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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

My Churchill Fellowship to Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Canada investigated these countries’ approaches to preventing and addressing crime committed by young people. Attendance at a European Society of Criminology Conference in Cardiff, Wales at the mid-point of my journey, provided invaluable reflective space to learn, enquire and ponder European and international trends and approaches and contextualise my previous and subsequent experiences.

This Fellowship provided a timely opportunity to identify the critical elements of human service and justice systems that result in other countries having significantly lower youth offending and detention rates than Australia. In doing so, I discovered that Australia is experiencing similar trends and challenges to the rest of the developed world - declining crime rates accompanied by a concentration of offending among a small group of young people with very complex needs.

**Primary crime prevention** was characterised by formalised, coordinated, and in some cases, national crime prevention strategies with a dedicated agency to provide support for crime prevention planning and implementation. In Denmark and Sweden, this support took the form of advice, resources, professional development and research delivered by well-respected crime prevention authorities. In Canada these functions were enhanced by a well-resourced crime prevention research agenda and funding programs to pilot and evaluate new crime prevention approaches.

**Secondary crime prevention** in the form of early intervention initiatives and strategies targeting high risk groups of young people (including gangs) and neighbourhoods were evident in all four countries. These initiatives were characterised by coordinated, multi-agency programs that provide a mix of prosocial activities and evidence-based support and intervention.

**Diversion** activity was evident in all countries, with many different forms of cautioning, mediation and restorative justice. There were some excellent evaluated examples from the province of Ontario, Canada where children and young people are diverted to case management and support instead of the criminal justice system and in Alberta, to an expansive suite of restorative justice programs.

**Tertiary crime prevention/tertiary intervention** programs which target young offenders to prevent them from reoffending were delivered in the community and to a lesser extent in secure or open institutions. Common features were the use of evidence-based assessment tools and programs, small scale custody facilities and relationship-based casework models, supported by quality forensic treatment and high levels of oversight and monitoring of institutions by an independent organisation.

For any country to effectively tackle youth offending, all four response domains are required within an integrated, clearly communicated policy framework. Canada provides a pertinent example of how a long term sustained commitment to full scale reform of the youth justice system can reap significant benefits. The high performing province British Columbia is a useful reference point for Queensland with a similar sized population and economy, significant cultural diversity and Indigenous populations who remain over-represented in the criminal justice system.

Australia and Queensland could benefit from an approach that integrates all domains in an effective and evidence-based way. I conclude with a representation of the key features of a system that, in my view, would enhance community safety and improve life outcomes for troubled young people. Time is of the essence in making these changes. Implementing system wide reform will create capacity to respond to changing community dynamics and the increasing complexity of young offenders, including the emergence of gangs.

Since returning to Australia in November 2017, I have delivered multiple presentations to justice colleagues, participated in a public panel discussion and will soon deliver a seminar at Griffith University. I have connected Australian colleagues with new Canadian colleagues and shared many resources and contacts. I am hopeful that my experiences will continue to inform the development of high quality youth crime prevention and youth justice policy, programs and services, that will position Queensland favourably alongside the best in the world.
RECOMMENDATIONS

AUSTRALIA

1. The Australian Attorney-General’s Department with the National Crime Prevention Council develop, implement and monitor a contemporary, comprehensive national crime prevention strategy.

2. The Australian Government encourages and supports research, continuing to develop the evidence base about what works in Australian crime prevention and responses to crime; with a renewed focus on effective approaches, programs and services, including building the evidence base for Indigenous approaches.

QUEENSLAND

3. The Queensland Government develops a multi-agency policy regarding the prevention of childhood and adolescent crime and responses to youth crime that:
   3.1 Includes a forward plan to raise the age of criminal responsibility from the current age of 10 years to at least 12 years;
   3.2 Emphasises diversion to appropriate support of children and young people (and their families) coming to the early attention of police and the formal criminal justice system;
   3.3 Integrates child protection, non-statutory family support, youth at risk, mental health and youth justice policies at appropriate points;
   3.4 Prioritises alternatives to the use of secure custody, except for the most dangerous young offenders; and
   3.5 Strengthens preventive efforts in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and families and the role of local government in contributing to crime prevention.

4. The new policy is accompanied by strategic and operational plans to guide the direction, ongoing development and implementation of key activities and initiatives and is accompanied by governance, coordination and oversight mechanisms.

5. The Youth Justice Act 1992 is reviewed and amended, to align it with contemporary evidence, to effectively manage young offenders across the continuum of risk, and provide sufficient scope to divert young people from the system or to appropriate support.

6. Consider implementing the following best practice initiatives (with or without an integrated policy):
   6.1 Establish formal partnerships between Police, Education, Social and Health services agencies and local government (or existing partnerships reprioritised) to identify and develop local response to youth crime and anti-social behaviour, and monitor and respond to emerging trends.
   6.2 Implement youth outreach workers (or utilise existing roles) in local communities to engage, monitor and contribute to coordinated responses to emergent youth crime.
   6.3 Develop and implement a state-wide youth diversion program with young people referred based on an evidence-based assessment and local diversion initiatives designed in collaboration with community and agency stakeholders.
   6.4 Continue to expand, develop and resource the use of restorative justice and Indigenous cultural models of justice.
   6.5 Parenting and caring programs are designed and developed for families from diverse cultural backgrounds and those with complex needs whose children are at risk of criminal justice involvement.
6.6 Develop and implement education programs suitable for young people with developmental delays, cognitive disabilities, experiences of trauma and fragmented education histories.

6.7 Intensive supervision and intervention models are developed for high risk young offenders to better respond to their complex criminogenic and social wellbeing needs, including the use of cultural healing and mentoring for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people.

6.8 Develop, trial and evaluate alternative to custody programs that test different care models, including the use of professional foster care and Indigenous approaches.

6.9 Ensure that young people’s mental health needs are identified at the earliest possible opportunity through access to high quality forensic and psychological services.

6.10 Youth justice staff are equipped with the knowledge and skills to manage and respond to mental health issues and challenging behaviour in both community and custodial settings.

7. All youth justice staff have a minimum human services qualification, preferably a degree and this is supplemented by knowledge of child development within a range of cultural contexts, the impact of trauma on children’s behaviour and skills in managing challenging behaviour, de-escalation and motivational and behaviour change techniques.

8. Regional senior youth justice practice experts are appointed as a core part of youth justice staffing to provide supervision, mentoring and coaching to caseworkers and youth workers, to facilitate the delivery of consistent, high quality casework, interventions and behaviour management.

9. Instead of continuing to plan and build large secure institutions for the detention of children and young people, that Queensland:
   9.1 Progressively designs and acquires a range of small scale detention facilities, together with:
   9.2 Contemporary philosophies of care that are culturally safe, trauma informed, age appropriate, and responsive to the mental health and needs and cognitive capacity of children and young people.
   9.3 Comprehensive assessment processes to determine placement within the custody environment, supervision levels and where appropriate, the nature of reintegration activities.
   9.4 Genuine reintegration and normalisation activities occur that allow suitable young people to spend time outside the detention centres for specific activities, family or community events.
   9.5 Reintegration activities and support with young people is facilitated by workers in community based non-government organisations including engaging those workers/organisations in pre-release or reintegration planning.

10. Queensland Government institutes oversight of youth detention centres by an independent body with expertise in children and young people’s wellbeing, legislated powers to investigate complaints and review operational and systemic issues within custody, alternative to custody and residential facilities and integrates community visitor functions into the oversight organisation.

11. Forensic psychiatric and psychological services, including sexual offender services, are made available for all eligible young people in Queensland, modelled on successful features of the British Columbia Youth Forensic Psychiatric Service that has secure, inpatient facilities and several outpatient clinics.

12. Develop a comprehensive research agenda and associated funding that allows Queensland to contribute to the evidence based regarding preventing and reducing offending, including incentives to pilot and evaluate new models and to develop evaluation capacity within Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisations.
INTRODUCTION

TOPIC AND SCOPE OF RESEARCH

‘To study world class strategies to prevent and respond to youth crime: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Sweden and United Kingdom’. As the official title indicates, the focus of my Churchill Fellowship was to investigate innovative ways in which youth crime is addressed in world-leading countries.

I visited countries that have robust legal frameworks and a range of system elements and services that provided a vast array of learning experiences. The United Kingdom component involved attending a European Society of Criminology conference in Wales. This conference provided many opportunities to learn about the research, program and policy initiatives occurring across the world, with the added benefit of developing new networks of people with similar professional interests as myself.

METHODOLOGY

I commenced this project intending to apply the concept of crime prevention to describe primary, secondary and tertiary approaches to activity in each of the countries I visited (Australian Institute of Criminology, 2003). This was more difficult to do in practice, as many programs or approaches were hybrids and targeted a range of young people at different or multiple points of involvement in the justice system. I also utilise the term diversion to describe processes where young people who come to the attention of the criminal justice system are directed away from the system absolutely or are referred to services outside of the criminal justice system.

At the time of applying for the Churchill Fellowship, I contacted lead agencies for youth justice and crime prevention in each country to determine the feasibility of visiting. These contacts provided a significant amount of information, allowing me to refine my overarching research topic and confirm the countries to visit. Prior to leaving Australia, I developed a series of questions regarding policy, program, research and service delivery domains which I forwarded to key contact people in each country. Early feedback from countries such as Canada about its national policy and legislation, allowed me to reorient my visits to focus on a broader range of service delivery sites.

I also researched public material available through online sources. This meant I was able to approach each interview relatively familiar with the context in which youth crime prevention and youth justice services are developed and delivered in each country. There were surprises along the way including the opportunity to meet with people responsible for a street mediation program in Helsinki, visits to two First Nations communities in British Columbia and Alberta, and meeting international criminal justice experts Professor Tapio Lappi-Seppälä (University of Helsinki, Finland) and Professor Bob Hoge (Carleton University, Ottawa).

I also spent two days at a residential home for troubled young people in rural Finland. This experience included sharing meals and informal conversation with young people and supervisory staff in a behaviour management unit; an unforgettable experience. The obvious language difference was not a significant barrier to understanding. Staff were fluent in English, young people had some command of English and I was easily able to ask questions to check my observations of interactions between staff and residents.

Through the course of these engagements, my hosts provided me with an abundance of written and electronic material including policy and research papers, legislation summaries (in English), program manuals, copies of assessment tools, brochures and website information about other related organisations.

Following my return to Australia, I followed up with some organisations for additional information and I am enormously grateful for the comprehensive responses I received.

I sought and gained consent from individuals to use their images in the photographs contained in this report.
RATIONALE FOR SELECTED COUNTRIES

The Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) have an enviable record with respect to low rates of youth offending and youth incarceration. I selected three Nordic countries based on responses to my emails while preparing my Fellowship application. As it eventuated, these countries were a good choice. Norway is often mentioned as a country with high quality innovative responses to youth and adult crime. It also has the benefit of significant financial resources due to its oil exploration industry and sovereign wealth fund. Because of this, investigating Finland, Sweden and Denmark was a more realistic comparison, as these countries have economic conditions on par with Australia.

Canada provided a highly relevant comparison country with many features in common with Australia, a similar history of colonisation, a large geography and relatively small population, similar legal and government systems and Indigenous populations who are over-represented in the criminal justice and welfare systems. Canada has taken great strides to reduce its youth offending, youth supervision and youth custody rates over the past 15 years. The rate of youth incarceration decreased by 40% between 2005-06 and 2015-16 with the greatest decrease occurring in British Columbia (Public Safety Canada, 2017). Along with British Columbia, I selected Alberta and Ontario, as their youth offending and custody rates are among the lowest in Canada.

In terms of relative rankings among Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, Australia fares very well, Queensland in particular (Appendix 2). Notwithstanding these rankings, Australia’s performance with respect to the treatment and outcomes of juvenile and adult offenders has room for improvement. Australia ranks in the mid-range for statistical indicators of imprisonment and recidivism, for example with average daily numbers of young people in youth detention at 3.4 per 10,000 compared to 1.9 per 10,000 in the United Kingdom and Wales in 2015-16 and 5 per 10,000 in Canada (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2017; Department of Justice, 2016).

REPRESENTATIVENESS OF PLACES VISITED

My itinerary purposely included organisations and services located outside of capital cities to obtain a perspective on regional service delivery, as well as visiting central and service delivery agencies in well- resourced capital cities. I was unable to visit remote locations, but issues associated with remote service delivery were discussed and I subsequently contacted people working in more remote parts of Canada.

Regional engagements included crime prevention sites in northern Denmark, two semi-secure residential centres located in rural Finland and Denmark, two First Nations communities in Canada and a District Court and community service providers in a regional town in Sweden.

PLANNED VERSUS EXECUTED PROGRAM

Appendix 1 provides details of 70 engagements in Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Canada, in addition to attending a four-day European Society of Criminology conference in Cardiff, Wales. Only one pre-arranged meeting failed to take place; this was with staff from the Research Division of Public Safety Canada which had been scheduled to occur in Ottawa. I was however later able to catch up on the purpose, operations and research agenda of this organisation when I met with Marion Cook, the Pacific Region Manager of Public Safety Canada in British Columbia. One meeting with Aseman Lapset Ry, a not for profit organisation undertaking youth outreach work and restorative justice interventions in Helsinki, took place on the recommendation of Finnish Ministry of Justice staff.
## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following table summarises key findings that in my assessment represent the optimal features of a preventive and responsive service system in the countries I visited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Early intervention/diversion</th>
<th>Tertiary intervention - community</th>
<th>Tertiary intervention - custody and transition from custody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age of criminal responsibility at least 12 years of age.</td>
<td>Universal family centres that also serve as points of entry into secondary and tertiary systems.</td>
<td>Parenting programs and therapy for at risk families and youth.</td>
<td>Use of evidenced based screening, assessment tools and tools to facilitate good case planning.</td>
<td>Transition/reintegration workers located in community based NGO organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences are proportionate to age, capacity and income.</td>
<td>Crime prevention activities resourced and implemented in line with national strategy.</td>
<td>Diversion programs consistently available across the country (in all states and provinces).</td>
<td>Parenting and family therapy programs available for families/young people with complex needs.</td>
<td>Multiple small custody facilities that accommodate different groups/categories of offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion by Police of children and young people alleged to have committed offences to a diversion program.</td>
<td>Youth outreach work to identify emerging groups and hot spots; engage and work with at risk children, young people and neighbourhoods.</td>
<td>Police are resourced to engage in assessment and diversion.</td>
<td>Forensic child and youth mental health, psychiatric and substance abuse services that are accessible in multiple locations.</td>
<td>Open custody facilities or sections within to facilitate integration/reintegration/low risk young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion by Prosecutors of children and young people charged with offences by way of caution or by referral to a diversion program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum time periods for matters to be finalised in court.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal record erased in relation to diversions and offences after a specified time provided no further offending.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation that allows information exchange by relevant parties for prevention purposes that cannot be used in criminal proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Information about Scotland obtained at European Society of Criminology conference in Cardiff Wales, 13 to 16 September 2017 and literature (Centre for Youth and Criminal Justice, 2017).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Early intervention/diversion</th>
<th>Tertiary intervention - community</th>
<th>Tertiary intervention - custody and transition from custody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police as key partners in activities with at risk child/youth populations.</td>
<td>Judicious use of assessment tools to divert children out OR engage them in interventions to address risks and needs.</td>
<td>Day programs for moderate to high risk young people which include individualised education programs.</td>
<td>Use of assessment tools to determine groupings and placement within or among custody facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local crime prevention teams/networks to plan, coordinate and deliver crime prevention activities; with dedicated staff and expertise.</td>
<td>Police and social service staff co-located to assess, plan and coordinate service delivery to high risk young people and families.</td>
<td>Intensive supervision and intervention for high risk young people with transitional support, including mentoring.</td>
<td>Relationship based philosophy and operations of youth custody facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of child and youth services including those that can effectively engage with marginalised young people.</td>
<td>Referral pathways to support and intervention services are open and accessible to at risk young people and families.</td>
<td>Range of small scale placement options (including professional foster care) for young people who lack suitable family or kinship care.</td>
<td>Three-year degree level qualified staff in custody facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and homelessness services for young people including family reunification, independent living skills, supported housing and independent housing.</td>
<td>Widespread use community and government led restorative justice programs developing in accredited alternative to custody facilities and placements.</td>
<td>Accredited alternative to custody facilities and placements.</td>
<td>Mix of accredited NGO and state operated custody centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use education in schools.</td>
<td>Multiple quality education/school alternatives for at risk youth, young offenders and disengaged children.</td>
<td>Senior staff with high levels of experience provide practice expertise and supervision to youth justice staff in regional areas.</td>
<td>Independent oversight bodies with unfettered access to custody, alternative to custody and placement facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enabling and supporting factors**

- A coherent strategic policy agenda that criminal justice agencies can articulate, understand and align their contributions
- Collaborative relationships between service providers and government and sufficient resourcing to deliver quality services
- Resourcing for research and evaluation that is used to inform program and service system development, with publishing capability.
- Funding for pilot programs of sufficient duration to allow outcomes to be measured and resources to support ongoing implementation

**Key:**

Canada
Denmark
Finland
Sweden
Scotland
Detailed Findings

Social Policy as the Foundation for Crime Prevention

Criminal justice policy is affected by the prevailing social policy environment. The Nordic countries - Finland, Sweden and Denmark (along with Norway, Iceland, Greenland, Faroe Islands and Åland) have a long history of preventative social policy delivering high quality, universal health, education and welfare services, under a model that is often described as the ‘Nordic Welfare State’. These countries share well developed human service systems, high standards of living and relatively low crime rates.

The Nordic model of welfare is distinguished from other types of welfare states by its emphasis on maximizing labour force participation, promoting gender equality and preventing social inequality and social exclusion delivered through income redistribution and sustained by expansionary fiscal policy and private investment (Nordic Cooperation, 2018). Similarities between the countries are maintained by formal cooperative economic agreements, the Nordic Council for inter-parliamentary cooperation, Nordic Council for Ministers and subordinate content specific councils such as the Nordic Welfare Centre.

A pertinent quote that captures the critical link between social policy and crime prevention I credit to Tiina Vogt-Airaksinen in response to an early email where I was seeking her assistance to connect with crime prevention organisations – In Finland we believe that good social policy is the best crime prevention policy!

Members of the public and staff I encountered valued the quality of life they enjoyed, appreciated the standard of their health and education systems and were concerned to ensure that all citizens had access to these fundamental services. While my Fellowship did not seek nor could possibly interrogate the operation of all these systems, it was possible to discern how they impacted on aspects of the criminal justice system and the service system for ‘at risk’ youth.

All is not perfect however, and these countries experience similar challenges to Queensland and Australia, those of note being:

- equity of access to services in rural and regional towns and communities;
- growing populations of individuals and families from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds; including recent arrivals from areas of conflict in Africa and the Middle East;
- radicalisation of young people – nationalist, religious and ethnic;
- over-representation of Indigenous, ethnic and minority groups coming to the attention of welfare and justice agencies in each country; and
- drug abuse, trafficking and formation of gangs around these activities.

