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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CONTEXT FOR THIS REPORT
The Family Inclusion Project (FIP) was operational between November 2010 and June 2011. The origins of the project were a series of discussions between senior officers of Juvenile Justice and the Coffs Harbour Indigenous Coordination Centre (ICC) in early 2010. The venue for these discussions was the North Coast Justice and Human Services Regional Forum. This venue is a multi-agency forum coordinated by the NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet. Its purpose is to coordinate the various justice and human service programs in regional NSW. The ICC and Juvenile Justice recognised that they had shared agenda in terms of reducing both Indigenous over-representation and levels of juvenile recidivism in the criminal justice system.

These agencies approached the Centre for Children and Young People at Southern Cross University to coordinate and evaluate the implementation of a Wraparound model of intervention with Juvenile Justice clients. The community of Kempsey on the North Coast of NSW was chosen as the site to conduct the project as it has a history of high levels of general and Indigenous juvenile recidivism and is also the site of a number of government funded family support agencies.

The Family Inclusion Project therefore mirrored the collaborative effort that it sought to implement and evaluate. The project was funded by the Indigenous Coordination Centre, coordinated by the Centre for Children and Young People and staffed by a psychologist with research expertise seconded from Juvenile Justice.

“Wraparound” is an individualised and strengths-based way of working with families with complex needs. It relies on collaboration among service providers and is based on 10 principles. These principles include promoting family voice and choice in the casework process and using natural supports such as families’ networks of interpersonal and community relationships, as well as community based services.

The project was important because Wraparound offers a different approach to working with Juvenile Justice clients, which has largely focused on the individual client rather than the families and agencies supporting them. A key feature of the Juvenile Justice Corporate Plan 2010-2013, however, is to improve its community based services by increased use of family-focused programs and interventions and by developing effective relationships with other service providers in all areas of NSW.

The Coffs Harbour Indigenous Coordination Centre funded a 12-month trial of a Wraparound casework approach and the project officer was seconded to the Centre for Children and Young People in August 2010. The project concluded with the release of this evaluation report in August 2011.
OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT METHODS

The Family Inclusion Project involved two distinct activities: the development and implementation of the Wraparound model, and the concurrent evaluation of the impact of the model on Juvenile Justice clients and families as well as on Juvenile Justice caseworkers and interagency partners.

The project research plan involved five sequential phases:

Phase 1 – Baseline Data Collection

- A survey of human service agencies to understand and map the policy context and current network of agencies providing services to young people and their families, including Juvenile Justice clients, in Kempsey.
- Baseline measurement of attitudes towards interagency collaboration in Kempsey using the Collaborative Partner Questionnaire (CPQ).
- Baseline measurement of levels of client engagement in the Kempsey Juvenile Justice office prior to the project becoming operational. This was done via administration of the Therapeutic Engagement Measure (TEM).

Phase 2 – Wraparound Model Development

- Formation of an Interagency Steering Committee to bring together service providers to advise on the model, secure support for the process within individual agencies and the Aboriginal community, and to ensure coordination and collaboration.
- Collaborative development of a Wraparound model of service delivery and accompanying operations manual for Juvenile Justice staff, including referral criteria and case management processes. In this model the Juvenile Justice Officer was allocated a “primary casework” role – with responsibility for ensuring the young person’s full range of needs were addressed, including through increased interagency cooperation, under the mentorship of the project coordinator. This was a significant change in philosophy and therefore practice of Juvenile Justice Officers who had historically focused on working solely with the young person.
- Development of a comprehensive evaluation strategy for the routine collection of a range of process, outcome and associated cost data within the Wraparound model.

Phase 3 – Wraparound Model Implementation & Refinement

- Wraparound casework offered to Kempsey Juvenile Justice clients and families meeting referral criteria.
- Implementation of the wraparound service and routine data collection with consenting young people and families.
- Continuing collaborative refinement of the process. Regular service review meetings to coordinate the process, to document issues and refine the approach, including data collection.
Phase 4 – Follow-up Data Collection

- Post-project follow-up of caseworkers and interagency partners using the CPQ to assess any change in their attitudes, capacity, practice and experiences regarding interagency collaboration in relation to young people (and their families) involved with Juvenile Justice.
- Post-project administration of the TEM with Juvenile Justice Officers for clients who had participated in the FIP.
- Semi-structured interviews with the young people (and their families) in Kempsey having participated in the project to explore their perceptions and experiences (positive & negative) of interacting with multiple community service agencies within the Kempsey community.

Phase 5 – Analyses & Reporting

- Analysis of follow-up data and interviews.
- Writing of a project report with recommendations for use of the model with respect to the reduction of youth recidivism and Aboriginal over-representation in the criminal justice system.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Although the project was not restricted to Aboriginal clients, the priority target group was families of Juvenile Justice clients who were male, from an Aboriginal background, aged 14 years or younger, had been suspended from school and had previous involvement in the criminal justice system.

Eight families were invited to participate in the Family Inclusion Project. Of these eight families (five Aboriginal), five accepted the invitation (three Aboriginal). Of these, four families (two Aboriginal) progressed to engage with the project.

All participants were male and aged 14 years at the time of referral. Despite their young age, all had previously been placed in detention either as a result of being refused bail or having previously been sentenced to a Control Order. One client had first been sentenced at 12 years of age, another at 13 and two were 14 when first sentenced. Their criminal histories predominantly included property offences, such as stealing from shops or homes, as well as breaking and entering and some drug offences. One client also had a history of assaults and reckless wounding in company.

