary to assess the impact of the strategies and measures adopted throughout the local justice reinvestment process. This involves the ongoing evaluation of the interventions as well as continuous collection and analysis of the relevant data – usually agreed at the outset of the initiative/s. Experience from the USA indicates that the continuous monitoring better enables the implementation group (including local contacts and any centralised body – see below) to adapt to any demographic changes that occur in the criminal justice population as well as any structural changes within the criminal justice system¹⁶.

Step 5 – Implement and evaluate justice reinvestment strategies

Justice reinvestment requires a range of communication and decision-making process, as well as methods to encourage and enable collaboration among stakeholders, to be established before it can be initiated. Logistically, this means that justice reinvestment planning requires a collaborative entity to make operational decisions about the strategies adopted, updating associated criminal justice

¹³ Australian Social Inclusion Board (2011) *Governance Models for Location Based Initiatives*. Australian Social Inclusion Board: Canberra. Available online at

<http://www.socialinclusion.gov.au/sites/www.socialinclusion.gov.au/files/publications/pdf/governance-models-for-locations.pdf>

¹⁴ La Vigne, N; Neusteter, R; Lachman, P; Dwyer, A. & Nadeau, CA. (2010) *Justice Reinvestment at the Local Level: Planning and Implementation Guide*. Urban Institute Justice Policy Center. <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412233-Justice-Reinvestment.pdf>

¹⁵ Such assistance is offered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance Justice Reinvestment Initiative – more details are available at https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program_ID=92

¹⁶ La Vigne et al (2010)

planning policies, and preparing agency budgets based on data¹⁷.

Given how critical the implementation and evaluation of justice reinvestment is to the success of the justice reinvestment initiatives it has been suggested that the function is best undertaken by an independent, centralised agency or body. In the USA and elsewhere strategic planning entities¹⁸ have been established that are responsible for designating authority and responsibility to make data driven decisions regarding the criminal justice system for a jurisdiction. The entity is responsible for determining what they want the vision for the local criminal justice system to be and also what adaptations may be required to the system. They are also responsible for implementing the chosen targeted interventions, setting the outcomes measures and benchmarks, and monitor the outcomes associated with the adoption of the justice reinvestment approach¹⁹.

(f) The benefits of, and challenges to, implementing a justice reinvestment approach in Australia;

Although we have increased the expenditure on imprisonment over time, there has been a limited impact on crime rates or recidivism and consequently no improvement in community safety. On this basis there are questions being raised about whether imprisonment is good value for money in Australia. The main benefits to implementing a justice reinvestment approach in Australia therefore are those that have already been highlighted – primarily a reduction in costs associated with the criminal justice system, reduction in crime and an increase in community safety.

Of equal importance in our view, albeit not the primary reason justice reinvestment has been adopted elsewhere, is that justice reinvestment provides a practical, meaningful and effective way to address the extreme yet increasing over-representation of Aboriginal Australians in custody, particularly young Aboriginal Australians.

Also important are the significantly improved longer-term outcomes for individuals who have benefited from the justice reinvestment approach by being diverted from initial or ongoing involvement in crime. These outcomes would include improved employment prospects, maintenance of social connections, increased housing stability and a reduction in the crime-producing effect that prison can have given all of these indicators are adversely affected by incarceration. These benefits can also extend to the victims of crime also given one of the strengths of justice reinvestment is the ability to divert funding to victim support services²⁰.

Justice reinvestment can also significantly improve the outcomes for communities, particularly Aboriginal communities, by preventing the entire communities being weakened by reducing the number and frequency at which people are taken out of their communities through imprisonment. Enabling the communities to focus on community wide crime prevention strategies to try and minimise imprisonment can also increase community confidence and lead to improved governance. This becomes increasingly beneficial to communities as the crime

¹⁷ Cushman, R. (2002). *Guidelines for Developing a Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee*. National Institute of Corrections: Washington, D.C.

¹⁸ These entities are known as by many names - for example strategic planning boards, criminal justice advisory boards, community justice councils, and public safety coordinating councils.

¹⁹ La Vigne *et al* (2010)

²⁰ Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner (2010)

prevention initiatives decrease imprisonment and the community engagement strengthens the community thereby reducing the preconditions for crime²¹.