Indigenous Peoples – Status and Policy

I had many opportunities to discuss and observe the status of and responses to Indigenous peoples in Canada. However, this was not possible with respect to Indigenous Sami people in the Nordic countries. The Sami originate and remain in small numbers across northern Sweden, Norway, Finland and Kola Peninsula in Russia. Sami people constitute approximately 9000 people in Finland and between 20,000 and 40,000 people in Sweden. However, population numbers are estimates only because data is not routinely kept about ethnicity in Nordic countries. The United Nations observer groups note that the major issues for Sami people are a loss of language and land on which to undertake traditional economic activities of reindeer husbandry (United Nations, 2017). It is difficult to determine Sami involvement in the justice system and my unconfirmed
suspicions were of that this may be a somewhat hidden issue, given the well documented linkages between cultural repression, economic deprivation and justice system involvement.

In contrast, the Canadian Government and government agencies have a commitment to improving the well-being and economic participation of Indigenous peoples alongside reducing their over-representation in statutory systems (see for example http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csj-sjc/principles-principes.html).

First Nations, Métis and Inuit Young People are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice systems in Canada. Together, Indigenous people in Canada make up four percent of the Canadian population but almost 25% of all inmates in prisons. Indigenous youth make up 7% of the youth population and over 35% of youth custody admissions.

I had many interesting conversations about and with Indigenous people in Canada. On the positive side, there was great commitment of staff in the programs I visited to culturally inclusive practice, partnering with Aboriginal communities to deliver services and integrating cultural practices into work with young people.

I visited Aboriginal organisations where staff shared their experience and those of other Indigenous peoples in Canada, of genocidal and punitive government policies that have a lived impact on current generations. Some members of the public were not so understanding. A view along the lines of ‘they just need to get on with things and put the past behind them’ was commonplace and in some cases linked to a view that a formal government apology was sufficient to address past wrongs. The diversity of Canadian views is similar to the diversity of views found in Australia and other former colonial countries, but speak volumes about the long journey that remains to achieve reconciliation.

Reminders of former harmful government policy on display at Wabano Centre for Aboriginal Health, Ottawa.
IMPLEMENTING SOCIAL POLICY

Policy experts from Finland, Sweden and Denmark described similar institutions and approaches to social policy and service delivery in their countries. Canada’s system is similar to Australia with universal public health care, but an increasing leaning towards non-government sector provision of other services with a government safety net for income support.

In the Nordic countries, services are primarily delivered by local government (or municipality to use their preferred term), in conjunction with not for profit and private organisations. In Canada service delivery is undertaken by a combination of local and provincial governments with the federal government generally providing high level oversight, resources for research and setting standards for service provision under funding contracts.

Free primary, secondary and tertiary education facilities, along with health, disability, child care and aged care services are a notable feature in the Nordic countries. Municipalities have responsibility for all but tertiary health services. They are configured differently depending on the location so that large cities for example can specialise and concentrate delivery of services in different ways to maximise their resources.

Sweden and Finland have an extensive network of Family Centres and municipality-delivered family support services. From these centres, individuals, families with babies, children and teenagers can access range of health and wellbeing services free of charge. These are recognised by the Finnish population as universal services that people access to attend to their health and parenting needs.

Senior officials from Finland’s Ministry of Social Affairs and Health described a process of reform whereby municipalities will combine and integrate resources across boundaries to create service hubs. This program called LAPE (Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, 2017) aims to provide more accessible services and through the coordination of resources, achieve cost saving benefits. Under this suite of reforms, preventive child and family-oriented services (Family Centres and school based support) are being prioritised to ensure more timely access of families with children to the services they need at an early stage. This is a long-term strategy with published indicators and outcomes at specified points in time – cost savings by 2019 and improved client outcomes by 2025.

In Canada, I visited three agencies that provide primary social and health services to Indigenous families, children and young people. They were the Ottawa Inuit Children’s Centre, Wabano Centre for Aboriginal Health in Ottawa and Native Counselling Service of Alberta in Edmonton. They are large organisations with advocacy and public education roles as well as substantial service delivery roles. All receive funding from multiple sources: municipal, provincial, federal governments and some private funding for specific programs or events. The Native Counselling Service and Wabano also have justice roles, (see pages 33 to 34).

These organisations although unique in their target groups and cultural origins, share some common characteristics including a cultural healing philosophy, that is, building resilience and healing through an understanding of culture, and restoring the connectedness of individuals and families with the spiritual and natural worlds. An important assumption is the notion that positive change can be created by restoring and maintaining these connections.

Above: Ottawa Inuit Children’s Centre facilities, rich in cultural symbols.
The Ottawa Inuit Children’s Centre builds children’s resilience from an early age, by developing a positive cultural identity and language skills among children of Inuit communities whose families reside in urban Ottawa. The Centre provides language immersion, pre-school and after school care as well as cultural activities for families, Elders and young people.

Right: Toni Craig with Ottawa Inuit Children’s Centre staff Rachel Quinn and Carmen Barrieau.

Indigenous service delivery organisations are well positioned to influence the broader community, and many assume a key role in educating members of the public and service providers about Indigenous culture, reconciliation and culturally safe practices. The Native Counselling Service of Alberta does this through its advocacy on Indigenous justice issues and the strategic use of Bear Paw Media Productions and Bear Paw Legal Education (see for example http://ncsa.libguides.com/bearpawvideos).

The Ottawa Inuit Children’s Centre delivers a twice yearly Seeing the Light conference that concentrates expertise about Inuit history and culture, and effective and culturally safe service delivery with Inuit people into a one-day conference format.
CRIME PREVENTION

All countries have national crime prevention strategies, national coordinating bodies, some embedded in existing government agencies and in Canada, a stand-alone agency Public Safety Canada.

In terms of crime prevention service delivery, Sweden and Denmark have well developed crime prevention systems and organisations supported by legislation and years of practice expertise. The Danish system of Schools, Social Services and Police partnerships (SSPs) have operated for many years as have Swedish Social Action Groups (SIGs) and in limited locations Social Services, Schools, Police and Free time partnerships (SSPF). Finland has a national strategy, de-centralised municipality-based activity and some funding allocated for regional crime prevention initiatives.

SWEDEN

Crime prevention activity in Sweden is supported by Police and Municipality cooperation agreements to prepare and deliver local crime prevention plans.

The Swedish National Crime Prevention Council, Brottsförebyggande rådet (Brå) provides support and research to municipalities in partnership with the Swedish local government coordination organisation, Sveriges Kommuner och Landsting (SKL). SKL produces many resources to support the operation of SIGs including guidelines for local agreements and plans.

Police initiated social action groups (SIGs) in 20 municipalities and continue to coordinate and resource them. Direct police involvement in SIGs was reported to have reduced over the years with other partners taking responsibility for individual work with young people. This changed approach is being evaluated with findings due in 2018.

Stunning views from the top floor of SKL building in Stockholm, Sweden, from left Charlotta Gustafsson, Brå, Greta Berg, SKL and Toni Craig.

Toni Craig with Anders Hall, Police Commissioner, Head of Development, National Operations Department, Swedish Police Authority.
FINLAND

Finland has developed and published crime prevention policies over many years and has a national crime prevention council administered by the Ministry of Justice. I did not however see evidence of the organisation of crime prevention activity to the extent that it existed in Denmark and Sweden. The most recent Finnish crime prevention strategy Turvallisesti yhdessä /Safely Together National Crime Prevention Program 2016-2020 was being progressively implemented by the Finnish Ministry of Justice. The strategy has 29 different actions and has a focus on high risk groups, including young people. Activities to support implementation include:

- a ‘road show’ for communicating the program,
- funding for local crime prevention initiatives and projects, and
- disseminating information on good practices.

A series of regional seminars were held throughout 2017 focussed on developing crime prevention networks, identifying different municipality stakeholders and how they can contribute to municipality crime prevention efforts. The seminars purposely considered local issues to ensure that locally relevant crime prevention plans are developed.

DENMARK – SSP PARTNERSHIPS

Formal partnerships between Schools, Social Services and Police were established in Denmark in 1975 with the aim of preventing and reducing crime and related risk behavior among young people as early as possible. The age group target is children and young people aged six to 18 years, but in practice extends to 25-year olds. SSPs have evolved and expanded over time with 98 SSPs operating across Denmark, applying different approaches dependent on local resources and priorities. SSPs are administratively aligned into groupings based on 12 police districts (Kredsråd) which facilitates police involvement in the SSPs.

Under social services law, Serviceloven, the three parties are required to engage in crime prevention work in the widest possible sense. There are no laws governing the operation of the SSP but there are national and municipality guidelines for the operation of SSPs and the work of SSP consultants (eg. DKR, 2012, http://sspkbhguide.dk/). There is legislation that allows information exchange by relevant parties that cannot be used in criminal proceedings. Paragraph 115 in “Retsplejeloven” or “The Danish Administration of Justice Act” stipulates that authorities can share information about an individual if necessary to cooperate in crime prevention or for cooperation between the police, social services and social psychiatry and mental health authorities in their efforts to help socially vulnerable individuals. Information may not, however, be shared for the purposes of criminal investigations. This legislation was described as a ‘game changer’ in terms of improving the effectiveness of cooperative arrangements.

SSP consultants are employed by municipalities, drive local crime prevention efforts and are considered one of the critical success factors for SSPs. A consultant’s work is multi-faceted and diverse. It includes activity on a continuum from coordinating or contributing to national activities, facilitating multi-agency panels, through to direct service provision to young people. The diversity of functions is reflected in three major groupings of activity (aligned with primary, secondary and tertiary crime prevention definitions) that define the role of an
SSP consultant and breadth of activity for local SSPs. However, municipalities are large organisations and differences in roles are evident depending on location and organisational arrangements. For example, a consultant located in a school will focus more on the general level and a consultant in social services more on the individual level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of crime prevention</th>
<th>Examples from SSP practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Effort:</strong> Preventing crime among all children and young people.</td>
<td>‘A teen in the family program’ for all families of seventh grade students, delivered at night in schools. Changing neighbourhood attitudes about reporting crime. Social normative approach in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Effort:</strong> Working with groups of vulnerable or at risk young people to prevent crime.</td>
<td>Analysis and local agreement about working with problem groups of young people, eg. Adventure based nature programs. Spare time job program (Amager SSP, Copenhagen). Street football and basketball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Effort:</strong> Working with individual young people who have committed offences or at high risk.</td>
<td>Planned intervention with individual young people and families to complement work of social services case work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practice is however constantly evolving in response to emergent issues. For example, SSP consultants have delivered emergency responses to critical events, in a volatile suburb of Copenhagen, managing youth events and utilising youth outreach workers to engage with, monitor and de-escalate crime and disorderly behaviour at gatherings of young people and organised marches.

I met consultants from four SSPs, Michael Novak Langholm-Pedersen and Clifford James Phillips, who each work in different parts of Copenhagen and Jørgen Pedersen and Benny Husted from Silkeborg and Skanderborg, regional towns in North East Jutland, near Aarhus. Being able to meet consultants from these two vastly different environments gave me insight into the differing nature of young people’s lives in regional and metropolitan communities and by extensions, the different roles of SSP consultants.

SSP consultant roles are inherently complex and becoming more so as the nature of crime, young offenders and community expectations change. The diversity of activities within the role speaks volumes about this complexity (see text box left).
An effective social normative approach based on the work of Alan Berkowitz was being used in schools in northern Jutland and Aarhus. This involves challenging young people’s misconceptions about the extent of their peers’ anti-social and criminal behaviour. An evaluation has shown success in reducing anti-social behaviour.

Copenhagen is a large city, therefore there are five SSP consultants operating across its municipal boundaries, working with 16 different local leader (action) groups. SSP cooperative arrangements in Copenhagen also differ in terms of membership, with the Danish Probation and Parole Services an additional partner and young people from 18 years to 25 years included in the target group. Crime prevention in Copenhagen is extensively resourced with 400 staff, including SSP consultants. With an organisation of this scale, bi-annual planning is a critical activity to facilitate a coordinated effort. Guidance for practice has also been created called \textit{Methods and Themes}, which provides a way of prioritising and guiding SSP effort, currently focussed on the following offence and behaviour types: theft, social media, drugs (specifically hash), violence and alcohol.

Michael and Clifford described their activities as aligning with the general three level framework but constantly evolving in response to emergent issues, hence the evolution of emergency response activities. Clifford undertakes ‘hands on’ work with young people, arranging neighbourhood youth activities, many centred on physical activity and building relationships with the families of youth. Some of Clifford’s work is with immigrant families and facilitating their engagement in the broader community.

Benny and Jørgen described a new model of SSP operation which has evolved to respond to contemporary challenges with a focus on safety and developmental prevention and less on working directly with young offenders. This is expected to provide more capacity for SSPs and consultants. The new paradigm shift was described as moving from a focus on criminal youth to achieving “\textit{A good life for all}”. Similarly, Michael and Clifford described an evolving role in Copenhagen, where a group of key workers from each agency would work with individual cases, rather than the consultants who could then focus on primary and secondary crime prevention and crisis responses.

Another critical success factor in the longevity and effectiveness of the SSPs is the employment and professional development of consultants by municipalities to coordinate, drive and in some cases, undertake crime prevention activity.
SSPs are supported by an organisation called the Det Kriminal Praeventive Råd (DKR) or Danish Crime Prevention Council. DKR was established in the 1970s and is an independent council established by the Minister of Justice with the aim of preventing crime and creating a safer society. DKR is a membership organisation with members from a vast range of government, non-government and academic organisations, including SSP Samrådet representative consultant, Jørgen Pedersen. DKR crime prevention specialist, Anders Young Rasmussen, was one of the first people I contacted when planning my Fellowship travel. Anders was a wealth of information and connections to people and other organisations in Denmark.

DKR conducts research, develops strategy and activities in consultation with members. It also collects and disseminates research, policy and practice knowledge to journalists, politicians, citizens, private enterprises and local crime prevention professionals such as SSP consultants throughout Denmark.

DKR's priorities in 2017 were reducing burglary, cyber-crime and juvenile offending.

There are four youth crime prevention specialists within the organisation. Henriette and Flemming pictured above are two of these specialists. One of the team’s major projects for 2015 to 2017 focused on disseminating knowledge about promising youth crime prevention initiatives to local employees in Danish municipalities using a workshop format. Municipal consultants come to the role with a variety of skills and backgrounds. The aim of these workshops therefore is to increase and certify their knowledge, practice, skills and motivation with respect to crime prevention and analysis, along with improving evidence-based municipal decision-making in the field of at risk children and youth in general. Representatives from municipalities have been invited to between two to four workshops per year. The uptake has increased throughout the years, with 74 of the 98 municipalities represented in 2017 (as at early September when I visited).

A recently announced Danish government policy on youth crime - ‘Alle handlinger har konsekvenser’/‘All Actions have consequences’ - may have a big impact on the treatment of children and youth at risk in Denmark. This policy and a 15-point action plan was announced in November 2017 (Ministry of Justice, 2017). It may, among other things, influence and standardise the education and work of municipal SSPs. It is still unknown how political negotiations will play out. For now (February 2018), there is a lively public debate, and organisations that work to protect children’s rights and prevent social problems are urging politicians to improve the rather unspecified action plan, which focuses on sanctions and proposes to introduce children from the age of 12 to the police and a judge. The government is being recommended, for example, to include a restorative approach and to improve cooperation with parents at an early stage.
Recommendations

1. The Australian Attorney-General’s Department in partnership with the National Crime Prevention Council develop, implement and monitor a comprehensive, contemporary national crime prevention strategy.

6.1 Establish formal partnerships between Police, Education, Social and Health services agencies and local government (or existing partnerships reprioritised) to identify and develop local response to youth crime and anti-social behaviour, and monitor and respond to emerging trends.

6.2 Implement youth outreach workers (or utilise existing outreach roles) in local communities to engage, monitor and contribute to coordinated responses to emergent youth crime.
EXAMPLES FROM SWEDEN, FINLAND AND CANADA

Municipalities and non-government organisations (NGOs) in Canada and in Sweden are also engaged in the delivery of programs and services to at risk young people and their families. This was evident in Stockholm where the city municipality had concentrated its early intervention services into one large organisation, Framtid Stockholm. This organisation delivers a range of free parenting programs to all families regardless of risk, and appropriate to specific developmental milestones. In addition, they deliver more targeted services and programs to families that are beginning to experience issues. Brief Strategic Family Therapy is delivered along with substance abuse programs through the Mini-Maria program. Mini Maria is described on p. 28.

Red Cross Finland is an example of an NGO that provides early intervention services alongside emergency and short-term youth accommodation in the main cities of Finland. I visited one of the Helsinki homes and met the Finnish youth shelter program coordinator, Leena Surpaa, along with shelter staff Saara and Paivi. They explained their role as one of family restoration following family conflict and/or children running away from home. Over time in recognition of this changing dynamic, the program has changed, and staff’s focus has been reoriented to family mediation, family counselling and reunification with the shelter itself taking on more of a ‘time out’ facility. The shelter itself was a comfortable, homely environment situated in central Helsinki with meals provided and children expected to attend school (and sometimes transported) during week days.

iHuman Youth Society in Edmonton, Canada operated from a very different youth focussed and arts-based engagement philosophy targeting young people aged between 12 and 24 years. 80% of the young people attending iHuman programs are First Nations. iHuman operates from an impressive purpose-built facility situated in a human service-rich part of downtown Edmonton. The facility itself had been built within the last two years as a result of a substantial fund-raising effort on the part of the organisation, private industry and the thriving Edmonton arts community. I was most impressed with the organisation, its services and the way it prefaced its engagement with young people in such a positive way.

Thank you to Catherine Broomfield, Executive Director of iHuman who generously gave up her time on a cold October morning well before the service opened and allowed me to take photos of the amazing youth friendly space her organisation occupies.
iHuman has an overtly Indigenous focus, the name itself originating from an Inuit concept which describes the symbiotic relationship of the individual with the community. A dedicated cultural space is available within the iHuman premises where First Nations young people can participate in Smudge ceremonies and engage in quiet reflection. To create accountability for its work with Indigenous young people, a policy statement has been developed that outlines how iHuman works with its clients and the broader Indigenous communities.

The creative arts focus of the original organisation has evolved over the years and is now supplemented by an extensive range of programs and services that respond to the needs of marginalised young people.

Programs span three domains: Creativity, Caring (crisis intervention) and Authenticity (culture and life skills) along with community collaboration as way to integrate young people into the mainstream community. These domains align with iHuman’s trust compass depicted below. There were a vast range of programs and activities operating under those domains including an impressive array of creative arts programs as well as health, wellbeing and living skills.

On arrival at the building, the first point of entry is a communal space where young people can prepare food and chat to staff, have a shower and store their belongings.

Onsite are in-house mental health and medical services as well as space for visiting health professionals, an alternative school, vocational training programs and a young mothers program with purpose-built facilities where babies and young children can attend with them. A young father’s program is also in the pipeline.

The organisation also has a youth justice connection. Young people can carry out their community service orders through one of the community arts-based projects that are regularly undertaken. iHuman truly is a ‘one stop shop’ for marginalised young people.

GANG AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Concern about the involvement of young people in gangs and gang-related crime has resulted in some countries implementing dedicated gang strategies. Canada, and more recently Denmark, has issued a policy statement and strategy about targeting young people at risk of gang involvement and violent offending.

In Canada I visited five specific gang prevention initiatives:

- WrapED – a gang prevention pilot programme funded by Public Safety Canada and operating from Edmonton, Alberta;
- Masckwacis Youth Initiative – a First Nations gang prevention program operating in Maskwacis, a large First Nations community located an hour south of Edmonton, Alberta;
• Surrey Wraparound – a gang prevention and early intervention programme operating from Surrey, British Columbia;
• Time for Change program – a program designed to assist young adults who are contemplating or have decided to exit gangs in Ottawa; and
• Youth Outreach Worker program – an Ontario government initiative (see page 25).