Most clients had experienced significant adversity in their young lives. All clients had experienced parental separation, with one client suffering the loss of his mother and unborn sister in a motor vehicle accident when he was aged seven. He was also an occupant of the car but escaped serious physical injury. Another client had also experienced the traumatic death of an older sibling.
**Main Findings**

While the limited sample and data available for this 12-month pilot don’t allow for conclusive findings, the results and discussion presented throughout this report do indicate the following key learnings:

1. **A number of factors were identified that supported the implementation of a Wraparound model aimed at reducing youth recidivism**
   - A survey of existing agencies providing services to families and young people in Kempsey revealed a broad range of services to which Juvenile Justice clients could be referred.
   - A policy context was identified that helped to highlight the relevance of the project to meeting the objectives of these services.
   - The project Steering Committee facilitated positive relationships between agencies.
   - The pre-project measurement of attitudes of collaborative partners indicated a high level of willingness to work with Juvenile Justice clients, with slightly lower levels of confidence and knowledge about the client group.

2. **Other factors were identified as barriers to the implementation of the model**
   - The pre-project survey also indicated that workload demands were seen as the main obstacle for interagency collaboration.
   - Although initial referral and recruitment for the project was positive, the project faced challenges in maintaining momentum. This had less to do with opposition or resistance to the project, as much as responding to the significant case management issues presented by clients, as well as dealing with the challenge of staff turnover in regional areas.
   - Efforts were made by the project to secure Commonwealth funding to expand the project via the addition of an Aboriginal Family Engagement Officer. Such funding was contingent, however, on State Government funding also being available to continue the FIP coordinator position. This funding was not forthcoming within the required time-frame.
   - The change of government in NSW in March and the postponement of the state budget until September significantly contributed to the difficulty of identifying funding to continue the project.

3. **A number of factors were identified as being key in securing and maintaining engagement of families and young people with the Wraparound model**
   - The main factors that supported clients and families to engage with the model were the existence of prior relationships and the program rationale being easily understood and considered relevant.
   - Factors that inhibited engagement with the model had to do with confidence and experience of working within the Wraparound model and the matching of expectations between parents and Juvenile Justice Officers, as well as the challenge of finding an opportunity to get the sustained attention of clients who often have quite changing, chaotic and unpredictable lives.
   - Some ethnic and gender-based cultural challenges also arose. Although successfully navigated in this case, they highlight the desirability of having an Aboriginal Family Engagement Officer as part of the project.
4. Involvement in the development and implementation of a Wraparound model had a number of impacts on the attitudes, capacity and practice of interagency collaboration.

- There were no significant changes in agency partners’ attitudes regarding inter-agency collaboration but the pre and post-project measurement scores were trending in the desired direction.
- Caseworkers reported improved communication and role clarification as benefits of the model.
- The relationship with the Juvenile Justice Officer was reported as being a key factor in enabling good interagency collaboration with other agencies.
- Having personal contact with other agencies was reported by Juvenile Justice Officers as a benefit of the model.
- There was an acknowledgement among Juvenile Justice Officers that working in a Wraparound model required more time than delivering services as usual.
- Notwithstanding the extra time needed to work within this model, there was also evidence of the potential for casework efficiencies to be gained in adopting this model.

5. There were a number of impacts of the Wraparound model on the young people and families.

- The evaluation suggested clients had higher than normal levels of engagement under this model, at least as far as keeping appointments and relating well to their Juvenile Justice Officer.
- One parent reported feeling greatly supported by their involvement in the project, another parent reported the opposite and a third parent reported their involvement was better than previous experiences of supervision.
- One client reported an improvement in his relationship with his father as a result of his father being referred to a mental health service during the project.
- Clients were reluctant to attend school despite significant efforts being made to assist them re-engage. Similarly, clients were reluctant to engage in other community activities.
- Two of the four clients were charged with further offences during the course of the project and for which they served periods of time in custody on either remand or control.
- The long-term impact of the project on both clients and agencies is difficult to estimate because of the short duration of the project and the small number of families referred to it.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and discussion presented throughout this report, the following recommendations are offered regarding the potential of a Wraparound interagency model to reduce youth recidivism:

1. The Wraparound service model warrants further exploration and implementation over an extended period of time in Kempsey. There is widespread support for the model among human service agencies in Kempsey and it is consistent with the Juvenile Justice Corporate Plan 2010-2013, specifically with regard to the outcomes associated with Community Based Services – Increased use of family-focussed programs and interventions. Additionally, the model is consistent with previous imperatives for the government to invest in collaborative and community-based programs to address juvenile offending and Indigenous over-representation e.g. Murphy et al. (2010) and Richards et al. (2011).

2. The Commonwealth and State Governments should commit to funding an expanded trial of Wraparound. The current project has suggested the potential of the model to improve service delivery to Juvenile Justice clients, including those from an Aboriginal background. The recent Commonwealth Parliamentary Inquiry into Indigenous youth in the criminal justice system has recommended that the Commonwealth Government work with state and territory governments to coordinate sustained and flexible funding support for a range of youth justice diversion and rehabilitation services which are developed with and supported by local Indigenous communities (Recommendation 39). The Inquiry also recommended that the Commonwealth Government commit further resources to evaluate the effectiveness of Indigenous youth justice and diversion programs and that the findings be published by the Indigenous Justice Clearinghouse and the Closing the Gap Clearinghouse websites (Recommendation 32).

3. Any future Family Inclusion Project should include an identified Aboriginal Family Engagement Officer. The project demonstrated the crucial role played by Aboriginal staff in this model and the importance of mitigating against staff turnover or attrition.

4. Any future Family Inclusion Project should delineate the responsibilities of the FIP facilitator and evaluator. The research integrity of any future FIP would be strengthened by ensuring the FIP facilitator is not also responsible for the evaluation of the project.

5. The ethics review process of Southern Cross University and Juvenile Justice should be more closely coordinated. More time could be invested in the operational aspects of any future project if the ethics review processes of SCU and Juvenile Justice were concurrent, rather than consecutive.