One of the challenges in developing a justice reinvestment framework in Australia is the smaller and more geographically dispersed population we have in comparison to overseas jurisdictions. Many of the areas that would perhaps benefit most from adopting a justice reinvestment approach to address their local issues are also those areas not well resourced by services given their location. Ensuring equitable access to services and other support to those communities who did decide to adopt justice reinvestment would therefore represent a significant challenge but one that could and should be overcome.

Justice reinvestment is also a relatively new concept in an Australian policy context and has not yet been implemented anywhere. While there may be confusion as to what justice reinvestment entails, there may also be reluctance to be the first to implement a justice reinvestment approach. New initiatives such as *Youth on Track*, *Opportunity Hubs* and *Connected Communities* which have recently announced by Government represent a good means by which to generate discussion on the topic. We would be concerned however if these projects were portrayed as justice reinvestment initiatives as justice reinvestment is not simply the provision of early intervention, diversion or case management initiatives; nor is it a short-term, top-down or one size fits all approach. Justice reinvestment also requires a whole of government approach to ensure agencies are working towards the same goal rather than the responsibility of a single government department.

The newness of the concept within an Australian context may also create resistance in communities who may see it as yet another government intervention. Ensuring that communities are the driving force behind any justice reinvestment approach in their area, as well as their ongoing inclusion in the adoption, implementation and evaluation of the initiatives adopted, is therefore not only necessary as part of the process but also as a means to develop mutual understanding, trust between community and agencies plus a shared commitment to the goals set.

(g) The collection, availability and sharing of data necessary to implement a justice reinvestment approach

Theoretically there should be sufficient data available to enable a justice reinvestment approach to be implemented wherever it is wanted and warranted. Our own research, as well as our experience as a member of the working group for the *Justice Reinvestment for Aboriginal Young People Campaign* however has shown us that, even where data does exist, it can be difficult to access. Further there are differences in the way data is captured making comparisons and analysis complex. For example there are differences in the data available for youth and adult detention populations.

None of these complexities should preclude an adoption of justice reinvestment approach however. As the first step required to implement a model of justice reinvestment is that of collecting and analysing criminal justice data, this presents an ideal opportunity to fully disclose and examine all local data sources. Decisions can then be made about the frequency with which this data needs to

²¹ Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner (2010)

be collected and analysed as part of the implementation and evaluation phases as well. (See the next section for more information about a potential role for the federal government in relation to data).

(i) The scope for federal government action which would encourage the adoption of justice reinvestment policies by state and territory governments

While responsibility for much of the relevant service delivery, policing, and data collection clearly rests with individual states and territories, there is significant scope for action by the federal government. This includes the Commonwealth supporting consistent data collection, or aggregation of consistent data from state agencies, as a means to provide a national framework for justice reinvestment at a scale beyond that possible by any single jurisdiction. This function could extend beyond criminal justice data and criminal activity in particularly locations, to program outcomes; a function that could be supported by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, for example. The federal government could also commit to making its own data available from any Commonwealth agencies that align with justice reinvestment initiatives.

As the Commonwealth already has responsibility for delivering certain services directly to communities, there is scope to expand these in line with the recommendations of *Doing Time, Time for Doing*²². These services could also be linked or incorporated within a justice reinvestment framework. It will be particularly important that in any community adopting a justice reinvestment approach that both Commonwealth and state funded services are captured within the framework.

Equally, the Commonwealth could consider supporting the financial modelling required for states and territories to implement a justice reinvestment framework. This could be done by providing some form of 'vanilla' financial modelling product that could be adopted for state or territory needs, while also providing a consistent platform to compare performance across different jurisdictions. This funding could also extend to co-funding a demonstration site.

The significant over-representation of Aboriginal Australians within the justice system also provides a logical point of involvement for the federal government. This is consistent with a number of the recommendations in *Doing Time - Time for Doing* as well as the social inclusion agenda. The Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner has stated that "In effect, justice reinvestment could become a very powerful tool for ensuring that Indigenous Australians are socially included. It meets the concerns of policy makers 'mindful of the costs and benefits and evidence of returns for investment', the need for holistic early intervention and evidence based policy" (p5)²³.

Justice reinvestment also provides the federal government with an opportunity to seek to close the gap in imprisonment rates through the inclusion of targets for reductions in Aboriginal incarceration rates in its *Closing the Gap* strategy. Something suggested by the Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner in the 2009 Social Justice Report. This would provide an avenue to drive

²² House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs (2011) *Doing Time - Time for Doing: Indigenous youth in the criminal justice system*. Commonwealth of Australia: Canberra.