Public Safety Canada funds a range of gang prevention initiatives throughout Canada, with the aim of better understanding what works to prevent young people from becoming involved in gangs. Public Safety Canada also produces a suite of resources and research material to inform the ongoing understanding and response to gangs (eg. Dunbar, 2017). Edmonton based Wrap Edmonton is one of these and the Surrey Wraparound program was a previous pilot program under this scheme.

Surrey Wraparound and Wraparound Edmonton are both multi agency, multi-disciplinary informed programs. The latter has evolved from learnings from earlier funded pilot programs and utilises a specific methodology called High Fidelity Wraparound (Vroon Vandenberg™).

WRAPAROUND EDMONTON (WRAPED)

WrapED is a formal partnership between several Edmonton agencies with expertise in working with at risk young people. Reach Edmonton is a backbone organisation which provides support, facilities and the lead coordinator position. WrapED partners represent the diversity of participating young people: the Africa Centre, Edmonton John Howard Society, Edmonton Police Service, Native Counselling Service of Alberta, and YOUCAN Youth Services. The target group for the program is young people between 12 and 17 years of age affected by violent crime and at risk of ongoing involvement in gangs.

WrapED has been delivering High Fidelity Wraparound for two years as part of a five-year funding contract with Public Safety Canada, which ends in late 2018. Program partners took some time to successfully implement the High Fidelity Wraparound approach but early indications are this is a successful program.

High Fidelity Wraparound – different to wraparound case management?

High Fidelity Wraparound is an intensive model similar to wrap around case management. It has some unique features and a strong value based including a set of 10 principles. Work using high fidelity wraparound is inherently young person and family led, strengths based, and aimed at building sustainable community support (called natural supports) during and beyond the case management period.

High Fidelity Wraparound was developed by Vroon Vandenberg in the United States as a child or youth led planning and case management approach and is licensed to be delivered in Canada.

A strength-based planning approach is used: Strengths, Needs and Cultural Discovery. This process actively engages the young person and their family in defining their needs to be addressed through the program.

Left: WrapED partner agencies: from left: Arthurmon Rurangwa (Reach Edmonton), Holly Hallborg (Reach Edmonton) and Sarah Holmes (John Howard Society).
The WrapED process involves the following steps:

- Edmonton Police help make referrals and build positive relationships with police and community.
- Matching a youth facilitator with a referred young person. The model is young person-led in that the young person identifies their own priorities and develops a personalised plan with assistance from the youth facilitator.
- The young person also identifies their own support team, which may involve family members, religious leaders and service providers.
- Youth facilitators use culturally sensitive and appropriate approaches.
- Clinical psychologists provide counselling and psychological treatment.
- Wisdom Keepers from immigrant, refugee and Indigenous communities help WrapED youth connect with their cultures.

164 young people have completed the WrapED program since it commenced in 2014, with the current funding arrangements due to end in September 2018. The organisation has commissioned an evaluation, using a methodology and tools which are unique to the High Fidelity Wraparound methodology.

In the meantime, the program provides progress and evaluation updates to stakeholders and is now able to identify its strengths and achievements. Holly Hallborg, program coordinator described key success factors of WrapED that strengthen it over other case management approaches, these being:

- The young person identifies their own personalised team to provide wraparound supports;
- WrapED’s youth facilitators receive specialized training; learning together as a team, building relationships and coordinating approaches;
- Youth facilitators are in continuous communication; sharing learnings and resources; and
- Youth facilitators have low caseloads so there is time to build trust with youth and families needed to work through difficulties and challenges.

**SURREY WRAPAROUND PROGRAM**

Surrey Wraparound (Surrey Wrap) a previous Public Safety Canada program, fulfilled its five-year contract over a year ago and is now funded jointly by the Surrey Education Board and Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I spent a day ‘in the field’ with staff from Surrey Wrap attending a range of activities and services that staff either deliver or access for young people referred to the program. Surrey is a city located to the south of Vancouver with a high proportion of new and second-generation Canadians. Drug use and crime related to the drug trade is prevalent, including shootings between rival gang members. Police and Surrey Safe Schools are major partners, while other services are brokered or provided in kind such as family therapy, English language support from the Surrey Welcome Centre and recreation facilities from the local municipality.

The program’s objective is to positively attach youth to school, their community and the home by building a trusting and positive relationship. Parents, caregivers and/or guardians are included in goal setting to build a positive lifestyle and self-worth for youth. Surrey Wrap provides support to students 11 to 17 years of age who are displaying gang associated behaviour or a high level of risk factors that are predictive of gang involvement, wrapping the student with a ‘network of support and encouragement’.

Clients referred to the program are assessed and linked to various positive community supports and alternative education programs as required. Surrey Wrap staff including police officers engage in pro-social activities with the young people. I observed a lively game of basketball, a much-anticipated weekly occurrence. Self-defence and activities to enhance self-esteem are also part of the suite of activities.
Staff from Surrey Wrap and local Police also deliver educational crime prevention in schools. I was taken to one of these events at a local primary school where I met the school principal, teachers and saw the session in action with a large group of year 5 and 6 students. The primary school setting was a surprise to me and I asked about the choice of this age cohort. Schools have asked for these sessions to be targeted at children before they reach high school for two inter-related reasons:

- Gangs are using younger and younger children to pick up and deliver drugs.
- Several of the children at the school come from families where drugs and gang involvement are already a significant issue.

The session consisted of information from a Police Sergeant involved in policing drug related crime, a real-life story from one of the program’s outreach workers who had been involved in gang related crime, a question and answer session and a series of fun activities which kids rotated through. It was an intense session in terms of content and duration, but kids responded positively, and teachers were on the lookout for any distress or opening questions from kids from known at risk families.

OUTREACH WORKERS AS A GANG PREVENTION STRATEGY

CANADA

In Ontario, the provincial government funds an outreach worker program to help deal with gangs and associated violence, with approximately 130 different programs/workers operating across the province. Ottawa has several outreach workers, coordinated and auspiced by the Boys and Girls Club of Ottawa. The goal was to have workers as a bridge between mainly young men and services. Workers operate in the community and in school identifying and linking with high risk young people. Among the seven workers in Ottawa, there is one worker specifically engaged to work with Syrian refugees and one with Somali young people. In Ottawa, workers are supported by the Boys and Girls Club but because of the independent nature of the work and single worker model, they are professionally supported by a Community of Practice and annual training by the Ministry of Children and Youth.

Maskwacis First Nations community in Alberta utilises a form of outreach where the workers are called ‘Violence Interrupters’. The organisation employs workers who have been involved in gangs but who are healed, understand the dynamics of gang involvement and can offer viable alternatives based on their own experiences.
Sweden and Finland

While the term ‘gangs’ was not used when discussing high risk young people, workers in Sweden and Finland spoke of groups of young people creating disturbances and engaging in anti-social behaviour. Different approaches operate in different municipalities. Nacka municipality in Sweden had developed an outreach model using youth mentors to engage and influence young people known to be at risk.

Stockholm has a concerted outreach effort to engage and target at risk young people with three programs; one a team with social workers in each of three police stations (north, central and south) and the second group of outreach workers who target young people hanging out in the city square engaging in drug use, prostitution and anti-social behaviour. This is heavily resourced with 10 workers rostered through the day, evening and until 2am. The aim is to identify at risk young people early, link them to assistance and engage their parents. A third approach is targeting unaccompanied minors who arrived in Stockholm in the last five years. Two special police officers work with three social workers are dedicated to this role.

Finland’s Police Prevention Unit has a dedicated team of officers who connect with young people to monitor and put in place local partnership to deal with emerging minority groups and crime hotspots. They also work with the families of these young people to link them to parenting support.

Denmark

I participated in several conversations about the rise of gangs and gang-related crime among ethnic minority groups in inner city Copenhagen. Drugs were said to be prevalent and contributing to competition between different groups of youths and adults in the inner-city suburb of Nørrebro. The recent publication of a new youth justice policy targeting ‘hard core of offenders’ and ‘gang members’ exemplifies the high level of community and political concern. Time will tell what strategies will emerge in relation to this new focus, but it is likely that successful strategies by neighbouring countries will be considered.

GANG PREVENTION – LEARNINGS FOR AUSTRALIA

All the gang prevention and intervention strategies I saw focussed on positive engagement and support rather than criminalisation and stigmatisation. Working with and in and the communities young people from ethnic communities reside is critical to breaking down barriers and facilitating people’s access to positive support. The role of system navigators is an important one that can either be undertaken as part of youth and community outreach work, or undertaken as a standalone role.

The recently published Public Safety Canada paper on Youth Gangs in Canada (Dunbar, 2017) highlights the dangers of classifying young people as gang members; ie. stereotyping and maltreatment that may occur once a youth is identified as a gang member and the self-fulfilling nature of that pejorative label.

In terms of prevention and early intervention, for youth from immigrant families, Public Safety Canada’s research highlights the criticality of ‘a shared vision of collaboration among stakeholders from diverse sectors to promote the development of positive identities and to achieve a healthy sense of belonging at home, at school and in the community’ (Dunbar, 2017, p.16).
SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION, EARLY INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT

The nature of substance abuse prevention, early intervention (and treatment) varied significantly between locations, some organisations relying on purchasing or accessing specialist services from other agencies while others delivered in house programs of their own. Each country had its own tolerance and strategy with respect to substance abuse, and the links between substance use and crime. For example, drug offences are treated seriously in Sweden and are dealt with by quite severe penalties; in comparison with Canada where harm minimisation is a strong philosophy. Cannabis is to be decriminalised in Canada from 1 July 2018.

I provide examples below of three different programs targeting substance abuse in very different ways.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS – VANCOUVER, CANADA

Substance Abuse Children and Youth (SACY) delivers universal drug education and early intervention to children and young people. Drug education work targets year 8 and 9 student (the first two years of high school) in 18 high schools in Vancouver, British Columbia. The program is delivered by Vancouver Coastal Health Authority in partnership with Vancouver high schools. It is partly funded by Public Safety Canada crime prevention funding with contributions from the health authority and local public-school boards.

SACY also delivers brief interventions to young people as an alternative to school suspension along with a parent support program. For young people who are already using drugs, the Leadership Resilience Program offers long term, more intensive support. A cohort of 15 young people are identified who operate as a closed group and they and their families engaged in the following specific activities with weekly contact:

1. Resiliency – coping skills, goal setting and health relationships;
2. Participation in volunteer work for one month;
3. Alternative to risk taking outdoor activities; and
4. Family engagement and counselling of up to six contacts.

Key success factors identified by coordinator Jen Donovan include the five-year duration of Public Safety Canada funding to give the programs sufficient time to develop. The inclusion of alternative to risk taking activities has proven to be particularly effective with this age cohort while working in schools who are interested and willing to contribute is also important. The program combines highly skilled staff (Master degree qualified) alongside volunteers who support the volunteer work component. Indigenous cultural content is incorporated throughout the program with positive identity development a goal for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous young people.

SUBSTANCE USE EARLY INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT – STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

Maria Ungdom is a multi-disciplinary substance abuse service that can also assist young people and their families with related mental health and sexual health issues. It is delivered by the Stockholm municipality and consists of both in-patient and out-patient services. Mini Maria outpatient services are available in multiple locations throughout Stockholm and I visited one at Framtid Stockholm, the child and youth social service division located in inner city Stockholm.

Mini Maria is a treatment program for young people under the age of 20 which incorporates support and therapy for families. Families may also be linked to Brief Strategic Family Therapy if intensive family work is assessed as required. People access the program either directly or on referral by parents or social workers. An assessment is undertaken, and decisions made about the best intervention option. It is also supported by a telephone advice service. The strength of these programs delivered under the Framtid Stockholm umbrella is the ability to access and coordinate a range of programs and responses.
INDIGENOUS SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT - ALBERTA, CANADA

Maskwacis First Nations community in Alberta had the benefit of an accredited substance abuse day program for young people located within the community – Young Spirit Winds. Interventions are structured around the medicine wheel and as such address the four elements of life for First Nations peoples – mental, physical, spiritual and emotional. Restorative justice ‘Circles’ that resonate strongly with First Nations culture are used to help heal and address individual and group issues.

Up to 10 young people aged between 12 and 17 years participate in the program, with four cycles per year. To encourage and facilitate participation, transportation to and from the centre is provided along with meals while young people attend a six-hour per day program. Follow up and after care is provided once they finish the program. Young people on youth justice orders as well as non-justice involved youth are referred to this program. The photo includes staff from Alberta Correctional Services and Four Spirit Winds in the main meeting room with many observable cultural symbols. The medicine wheel is depicted on the floor in front of staff and as mentioned elsewhere, is a First Nations cultural concept often integrated into healing practices.

From left Brad Clark, Chrysta Angus, Gina Wildcat, Alex Behnke and Cheryl MacKinnon at the Young Spirit Winds Youth Treatment Program in Maskwacis, Alberta.
DIVERSION PROGRAMS

NORDIC DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Diverting young people from the criminal justice system took many forms in the countries I visited. In Scandinavia, this activity generally takes the form of restorative justice initiatives. Because of the well-developed secondary and tertiary prevention activities in Finland, Sweden and Denmark coupled with the higher age of criminal responsibility, my assessment is that there has not been as much pressure to introduce police involved diversion programs. I saw evidence of building momentum of restorative justice programs diversion programs in action in Finland and Denmark.

COMMUNITY DRIVEN RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

At short notice I was able to meet Heikki Turkka and Timo Kyllönen, from Aseman Lapset Ry (Children of the Station), a Helsinki-based program that has worked for many years as an outreach service (Walkers) targeting children and young people at risk of harm and police involvement in the central business area. A street mediation program developed organically because of minor nuisance and theft crimes coming to the attention of security staff in large shopping centres. Aseman Lapset staff were contacted on a regular basis to intervene and mediate an immediate solution. The initiative has become more formalised over the years and is now part of a restorative justice pilot program administered by the Ministry of the Interior. As a result, referrals must now be made via the Police and there is a delay to prepare the mediation response. My observation is that this change is a necessary part of ensuring quality and consistency, it is a loss that the program can no longer immediately respond to minor street crime involving young people.

POLICE DRIVEN DIVERSION

In Finland, the Helsinki Ankkuri/Anchor team is an example of a partnership based early intervention initiative led by Police to respond to anti-social behaviour among young people aged under 15 years. The service is based on the Ankkuri model originally developed by Police in the city of Hämeenlinna in 2003 that has since been expanded throughout police districts in Finland.

Members of the Helsinki Preventive Policing Unit pictured at left. Front row from left: Sergeant Mikko Pennanen, Psychiatric Nurse Pia Pastinen, Senior Constable Tiina Alanen. Second row from left; Senior Constable Jenni Mutikainen, Social Worker Emmi Auhtola, Social Worker Anna Kärkkäinen and Toni Craig.

Ankkuri is a multi-disciplinary, multi-agency team consisting of Police, social workers from Helsinki municipality Social and Health Services division and a psychiatric nurse who are co-located and work across two locations, Malmi and Pasila in the Helsinki Police District. The team’s aim is to intervene early in the lives of young people experiencing problems to halt their trajectory into a life of crime.

When young people under the age of 15 are suspected of committing offences, they and their families are invited to participate in an interview at the police station about the offence and surrounding circumstances.
Upon consent from the young person and their parent or guardian, they are engaged in a time-limited case management process involving:

- Assessment by social work staff using the Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY) tool and if indicated, mental health assessment by the psychiatric nurse;
- Case plan developed based on the assessment; and
- Referrals of the young person and their family made to relevant community services (NGO and municipality) to respond to their needs.

Staff attributed the success of this approach to workers’ respectful relationships with each other, co-location of staff from different organisations at the police station, and the multi-disciplinary contribution and connections to external agencies and organisations.

Along with the Ankkuri team, the Police Prevention Unit consists of two other teams: a Youth Team that engages in proactive community policing with young people and another that works with multicultural and multilingual communities to prevent political extremism.

This three-team arrangement means that Police In Helsinki are well connected with intelligence about emerging antisocial behaviour, at risk young people and potential crime hot spots.

**CANADIAN DIVERSION PROGRAMS**

I investigated different forms of diversion operating in Canada under extrajudicial measures (initiated at police contact) and extrajudicial sanctions (initiated by Prosecutors) provisions of the federal Youth Criminal Justice Act. Within provinces I discovered different local responses that are dependent on local resources and expertise, and that reflect local issues and needs of young people.

In Alberta extrajudicial sanctions using restorative justice processes occur though formally approved Youth Justice Committees throughout the province. In this province, when no Youth Justice Committee exists in a community, probation officers deliver the extrajudicial sanctions.

According to Canadian commentators, the delivery of these interventions sanctioned under national legislation has, in conjunction with other diversionary initiatives, contributed to the significant decrease of young people in the criminal justice system.

The Ottawa Community Youth Diversion Program delivered by the Boys and Girls Club of Ottawa provides a highly tuned case management service to young people assessed as being at moderate to high risk of offending. This program is a partnership between the Ottawa Police Service and the Boys and Girls Club of Ottawa who together deliver the program and the Ontario provincial government which provides funding for the program.

This program has been operating for several years, has been evaluated and has evidenced significant reductions in recidivism rates compared with groups of young people in matched samples participating in probation supervision (Wilson and Hoge, 2012). In addition, this evaluation found that an accurate assessment of young people’s risk level is critical and that erroneously engaging young people at low risk is harmful to their outcomes in the long run.
The Ottawa Community Youth Diversion Program manager, Tom Scholberg identified the following, key success factors, underscoring the cooperation and willingness of other agencies as the number one factor:

- Willingness of agencies to provide services to the young people;
- A resource-rich human services sector in Ottawa;
- Having a case manager overseeing the entire process is important, preventing duplication and repetition of services;
- Supportive police service; and
- Program dollars to purchase service is ideal (given that brokerage dominates).

Exemplary diversionary practice: Ottawa Community Youth Diversion Program

This highly effective program delivered to divert young people at high risk of offending operates in Ottawa, Canada; a city of a similar size to Brisbane.

Key success factors:

- Use of brief screener tool to identify and appropriately divert young people
- Joint contribution by Police and NGO
- Voluntary participation of young people
- Use of goal-specific and time-limited case plan to guide interventions
- Good network of agencies and service to refer young people and their families
- Feedback to Police and Prosecutions engenders confidence in program

A similar program that targets a younger age group called Intersections is available in five locations of Eastern Ontario (including Ottawa) for children and young people with suspected mental health, developmental disabilities or addiction issues who would not be suitable for diversion. The purpose is to reduce their likelihood of future police contact.

This model was developed by the Champlain Youth Justice Services Collaborative (a formal collaboration of 74 agencies and organisations across Eastern Ontario) and has been adapted from the United Kingdom’s Youth Justice Liaison and Diversion Model, Child and Maternal Health Intelligence Network developed by Public Health England. I did not visit this program but had given a brochure among other material while visiting the Ottawa Police Station. I was subsequently able to contact the program manager, Ian Wiseberg, who provided helpful information and an operations manual by email.