6. That Southern Cross University and Juvenile Justice continue to identify opportunities for collaboration that result in improved understandings in responding to the needs of Juvenile Justice clients and their families and communities. The project has demonstrated the value of Southern Cross University and Juvenile Justice collaborating in areas of overlapping agenda. It is likely that other opportunities exist for further collaboration that would be of benefit to both Juvenile Justice and Southern Cross University.
INTRODUCTION

PROJECT CONTEXT – YOUTH RECIDIVISM

The rate at which young people commit crime and then re-offend (recidivism) is a subject of much concern for Australian governments and public policy makers. In 2006 the New South Wales (NSW) government set itself the task of reducing the proportion of those who re-offend within 24 months by 10% by 2016. Although rates of adult recidivism have remained steady since the baseline reporting year of 2004-05, rates of juvenile recidivism have increased during this time and are approaching 60%. That is, worse than every second juvenile who participates in a Youth Justice Conference or receives court-ordered supervision with Juvenile Justice receives another supervised court order or Youth Justice Conference within two years.

Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system is also of particular concern for all Australian states. Australia’s Indigenous peoples are over-represented in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems (Tilbury, 2009). New South Wales is home to the largest number and proportion of Indigenous people in Australia. Although just 4% of the population of young people in NSW are from an Aboriginal background, they comprised 33% of those in out of home care and 50% of those in the state’s juvenile detention centres during the 2009-10 financial year (NSW Department of Human Services, 2010).

Although not an independent predictor, research in Australia has shown that a young person’s Indigenous status is correlated with rates of recidivism. Chen et al. (2005) found that the rate of juvenile recidivism for Indigenous males was 187% higher than that for non-Indigenous males, while the odds of an Indigenous juvenile appearing in an adult court within eight years of his or her first court appearance are more than nine times higher than those for a non-Indigenous defendant. Similarly, Vignaendra & Fitzgerald (2006) found an odds ratio of almost three for Indigenous versus non-Indigenous juvenile offenders having a proven court appearance within five years of completing a Youth Justice Conference (a restorative justice court-diversion scheme). Weatherburn, Cush and Saunders (2007), however, found that although Indigenous offenders were significantly more likely than non-Indigenous offenders to recidivate, Indigenous status did not exert an independent effect on risk of re-offending. In other words, although many Indigenous offenders recidivated, this was more likely due to the fact that they were also young or not at school, rather than simply that they were from an Indigenous background. It is important to note that the research does not point to purely racially-based explanations of Indigenous juvenile recidivism in Australia.

Given the high rates of Indigenous recidivism, however, it is evident that successful efforts to reduce juvenile Indigenous recidivism would substantially reduce juvenile recidivism in general. It is also likely to reduce adult Indigenous over-representation in the prison system. A study by Beranger, Weatherburn and Moffatt (2010) highlighted the impact of adult Indigenous recidivism on Indigenous over-representation in prison. It was estimated that by reducing Indigenous recidivism by 10% there would be a reduction of 30% in the number of Indigenous court appearances each year. The report’s authors concluded efforts to reduce Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system should be focused on offender rehabilitation and assistance in promoting compliance with court orders.
RISK, NEED AND RESPONSIVITY

A number of lines of criminological research have converged on the findings that efforts to reduce recidivism and enhance rehabilitation are most likely to be effective when the risk, needs and responsivity principle is applied (Andrews et al., 1990; Bonta et al., 2008; Lipsey et al., 2010). Therefore the focus of rehabilitative interventions with juvenile offenders should therefore be on high-risk clients with large numbers of criminogenic needs and should be delivered in a way that maximises the likelihood of them responding positively.

As noted above, recent research in NSW has identified juvenile offenders who are most at risk of re-offending to be those who:

- are male
- are of Indigenous descent
- are aged less than 14 years
- are out of school and
- have had two or more prior contacts with the criminal justice system (Chen et al., 2005; Lynch et al., 2003; Payne, 2007; Vignaendra and Fitzgerald, 2006; Weatherburn et al., 2007).

INTERVENTION MODELS

There are currently two main approaches to working with young offenders in NSW. The first is based on the premise that criminogenic needs are best addressed by Juvenile Justice Officers (JJOs) correcting faulty thinking and teaching new skills to clients. This is exemplified by the Changing Habits and Reaching Targets (CHART) program, which is described as a practical tool to support casework with young offenders. It has a skills-oriented, cognitive behavioural focus (Victorian Department of Human Services, 2009). CHART is a worksheet-based program and is based on a similar program delivered to clients of a UK Probation Service and which demonstrated its effectiveness with these clients.

A second approach to working with young offenders focuses less on changing the thinking of clients and more on changing their “social ecologies”. This approach is exemplified by the Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) of Juvenile Justice. The ISP aims to intervene intensively in the various “systems” in which a young person is situated, e.g. family, school and community systems. This approach is based on Multisystemic Therapy (MST) and has also been shown to be superior to other “services as usual” approaches to working with young offenders (Borduin, 1999; Henggeler et al., 1996; Swenson et al., 1998). The ISP employs clinical psychologists who work intensively with small numbers of families and are on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In addition to spending several hours a week in the homes of clients, ISP clinicians can be called on to attend the family home within 45 minutes in response to a crisis. In contrast to CHART, the ISP would be difficult to take to scale outside of metropolitan areas of NSW because of the costs involved and the skills and qualifications required to deliver it are not readily attainable or possessed by most Juvenile Justice staff.
Despite this, however, there are good reasons to favour systems-based interventions over an approach based mainly on cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT) or relapse prevention. Among these are the risk, needs and responsivity principle referred to above. It may be argued that modular and work-sheet based CBT approaches may not optimally match the needs, motivations and learning style of young Juvenile Justice clients who have exited the mainstream school system before age 14.