²³ Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner (2010)

a national framework through the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), establish data collection mechanisms and evaluations, and monitor progress towards the targets. Any commitment at the COAG level would also ensure that there was cooperation across all levels of government and all departments; substantially reshaping how we deal with over-representation. There is a risk that this approach could override the local, tailored placed based responses that are essential to an effective justice reinvestment model. The *National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness*, for example, has however fostered regional planning mechanisms, so the two processes need not be contradictory.

Justice reinvestment could also realistically be built into the *Safer Communities* building block. Again this would provide an opportunity to create a COAG partnership agreement to fund programs to support a justice reinvestment framework. Although clearly not perfect, the partnership agreements provide a useful template for allocation of resources to programs implemented by the states within a national framework.

Supporting *Closing the Gap* is the *National Indigenous Law and Justice Framework*²⁴ which aims to eliminate Indigenous disadvantage in law and justice by providing a national approach to addressing interactions between Aboriginal Australians and the justice systems in Australia. This too could be a mechanism for the federal government action as the framework is intended to support *Closing the Gap* in relation to community safety. It is considered the framework will be instrumental in achieving COAG objectives so could provide a suitable mechanism by which to incorporate justice reinvestment into policy.

(j) Any other related matters

The *Social Justice Report 2009* included a chapter specifically dedicated to the issue of justice reinvestment²⁵. That chapter contained a number of recommendations specific to justice reinvestment that we would like to reiterate here given they remain as relevant as they were in 2009.

Recommendation 1: That the Australian Government, through COAG, set criminal justice targets that are integrated into the Closing the Gap agenda.

Recommendation 2: That the Standing Committee of Attorneys General *Working Party* identify justice reinvestment as a priority issue under the National Indigenous Law and Justice Framework, with the aim of conducting pilot projects in targeted communities in the short term.

Recommendation 3: That the Australian Social Inclusion Board, supported by the Social Inclusion Unit, add justice reinvestment as a key strategy in the social inclusion agenda.

Recommendation 4: That all state and territory governments consider justice reinvestment in tandem with their plans to build new prisons. That a percentage of funding that is targeted to prison beds be diverted to trial communities where there are high rates of Indigenous offenders.

²⁴ Standing Committee of Attorneys-General Working Group on Indigenous Justice (2010) *National Indigenous Law and Justice Framework 2009-2015*. Standing Committee of Attorneys-General: Canberra.

²⁵ See *Chapter 2 - Justice reinvestment – a new solution to the problem of Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system* in Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner (2010).

Appendix One: Additional youth justice-related programs offered by Mission Australia 2011-12

- **Youth Beat** – various locations

Youth Beat provides street present support and referral for at risk young people to keep them safe. The service provides youth workers, information, activities, referral, presence at local events, but the most important aspect of the work is the incidental contact that is made with the many young people out and about, as this service runs out of the normal 9-5 working hours.

- **On -TRACK** - various locations

The On-TRACK program provides a preventative and brief intervention service as an alternative to police custody for vulnerable young people in crisis. It includes assessment, referral and harm minimisation/prevention strategies.

- **Richmond Respect Project** – Victoria

This service aims to engage young males on and around the Richmond public housing estate who are at risk of becoming involved, or are already involved, in violent and/or anti-social behaviour.

- **Cannabis Intervention Sessions DAYS** – WA

The service provides education and information to young people who are referred as a product of being found in the possession of a small amount of cannabis.

- **Police Drug Diversion Initiative (PDDI)** – various locations

The PDDI is a diversionary program for people apprehended by the police or who attend court with minor substance issues. People referred to the program receive assessment, brief intervention, referral to other services and education/information services.

- **Post Release Support Program (PRSP)** – various locations

A post release support service offered to young people for up to 6 weeks prior to and for 12 to 24 weeks after their release from custody, into the community. The program aims to assist young offenders overcome offending behaviour and reintegrate into their community.

- **Supervised Community Accommodation Service** - Queensland

SCA provides 24hour/7day supervised accommodation in the Townsville community for up to four young males who are exiting detention and are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Young people are provided with tailored case management support to assist them in achieving their personal, developmental and welfare goals. The target age group is 16-18 years; with the service also able to accommodate young males aged 12-15 on a short-term basis, while reconnecting them with family or kin. A young person may reside in the SCA house for up to 6 months.

Appendix Two: Mission Australia's Youth Justice Policy Statement 2013

(provided as separate document)