Eligibility criteria for the Intersections program in the Champlain region (which includes Ottawa) were narrowed down to address the highest need age group in each of the five counties of the region, who have contact with Police. The Intersections target group also acknowledges the existence of the Ottawa Youth Diversion program and its target cohort. Noting that 12 years is the lower age of criminal responsibility in Canada, the eligibility criteria for Intersections are children who are:

- 9 -13 years of age and have engaged in troubling behaviour;
- 9 to 12 years of age but their behaviour would constitute criminal behaviour if they were older;
- 12-13 years engaged in nuisance and/or troubling behaviour that is not criminal;
- suspected mental health, developmental disabilities and/or substance use issues, and
- who have had initial police contact.
Intersections is operated by Crossroads Children’s Centre and relies on an effective partnership with the Ottawa Police for referrals. Similar to the Ottawa Community Youth Diversion Program, an important component of the program is feedback to police officers about the child and their family’s successful engagement with the program.

The process involves a police patrol officer or a school resource officer submitting a report to the relevant Youth Division in the Police Service, following an interaction with a young person between the ages of nine and 13 years. The Youth Division officer follows up with the parent or guardian of the child and describes the Intersections program and how it could be of assistance to their family. If the parent or guardian consents, the Youth Division officer makes the referral to the Crossroads Children’s Centre. Within 24 hours, an Intersections worker contacts the family and arranges to meet with them. An assessment is conducted, and next steps are discussed which may include a variety of referrals. These could include referral to a mental health agency for clinical services, linking them with an organisation for recreational activities or referral to further assessment if that is indicated. One of the primary goals of Intersections is to reach a target population that would not otherwise be seeking out services and/or supports (personal communication with Ian Wiseberg, 9 December 2017; Intersections Operational Guide, 2016).

A key success factor of Intersections posited by the coordinator is the well-resourced nature of Ottawa’s human services sector. This means that there are many services to which troubled children and families can be referred and supported.

INDIGENOUS DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Cultural input and cultural responsiveness were key elements of these programs that differentiated them from mainstream approaches. This was achieved through employing Indigenous staff and applying cultural healing frameworks to both the organisation and the way of working.

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

A diversionary program operates for First Nations, Metis and Inuit young people and is delivered by Wabano Centre for Aboriginal Health (Wabano), an Indigenous organisation in Ottawa, Ontario. This program differs from the Ottawa Youth Diversion Program as it delivers culturally specific interventions and activities by Indigenous staff from its premises. Wabano and its programs are highly regarded in the Indigenous community in Ottawa, and the location of the youth diversion program within Wabano premises means it is accessible and can provide a more integrated and holistic response to young people as well as their families. Young people can use the weekly youth kitchen and drop in program, counselling services, a youth housing program and medical services.

I visited Wabano and was hosted by youth coordinators Melanie Charbonneau and Meghan Boulanger. Part of my visit involved participating in a Smudge, a first Nations ceremony involving burning sacred herbs for spiritual and emotional cleansing. Staff were generous with their time, told me about the way they engage and work with young people and took me on a comprehensive tour of the beautiful Wabano premises. They identified cultural healing elements as key to facilitating change for young people, for example the use of Circle Talk, a group based therapeutic conversation. The other important success factor was the utilisation of a dedicated cultural space that makes Wabano a welcoming and supportive environment for First Nations young people.
Above: Left Meghan Boulanger in Wabano’s large meeting room and right, the medicine wheel on the ceiling

Wabano also hosts a magnificent ceremonial and community meeting room which has been designed based on the medicine wheel and other First Nations cultural symbols.

Wabano premises also accommodates a museum that includes displays of cultural and historical symbols and stories including the story of residential schools and a roof-top garden on where sacred herbs are grown for ceremonial purposes. Cultural healing is an important part of what this organisation offers; which was evident in terms of both the programming and the built environment.

**BRITISH COLUMBIA**

In British Columbia, most extrajudicial measures are delivered by non-government organisations who partner with the Police to deliver brief interventions. I visited two such programs, one on Vancouver Island and another at Tsawwassen, a First Nations community south of Vancouver. Restorative justice processes feature prominently. They take many forms including Restorative Justice Circles (or Circles), victim-offender mediation or a one on one restorative conversation and agreement.

The John Howard Society with funding from the Saanich Police Service delivers three restorative justice programs for young people under both extrajudicial sanctions and extrajudicial measures provisions of the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*. Other restorative justice programs are offered on Vancouver Island with adjunct services such as mentoring. The Saanich program in comparison is small and resourced with only one worker who facilitates restorative justice options for up to 100 adult and youth offenders per year. Participation must be voluntary, and the offender must be willing to take responsibility for the harm they have caused.

There are three types of restorative justice interventions with varying levels of intensity:

1. Diversion agreement for simple offences;
2. Victim offender mediation;
3. Restorative justice circle or conference.
For young people, most offences are relatively minor and can readily be dealt with by a simple diversion intervention. The worker will generally meet with the offender and deliver a one on one intervention where a diversion agreement is created.

Typically, an agreement consists of undertaking community service work for an agreed number of hours, delivering an apology (where there is an identifiable victim), paying restitution or connecting them with community support services. This could involve counselling, employment seeking services, or accessing housing support. Sometimes the young person will undertake reflective writing about the impact of the crime and set some personal goals to make amends.

Key success factors for this type of diversion are that the agreement is reached speedily, preferably within an hour, be specific in terms of what is required, have a deadline and include an exit appointment. There is extensive follow up on the agreement and completion information is sent to the Saanich police.

For both victim offender mediation and restorative justice circles, an intake process is always undertaken to ascertain which type of intervention will work best in the circumstances. Victims and other participants are fully briefed prior to the conference or circle taking place. If the young person is Indigenous, the circle may take place in the local First Nations Band office with relevant cultural support people in attendance.

**INDIGENOUS POLICING AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE**

I was honoured to visit Tsawwassen First Nation’s (TFN) the site of British Columbia’s first modern treaty where I was hosted by members of the community and First Nations police officers. Tsawwassen First Nations Policing program was initiated by the TFN community and the Police Service seven years ago as a result of a growing problem with crack houses and gang violence. This program is now funded by Public Safety Canada.

The policing model used in this community could be described as culturally responsive community policing. Police staff do not wear uniforms and work proactively and collaboratively with local community members to identify and resolve crime and antisocial behaviour issues. Part of their role is engaging positively with youth by organising community events, delivering sporting activities and participating in community cultural events.

![Members of the Tsawwassen First Nations Policing program and Public Safety Canada staff at Tsawwassen First Nations. From left: Lisa Jacobsen, Elder Barb Joe, Kevin Plummer, Toni Craig, Constable Mike Grandia and Virgil Awasis.](image)

Crime has diminished significantly since the program commenced. When issues do occur, police officers will arrange a diversionary restorative justice process where members of the community, the young person and the Police work out a plan to reconnect the young person, and their families positively with the community. Family and community workers assist this process. The goal is to utilise the care that exists in the community to re-establish or build sustainable relationships. As a result, there has been increased youth participation in community activities and at the time of my visit, there were no young people under youth justice supervision.
This First Nations Policing program also links with adult offenders in prison as part of reintegration planning and supports them on their return to TFN. The collective outcomes of this program are impressive – there has been a 25% reduction in police callouts over the last three years, a decrease in violent crime and domestic violence alongside increased reporting of crime to Police.

**YOUTH JUSTICE COMMITTEES**

In Alberta, 139 Youth Justice Committees across the province provide locally developed forms of restorative justice on referral of young people from the Police and Courts. Committees must be approved by the Provincial Director and have a legislated basis in the *Youth Criminal Justice Act 2003*. These committees are staffed by volunteers from the local community and Police and are trained and supported by Ministry of Justice probation officers (*Alberta Justice and Solicitor-General, 2017*). Some have formed to deal with offending by specific cultural and linguistic groups and there are a significant number that are dedicated First Nations Youth Justice Committees.

Youth Justice Committees may also take on sentencing advisory, public education and crime prevention activities. With a total budget of $350,000 per annum, these Committees are a cost-effective way of delivering restorative justice in a locally relevant way. There is a great deal of responsibility allocated to the Committee members, with data collection and evaluation required as part of their role.

Young people can be referred to a Youth Justice Committee in one of two ways; either by Police following arrest for an offence or by Courts when charged with an offence and on appearance at court the Judge considers the case best dealt with by a Youth Justice Committee. The aim of the young person’s referral to a Committee is to repair harm and restore the young person to the community.

The restorative justice process delivered by these Committees is purposely simple:

- The young person is referred by either Police or the Court;
- Involves victim, offender, community members, and parents;
- Must be completed within 3 months of referral and
- Young person is supported by a community mentor through process.

There has not been any evaluation of the collective impact of this program across the province, however Ministry staff report Youth Justice Committees to be an effective, inclusive and responsive way of dealing with local youth crime issues.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

There are several key success factors identified by providers of diversion programs that distinguish the success of diversion programs I contacted:

- A shared framework that guides practice;
- Community led initiatives to allow local circumstances and stakeholders a place in the ongoing development of the program and allow innovation to occur;
- Police as critical partners with resources to support their part in the process;
- A comprehensive and well-functioning network of organisations to whom young people and their families can be referred; and
- A case management function allocated to a specific agency which can conduct assessments, facilitate contacts with other agencies, ensure goals are met and provide feedback to Police about progress and outcomes in a timely way; and
- Sufficient resources or in-kind support to the key service delivery partners and case managers.
IMPLICATIONS FOR AUSTRALIA

In 2010, an Australian National Youth Policing Model was developed (Australian Government, 2010). Early intervention and diversion strategies were identified as one of the six high priority strategies for policing young people. This acknowledged existing diversionary police practices but suggested a range of other options:

- Ensuring police policy guidelines strongly promote police cautioning, early intervention and referrals for less serious or first time young offending;
- Introducing screening officers to review decisions to prosecute young people;
- Enhancing or developing programs that engage young people in community policing initiatives, recreational programs and crime prevention activities;
- Developing national best practice guidelines for restorative justice conferencing programs and increasing training for these programs; or
- Improving access to restorative justice conferencing programs, especially for Indigenous young people.

My assessment is that within Australia there is a good understanding and a sound body of knowledge regarding what is needed to effectively divert young people to support. What is missing however, is a commitment to put this knowledge into action. Canada provides some excellent examples of how this can be effectively undertaken within a broader policy and legislative context.

The success of the above programs provides further justification for a more concerted effort in Queensland and Australia to consistently divert young people to appropriate support at an early age or as early as possible in their contact with the criminal justice system.

Recommendations

6.3 Develop and implement a state-wide youth diversion program with young people referred based on an evidence-based assessment and local diversion initiatives designed in collaboration with community and agency stakeholders.

6.4 Continue to expand, develop and resource the use of restorative justice and Indigenous cultural models of justice.

6.5 Parenting and caring programs are designed and developed for families from diverse cultural backgrounds, and those with complex needs whose children are at risk of criminal justice involvement.
CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICY AND LEGISLATION

AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

In comparison to Australia which has a minimum age of criminal responsibility of 10 years, the lowest age of criminal responsibility in all countries I visited was higher; 12 years of age in Canada, and 15 years of age in Finland, Sweden and Denmark.

In Nordic countries, children under the age of 15 engaging in criminal behaviour are considered best dealt with by municipal social service authorities. Children under 15 can be interviewed by Police or specially trained interviewers but they cannot be charged, and their matters will not be brought to court. They can however be the subject of compensation proceedings where they have caused damage to a person or property. The guiding principle is always ‘the best interests of the child’.

In Sweden, children and young people can only be interviewed by specially trained members of the police service, with a social services representative present at the interview, hearing and also preliminary investigation. Most police investigations involving children are handled by specialist investigators, for whom a national curriculum has been developed and training must be undertaken every three years.

Young offenders are generally defined as those aged 15 to 18 and in some cases older. In Sweden they are defined as those between the ages of 15 and under the age of 21. Regardless of age definition, young offenders are under the jurisdiction of both child welfare and criminal justice systems in the Nordic countries.

SPECIALISED VERSUS GENERIC LEGISLATION

Canada was the only country I visited that had specific youth justice legislation, in the form of the Youth Criminal Justice Act 2003 (YCJA). Neither Denmark, Sweden nor Finland have specialised youth justice legislation. Adult and youth penalties are guided by the respective Criminal Codes and Community Sanctions legislation. In addition, young people under the age of 18 years can be dealt with by social services legislation if this is in their best interests.

In the Nordic countries, under the respective criminal codes, there are special procedural rules for dealing with children and some special sanctions for young people compared to adults, adults being defined slightly differently in each country. Generally young people do not bear the full weight of the law until the age of 21 years. Exceptions would be in extremely rare cases of violent crime or murder (Lappi-Seppälä, 2016).

Age is also considered a mitigating factor in sentencing practice. In Finland and Sweden, there is a graduated sentencing dependent on age, along with lesser penalties for 18 to 20 year olds.

In Sweden proportionality of sentencing of young people is guided by a set of practice rules which includes both sentencing guidance, and rules about timeliness, legal representation and the role of parents. In determining a sentence for a criminal offence, a young person will receive a reduction in their sentence depending upon their age. For example at age 15 years, when found guilty, a young person may receive a discount of 80% on their sentence. The discount reduces as the age of the young person increases.
LEGISLATION AS AN INSTRUMENT TO INFLUENCE CHANGE

In Canada, the commencement of the YCJA heralded a significant change in the way in which the justice system responded to young people in contact with the law. This Act fundamentally altered the way in which young people are perceived and dealt with, reflected in its features and principles such as:

- Recognition of the greater dependency and reduced maturity levels of young people;
- Resulting principles of sentencing (deterrence, rehabilitation, denunciation, proportionality, incapacitation, use of custody as a last resort, and restoration); and
- Emphasis on diversion at early contact with law enforcement and availability of extra judicial sanctions and measures as options for Police and Prosecutions.

The Declaration of Principles in the YCJA states that it is the policy for Canada with respect to young persons (Government of Canada, 2015).

The YCJA has had two major sets of amendments over time to increase penalties for repeat and serious violent offenders and reduce the complexity of pre-trial detention provisions to facilitate effective decision making; including managing youth in the community where possible while at the same time ensuring that youth who should be detained can be detained.

The amendments created a new stand-alone test for pre-trial detention of youth so that a youth may only be detained if a specific set of criteria are met, including the young person being charged with a serious offence (an offence for which an adult would be liable to imprisonment for five years or more) or has a history of either outstanding charges or findings of guilt (see: http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/yj-jj/tools-outils/back-hist.html for further details).

Across Canada, this has resulted in a decreasing reliance on incarceration for youth and over time plummeting numbers of young people in remand and sentenced to periods of custody. It has also resulted in a flourishing of innovative diversionary and alternative to custody programs and services. These are considered critical elements to an effective crime prevention system as referenced in the work of Wilson and Howell (1993, 1994) and Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman and Carver (2010).

The Ontario Ministry of Children and Youth is one of the Canadian provincial agencies that has undergone radical change since the commencement of the YCJA. Three initiatives that were highlighted for me during a visit to the Ministry were:

- A reorientation of effort towards high risk young people with mental health issues;
- Addressing over-representation of Indigenous people; and
- Accountability for outcomes under a Youth Justice Outcomes framework

This province like others has achieved significant improvements in youth offending and custody rates and is now able to focus its efforts on high risk young people with complex needs and challenging behaviour.

In addition, Public Safety Canada has built an important role in developing the evidence base regarding the prevention of crime. This agency has invested in prevention and early intervention initiatives and commissioned or undertaken research and evaluation of emerging problems such as gangs and mental health and offending. In my view this investment has been an important contributor to the implementation of the many high-quality programs I was witness to in Canada.
TIME LIMITS RELATING TO COURT AND FINALISATION OF COURT MATTERS

The efficient finalisation of court matters to expedite justice and facilitate the distance between the commission of an offence and a sentence is recognised in all countries as an important goal. In Canada and in Sweden there are maximum time periods required by law to bring matters to court and for finalisation.

This was recently determined in Canada under the 2016 Supreme Court Decision R v Jordan where there is now a time limit of 18 months from laying of a charge to finalisation for provincial court matters or 30 months for serious matters determined in higher courts. This ruling applies to all criminal matters, juvenile and adult. The decision was upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada in June 2017. While somewhat controversial, this decision has forced the federal and provincial governments to put in place strategies to speed up trials, including the appointment of additional judges.

Swedish courts have several procedural rules at different points in the legal process that aim to expedite the finalisation of juvenile matters before the courts. One rule is a six-week period between charging a young person (Serving of a reasonable suspicion) to indictment and I was told that 75% to 80% of matters meet this requirement. Furthermore, a trial must be held within 14 days of indictment. Swedish judges I met commented it was rare for there to be delays at this stage. Other processes have been introduced that have created further efficiencies; penalty warnings were introduced one year ago as a means by which prosecutors can administer a punishment without the matter going to court. For young people aged 18 to 21 years, cases must be dealt with promptly but courts may decide their own specific time limit. At Attunda District Court for example, Judges aim to have these cases dealt with within three months.

Helsingborg with a population of about 140,000 people had introduced an efficiency process called the ‘Fast Track for Youth’ due to mounting numbers of youth cases. Under this scheme, a special youth court is held three days per week. Specialised prosecutors and Judges are utilised in the youth courts and parents are strongly encouraged to attend. This process has operated well since 2010 and incremental improvements made as a result of stakeholder meetings which are held every six months. Other towns in Sweden have created similar processes, for example Uppsala has a similar process for 18 to 21-year olds.

Helsingborg has a dedicated group of Judges and Prosecutors, with a commitment to the community they serve, evidenced by their success in collaborating to develop court and judicial services appropriate to young people. This was also evidenced by their close working relationship with local municipality staff who also attended part of the day during my visit. Municipality social workers play a key role in providing assessments and information to the court to inform sentencing, similar to the role of Youth Justice Court Coordinators in Queensland.
Finland does not have specific rules relating to bringing matters to court, but the timely administration of justice remains an important legal principle. Notwithstanding this principle, juvenile cases can take a long time to be finalised. I was told that this is often due to these cases not being sufficiently serious and therefore continually moved down the priority list. Some delays can be offset in particular courts by Prosecutors intervening with a warning or mediation, however my understanding was these mechanisms are not standardised across all courts.

OPERATION OF COURTS

Sweden, Finland and Denmark have similar court processes to each other. The court of criminal and civil jurisdiction is the District Court with a right of appeal to a higher court. Denmark has a High Court from which decisions can be appealed to the Supreme Court. In Sweden and Finland, decisions from the District Court can be appealed to the Court of Appeal. A key difference to Australia is the use of lay judges and the way in which jurors are selected and used in both juvenile and adult matters (see text box). The role of lay judge or jury members is considered an important part of civic responsibility in the Nordic countries. Lay judges are elected by municipalities and may be used alongside an appointed and legally trained Judge to hear criminal matters, decide guilt and order sentences. The process and roles of lay judges is operationalised differently in each country.

A CITIZEN’S DUTY: LAY JUDGES AND JURORS IN DENMARK

Every four years, each local authority puts together a list of possible lay judges and jurors selected from residents of that municipality. Lay judges and jurors must be between the ages of 18 and 70; they must be entitled to vote in parliamentary elections, and they may not have been convicted of any serious offences. In addition, each local authority must ensure that its final list represents a broad section of the population, i.e. in terms of gender, occupation, etc. These lists are then sent to the high courts, who select by drawing lots to fill the number of lay judge positions required by each court.

The courts of law must be independent. That is why government ministers, attorneys, assistant attorneys, ministry staff members, civil servants and staff members of the police, the prison service or the Danish national church and other recognised religious communities cannot act as lay judges or jurors.