Research has highlighted the effectiveness of systems-based interventions specifically with Juvenile Justice clients (e.g. Gordon et al., 1995; Pullmann et al., 2006) and their families (Lipsey et al., 2010). Systems-based interventions also have good “face validity”, whereby they could be expected to work better with young people than a CBT approach alone. Figure 1 below is a series of concentric ovals with the young person at the centre and sources of influence on the young person situated at different layers of the various rings. In terms of influence on a young person, those closest to them are likely to be their family members. Next is likely to be their peers or school. Next is likely to be the community in which they live. The level of influence of a Juvenile Justice Officer who is not related to them and is not part of their community is likely to have very little direct influence on the behaviour of young people, particularly Indigenous males.

*Figure 1 Layers of Influence*

![Layers of Influence Diagram](image)

Similarly, it is also often observed that a relatively small number of families in a community can have a disproportionately large effect on levels of offending and the consumption of human service resources in that community. Many clients of Juvenile Justice who are at high risk of recidivism come from families who are also involved with other agencies such as Family and Community Services, Department of Housing, Health, Education and a variety of other non-government agencies such as the various Family Support Services. A significant amount of funding from Federal, State and Local government agencies, as well as other community based organisations, is targeted toward such families. The resulting support services, however, are often implemented in isolation or, at best, with minimal coordination between them. Effective and coordinated service delivery to a relatively small group of families in a community therefore has the potential to make a substantial and positive impact on the functioning of the community as a whole.
In 2009, the NSW Minister for Juvenile Justice commissioned an independent review of Juvenile Justice policy, with specific reference to the delivery of services to achieve a reduction in offending by Indigenous youth (Murphy et al., 2010). The report observed that juvenile crime has a number of drivers and, therefore, requires coordinated action across government agencies, non-government agencies and the community. The report made a total of 77 recommendations, many of which related to government adopting a “whole of government” approach to juvenile crime and pursuing a “justice reinvestment” agenda in which more money was diverted towards effective community-based rehabilitation programs and away from building further juvenile detention centres.

These recommendations were echoed in a more recent review of promising interventions for reducing juvenile offending (Richards et al., 2011). This review identified four principles for prevention of offending by Indigenous juveniles: Community based strategies, building on existing strengths, addressing juvenile offending in a holistic way and addressing juvenile offending through collaborative approaches.

Consistent with these recommendations, the Family Inclusion Project sought to explore the potential of a Wraparound interagency service model to reduce levels of juvenile recidivism via a pilot in one NSW regional community.

**Wraparound Systems of Care Model**

Wraparound is a systems-based, individualised and strengths-based way of working with families with complex needs (Suter and Bruns, 2009). It relies on teamwork and collaboration among service providers and is based on 10 philosophical principles:

1. Family voice and choice
2. Team based
3. Natural support (e.g. interpersonal and community relationships)
4. Collaboration
5. Community-based
6. Culturally competent
7. Individualised
8. Strengths based
9. Persistence
10. Outcome based

Unlike Multisystemic Therapy, the Wraparound coordinator does not deliver clinical services to the family. Rather, they act as a conduit between the family and local service providers who may offer clinical or more general support services. The Wraparound coordinator’s skill-set is, therefore, more in the area of networking and case planning, rather than in clinical areas requiring specialist registration or licensing. Rather than training Juvenile Justice Officers to become clinicians, the Family Inclusion Project sought to train them to develop better collaborative partnerships with clients families, existing family support organisations and more thorough case plans, based on the 10 Wraparound principles outlined above.
There are a number of differences between Wraparound and generic service integration or interagency models:

- Although it is not a licensed program like MST, Wraparound does have specific principles and is supported by an organisation called the National Wraparound Initiative.
- Wraparound also has specific methods of measuring an agency’s adherence to the model via administration of the Wraparound Fidelity Index (Bruns et al., 2009).
- Wraparound is a collaborative approach that is entered into with families, as highlighted by one of the guiding principles: Family Voice and Choice. It is not an intervention that is thrust on to families. It takes a philosophical stance that families actually know what is helpful for them and can participate meaningfully in the casework process. Participation in the FIP was voluntary and the input of family voice and choice in the development of the casework was explicitly sought.

There were a number of reasons the Wraparound model was considered to be a good match between the needs of the families and clients of Juvenile Justice and the objective of that agency to reduce levels of juvenile recidivism, particularly Indigenous recidivism. Among these reasons was that the 10 principles of Wraparound were considered highly consistent with the seven principles of the NSW Aboriginal Justice Plan, as highlighted in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of NSW Aboriginal Justice Plan</th>
<th>Wraparound Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. As Aboriginal people understand their own problems and issues, they are best placed to find innovative ways to address them.</td>
<td>Cultural competence (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The significant cultural diversity among NSW Aboriginal communities will be recognised and respected, along with their differing needs being acknowledged.</td>
<td>Individualised (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connection to culture and family and the wider Aboriginal community is an essential component of protecting and supporting all members of the community.</td>
<td>Natural supports (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The responsibility for addressing the underlying causes of crime in Aboriginal communities is shared by Aboriginal communities, government and the broader community.</td>
<td>Community-based (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The provision of improved access to opportunities and services for Aboriginal people promotes choices that reduce the likelihood of their contact with the criminal justice system.</td>
<td>Collaboration (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The negative impact of past government policies, practices and philosophies on Aboriginal people will be recognised and acknowledged.</td>
<td>Team based (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aboriginal people have an inherent right to equality before the law, a right to self-determination and a right to live free from discrimination.</td>
<td>Persistence (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aboriginal people understand their own problems and issues, they are best placed to find innovative ways to address them.</td>
<td>Outcome based (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the best of our knowledge, there are no other programs in Australia currently using a Wraparound model with Juvenile Justice clients. The “Turnaround” service for young people with intensive support needs was established in the Australian Capital Territory in 2004 and was based on Wraparound principles (Wyles, 2007). Beyond this, however, a brief literature search conducted prior to the establishment of the Family Inclusion Project was unable to identify and other descriptions of similar services currently operating in Australia. Despite this, however, it was considered that Wraparound was a clearly articulated, adaptable and successful model of intervention and was well suited to meeting the considerable challenges of improving service delivery to clients of Juvenile Justice with the aim of reducing levels of youth recidivism.
THE FAMILY INCLUSION PROJECT

The Family Inclusion Project (FIP) was operational between November 2010 and June 2011. The project emerged from discussions between senior officers of Juvenile Justice and the Coffs Harbour Indigenous Coordination Centre (ICC) in early 2010. The venue for these discussions was the North Coast Justice and Human Services Regional Forum. This forum is a multi-agency meeting coordinated by the NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet that seeks to coordinate the various justice and human service programs in regional NSW. The ICC and Juvenile Justice recognised that they had shared agenda in terms of reducing both Indigenous over-representation and levels of juvenile recidivism in the criminal justice system.

These agencies approached the Centre for Children and Young People at Southern Cross University to coordinate and evaluate the implementation of a Wraparound model of intervention with Juvenile Justice clients. The community of Kempsey on the North Coast of NSW was chosen as the site to conduct the project as it has a history of high levels of general and Aboriginal juvenile recidivism and was also the site of a number of government funded family support agencies.

PROJECT AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The Family Inclusion Project had two broad aims:

a) To reduce youth recidivism, and
b) To improve interagency collaboration,

via the development and implementation of a Wraparound casework approach with Juvenile Justice clients in Kempsey.

There were four research questions that emerged from these aims:

1. What factors (historical, structural, political, systemic, skills, training, etc) support or inhibit effective interagency collaboration in the development and implementation of a Wraparound model aimed at reducing youth recidivism?
2. What factors support or inhibit the engagement of young people and their families with the model?
3. How does involvement in the development and/or implementation of a Wraparound model within a regional community impact on the attitudes, capacity and practice of interagency collaboration amongst the service professionals in that community?
4. How does involvement in a Wraparound model impact on the young people, and families, being supported?
METHODS

OVERVIEW
The Family Inclusion Project involved two distinct activities: the development and implementation of the Wraparound model, and the concurrent evaluation of the impact of the model on Juvenile Justice clients and families and caseworkers and interagency partners.

The overall research plan is first presented in this section. A description of the development and implementation of the Wraparound model follows, specifically in relation to the project research aims. The section concludes with a description of the methods of evaluating the model and its impact on interagency collaboration, as well as its impact on Juvenile Justice clients and their families.

RESEARCH PLAN
The project research plan involved five sequential phases:

Phase 1 – Baseline Data Collection
- A survey of human service agencies to understand and map the policy context and current network of agencies providing services to young people and their families, including Juvenile Justice clients, in Kempsey.
- Baseline measurement of attitudes towards interagency collaboration in Kempsey using the Collaborative Partner Questionnaire (CPQ).
- Baseline measurement of levels of client engagement in the Kempsey Juvenile Justice office prior to the project becoming operational. This was done via administration of the Therapeutic Engagement Measure (TEM).

Phase 2 – Wraparound Model Development
- Formation of an Interagency Steering Committee to bring together service providers to advise on the model, secure support for the process within individual agencies and the Aboriginal community, and to ensure coordination and collaboration.
- Collaborative development of a Wraparound model of service delivery and accompanying operations manual for Juvenile Justice staff, including referral criteria and case management processes. In this model the Juvenile Justice Officer was allocated a “primary casework” role – with responsibility for ensuring the young person’s full range of needs were addressed, including through increased interagency cooperation, under the mentorship of the project coordinator.
- Development of a comprehensive evaluation strategy for the routine collection of a range of process, outcome and associated cost data within the Wraparound model.

Phase 3 – Wraparound Model Implementation & Refinement
- Wraparound casework offered to Kempsey Juvenile Justice clients and families meeting referral criteria.
- Implementation of the wraparound service and routine data collection with consenting young people and families.
- Continuing collaborative refinement of the process. Regular service review meetings to coordinate the process, to document issues and refine the approach, including data collection.
Phase 4 – Follow-up Data Collection
- Post-project follow-up of caseworkers and interagency partners using the CPQ to assess any change in their attitudes, capacity, practice and experiences regarding interagency collaboration in relation to young people (and their families) involved with Juvenile Justice.
- Post-project administration of the TEM with Juvenile Justice Officers for clients who had participated in the FIP.
- Semi-structured interviews with the young people (and their families) in Kempsey having participated in the project to explore their perceptions and experiences (positive & negative) of interacting with multiple community service agencies within the Kempsey community.

Phase 5 – Analyses & Reporting
- Analysis of follow-up data and interviews.
- Writing of a project report with recommendations for use of the model with respect to the reduction of youth recidivism and Aboriginal over-representation in the criminal justice system.

ETHICS
This project was formally reviewed and approved by Southern Cross University’s Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number: ECN-10-164) and conducted in accordance with the CCYP’s own Code of Ethical Practice for Working & Researching with Children & Young People. The Research Steering Committee of Juvenile Justice also reviewed and gave approval for the project.
KEY PROJECT COMPONENTS

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A WRAPAROUND MODEL IN KEMPSEY

Research questions 1 and 2 were related to aspects of the development and implementation of the Wraparound model:

1: What factors (historical, structural, political, systemic, skills, training, etc) support or inhibit effective interagency collaboration in the development and implementation of a Wraparound model aimed at reducing youth recidivism?

2: What factors support or inhibit the engagement of young people and their families with the model?