Extract from Danmarks Domstole/Danish Courts, http://www.domstol.dk/om/publikationer/HtmlPublikationer/Profil/Profilbrochure%20-%20UK/kap08.html

COURT PROCESS FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS

Children appearing before the court from the age of 15 years onwards will generally be represented by a legal advocate; there will be a municipality social worker present and the attendance of a family member or support person for the young person is strongly encouraged.

I attended two court hearings involving young people in Finland at the Helsinki District Court and in Sweden, at the Attunda District court in Sollentuna, a northern suburb of Stockholm. I also separately met with a Judge and Prosecutor at Helsinki District Court and spent an interesting and very hospitable day with Judges, a Prosecutor and community stakeholders in Helsingborg, Sweden.

The operation of courts in both countries was less formal than court hearings in Australia. Along with the obvious absence of judicial robes, young people were actively engaged in the hearing by the Judge and discussion between parties was encouraged. Apart from Lay Judges who sit at the bench with the Judge, the layout of court rooms and court and buildings was similar to Australian courts. A description of my observations for both court hearings follows.
CASE STUDY - FINLAND: A young man aged 16 years of age, charged with stealing various items from a fellow school student and then using a mobile phone to purchase other items. The defendant had already entered a plea of guilty and the offences were not those that would require a sentence of imprisonment under the Criminal Code. Key features of this youth hearing were:

- Prosecutor is to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed to court, the severity of the offence and whether to execute a waiver.
- Senior Prosecutor can issue a caution or facilitate a mediation.
- Courts are open for youth proceedings, unless otherwise ordered closed by the Judge.
- Lay Judges are only used when the offences if committed as an adult would attract a term of imprisonment.
- Victim attendance and participation is encouraged.
- Bilingual nature of court hearing in Helsinki (due to defendant and victim’s first language).
- Pre-sentence assessment reports are required to inform sentencing.
- Municipality forensic social worker prepares the pre-sentence report, attends and supports the young person at court and provides advice/direction following court about the sentence.
- Judge facilitates negotiation of compensation between offender and victim during the hearing.
- Private arrangements for payment of compensation discussed outside of court with formal collection arrangements made on in exceptional circumstances.
- Legal representation is not mandatory but is available on request or as determined by court.
- Young person has the right to speak for themselves in court regardless of representation.
- Parental attendance is encouraged.

CASE STUDY - SWEDEN: A young woman aged 16 years had been charged with a drug offence (possession of cannabis). Police had been tipped off that that there was drug use occurring on the premises where she resided with her family. The charges were eventually dismissed due to a lack of evidence that the drugs were possessed by the young woman. Key features of this youth court process were:

- An appointed Judge and three lay Judges sit at the bench to determine the outcome of serious youth and adult criminal matters; drug offences are considered serious.
- Lay Judges are elected through local municipality processes for a set term.
- Young people must be legally represented by a lawyer.
- The Ministry of Justice through the Courts pays the defence lawyer and the amount of payment is negotiated and approved by the presiding Judge immediately following hearing.
• Prosecutors can under certain circumstances, decide whether a matter proceeds to court and in addition, can deal with the young person themselves by way of caution or a restorative justice process.

• Young person has the right to speak for themselves in court regardless of legal representation.

• Parental attendance is encouraged and parents have the right to be reimbursed for their costs if they come to court.

• Parents or guardians can be held responsible for damages, but the amount is limited.

• Victims usually attend court and this is arranged by the court.

• Judges engage with community stakeholders to determine resources and services available in the community, to inform sentencing.

• There must be a comprehensive assessment about young people, prepared by social workers that includes suggestions for an appropriate sentence.

Judge Susanne Allgårdh and Toni Craig at Attunda District Court, Solentuna, Sweden.

JUVENILE SANCTIONS AND AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES

Among Nordic countries, young people under the age of 18 are considered best dealt with by welfare authorities. This is a long-standing Nordic tradition, originating in Norway in the late 19th Century where children under the age of 18 were dealt with municipal boards rather than courts, similarly operationalised in Sweden from 1906, Denmark in 1905, and Finland in 1936. The age of criminal responsibility was raised to 15 years of age at the same time (Lappi-Seppälä, 2012). This has remained a firm position in Norway, Sweden and Finland but there has been a wavering of commitment by Denmark in recent years.

Offenders under the age of 15 can only be dealt with by municipal welfare authorities while young offenders aged between 15 and 17 years fall under the jurisdiction of both child welfare and criminal justice authorities. Young adults aged 18 to 20 years are dealt with by the criminal justice authorities (and to a limited extent the child welfare system by providing aftercare). All Nordic countries restrict the use of imprisonment for young offenders and can young people aged 15 to 17 can only be imprisoned for exceptional reasons. Consequently, the number of children sentenced to imprisonment orders is very low, varying between zero and 10 in each country (Lappi-Seppälä, 2012). In Finland for example, in 2016, there were only five young males held on remand in prison and four males and one female sentenced to imprisonment (RISE, 2016).

There is no specialised legislation for dealing with young offenders but instead some provisions for young people to be sentenced differently based on age and a limited range of youth specific sanctions. These sanctions include Juvenile Punishment orders in in Finland, a Youth Contract in Denmark, and Youth Care and Youth Service orders in Sweden.
FINLAND

Finnish law allows a specific legal process called ‘waiving of measures’. This gives the police, the prosecutor or the judge, the ability to waive further action against the person charged with offences. For police and prosecutors, in practice this provides an opportunity to either implement alternative or diversionary measures and for courts, deferral of cases to municipal welfare authorities. This was recounted to me at the Helsinki District Court, where the Chief Prosecutor administers cautions and undertakes mediation processes with young people in certain cases. This option did not however appear to be consistently applied and the processes based on what I was told, appeared to lack the rigour applied to community-based mediation and restorative justice processes.

SENTENCING JUVENILES IN FINLAND

The primary differences in sentencing of young offenders and adult offenders lie in the fact that offenders between the ages of fifteen and seventeen (inclusive) benefit from a mitigated scale of punishment and they benefit from a greater possibility for waiving of measures. There are also some differences in criminal procedure and enforcement of punishments. Juvenile delinquents are given less severe penalties than adult offenders. Also the duration of penalties are shorter and the scales smaller. (p168, Lappi-Seppälä, 2016)

Finland has a dedicated Criminal Sanctions Agency, Rikosseuraamuslaitos (RISE) which is part of the Ministry of Justice. RISE is responsible for the enforcement of sentences including remand and imprisonment. The Criminal Sanctions Agency operates 14 local community sanctions agencies across Finland, 26 prisons and 3 assessment centres, a Training Institute for Prison and Probation Services. Staff from the community sanctions offices supervise youth and adult offenders.

Sanctions are the same for adults and juveniles, except for the abovementioned juvenile punishment order, but always moderated by age at the time of commission of offences. Sanctions include fines, conditional imprisonment (structured case management and supervision), community service, monitoring sentences and unconditional imprisonment (sentence of outright imprisonment). A new specialised juvenile sanction Juvenile Punishment was introduced on a substantive basis in 2005, for young people who are repeat offenders and who have had previous multiple conditional sentences. This youth-specific sanction has not realised any real impact. When speaking with court staff in Helsinki, they indicated this was because very few young people met the fairly strict qualifications for this type of sanction.

Fines are the most common form of sanction applied to young offenders in Finland. This pattern of sanctioning contrasts with Australia, where fines are seldom used with young offenders, possibly because of the younger age of criminal responsibility combined with a lack of capacity to pay the fine. I observed this first hand at the hearing involving a young person in Helsinki District Court, where the penalty for multiple stealing offences was a fine in conjunction with compensation to the victim.

Conditional imprisonment may be applied to cases where sentences of imprisonment of at most two years may be imposed. For youth offenders, conditions may include supervision, curfews and attendance at programs. In practice supervision is undertaken by RISE staff and is similar to youth justice practice in Australia.

Case work with young people in the justice system is predicated on a comprehensive assessment that is undertaken prior to sentencing by a forensic social worker. Once a young person is placed under the supervision of RISE workers, on either conditional imprisonment, community service or youth supervision, case work consists of further assessment and case planning and implementation.
SWEDEN

According to Brå (2017) young people under the age of 21 years most commonly receive fines or waivers of prosecution where the matter is dismissed, and they are seldom sentenced to imprisonment. Young people who commit serious offences under the age of 18 will be sentenced to secure youth care rather than prison.

Sanctions that can be ordered by Swedish court with respect to young people found guilty of criminal offences currently include two specific youth sanctions - Youth Care and Youth Service along with adult sanctions such as fines, probation (with supervision), imprisonment, forensic psychiatric care. At court, young people are presented with a contract which they must agree to before the court but is optional for them to sign.

Youth Care involves supervision by social services agencies and participation in programs and depending on assessment, could be in a residential facility or in the community. Youth service on the other hand is work in the community of some sort; often this involves work in a business or organisation where there may be options for future employment. In Sweden every year about 1000 young people are admitted to residential homes under secure care provisions of the Care of Young Persons (Special Provisions) Act or for 15 to 17 year olds, provisions of the Secure Youth Care Act. This can be for non-criminal reasons such as substance abuse, violent or disruptive behaviour and as a result of criminal behaviour.

Some court stakeholders expressed concern that the range of sanctions was inadequate, although not all shared this view. Clearly this is a growing issue with two new sanctions currently under consultation which provide options for the court when the young person does not consent. These orders are youth supervision and youth monitoring. The latter consists of curfews and electronic monitoring. The official reason for these sanctions being proposed is to provide a broader suite of sanctions and avoid the use of adult penalties for serious offences. (Sveriges Domstolar, 2017).

In addition to formal sanctions, social services can undertake mediations at the request of the prosecutor if the young person admits guilt. Following mediation the matter must still be bought to court. Provided there is a satisfactory outcome in court, a mediation process can reduce the penalty.

Prosecutors play an active role in reducing the matters that are brought to court. As well as deciding whether there is sufficient evidence to bring a matter to court, prosecutors also deliver sanctions such as penalty warnings and fines. Penalty warnings resemble a caution and can be delivered once a young person admits guilt. Senior Prosecutor Magnus Larsson considered this an effective approach and in most cases, he does not see the young person again. The record of conviction for a penalty warning stays in place for only three years compared to a conviction for a juvenile crime where the record stays in place for five years. Fines are given in cases where it is evident that a court would order a fine. The most common offences for juveniles resulting in fines are driving without a license, traffic offences and driving a motorbike without a helmet. Drug offences and stealing are also common among young people, but would be referred to courts to deal with.

CANADA

The federal Canadian government is responsible for the criminal law, including youth justice legislation, research and policy development (along with funding for youth justice programs and services as well as some other youth justice related initiatives, such as gang prevention).

Canada’s eight provinces and territories are responsible for the administration of the criminal justice system. This includes providing court services, administering youth justice orders, collecting and reporting on data and administering funding for services contracted to non-government organisations.
Sanctions available under the YCJA include diversionary options, extrajudicial sanctions and extrajudicial measures along with a range of sentences. Reprimands, Community Service Orders and Probation Orders are similar to Australia, but here are several sanctions that are very different to those available in Queensland (see text box below that describes sanctions different to those in Queensland. There are specific sanctions for young people with higher levels of risk, and/or those who have committed very serious offences.

SELECTED SANCTIONS AVAILABLE UNDER THE YOUTH CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT 2003

**Intensive Support and Supervision Order:** this sentencing option provides closer monitoring and more support than a probation order to assist the young person in changing his or her behaviour.

**Attendance order:** this order requires the young person to attend a program at specified times and on conditions set by the judge. It can be crafted to address the particular circumstances of the young person; for example, the order might target specific times and days when a young person is unsupervised and tends to violate the law.

**Deferred Custody and Supervision Order:** this sentencing option allows a young person who would otherwise be sentenced to custody to serve the sentence in the community under conditions. If the conditions are violated, the young person can be sent to custody. This order is not available to the court for offences in which a young person caused or attempted to cause serious bodily harm.

**Intensive Rehabilitative Custody and Supervision order (IRCS):** this order is a special sentence for serious violent offenders and can be made if:

1. the young person has been found guilty of a serious violent offence (murder, attempted murder, manslaughter or aggravated sexual assault) or an offence in which the young person caused or attempted to cause serious bodily harm and for which an adult could be imprisoned for more than two years and the young person had previously been found guilty at least twice of such an offence;
2. the young person is suffering from a mental or psychological disorder or an emotional disturbance;
3. an individualized treatment plan has been developed for the young person;
4. an appropriate program is available, and the young person is suitable for admission.

*Source: The Youth Criminal Justice Act Summary and Background, Department of Justice Canada, 2017.*

One of the unique features of Canadian legislation and practice is the ability for provinces to implement some sanctions and not others, and for the Provincial Director to declare particular programs under the YCJA. An example is provided later in this report regarding Ontario’s approach to mental health and substance abuse. Another is the use of Youth Justice Committees (see page 34) and another, the use of full-time attendance centres in British Columbia (see pages 49 to 50).

**LEGAL SYSTEM RESPONSES TO INDIGENOUS OVER-REPRESENTATION**

**GLADUE PRINCIPLES AND SUBMISSIONS**

The 1999 R v. Gladue decision (*Gladue Decision*) by the Supreme Court of Canada, under section 718.2 (e) of the Criminal Code of Canada, requires courts to look at all reasonable options available other than imprisonment when sentencing offenders. The *Gladue Decision* stated that this section was intended to be a remedy to address the over-representation of Aboriginal people in Canadian prisons. The implementation of the Gladue Decision means that courts must take into account a specific set of principles (Gladue Principles) when an Aboriginal person is before a court for criminal matters.
Information can be captured in a Gladue report or submission to assist Judges in two ways:

- The factors contributing to offending can be taken into account; and
- Deciding on bail or sentence outcome which can involve alternative and culturally appropriate forms of justice, often restorative justice.

Submissions can be oral or written and can be made by the person appearing before the court or their representative, legal or other advocate. Gladue reports are different to pre-sentence reports and often, both are required. For young people, in British Columbia, youth justice staff are accredited Gladue report writers for young people appearing in court, while in Alberta, Gladue report writers included people from Indigenous organisations such as the Native Counselling Service of Alberta.

Factors considered in Gladue reports or submission by courts are extensive and include a person’s history of abuse, institutional care, disconnection from family and culture, disabilities including Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD), trauma, poverty and experience of substance abuse and violence.

Within Canada’s justice system, First Nations Courts and First Nations Court worker programs are also part of a more responsive and culturally inclusive justice system than mainstream courts and court processes. This Fellowship did not however include visits to those programs - they have been the subject of other Australian Churchill Fellowships (2003, 2009, 2012, 2014 and 2016). Nevertheless, First Nations Courts form a critical part of the overall service system and share similarities with Murri Courts in Queensland.

YOUTH CRIMINAL HISTORIES

In Canada a youth’s criminal history is called a *Youth Record* and has a special definition and status under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act 2003*. A Youth Record is anything that contains information created or kept for the purposes of investigating an offence that could be prosecuted under the *YCJA*. Therefore, it includes more than the identifying information contained in details of arrest and charge and can include information provided by family members, neighbours, school authorities and victims. Youth Records remain open for a defined period, dependent on the offence committed, sentence imposed or whether the young person commits another offence while the record is still open.

The period during which a record is available is called the ‘access period’. Once the access period ends, youth records are sealed and/or destroyed. However, if someone over the age of 18 with an open Youth Record commits another crime, the Youth Record will become part of that person’s adult record. (Department of Justice, 2017).
Access periods for Youth Records vary depending on the seriousness of the offence and the penalty. They vary between two months for a finding of guilt and reprimand to five years for an indictable offence (see Department of Justice Canada’s website [http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/yj-jj/tools-outils/sheets-feuillets/recor-dossi.html](http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/yj-jj/tools-outils/sheets-feuillets/recor-dossi.html)). Access periods for Youth Records related to extrajudicial sanctions are for two years, provided the sanction is completed successfully.

**SUMMARY**

There is much that Australia can learn from Canadian and Nordic legislation and accompanying practices regarding the treatment of children and young people in the criminal justice system. It is apparent that a system where age appropriate and humane treatment of children and young people can be effectively balanced with community safety. Canadian legislation is a particularly pertinent example of this as it has sustained bi-partisan commitment over a 15 year period and has led to significant decreases in youth involvement in the statutory criminal justice system. We can also look to Canada for guidance about pre-sentencing practices and sanctions that are responsive to the unique circumstances of Indigenous people.

Canadian and Nordic examples also demonstrate how community and victim participation can be achieved at multiple stages of the criminal justice process including pre-arrest and pre-court diversion, pre-sentencing, sentencing and post-adjudication. The use of Gladue reports to inform sentencing and encourage restorative justice is an example of how legislation can be used to provide a foundation for more culturally appropriate sanctions and alternative justice mechanisms for Indigenous people.

**Recommendations**

3. That the Queensland Government develops a multi-agency policy regarding the prevention of childhood and adolescent crime and responses to youth crime that:

   3.1 Includes a forward plan to raise the age of criminal responsibility from the current age of 10 years to at least 12 years;

   3.2 Emphasises diversion to appropriate support of children and young people (and their families) coming to the early attention of police and the formal criminal justice system;

   3.3 Integrates child protection, non-statutory family support, youth at risk, mental health and youth justice policies at appropriate points;

   3.4 Prioritises alternatives to the use of secure custody, except for the most dangerous young offenders; and

   3.5 Strengthens preventive efforts in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and families and the role of local government in contributing to crime prevention.

4. The new policy is accompanied by strategic and operational plans to guide the direction, ongoing development and implementation of key activities and initiatives and is accompanied by governance, coordination and oversight mechanisms.

5. The Youth Justice Act 1992 is reviewed and amended, to align it with contemporary evidence to effectively manage young offenders across the continuum of risk and provide sufficient scope to divert young people from the system or to appropriate support.
EVIDENCE BASED ASSESSMENT AND CASE MANAGEMENT

Pre-sentence reports, screening tools and a range of evidence-based risk and need assessment tools are used throughout Canada. There is no one standard tool used in the three provinces I visited. The Youth Assessment Screening Instrument (YASI), Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory, Risk Needs Assessment (RNA) and Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY) are used differentially in each of the provinces I visited along with specialist mental health assessment tools such as the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument version 2 (MAYSI 2). Within provinces, non-government organisations use different and specialised tools depending on agency policy and the specific needs of their client groups.

All jurisdictions utilise evidence-based assessment and case management tools. Where I saw differences to Australia was in terms of a shift to strengths-based tools. For example, the YASI (Orbis Partners, 2007) tools and frameworks were being used widely by non-government organisations providing services to young people in Ontario and by government youth justice staff in Alberta. A less structured Strengths, Needs and Cultural Diversity assessment was being utilised under the High Fidelity Wraparound model used by WrapED in Alberta.

In some cases the use of more strength-based tools has come about because of the way in which deficits and risks are subsequently emphasised when primarily risk focussed tools are used. Users of the YASI suggest that this tool positions staff assessment and therefore engagement with young people in a more positive way. They assert that using the YASI therefore facilitates the development of more positive therapeutic relationships.

I am not advocating that Queensland abandon its use of the well evidenced YLS/CMI, which does provide for consideration of protective factors in the determination of risk. However, I think there is benefit in responding to two key criticisms of the use and application of the YLS/CMI in Queensland, that is:

- the cultural validity of the tool for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people; and
- translation of the assessment into a valid case plan and actions.