STRATEGIES FOR ADDRESSING RESEARCH QUESTION 1

The main strategies for ascertaining the key factors impacting on the implementation of a Wraparound model in Kempsey was firstly to understand the policy context in which various human service agencies are placed and then map the current network of agencies in Kempsey providing services to young people and their families, including Juvenile Justice clients. This was achieved via a number of site visits and attendance at interagency meetings by the FIP coordinator in the period leading up to and during the operational phase of the project, as well as the formation of the project Steering Committee.

A project Steering Committee was established at the start of the project. The role of the committee was to:

- monitor and assist the implementation of the project and achievement of outcomes
- keep the project’s scope manageable as emergent issues or opportunities arise
- provide guidance and support to the project coordinator
- provide advice and guidance on issues impacting on the project
- assist with resolving strategic level issues and risks
- approve or reject changes to the project likely to impact on timelines and/or budget
- promote the project to stakeholder groups and relevant networks
- assess and monitor project progress and report on project to senior management and higher authorities

The Steering Committee met in Kempsey in November 2010 and March, May and June of 2011. It comprised senior members of local human service organisations and peak Aboriginal groups. Agencies represented on the Steering Committee were:

- The Coffs Harbour Indigenous Coordination Centre (Commonwealth Government)
- Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (Commonwealth Government)
- NSW Department of Families and Communities
- NSW Department of Education and Communities
- NSW Department of Health
- Kempsey Aboriginal Community Justice Group
- Dunghutti Aboriginal Management and Leadership Alliance (DALMA)
- Juvenile Justice (NSW)
- Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University
- NSW Police (attended one meeting)
**STRATEGIES FOR ADDRESSING RESEARCH QUESTION 2**

The main strategies for identifying factors that support or inhibit the engagement of young people and their families with the model was to engage young people and their families in the Wraparound service delivery model and collect data at different points in the case work process. The FIP received referrals from Juvenile Justice Officers who were supervising clients of the Kempsey Juvenile Justice office. Although the project was open to both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal clients, referrals were prioritised for those who met the five criteria corresponding to previous research on the characteristics of high-risk juvenile offenders. Priority was therefore given to those who were male, of Aboriginal descent, aged less than 14 years, were out of school and had two or more prior contacts with the criminal justice system. Participation in the FIP was voluntary and required the informed consent of both the juvenile and their parents.

The logic model for the proposed Wraparound service delivery model (shown in Figure 2) was included and explained in detail in the operations manual supplied to Juvenile Justice Officers at the start of the project. The operations manual was based on the phases and activities of Wraparound described in Walker et al. (2004) and adapted to the Juvenile Justice setting in Kempsey by incorporating local policies and procedures.

---

**Figure 2: FIP Program Logic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>CLIENT PATHWAY</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>REFERRAL</td>
<td>Initial meeting between FIP facilitator, JJO &amp; potential client and client’s family</td>
<td>Facilitator and JJO</td>
<td>Form A: Referral &amp; Consent – tracks referral numbers, records client acknowledgment of conditions &amp; consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>PHASE 1 ENGAGEMENT &amp; TEAM PREPARATION</td>
<td>Orient family &amp; youth to wraparound philosophy &amp; process Stabilise crises Engage other team members Make meeting arrangements</td>
<td>Facilitator, JJO, client and family</td>
<td>Form B: Client Intake – APQ, school attendance measure, community involvement, YLSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>PHASE 2 INITIAL PLANNING</td>
<td>Develop an initial case plan Develop crisis/safety plan</td>
<td>Facilitator, JJO, client, family and team</td>
<td>Form C: Initial case plan, team contact details and meeting schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>PHASE 3 IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>Team meeting with client and family - review progress towards goals, refine strategies</td>
<td>Facilitator, JJO, client, family and team</td>
<td>Form D: Case Planning &amp; Progress – revisit &amp; document progress against goals, administer TE measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INTERIM REVIEW</td>
<td>Fortnightly meetings to review plan</td>
<td>Facilitator, JJO, client, family and team</td>
<td>Form E: Wraparound Fidelity Index – evaluate progress against wraparound model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>INTERIM REVIEW</td>
<td>Team meeting with client and family - review progress towards goals, refine strategies</td>
<td>Facilitator, JJO, client, family and team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>Continue with plan, track progress, review plan, celebrate success</td>
<td>Facilitator, JJO, client, family and team</td>
<td>Form F: Transition – records final progress &amp; outcome ratings, (APQ, school attendance measure, YLSI, TE) client feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14+</td>
<td>PHASE 4 TRANSITION</td>
<td>Plan for cessation. Review progress, determine future goals &amp; plan to achieve them Create post-transition crisis management plan</td>
<td>Facilitator, JJO, client, family and team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evaluation of the Impact of the Wraparound Model**

Research questions 3 and 4 were related to the evaluation of the Wraparound model and its impact on clients and agencies:

3: How does involvement in the development and/or implementation of a Wraparound model within a regional community impact on the attitudes, capacity and practice of interagency collaboration amongst the service professionals in that community?

4: How does involvement in a Wraparound model impact on the young people, and families, being supported?

**Evaluation Strategies for Addressing Research Question 3**

The main strategy for evaluating the impact on attitudes regarding interagency collaboration of the development of a Wraparound model in Kempsey was the pre and post-project measurement of interagency collaboration using the Collaborative Partner Questionnaire (CPQ) (see Appendix A).

Further feedback about the impact of a Wraparound model with Juvenile Justice collaborative partners was to be collected by using the Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI). The Wraparound Fidelity Index (Bruns et al., 2004) is an interview that measures adherence to the principles and primary activities of the wraparound process on an individual child, youth, agency or family basis. The WFI has evolved since 2004 into the Wraparound Fidelity Index 4.0 (Bruns et al., 2009) and is available for use by registered Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System (WFAS) collaborators. Although it was initially planned to become registered collaborators, the small number of FIP clients coming into the project was unable to justify the expense involved, and the WFAS was not employed.