British Columbia experienced the latter when it introduced the SAVRY in 2013 as its assessment tool of choice for youth justice clients. Simon Fraser University (SFU) was commissioned to conduct a review of assessment tools and undertook the subsequent implementation of the SAVRY. SFU quickly and fortuitously identified a gap between assessments and case plans. There were inconsistencies with respect to culture and risk statements. In response, SFU developed a tool called the Adolescent Risk Reduction and Resilient Outcomes work plan (ARROW) and training and support to staff. The use of ARROW has significantly improved the quality of case plans and risk statements. There are challenges remaining with respect to the describing protective factors and this could be limitation of the SAVRY tool. Fortunately, SFU has been retained to continue this important work and a longer-term plan includes refresher training, and providing enhanced support to team leaders with model plans and checklists.

Each country’s commitment to evidence-based practice was evident in the use of several gold standard and emerging approaches, particularly to address complex individual and family needs. These included Brief Strategy Family Therapy, Multi-systemic therapy, Functional Family Therapy, Anger Replacement Training, and Hi-Fidelity Wraparound. I also came across an Australian program – Friends, being delivered to at risk children in Helsinki, Finland. Friends is an emotional resilience program developed by Queensland psychologist Professor Paula Barrett.

Innovation was a feature of the work in Finland with senior experts engaged in a process of continuous improvement, seeking new approaches and ways of working to better reflect the changing needs of clients. For example, in Helsinki, a mental health assessment tool – BasisRaadsOnderzoek (BARO) - originating from
the Netherlands was being trialled with young people as part of pre-sentence assessment in recognition of the
need for a more sophisticated understanding of young offenders’ risks, needs and responsivity factors.
Different ways of engaging with clients using the Jersey checklist (Jersey Crime and Society Project, 2012) and
practice models such as the Good Lives Model (Ward, 2002) are also being trialled and implemented.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR JUSTICE INVOLVED YOUNG PEOPLE

Alternative education programs featured as a key component of several interventions with justice involved
and young people in Canada and were integral to the residential services, attendance centre programs and
custody facilities I visited in all four countries. In Ottawa I visited the St John Bosco Achievement Centre which
a partnership between You-Turn, John Howard Society and Immaculata High School, and in British Columbia, a
school that forms part of Waypoint and Daughters and Sisters Full Time Attendance Programs.

Every teacher or education supervisor I spoke with identified a similar set of success factors:

- A good understanding of young people’s learning needs, abilities and disabilities based on
  assessment provided by previously schools or assessment undertaken within the new setting;
- Small class sizes of up to six young people;
- Experienced teachers supported in the classroom by expert youth workers or counsellors, expert in
  engagement; in some cases, psychologists were readily available;
- Individualised, flexible programs of education;
- Access to learning and behaviour support in the classroom; and
- Curriculum and year level completion linked to mainstream schools.

Education and vocational training were universally included as components of all custodial environments in
the Nordic countries and in Canada vocational skills programs were a significant component of daily
programming alongside compulsory education.

In Ottawa, education was mandatory, regardless of the age of the young person. Small class sizes,
individualised programming and in-classroom youth work support were all standard features of these
environments. The William E Hay Centre in Ottawa had the benefit of corporate sponsorship for its vocational
program. Local businesses had contributed funds to build a construction and engineering workshop complete
with equipment for young people to undertake trade certificates.

In Finland, the Sippolan Koulukoti (residential facility) operated three different education programs – one for a
mixed group of high school age young people, one for a mixed gender group of primary school age children
and young people and a third for young people in the behaviour management unit. Teachers described the
education program as individualised, both in terms of pace and content. A small number of young people
from the Kouluhoti can attend a local high school if their behaviour is sufficiently manageable in a mainstream
school environment. At the time I visited one young woman from the Kouluhoti was attending a high school in
neighbouring town and staff transport her to and from school.

Recommendation

6.6 Develop and implement education programs suitable for young people with developmental
delays, cognitive disabilities, experiences of trauma and fragmented education histories.
MENTAL HEALTH RESPONSES

All jurisdictions recognise and address mental health and substance abuse issues. As is the case in Australia, these issues feature significantly among young people in the social services and justice systems, particularly for those under supervision. Assessment and treatment is provided by psychiatrists, psychologists and psychiatric nurses in Finland, Sweden and Denmark. Specialist adolescent substance abuse services are also available but for the most part are not specifically tailored to justice-involved young people. In Canada, I saw evidence of some highly specialised responses to these issues in Ontario and British Columbia, described below.

ONTARIO

There are three levels of mental health intervention in Ontario, including for young people with substance abuse issues impacting their offending:

- a mental health court worker program to identify young people with potential mental health issues and divert them to assessment and treatment;
- an Intensive Support and Supervision program (this is a designated program by the Provincial Director) where young people with significant health needs participate in one of nine community based clinical programs; and
- Intensive Rehabilitation Custody and Supervision Order (IRCS) for young people who have committed the most serious offences – first and second-degree murder or three violent offences.

The combination of these three orders/programmatic responses ensures that Ontario is well placed to deliver appropriately intense and evidence-based interventions for offenders with mental health needs.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

This is the only province with a dedicated Youth Forensic Psychiatric Service (YFPS) which has been operational for over 30 years, under the Ministry of Children and Family Development. Mental health, substance abuse and sex offender assessment and treatment services are available through one inpatient and eight outpatient clinics located throughout British Columbia. It has an annual budget of approximately $11M Canadian. I met the Provincial Director Andre Picard, Clinical Director Dr Kulwant Riar and the Southern Area Manager Andrea Yee on the same day as a visit to the Burnaby Youth Custody Facility, conveniently located next door to YFPS.

The Inpatient Assessment Unit located on site at Burnaby provincial YFPS headquarters has a dual designation as a mental health facility and a place of temporary custody for up to five young people. This consists of a secure facility and provides court-ordered inpatient assessment and temporary hospitalisation to stabilise young people found to be Not Criminally Responsible on account of Mental Disorder (NCRMD) and/or Unfit to Stand Trial. There were 147 admissions during the 2015-16 financial year from throughout the province. A generalist youth facility, Maples Adolescent Treatment Centre, operated by the same Ministry is located in close proximity to YFPS and once stabilised, will accommodate and treat NCRMD young people.

YFPS has also built up research capacity over time by partnering with British Columbia University, where it is also able to source and develop its clinical staff. It is accredited under the International Council on Accreditation scheme. As well as delivering individualised mental health and substance abuse services, staff also provide sexual offence treatment, violent offence treatment and family therapy. FPS is an accredited Functional Family Therapy provider. YFPS staff are multi-disciplinary professionals consisting of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and psychiatric nurses.

British Columbia youth justice services also have access to the Asante Centre, located in Maple Ridge, south of Vancouver. The Asante Centre offers assessment, diagnostic and family support services for young people and adults suspected of having Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) and other brain-based disabilities.
Importantly for youth justice service and young people coming to the attention of the justice system, the Asante Centre also has developed a FASD screening tool. This tool is simple for professional staff to use, requires minimal information and provides an important indicator of whether a full assessment should be pursued. Asante Centre staff also provide guidance and training to youth justice staff in how to appropriately manage young people with diagnoses (Asante Centre, 2018).

YFPS and the Asante Centre represent an enviable configuration of specialist forensic and mental health services for youth justice clients and staff, and are likely to be another factor in why British Columbia has achieved such large reductions in its youth custody and youth community supervision numbers.

Recommendations

6.9  Ensure that young people’s mental health needs are identified at the earliest possible opportunity through access to high quality forensic and psychological services.

6.10  Youth justice staff are equipped with the knowledge and skills to manage and respond to mental health issues and challenging behaviour in both community and custodial settings.

11.  Forensic psychiatric and psychological services, including sexual offender services, are made available for all eligible young people in Queensland, modelled on successful features of the British Columbia Youth Forensic Psychiatric Service that has secure inpatient facilities and several outpatient clinics.

ALTERNATIVE TO CUSTODY PROGRAMS - CANADA

Canada’s Youth Criminal Justice Act makes provision for intensive programs for high risk young offenders and provincial youth justice agencies receive funding to develop and deliver these programs and services. They include Attendance Centre programs. Provinces have discretion to deliver attendance centre programs and the form they take – day programs or full-time attendance centre programs.

NON-RESIDENTIAL ATTENDANCE CENTRES/DAY PROGRAMS

In Ontario, the Ministry of Children and Family Development has elected to deliver day-time attendance centre programs, contracted for delivery to non-government organisations. I visited one of these day programs in Ottawa delivered by the John Howard Society (JHS). The Non-Residential Attendance Centre (NRAC) program accepts only referrals from youth justice staff for young people assessed as moderate to high risk who are under youth justice supervision. The benefit of this program is that because of the court-ordered nature, JHS has the ability to develop a relationship and work consistently with the young person for up to six months. Young people are comprehensively assessed using the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) over four weeks. This NRAC provides gender responsive programming to young men and women with a range of programs offered depending on their assessed needs. Caseloads for each of the two workers are about 13 young people at a time. Staff have a college diploma or university degree and all undertake an extensive range of on-the-job training provided by JHS.

Alberta has two Attendance Centres delivered by the Corrections Division of the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor-General in Calgary and Edmonton. These Centres provides a one-stop shop for justice involved young people including those subject to extrajudicial sanctions, community service orders, probation order, intensive supervision orders and attendance centre orders. They appear to operate similarly to a Youth Justice Service
Centre however a key difference is engaged external agencies in the targeted delivery of programs and services to this client group within a dedicated youth justice setting. The model tends to mix young people at different points in the system and with different levels of risk. The centres have not been formally evaluated.

FULL-TIME ATTENDANCE CENTRE PROGRAMS

In contrast to Ontario and Alberta, British Columbia has 15 Full Time Attendance Programs (FTAPs) located throughout the province, all delivered by not-for-profit organisations. They deliver a combination of supervised accommodation and therapeutic interventions for high risk young people subject to supervised youth justice orders or bail.

FTAPs accommodate small groups of young people (between two and six) and deliver living support, substance abuse and therapeutic programs. Some are accredited, and some are not. They are funded on a per bed per program basis with costs varying significantly between FTAPs. The Ministry is however working towards standardisation of program models and funding. Future changes will be informed, at least in part, by an evaluation of the Indigenous program components program currently being conducted by Simon Fraser University.

Individual FTAPs target young people based on particular characteristics; for example, sex offenders, young Indigenous women, substance use affected young women and young men and incorporate in-house education as a key component. Two programs are specifically for young people subject to bail.

Young people participate in these programs as a condition of a court order, generally a probation order or other order that has a community supervision component. Youth probation officers will recommend a specific type of FTAP as a pre-sentence recommendation to the court. Young people are required to reside in FTAPs for between four and six months depending on the specific conditions of their sentence, their criminogenic needs and the type of program.

Two different residential models are used: Family Care and residential care models. An evaluation of FTAPs was undertaken in 2014 and changes to the service models were made that included a reorientation to the use the of Family Care models. Family Care models use a combination of professional foster carers with centre-based day programming that includes education. Young people may also attend evening and some weekend programming depending on the nature of the FTAP they have been assigned to.

In contrast, residential care centres accommodate young people in a house where they participate in education and programming on site. These centres are staffed 24/7 with a rotating roster. There are only two of these remaining, including Am-Ut one of the services I visited.

The variability in duration of stay in FTAPs for sentenced young people is a historical feature of the service delivery contract between the province of British Columbia and the different organisations. FTAP staff considered four months to be insufficient time to facilitate change for young people with complex needs. They suggested six months as the preferable timeframe. Similarly, during my visit to the Sippolan Kouluokti in Finland, staff at that institution believed six months stay was an optimal time to stabilise the behaviour of young people with challenging behaviour.

The FTAPs are contract managed by a senior youth justice manager Einar Poulsen who undertakes this role for the whole province. Einar clocks up thousands of kilometres traversing the length and breadth of British Columbia to support each of the 15 FTAPs.

Am’Ut for Indigenous young women is located in Surrey, British Columbia, and delivered by Elizabeth Fry Society, a non-government organisation with a long-standing history in correctional reform and advocacy for
women in the justice system. This service accommodates between four and five young Indigenous women and uses a residential care model. Am’Ut partners closely with local Indigenous people to deliver cultural healing and gender responsive programming alongside an education program delivered within the residential setting.

Am’Ut had only recently moved to new premises in Surrey having been previously located two hours north of Vancouver. The move was precipitated by the absence of support and quality education services and the presence of suitable accommodation and access to far superior services in Surrey.

On the day I visited Elizabeth Fry Society, evidence of a more responsive and sympathetic education service in the new environment emerged. A teleconference took place to resolve the provision of appropriate education services in the new residential facility involving staff from Am-Ut, the local Surrey Education Board, Ministry of Education staff and the FTAP contract manager. I was given permission to listen in on the conversation and several aspects of that discussion stood out:

- Ministry of Education allocates funding to regional school boards based on a per capita formula with an additional allocation to respond to special needs. They are flexible in terms of moving funding as students move to new locations with new School Boards.
- Surrey School Board provides a unique arrangement where funds for special needs are pooled and allocated in a flexible manner as needs dictate.
- FTAPs receive teachers and education support that are reflective of the target group.
- Allocation of resources included a teacher with expertise with the target group for between two and four hours of schooling per day for whatever number of days the program required.

The flexibility of funding and acknowledgement of the special needs of this group of young people was outstanding and warmly welcomed by participants in the teleconference. The Surrey School Board is credited by youth justice staff as being one of the most responsive and innovative in British Columbia.

**Waypoint and Daughters and Sisters**

I visited staff from two FTAPS delivered by PLEA Community Services Society of British Columbia (PLEA) at their Surrey facilities. These are both for substance abuse affected young people under youth justice supervision.

1. **Waypoint** is for up to six young men, located in Surrey, British Columbia and delivered by PLEA.
2. **Sisters and Daughters** is for up to four young women, also located in Surrey and operated by PLEA but located at a different site than Waypoint.

Both FTAPs deliver therapeutic, education and professional foster care to young men and women with substance abuse issues or substance abuse related offending. Young people reside with their foster families and attend PLEA for school and therapeutic programs during the day, some evenings and weekends. There are a maximum of two young people residing in each foster family, who may also have two of their own children.

The education component of the program is two hours per day, four days per week and is delivered by a teacher and a learning support worker. A youth support worker is also in the classroom to assist learning and manage behaviour when required. Education programming is individualised and based on learning assessments conducted prior to commencement at the program. They generally start the young people at year 10 equivalent and fill in the learning gaps as required. For young people with cognitive disabilities, the general strategy is lots of repetition, positive reinforcement and dedicated learning support.

The therapeutic elements of the program are focussed on substance abuse, life skills and developing personal resilience and are delivered in both group settings and individually by the staff psychologist.
While the family care models used in Waypoint and Daughters and Sisters have intuitive appeal and some support in the research literature (Broderson, Urquhar, Pankratz, and Viljoen, 2013), the evaluation of these programs due for completion at the end of 2018, will provide further evidence of their effectiveness and suitability for high risk/high needs justice involved young people.

ONTARIO’S RESPONSE TO INDIGENOUS OVER-REPRESENTATION

Since 2007 the Ontario Ministry of Children and Youth has reconfigured its staff capability, resourcing and programming to attempt to reduce the over-representation of Indigenous young people in the criminal justice system. This commenced with an extensive engagement strategy with Indigenous community partners, young people and agencies. As a result, there are now 46 dedicated Indigenous programs that range from crime prevention programs to custody and reintegration. These are delivered by 27 different agencies 24 of which are Indigenous.

Programs include small custody centres in the north of the province run by Indigenous agencies for Indigenous young people. Ge-Da-Gi Binez at Fort Frances is one of these, Mee-Quam Youth Residence in Cochrane another. This is remand and custody centre which is a partnership between Ininew Friendship Centre and the Ontario Government. Both centres incorporate strong cultural elements such as traditional teachings, Indigenous history, cultural ceremonies as well as education, anger management and life skills programs.

Reintegration work in the north of the province is undertaken by remote community workers. They support young people on discharge from custody. At the prevention end of the spectrum, two communities have access to child care and youth recreation services delivered by non-government organisation, Right to Play.

In addition, cultural competency training is compulsory for youth justice staff – an 8 hour online training program that must be undertaken within two months of a person commencing work in the Ministry.

More recently, The Journey Together: Ontario’s commitment to reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples (2016), a response to Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission has guided the work of the Ministry and other government agencies in the province. Commitments include:

- Indigenous specific victim services;
- Incorporation of Indigenous legal principles and systems into Ontario’s legal system;
- Piloting an Indigenous language court;
- Expanding use of restorative justice programs
- Increasing the number of Gladue report writers and aftercare workers;
- Increased community bail services – piloting eight new Indigenous bail and remand programs; and
- Culturally responsive healing services to Indigenous inmates in custody and community supervision.

**Recommendations**

6.4 Continue to expand, develop and resource the use of restorative justice and Indigenous cultural models of justice.

6.7 Intensive supervision and intervention models are developed for high risk young offenders to better respond to their complex criminogenic and social wellbeing needs, including the use of cultural healing and mentoring for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people.

6.8 Develop, trial and evaluate alternatives to custody programs that test different care models including the use of professional foster care and Indigenous approaches.
CUSTODY AND DETENTION

There is much Australia can learn about the use and nature of custody in both the Nordic countries and Canada. I visited five facilities in Finland, Denmark and Canada and one government agency which manages multiple custody facilities in Sweden.

Features in common across all custody facilities were the combination of small facilities or small living units within larger facilities, the use of open facilities or open custody status which allows detained young people access to services and support in the community, well trained staff, strong accountability and monitoring frameworks and the existence of oversight organisations independent of government.

CUSTODY FACILITIES VISITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and province</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of clients</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Sippolan Koulukoti</td>
<td>Males and females aged 13 to 18</td>
<td>12 plus 8 (secure)</td>
<td>Municipal care for 12 girls and boys Secure behaviour management units x 2</td>
<td>Government agency, Finnish Institute of Health and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Statens Institution Styrelse (SiS)</td>
<td>Males and females</td>
<td>700 places in 23 centres.</td>
<td>Municipal care and Sentenced</td>
<td>Government agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Nexus</td>
<td>Males and females aged 15 to 17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Open and restricted custody facility – sentenced and municipal care</td>
<td>Municipal social service organisation, City of Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada – Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>William E Hay Centre</td>
<td>Males aged 12 to 17 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Closed custody facility – sentenced and – remand</td>
<td>Private organisation: Youth Services Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Livius Sherwood Centre</td>
<td>Males aged 12 to 17 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Open custody and detention – co-located William E Hay Centre but with separate access.</td>
<td>Private organisation: Youth Services Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada – Burnaby, British Columbia</td>
<td>Burnaby Youth Custody Centre</td>
<td>Males and females aged 12 to 17 years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Closed custody – sentenced and remanded. Youth Forensic Psychiatric Service on same site.</td>
<td>Government agency: Ministry of Children and Family Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Youth Service Bureau had taken the initiative to developing transitional accommodation and support services on the former Sherwood site. This investment and change of strategy was a direct response to the diminishing numbers of young people being sentenced to and remanded in custody. In parallel, the building...

---

2 In Ottawa, the Sherwood Centre had only recently relocated to the William E Hay Centre premises from a now-decommissioned community location.

3 Burnaby Youth Custody Centre had experienced an average of 40 to 50 young people per day for the past five years so consistently has significant excess capacity.
and access points at William E Hay Centre were in the process of being reconfigured to accommodate the open custody status young people.

It was commendable that open custody arrangements are in place and that there are very few incidents involving young people not returning. This is credited to very good assessments about young people’s risk and placement, the relationships purposely developed between staff and young people and positive behaviour management strategies that staff are trained and adept at applying.

**SMALL SCALE FACILITIES**

Compared to Queensland, custody and residential facilities were smaller, as indicated by the table above. Facilities in Finland, Sweden and Denmark were small, accommodating between 20 and 30 young people in units of between 4 to 8 young people. In Canada, the two custody centres were moderate in size (capacity of 50 and 80 young people) with small groupings within. They have not reached capacity for several years and as a result have been able to reconfigure space for education, vocational training and leisure activities. Other facilities in Ontario and British Columbia that I did not visit are also small, accommodating between four and 24 young people in residential type open custody facilities, and these are in regional and remote parts of the country.

In **Finland**, there are five Koulukoti, similar in size, accommodating between 20 and 30 young people in small accommodation groupings. At Sippolan Koulukoti, up to 23 young people could be accommodated at the time I visited. This included four young people with challenging behaviours who were accommodated within a separate smaller secure house. An additional behaviour management unit had recently been built which could accommodate another four to five young people once open. Comfortable onsite accommodation is also available for visiting family members and a transitional unit for young people to live semi-independently leading up to their departure from the facility.

The buildings are old and registered historic places but internally are modern, home-like and well-equipped, including the ubiquitous Finnish sauna.

*Boys unit at Sippolan Koulukoti, Sippola, Finland*
In **Sweden**, Statens Institutions Styrelse (SiS) now builds single units to accommodation wings to accommodate individual young people with very difficult behaviour in Secure Youth Care facilities. They can then be separated from other young people and/or join other young people depending on their behaviour but are not in solitary confinement.

*Architect’s impression of a new Secure Youth Care facility in Sweden, image courtesy of SiS.*
Denmark’s facilities vary in size and security arrangements depending on their purpose. Nexus which I visited was located an hour from Copenhagen by train, small, open (with some capacity to secure young people) and accessible to the natural environment used in rehabilitation programs. This centre provides a school and therapeutic interventions and a variety of outdoor activities. Anger Replacement Training is one of the main programs delivered in this setting and youth work staff are trained to support young people’s skills and learning. A system of rewards and incentive-based behaviour management system is also in place.

Aerial view of Nexus showing the surrounding natural environment, surrounding space and recreation facilities.

Outdoor recreation area at Nexus complete with sauna.

Basement activity room at Nexus.
PHILOSOPHIES OF CARE

RELATIONSHIP BASED CARE

In Ontario, the Ministry is committed to the use of a relationship custody approach, directed at fostering respectful, caring relationships between staff and young people that enable staff to support and provide effective, evidenced based interventions to benefit youth.

A 2016 review of residential care services in Ontario found that while relationship custody approaches were commendable, the variability in quality of care across with stark differences between government operated centres and ‘transfer payment’ facilities which are operated by non-government organisations under contract. Other service providers and the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth referenced the high levels of care and professionalism in transfer payment facilities such as the William E Hay Centre which I visited.

The review panel made several recommendations (see Appendix 6) related to custody and detention centres with the intent of creating consistency of high quality care for young people by integrating and sharing standards of care, human resources, and best practices. In addition, the review recommended using the excess capacity in custody centres to improve other aspects of the juvenile justice system and ‘meet the needs of all justice-engaged youth’. Other improvements identified were the streamlining of relationship custody, minimisation and consistency of practice regarding the use of isolation, and improved reintegration support for both young people and their families, for example resources to engage families and provide young people with the necessary skills to support their return home.

The Ontario Government announced the closure of the Roy McMurtry Centre following the publication of this review and another report produced by the Ontario Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth (PACY). However, this facility will continue to operate until 2020.

Respectful relationships and therapeutic engagement of all staff with children and young people in residential care were obvious features of the Koulukoti environment in Finland. I observed staff taking the time to talk to young people in kind and caring ways, encouraging them to reflect on their behaviour as part of structured daily interactions and in the behaviour management unit as part of as structured positive behaviour management program.

Another noticeable feature in all the facilities I visited was the absence of staff uniforms. This was a purposeful strategy for all the centres to facilitate interactions between workers and young people.

ENGAGING ENVIRONMENTS FOR YOUTH

In the Nordic countries, the overwhelming philosophy was that young people in the youth justice system are generally those that have been harmed or disadvantaged and who require care and guidance as opposed to punishment. The impression staff conveyed was that young people are respected. They are not demonised or considered unworthy of comfortable and well-resourced living environments and they are able to access activities that young people outside of a detention centre environment would receive. There is a strong orientation towards outdoor activities for both young men and young women.

The facilities were all located outside of main residential areas and like Australia, there can be neighbourhood concerns expressed from time to time about the proximity of young offenders. Communication with neighbours is a key part of the management team’s role in these circumstances.

Children in Finland and Denmark had access to indoor and outdoor activities and free time around their compulsory schooling and therapeutic activities. This included excursions to the city and sporting events or activities. The most restricted young people are those subject to secure custody or closed care orders although they generally have access to onsite activities while accompanied by staff.
**Recommendations**

Instead of continuing to plan and build large secure institutions for the detention of children and young people, that Queensland:

9.1 Progressively designs and acquires a range of small scale detention facilities, with:

9.2 Contemporary philosophies of care that are culturally safe, trauma informed, age appropriate, and responsive to the mental health needs and cognitive capacity of children and young people.

9.3 Comprehensive assessment processes to determine placement within the custody environment, supervision levels and where appropriate, the nature of reintegration activities.

9.4 Genuine reintegration and normalisation activities that allow suitable young people to spend time outside the detention centres for specific activities, family or community events.

9.5 Reintegration activities and support with young people is facilitated by workers in community based non-government organisations including engaging those workers/organisations in pre-release or reintegration planning.

**OVERSIGHT AND MONITORING**

Every Canadian province and territory has an official advocate for children and youth or similar organisation. The Canadian Council on Child and Youth Advocates is an alliance of these advocates from Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Ontario, Yukon and Saskatchewan, as well as the Youth Services Section of the Nova Scotia Office of the Ombudsman and the Québec Commission des droits de la personne et des droits de la jeunesse. Where both Advocates and Ombudsman’s offices exist within a jurisdiction, Ombudsman’s offices vary in focus and use depending on the powers under the provincial advocate’s legislation.

While the mandate of each Advocate differs by jurisdiction, members share a common commitment to advocate for the participation, rights and dignity of children and youth in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

In Ontario, the Office of the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth (PACY) is particularly strong, influential and effective. It has a legislatively mandated role as an independent advocate for children and youth who are either in government care, in custody or ‘on the margins of government care’ in the province of Ontario. PACY reports directly to the government and has its authority in the Provincial Advocate for Youth Act 2007.

I met with two Child and Youth Advocates who explained their role further. Because the Provincial Advocate has powers to both proactively investigate or review matters as well as respond to complaints, it has a great deal of ability to influence government policy and service delivery.

Child and youth engagement is a strong component of this organisation’s approach and youth involvement is evident in its many reports and reviews available at the PACY website. A dedicated community development team within PACY undertakes Rights Education with young people in all institutions.
PACY was spoken of with greatest respect by service providers and government staff in Ontario including an acknowledgement of its ability to highlight systemic flaws and have these heard and addressed. A recently released report *It Depends Who’s working: the youth reality at the Roy McMurtry Centre*, resulted in the recently announcement that this large youth custody facility will close down by 2020. Immediate changes are the prohibition of secure isolation of youth for more than 24 hours.

I did not visit British Columbia’s Representative for Child and Youth (RCY), but I did access information from the organisation’s website ([https://www.rcybc.ca/about-us](https://www.rcybc.ca/about-us)) and from Ministry staff about RCY’s role in youth custody and other facilities. There are similarities with the PACY but some important differences that limit its power and disperse investigations across two agencies – RCY and the Ombudsperson’s office.

The RCY is independent and reports directly to the provincial legislation and it does have the ability to advocate for children in both child welfare and youth justice systems. However, under the BC *Representative for Children and Youth Act 2006*, it does not have the range of powers available in Ontario. For example, it does not have the ability to proactively review and investigate matters and is limited to reviews of critical injuries or death. Within custody centres, the Ombudsperson’s office appears to have more impact and investigates a range of concerns and complaints, including those of children and young people.

While a detailed analysis of the different models of oversight and monitoring is beyond this Fellowship report, it is worth considering Canadian models such as the Ontario PACY alongside Australian models when considering future options, consistent with the recommendations of the 2017 Independent Review of Youth Detention Centres in Queensland, namely recommendations 8.R1 and 8.R2.

**Recommendation**

10. *Queensland Government institutes oversight of youth detention centres by an independent body with expertise in children and young people’s wellbeing, legislated powers to investigate complaints and review operational and systemic issues within custodial, alternative to custody and residential facilities, and integrates community visitor functions into the oversight organisation.*
ENABLING AND SUPPORTING FEATURES

SKILLED AND WELL SUPPORTED WORKFORCE

All countries had developed specialised expertise and training for youth justice workers. Sweden, Finland and Denmark staff in institutions are well trained in comparison to staff in detention centre facilities in Australia. Staff holding roles equivalent to youth workers in Queensland youth detention centres are required to either have or be working towards obtaining a three-year Bachelor of Social Sciences degree. The required degree is common across the Nordic countries and is called Socionom (Sweden and Denmark) or Sosionomi (Finland). Institutions also employ nurses, psychiatric nurses, and psychologists. Finland has a dedicated training unit for probation and corrections staff.

In Canada, the skills levels and qualifications of staff working in custody facilities varies between provinces and within organisations, generally requiring both degree and certificate qualified staff. Burnaby Custody Centre in British Columbia is the only internationally accredited custody facility in the country, with accreditation achieved under the Council on Accreditation (COA) since 2006. It was the first custody service in North America to undergo and successfully become accredited. The BC Ministry for Children and Family Development also provides specialised training for youth probation staff to work with sex offenders. At one stage, working with sex offenders was a specialised role but with decreasing youth justice caseloads, this role and therefore access to training has been dispersed.

Alberta Corrections has introduced staff training called Effective Practices in Community Supervision or EPICS (University of Cincinnati). This is undertaken over seven months and provides a structured framework for supervision involving a combination of monitoring, referrals and face to face interactions at the right dosage to effect change. Similarly, Finland is increasing the engagement and supervision skills of probation staff by training in the use of the Jersey Checklist.

In British Columbia, senior youth justice staff, called Youth Justice Consultants are appointed in each service delivery regions to provide support and training to youth justice staff, expert advice on complex cases, coordinate local stakeholder arrangements and facilitate information flow and cooperation between regions and the provincial youth justice office. (See Appendix 5 for role description)

Youth Justice Consultants report directly to the Regional Directors who have responsibilities across the Child and Family portfolio, so this is a critical role to ensure high quality and consistent youth justice practice throughout the province. Given the similarities of British Columbia with Queensland and the nature of youth justice with respect to other human service agencies, this is a role that I consider could improve youth justice service delivery in Queensland. Importantly this is a role that could assist embed new practices and programs.

Recommendations

7. All youth justice staff have a minimum human services qualification, preferably a degree and this is supplemented by knowledge of child development within a range of cultural contexts, the impact of trauma on children’s behaviour and skills in managing challenging behaviour, de-escalation and motivational and behaviour change techniques.

8. Regional senior practice experts are appointed as a core part of youth justice staffing providing supervision, mentoring and coaching to casework and youth work staff to facilitate the delivery of consistent, high quality casework, interventions and behaviour management.
NATIONAL COORDINATED CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGY

All countries I visited had a national coordinating body, a national strategy and varying levels of resourcing for crime prevention planning, programs and research.

- National Crime Prevention Centre Canada
- Danish Crime Prevention Council (DKR)
- Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå)
- National Council for Crime Prevention, Finland

The national crime prevention bodies in Canada, Finland and Sweden were embedded in and administered by government agencies, Public Safety Canada, Finnish Ministry of Justice and Swedish Ministry of Justice. In contrast, DKR operated as a membership organisation but was funded by the Danish Ministry of Justice. All have input from a variety of government bodies, non-government sector and industry and they all rely on partnerships to implement their national crime prevention strategies. The strongest and most influential bodies are those with the ability to administer funding for strategic and operational crime prevention activity.

INVESTING IN RESEARCH AND EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICE

Canada evidenced a significant commitment to crime prevention in all its forms through the support and investment provided by federal government agencies, Public Safety Canada and Department of Justice Canada. Brå in Sweden is also a well published organisation with a great deal of accessible information about crime, and responses to crime available in the public domain.

I was particularly impressed by the independence and quality of the research and evaluation agenda in Canada, including Public Safety Canada’s ability to apply evaluation and cost-benefit analysis to the government’s ongoing program investment. A publication called *Tyler’s Troubled Life* (Public Safety Canada, 2016) demonstrates the type, cost and benefits of investment in intervention at various points in this hypothetical, but typical troubled young person’s life.

The Canadian government through Public Safety Canada makes a substantial investment in national priority areas to test new models, evaluate, aggregate and publish the findings. The five-year duration of pilot funding for programs originating from Public Safety Canada was commendable as it allows sufficient time for programs to be developed, implemented and improved. Recipients of this funding reported a high level of satisfaction with the five-year time frame.

Public Safety Canada also develops public domain tools and resources to assist government and non-government organisations develop and improve their policy, programmatic, and service delivery responses to prevent youth offending.

**Recommendations**

2. *The Australian Government supports research and continues to develop the evidence based about what works in Australian crime prevention and responses to crime, with a renewed focus on effective approaches, programs and services, including building the evidence base for Indigenous services.*

12. *Develop a comprehensive research agenda and provide associated funding that allows Queensland to contribute to the evidence based regarding preventing and reducing offending, including incentives to pilot and evaluate new models and to develop evaluation capacity within Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisations.*
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There were many features of each country that impressed me; that were founded on a combination of common sense, humanitarian philosophies and a commitment to evidence-based practice. Overall British Columbia in Canada appeared to have a superior youth criminal justice system with elements of specialisation and good practice evident across the service system continuum. It is no surprise therefore that British Columbia has evidenced the greatest decline in youth offending and detention population numbers of all Canadian provinces and territories. It currently has a rate of 2 per 10,000 young people in custody, in comparison with 5 per 10,000 for the whole of Canada and 3.4 per 10,000 for Australia.

Canada’s 15-year comprehensive reform agenda has reaped significant benefits from a consistent effort by successive governments to reduce and respond to crime committed by young people. Since 2003 when the Youth Criminal Justice Act commenced in response to the failures of previous legislation, the rates of young people being charged with offences, sentenced to community supervision and sentenced to periods of custody has declined by 40% across the country. Unlike Australia, Canada, has a single national legislative basis to its youth criminal justice system with some discretionary elements that provinces can elect to utilise. Differences in sanctions were evident in the three provinces I visited, including the differential use of attendance centre programs and Youth Justice Committees.

Alberta and Ontario were concerted in their efforts to work with Indigenous peoples, delivering a wide range of restorative justice options, and other services aligned with Indigenous healing and cultural frameworks. British Columbia proved to be exemplary with its combination of prevention, diversionary and restorative justice programs supported by excellent youth forensic mental health services, Indigenous-specific service delivery models and an extensive network of alternative to custody facilities.

As a result of its sustained reform agenda, Canada is now able to redirect resources to respond to the highest needs young people and address emergent issues and trends; for example, young people with serious mental health issues, and the prevention of gangs and associated gun violence and drug trafficking.

Nordic countries share a commitment to a welfare state with government funded support for all residents and citizens across the life span including free welfare, health, childcare and education. Social policy within these countries is focussed on equity of access to quality human services with a focus on prevention and early intervention. This philosophy, in my view, results in a more humane and responsive criminal justice service delivery system in these countries.

At the time of my visit, young people could not be charged with criminal offences until the age of 15 years in all Nordic countries. Court and justice services delivered within this context are particularly humane with sanctions proportionate to young people’s age and capacity. I was impressed with the inclusive and solution-focussed way in which courts operate in both Finland and Sweden and the use of lay people to ensure that courts operate as a reflection of the communities they serve. My visits to two residential centres for young people with challenging and criminal behaviour with small residential groupings, well trained staff and large open grounds was testament to very different approach to Australia’s high security youth detention centres.

Youth crime prevention is delivered as a mandatory part of Nordic human service systems involving Police, Schools and Social Services agencies. In Denmark this is particularly well developed with formal partnerships (SSPs) and legislation providing a platform from which to deliver place based proactive and reactive crime prevention activity. Sweden also has a formal system of place-based policing and community agreements forming the foundation for comprehensive crime prevention activity and responses to emerging antisocial behaviour and a network of crime prevention partners. I was impressed by the way in which municipalities...
such as those in and around Stockholm and Helsingborg were engaged in the delivery of prevention and early intervention activities with families and children from a very young age as well as youth specific services.

Nordic countries are challenged by new and second-generation immigrant populations with growing gang violence and crime emerging in locations where there are substantial immigrant communities. However, rather than being paralysed by this, crime prevention partners in Denmark, Sweden and Finland were actively engaging with these communities in positive ways and engaging proactively with forums and activities to promote inclusion and joint problem-solving.

Societal changes are however changing the nature of public discourse about crime and how to address it, and has resulted in recent and significant changes to government policy. In Denmark, while there is a long standing and genuine commitment to crime prevention, urban communities are challenged by the emergence of youth gangs and the concentration of offending among ethnic groups and communities. Shortly after I returned to Australia in late October 2017, a new youth justice policy framework was launched by the Danish government called ‘Alle handlinger har konsekvenser’/‘All Actions have consequences’. This strategy effectively lowers the age of criminal responsibility to 12 years of age for high risk young people. Rather than these young people being dealt with by youth courts, they will be dealt with by Youth Crime Boards, constituted by at least one member of the Judiciary. This represents a significant departure from the approach of other Nordic countries.

Nevertheless, all countries included in my Fellowship travels, have an impressive commitment to the wellbeing of their children and young people, enabled by a strong taxation base, the use of evidence-based programs and services and a willingness to innovate and respond to emerging challenges. There is much to learn from Canada, Finland, Sweden and Denmark. In combination, they provide the foundations and features of a world class crime prevention and youth justice system.

These features are summarised in a table on pages 10 and 11 of this report.

SURPRISE LEARNINGS AND EXPERIENCES

Every day of my Churchill Fellowship was a process of discovery and sometimes in unexpected ways. I have captured some of the more significant experiences below.

1. Facilitating connections between visited countries and individual agencies, for example, sharing evaluation tools between Australia and Finland, sharing crime prevention contacts between Denmark and Sweden and exchanging information about contract management processes between Canada and Australia, to name a few.

2. Nordic countries were complementary about Queensland’s specific youth justice legislation and specialisation of courts and youth justice services.

3. Every country was modest about their performance and felt they could be doing a lot better; which bodes well for an environment of learning, sharing and ongoing improvement.

4. Canada remains challenged by Indigenous over-representation and, justice officials while committed to playing their part are somewhat despairing that the justice system is expected to provide answers to problems and issues that need to be solved by multiple agencies and sectors of the community.

5. Drugs, guns and violence and radicalisation are the newest manifestations of a rapidly changing population and social dynamics in all countries.