In order to compensate for the unexpectedly low number of referrals and inability to collect an adequate amount of quantitative data for statistical testing, collaborative partners were invited to participate in post-project interviews to obtain qualitative data similar to that covered in the WFI for use in the evaluation.

The Collaborative Partner Questionnaire (CPQ) is an adaptation of the Griffith Youth Forensic Service (GYFS) Collaborative Partner Questionnaire (Smallbone et al., 2008). The CPQ is an eight item self-report measure about a participant’s level of confidence and willingness to work with Juvenile Justice clients, followed by seven items each on the obstacles and benefits of collaborative practice and three items about possible transferable benefits of collaboration. All scales are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1, not at all, to 5, a great deal).
EVALUATION STRATEGIES FOR ADDRESSING RESEARCH QUESTION 4

The major strategies planned for assessing the impact of involvement in a Wraparound model on young people and families was for pre and post-project measurement of levels of client engagement, as well as parenting practices and also levels of client involvement in criminal activities.

Baseline levels of client engagement in the Kempsey office were measured prior to the project becoming operational in November 2010. This was done via administration of the Therapeutic Engagement Measure (TEM). (See Appendix B). Juvenile Justice Officers rated the engagement a random sample of 16 (non-FIP) clients. Levels of engagement of FIP clients were measured at the conclusion of the project. The TEM is described below.

Engagement of families with the model was planned to be measured by changes in family functioning, including parenting practices. Family functioning was assessed during the intake interview, which was planned to include administration of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ) (See Appendix C). Complete intake data was only able to be collected from two families, so post-project interviews were substituted as a means to identify factors supporting or inhibiting engagement with the Wraparound model.

The impact of involvement in a Wraparound model on clients was assessed by collecting a range of data related to their involvement in crime. These data included offence histories, details of any subsequent offences and overall custody rates for clients of the Kempsey office. Overall custody rates for the Kempsey office were also collected from the Juvenile Justice regional office for comparison with rates at the same time in the previous year (Jan-June 2010), as well as to compare custody rates in Kempsey in 2011 to custody rates in another regional city with similar demographics (Taree) during Jan-June 2011.

The Therapeutic Engagement Measure (TEM) is based on an observer-rated measure of engagement with mental health services (Hall et al., 2001). Participants are rated on five dimensions of engagement: (1) appointment keeping (attending supervision appointments, or being at home when arranged), (2) client–caseworker interaction (the extent to which the client relates well with the caseworker, giving rise to a positive atmosphere during sessions), (3) communication/openness (the extent to which the clients volunteer personal information and are open in discussing their feelings, problems, and current situation), (4) perceived usefulness of supervision (the extent to which the client perceives supervision to be useful), (5) collaboration with supervision (the extent to which the client agrees with the proposed intervention, as stated in their case plan and is involved in carrying it out). All dimensions are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from never, almost never, sometimes, often, always.

The Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ) (Frick, 1991) is a 42-item caregiver measure designed to tap dimensions of parenting which have been consistently associated with conduct problems in children and adolescents. It assesses five parenting constructs: parental involvement; positive parenting; poor monitoring/supervision; inconsistent discipline; and corporal punishment. These constructs are measured by responses to a number of statements on a five-point Likert scale (almost never, sometimes, often and always).
**ANALYSES AND REPORTING IN RELATION TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The planned project evaluation strategy is detailed in Table 2 below. As can be seen from the table, the different domains are linked to the research questions, but the majority of measurement tools were quantitative instruments more suited to analysis of a larger sample size. As the project did not attract the expected number of participants, application was made to alter the research protocol and include post-project interviews for the purpose of qualitative, as well as quantitative, data analysis. All clients and families were invited to participate in a post-project interview, as were a number of collaborative partners and members of the project Steering Committee (See Appendix D).

Table 2 - Project Evaluation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project aims and planned outcomes in specific domains</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research questions: 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Increase in levels of interagency collaboration and collaborative case planning</td>
<td>Caseworker interviews</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain: Interagency collaboration and collaborative case planning</td>
<td>Increased self-rated knowledge, skills and confidence to work with JJ clients</td>
<td>Collaborative Partner Questionnaire (CPQ)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease in perceived obstacles and increase in perceived benefits and positive outcomes from interagency collaboration</td>
<td>Collaborative Partner Questionnaire (CPQ)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deployment of wraparound model of case planning and service delivery</td>
<td>Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research questions: 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Increased levels of client engagement in supervision</td>
<td>Therapeutic Engagement (TE) measure</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain: Multisystem response to intervention</td>
<td>Increased levels of parental supervision and monitoring; increased levels of parental involvement, increased levels of positive parenting practices, decreased levels of inconsistent discipline and corporal punishment</td>
<td>Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased school attendance</td>
<td>Average number of days at school per term</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased involvement in community activities</td>
<td>Interviews at intake and transition</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question: 4</td>
<td>Reduction in frequency and severity of offending</td>
<td>Measure developed by JJ</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain: Impact on criminal behaviour</td>
<td>Reduction in median number of days until re-offence</td>
<td>Measure developed by JJ</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in average number of clients in detention Jan-June 2011, as compared to average Jan-Jun 2008-10</td>
<td>Data supplied by regional office</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: WHAT FACTORS SUPPORT OR INHIBIT EFFECTIVE INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A WRAPAROUND MODEL AIMED AT REDUCING YOUTH RECIDIVISM?