6. Public discourse and political responses are becoming harsher and more punitive with respect to crime committed by young people, particularly evident in Denmark.
Since my return to Australia in late October 2017, I have delivered a series of presentations to justice colleagues about various topics from my Fellowship experiences. Topics have included alternatives to custody, diversionary approaches and working with Indigenous young people. In November 2017, I participated in a panel discussion at a public event about youth justice hosted by the Youth Advocacy Centre in Brisbane. In February 2018, I will deliver a seminar at Griffith University about the findings from this Churchill Fellowship.

My experiences will continue to be useful in my work in a youth justice agency. I am integrating many of my learnings into practice and programmatic changes and policy advice. I have connected colleagues in Brisbane with overseas colleagues to facilitate ongoing connections and information exchange. Social Impact Bonds (Finland) and improving the experience of Indigenous and ethnic minority youth in custody facilities (Canada) are two such topics.

Following the Queensland election, in late 2017, responsibility for Youth Justice Services has been moved to a new agency, Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women. This move provides a new set of opportunities, particularly the ability to influence prevention and early intervention policy and service delivery approaches for vulnerable families, children and young people.

I will continue to seek opportunities to present my findings at conferences and other public forums during 2018. Armed with a now completed report, I have greater ability to present options to senior leaders and influence policy change in Queensland and other jurisdictions.

In 2019, I plan to present a conference paper on reforms to Queensland’s youth justice system, complete with data and information in support of successful implementation, at the European Society of Criminology annual conference or a similar international forum.
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### APPENDIX 1: CHURCHILL FELLOWSHIP ENGAGEMENTS - COUNTRIES, PLACES, ORGANISATIONS AND PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institution or organisation consulted</th>
<th>Function or type of service</th>
<th>Persons who provided information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs and Health Care</td>
<td>Government policy</td>
<td>Marie Malja &amp; Päivi Kaukonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Criminal Sanctions Agency, Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>Government programs and practice</td>
<td>Tiina Kylönen (Instructor) &amp; Heikki Turkka (Project Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Research and evaluation, Nordic justice expert</td>
<td>Professor Tapio Lappi-Seppälä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Assman Lapset Ry</td>
<td>Youth At Risk and Outreach</td>
<td>Tiina Kylönen (Instructor) &amp; Heikki Turkka (Project Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Helsinki District Court</td>
<td>Justice Services</td>
<td>Judge Jari Sega, Judge Nina Järvinen &amp; Tapio Räike (Prosecution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippola</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Sippolakan Kolonkoti</td>
<td>Residential Facility</td>
<td>Ilja Lindberg (Director), Unit Staff, Teachers &amp; Paula Kerola (Advisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippola</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Sippolakan Kolonkoti</td>
<td>Residential Facility</td>
<td>Kolonkoti Teachers, Behaviour Management staff &amp; Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Helsinki Youth Social Work Unit</td>
<td>Youth Justice Assessment, Court Support</td>
<td>Leo Hämäläinen (Forensic Social Worker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Police Prevention Unit, Paalas</td>
<td>Youth Crime Prevention, Early Intervention, Diversion</td>
<td>Segaant Mikko Pennanen, Pia Päättinen, Senior Constable Tiina Alanen, Senior Constable Jenni Mustikanen, Emmi Ahosta (Social Worker) &amp; Anna Kärkkäinen (Social Worker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>National Board of Institution Care (NSI)</td>
<td>Crime Prevention and Custody Services</td>
<td>Camilla Jepson (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacka</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Nacka Municipality</td>
<td>Crime Prevention and Custody Services</td>
<td>Jan Landstrom, Bjorn Callmer &amp; Matts Bohman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Stockholm (Stockholm municipalities)</td>
<td>Crime Prevention, Early Intervention, Custody Services</td>
<td>Mikael Jepson (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish Police</td>
<td>Crime Prevention, Early Intervention</td>
<td>Anders I Hall (Police Commissioner) &amp; Jenny Girensen &amp; Justine Kerstin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Stockholm District Court</td>
<td>Criminal Court</td>
<td>Judge Susanne Åhgård</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SLF)</td>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>Ulla Bengtsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Stockholm District Court</td>
<td>Criminal Court</td>
<td>Judge Anna Tömmers, Senior Judge Margot Åsberg, Senior Judge Stefan Reimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Stockholm Police Prevention Service</td>
<td>Criminal Court Prosecutions</td>
<td>Magnus Larsson (Senior Prosecutor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingborg</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention</td>
<td>Crime Prevention Strategy</td>
<td>Elsa Bratt (Safety Strategist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingborg</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Helsingborg Youth Justice Unit</td>
<td>Youth Justice Services</td>
<td>Magdalena Svensson (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice, Research Division</td>
<td>Government Research and Data Analysis</td>
<td>Ann-Julie Boezen-Pedersen (Deputy Head of Division Research and Documentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice, Prevention Division</td>
<td>Government Policy</td>
<td>Michale Schaubung-Müller &amp; Katrin Thorsvig Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Venus, KURO</td>
<td>Youth Residential and Custody Services</td>
<td>Marie Ryan Olesen, Harri Hagemann &amp; Morten Serrinsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Copenhagen SPS</td>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>Annette Thore Boile, Michael Longhigo-Pedersen &amp; Clifford James Philips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanderborg</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Skanderborg and Silkeborg Municipality</td>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>Benny Heiste &amp; Pernille Petersen (SPS Consultants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Det Kriminalpræventive Råd (Scandinavian Crime Prevention Council)</td>
<td>Crime Prevention Coordination, Advocacy and Public Servicing</td>
<td>Henriette Nolbi Christiansen, Anders Young Rasmussen &amp; Flemming Wind Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>European Society of Criminology</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Kids Partnership</td>
<td>Government, Community, Community Management</td>
<td>Dr Marilyn Van Dieten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ministry of Children and Family Services</td>
<td>Community Development and Data</td>
<td>Brian Snajg (Manager, Mental Health and Specialized Client Services), Mike Hors, Emily Goudie, Steve Sylvester &amp; Mike Provine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Child and Family Services</td>
<td>Child and Family Services</td>
<td>Dr. Tony John McLean (Chief &amp; Youth Advocate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ottawa Police Services</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Jimmy Shillington (Chief of Police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Aboriginal Children's Centre</td>
<td>Youth Services and Youth Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Marina Gudebrant &amp; Megan Bradley (Youth Coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ottawa Inuit Children's Centre</td>
<td>Youth Services and Youth Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Brian Kruglic (Manager) &amp; Ray &amp; John Ross (Custodian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ottawa Inuit Children's Centre</td>
<td>Child and Family Services</td>
<td>Brian Kruglic (Manager) &amp; Ray &amp; John Ross (Custodian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ottawa Inuit Children's Centre</td>
<td>Child and Family Services</td>
<td>Brian Kruglic (Manager) &amp; Ray &amp; John Ross (Custodian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Institution or organisation consulted</td>
<td>Function or type of service</td>
<td>Persons who provided information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ridgetown Detention and Custody Centre, Youth Services Bureau of Ottawa</td>
<td>Youth custody and detention</td>
<td>Mr. Pate, (Program Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ottawa Police Service - Youth Services</td>
<td>Youth diversion</td>
<td>Justice Murray (Assistant Youth Advisor) &amp; Sergeant John Abbott (Staff Sergeant Youth Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ottawa Police Service</td>
<td>Daily residence, detachment</td>
<td>Mr. Morrow (Mental Health Clinician), Staff Sergeant (Mental Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Regional Youth Achievement Centres</td>
<td>Gang and violence prevention</td>
<td>Mr. Davis (Director), Miss Holland (Youth Worker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ottawa Youth Support Services</td>
<td>Day care and family therapy for high-risk youth</td>
<td>Mr. Hooper (Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>St. Pat's Drug and Alcohol Services</td>
<td>Drug and alcohol withdrawal for high-risk youth</td>
<td>Mr. Hooper (Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Nepean Youth Support Services</td>
<td>Youth diversion</td>
<td>Mr. Hooper (Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>The Youth Detention Centre</td>
<td>Youth diversion</td>
<td>Mr. Hooper (Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Kingston Correctional Centre</td>
<td>Crime prevention, integrated youth justice</td>
<td>Mr. Hooper (Secretary), Manager (Family Services) &amp; Manager (Youth Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>St. Edmundsmund's School</td>
<td>Crime prevention, Youth Engagement</td>
<td>Miss Hensby, Miss Ryczkowska &amp; Mr. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Correctional Services, Ministry of Justice and Solicitor-General</td>
<td>Youth custody supervision and program delivery</td>
<td>Bradley Clark (Director Community Corrections and Reentry Programs), Alice Branco, Cheryl MacIntosh &amp; Chrysa Angus (Reentry Corrections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Homewood School Education Authority</td>
<td>Out of School Education</td>
<td>Mr. West (Director of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>St. Paul's Youth Institute</td>
<td>Crime prevention, Youth Engagement</td>
<td>Mr. West (Director of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham, Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>York and Regional School</td>
<td>Child and youth justice</td>
<td>Mr. West (Director of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, Alberta</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Edmonton Youth Justice Initiatives, Young Offender Branch, Ministry of Justice and Solicitor-General</td>
<td>Restorative justice, youth justice supervision, programs</td>
<td>Lisa Prokopow (Manager - Alberta Corrections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, Alberta</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Edmonton and Calgary Youth Justice Centres</td>
<td>Youth custody supervision and program delivery</td>
<td>Ms. Prokopow (Manager - Alberta Corrections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, Alberta</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Edmonton Youth Justice Centre</td>
<td>Crime prevention, Youth Engagement</td>
<td>Catherine Brown (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Burnaby Policing Unit, Police, Delt. Canada (Pacific Region)</td>
<td>Crime prevention, Youth Engagement</td>
<td>Mr. Cook, Ms. Anaka, Ms. Peake, Ms. Brown, Andrew Hodges, David Simonds &amp; Lisa Jacobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Fraser Valley Youth Correction Centre</td>
<td>Crime prevention, Youth Engagement</td>
<td>Ms. Peake, Ms. Anaka, Ms. Peake, Ms. Brown, Andrew Hodges, David Simonds &amp; Lisa Jacobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Gang Prevention Program</td>
<td>Crime prevention and youth intervention</td>
<td>Ms. Peake, Ms. Ryczkowska, Ms. Greg, Ms. Hals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Gang Prevention Program</td>
<td>Crime prevention and youth intervention</td>
<td>Ms. Peake, Ms. Ryczkowska, Ms. Greg, Ms. Hals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Surrey Schools Welcome Centre</td>
<td>English language classes and preparation for adult</td>
<td>Caroline Lee &amp; Michelle Verma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: OECD REGIONAL WELLBEING INDICATORS: QUEENSLAND, AUSTRALIA AND SELECTED CITIES/REGIONS IN CANADA, DENMARK, FINLAND AND SWEDEN

Each region is rated in terms of eleven topics important for well-being. The values of the indicators are expressed as a score between 0 and 10. A high score indicates better performance relative to the other regions. Within Australia, the ACT’s rankings are provided as a comparison for Queensland and other capital cities in other countries. Queensland scores very well on all indicators with its lowest being for income. Canberra scores exceptionally well. In terms of safety Queensland rates very highly, slightly behind Helsinki and Copenhagen. ACT is the safest region.
APPENDIX 3: FINNISH FAMILY CENTRE MODEL AND OVERVIEW OF STRATEGY FOR THE INTEGRATION OF SERVICES FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN (LAPE)⁴

Family centre: a network of services

Support from specialised services

Social services
- e.g. family work, home and family counseling

Health services
- e.g. maternity and child health clinics, physicians, speech therapists

Services of NGO’s, parishes etc.

Meeting place

Child and the family

Early education

Integration of services for families with children

Ministry of Social Affairs and Health extract from an unpublished presentation on Reform to address child and family services (LAPE)

⁴ Ministry of Social Affairs and Health extract from an unpublished presentation on Reform to address child and family services (LAPE)
Surrey Wraparound Program

The Surrey Wraparound Program (Wrap) is a partnership between the Surrey School District, RCMP and the City of Surrey. The program’s objective is to positively attach youth to school, their community and the home by building a trusting and positive relationship. Parents, caregivers and/or guardians are included in goal setting while assisting the program’s objective in building a positive lifestyle and self-worth for youth.

The following are some of the program highlights:

- Wrap can collaborate with school staff, the parent and youth in goal setting and outlining strategic interventions that assist the youth to be successful in the school environment;
- Wrap has seven School District staff who work collaboratively with youth and family;
- Wrap has two dedicated RCMP members who can build a positive and trusting relationship with youth who may historically have had difficulty with police and authority figures;
- Wrap can provide and supervise work experience for youth that is helpful to the community while building self-worth;
- Wrap can provide athletic and recreational opportunities through the Parks and Recreation Department of the City of Surrey. Also, Wrap can facilitate artistic, creative and other opportunities in relation to a youth’s interests and strengths;
- Wrap can help youth utilize their strengths in a positive manner through awareness in a mentoring relationship;
- Wrap collaborates with family in a manner that is supportive and non-judgmental.

Contact:
Rob Rai, Assistant Manager
Safe Schools Department
Tel: (604) 505 8105
Email: rai.r@sd36.bc.ca
APPENDIX 5: YOUTH JUSTICE CONSULTANT JOB DESCRIPTION, BRITISH COLUMBIA

MINISTRY OF CHILD AND FAMILY DEVELOPMENT

The Youth Justice Consultant works as part of the Provincial Practice Branch amongst a team of consultants to support SDA practice and implement Ministry policy and programs. The Youth Justice Consultant is a practice expert in youth justice matters and provides clinical consultation on the most serious and complex cases. To facilitate evidence informed practice, the Youth Justice Consultant provides clinical guidance and practice leadership for youth justice programming and service delivery within the SDAs.

**Duties specific to this position include:**

1) **Staff support**
   - Provides guidance and assistance on the interpretation and application of legislation and policy and ensures the philosophy and legal requirements of the Youth Criminal Justice Act, other federal and provincial legislation (BC YJA, Criminal Code) and Ministry policies are understood and consistently applied.
   - Responds to questions regarding youth justice matters from staff in all service streams, ranging from policy and practice interpretations to the serious and complex case consultations.
   - Provides consultations regarding assessment, resources, integrated service planning, and clinical support to managers, team leaders, youth probation officers and others as required.
   - Where appropriate, facilitates/participates in integrated case conferences with a team of professionals and clients on the most complex cases.
   - Support youth justice staff and team leaders with facilitating appropriate Transition/Service Planning (Tool Box) requests
   - Consults with Team Leaders, youth justice staff and other MCFD service stream personnel to ensure that reportable circumstances are reported to leadership and Provincial Office, which may include gathering relevant information regarding the incident and advising on the written presentation of the report, plus identifying and addressing any related policy or practice issues.
   - Supports YPOs and team leaders through co-ordination of IRCS-SFF cases funded under the IRCS agreement, and with support in the preparation of IRCS, Adult Sentencing and other specialized complex reports.

2) **Training**
   - Provides mentoring and training support for new youth justice staff regarding the Youth Criminal Justice Act, other relevant legislation, youth justice policies and practice.
   - Assists with the ongoing professional development and training of youth justice staff, staff from other MCFD service streams and community partners through facilitation of practice forums and training events.
   - Assists with funding applications for training initiatives including IRCS part D special projects.
   - Assist with co-ordinating the provision of systems training (Cornet & Justin) for youth justice staff .
   - Supports student practicums in conjunction with youth justice team leaders.
3) SDA Leadership/Management Support

- Supports SDA team leaders in their evaluation of the clinical practice of youth probation officers by assisting with file reviews.
- Assists SDA managers and team leaders with case specific file reviews as requested.
- Supports the SDA to meet the targets of the Community Youth Justice Strategic Plan; monitors and provides reports to the Provincial Director regarding the Strategic Plan.
- Assists SDA leadership in the identification of gaps in youth justice services and the development of plans to address these gaps.
- Assists the Provincial Director and SDA leadership with strategic staff planning regarding vacancies, recruitment and hiring processes.
- Supports SDA leadership in liaison with contracted services, co-ordination of SDA based youth justice initiatives and facilitation of the SDA youth justice advisory group.

4) SDA Community Support

- Promotes reconciliation and indigenous engagement activities and initiatives including support in the completion of Gladue reports.
- Liaises with indigenous agencies and communities, ensuring all youth justice training includes or considers an indigenous component.
- Works with and provides support to contracted agency partners and assures that effective liaison is in place to facilitate best practice and program referrals.
- On behalf of MCFD, communicates with and presents to Ministry partners, schools and colleges, police and community organizations regarding youth justice.
- Supports the development and facilitation of Restorative Justice practice within the SDA's.

5) Provincial Office/Justice System Support

- Participates in policy and program evaluation and development with the provincial Specialized Intervention & Youth Justice Branch.
- Participates in practice evaluation and development with the provincial Practice Branch and the Specialized Intervention & Youth Justice Branch.
- Serves as a link between the Specialized Intervention & Youth Justice Branch and SDA in relation to policy and program development and implementation.
- Serves on the Youth Justice Programs Advisory Committee (YJPAC) as per YJPAC terms of reference.
- Works with youth justice staff, finance/procurement staff and provincial Specialized Intervention & Youth Justice Policy Branch to facilitate applications for IRCS and Special Federal Funding, and to assist with reporting for federal cost sharing purposes including tracking of YPO FTE utilization and expenditures on contracted youth justice services.
- Ensures that effective consultation and communication links are in place with youth custody services, the Judiciary, Crown Counsel, Court Services, Youth Forensic Psychiatric Services and Adult Corrections (Federal and Provincial).
- Supports the centralized administration of Full Time Attendance Program/bail beds with regard to screening, court ordered conditions, intake, tracking, incident reports, etc.
- Provide Court testimony as required during adult sentencing hearings and other complex Court hearings.
APPENDIX 6: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM REPORT OF RESIDENTIAL SERVICES REVIEW PANEL TO MINISTRY OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH ONTARIO, CANADA

1. The two separate systems of secure custody and detention (directly and transfer payment operated) be harmonized and integrated into a single system to ensure that the placement and transfer process considers the entire array of resources to meet the needs of youth, resources are maximized, training is standardized and best practices are shared and scaled up system-wide.

2. Consideration be given, where demand is demonstrated, to converting youth justice open custody residences with excess capacity to youth residences serving the full spectrum of youth justice-engaged youth requiring stable housing including: open custody youth; youth transitioning from open and secure custody requiring reintegration support; youth on probation; and youth for whom a stable residence is required to qualify for bail.

3. A review of the remaining excess capacity in youth justice open custody and detention as well as secure custody and detention be conducted and excess capacity be rationalized. Any savings accrued should be reinvested in residential services for youth, to address areas in which there is inadequate investment.

4. Standards and best practices from all operators with respect to relationship custody be documented and form the basis of training for all youth justice open and secure custody and detention staff in both transfer payment and directly operated facilities.

5. The Ministry ensure that the frequency and duration of Secure Isolation is minimized as required by legislation and policies and that conditions in Secure Isolation are not punitive. This will require that the Ministry sustain its current efforts on an ongoing basis.

6. The impacts of size of the facility and gang-affiliations of some of the youth at the Roy McMurtry Youth Centre be mitigated by transferring out youth with secure custody sentences of 30 days or more, as well as youth on long term detention (who would be returned for purposes of Court appearances), to the closest and most appropriate youth justice secure custody and detention facility with capacity. Such transfers should be considered using a case management model in the best interest of the youth.

7. Supports and resources be enhanced to support positive outcomes and the successful transition into, between, and out of residential services, including after care and reintegration into the community.