STRUCTURAL AND POLITICAL FACTORS

The Policy Context

The causes of juvenile crime are multi-factorial and include issues related to the young person themselves, but also to the young people as they exist in their various contexts, e.g. their family, school, community and also the broader Australian social context. Because of this complexity, there were a number of State and Commonwealth Government policy initiatives identified that directly or indirectly impacted on the operations of the FIP. Among these were the:

- National Framework for Protecting Children (Commonwealth) (COAG, 2009c)
- Communities for Children Plus
- Social Inclusion Policy (Commonwealth)
  - Closing the Gap (Commonwealth of Australia, 2011)
- Remote Service Delivery Strategy (Commonwealth) (COAG, 2009b)
- Urban and Regional Strategy (Commonwealth) (COAG, 2009a)
- The NSW State Plan (State) (NSW Government, 2010)
  - Keeping People Safe (Reduce reoffending)
  - Stronger Communities
    - Stronger Together
    - Two Ways Together
    - Keep Them Safe
    - Homeless Action Plan

The Commonwealth Government’s Closing the Gap strategy was of particular relevance to the Aboriginal community in Kempsey. This strategy highlighted three priority outcome areas for strategic intervention:

- Safe healthy supportive family environments with strong community and cultural identity
- Positive child development and prevention of violence, crime and self-harm
- Improved wealth creation and economic sustainability for individuals, families and the community

Each of these priority outcome areas is linked to a number of headline indicators, such as substantiated child abuse and neglect, family and community violence and imprisonment and juvenile detention. A community consultation report on the Closing the Gap strategy prepared by the Dunghutti Aboriginal Management and Leadership Alliance (DALMA) in Kempsey made this observation about the headline indicators:

Like the priority outcomes themselves, there is a strong thread of interdependence in the indicators. Few of the COAG targets or headline indicators are likely to improve solely as the result of a single policy or a single action. Positive change will generally require action across a range of areas, with collaborative partners, monitoring and customizing (“one size does not fit all”) with programs facilitated by trusted, known organisations. These are generally high level indicators, and most would be expected to take some time to improve, even when policies and actions are implemented in the strategic areas. (Yarnold, 2010, p. 26)
The 2001 NSW State Election

The NSW state election in March 2011 resulted in a change of Government. This occurred at a critical time for the project as efforts were being made to identify appropriate state-based funding to continue the project past its initial trial period. As a result of the change of Government the Department of Human Services was disbanded and Juvenile Justice was moved to the Department of Attorney General and Justice. Additionally, the new Government postponed the release of the state budget until September 2011. Both of these developments made it difficult to identify appropriate state-based funding to continue the project past the initial funding period that expired at the end of July 2011.

Perceived and Actual Rates of Youth Crime

There was significant print and radio media coverage of a perceived “juvenile crime wave” in Kempsey in January and again in February 2011. While there is no doubt that young people were involved in serious personal and property crime in Kempsey, the figures presented below suggest that the overall rate of juvenile crime was significantly less than at the same time the previous year and was better than in another comparable regional centre. By way of comparison, average custody figures for the January to June 2011 period for the Taree Juvenile Justice office are presented below.

Custody rates are driven by a number of factors, including behaviour of individuals and community factors, but are also impacted by the response of agencies such as Juvenile Justice, the Police and the Courts. Unfortunately there are insufficient data to suggest how the FIP may have impacted average custody rates in Kempsey during the first half of 2011. The following graphs, however, provide a context within which the FIP was implemented.

Average monthly numbers of clients in detention between January and June 2011 are presented in Figures 3 and 4. Figure 3 compares monthly detention averages for the Kempsey Juvenile Justice office in 2010 and 2011, while Figure 4 compares monthly detention averages for the Kempsey office in 2011 with those of the Taree office during the same period in 2011.

**Figure 3: Custody Averages in Kempsey 2010-11**
Monthly custody averages in Kempsey in the first half of 2011 were observed to be better than the corresponding months in 2010 for three of the six months, were the same for one month and were worse for two months. In the absence of significance testing, however, it is unclear whether these observations were due to real changes occurring or chance variation. Custody averages in January and February 2011 appeared to be substantially better than in 2010, but then in April climbed to a peak not seen in the same period in 2010, before again trending down in May and June.

Figure 4: Average numbers in custody 2011, Kempsey and Taree

Monthly custody averages in Taree during the first half of 2011 were the opposite of those observed in Kempsey during the same period. Custody averages in Taree showed a steady decline during the first five months, while Kempsey saw a steep increase over much of the same period. As noted above, the absence of significance testing limits the confidence with which these results can be interpreted.

Additionally, Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research figures recorded a 33% increase in charges of shoplifting in Port Macquarie in the period between April 2010 and March 2011. Although the FIP was based in Kempsey, approximately 35% of the clients of the Kempsey Juvenile Justice office lived in Port Macquarie or local environs (e.g. Wauchope or Lake Cathie) during the period of the FIP. While it was not possible to estimate the impact of this increase in crime in Port Macquarie on custody figures for the Kempsey office of Juvenile Justice, it is important to note that not all factors driving custody rates for the Kempsey office are necessarily related to the Kempsey community alone.
Systemic Factors - Service Mapping

Prior to the project becoming operational in November 2010, considerable effort was made to understand systemic factors by identifying and meeting with local agencies in Kempsey who could potentially provide services to clients of Juvenile Justice and their families. This was partially achieved through individual site visits, as well as attendance at a number of interagency forums. The project was immeasurably aided in this endeavour by introductions made by the Coffs Harbour Indigenous Coordination Centre to organisations such as DALMA. There was widespread support for the implementation of the FIP.

The FIP Coordinator attended a meeting of DALMA, as well as meetings of the Kempsey Aboriginal Community Justice Group, an interagency group convened by the Indigenous Services Officer at the Kempsey office of Centrelink, a Child Protection Forum (organised by Burrun Dalai Aboriginal Corporation) and meetings of the Families NSW group (organised by the Department of Families and Communities). The FIP Coordinator, the Director of the CCYP and the Regional Director of Juvenile Justice also met with the judiciary in Kempsey, as well as the Police Prosecutor and a representative of Aboriginal Legal Aid. At the broader level, the FIP Coordinator was also invited to present information about the FIP at a meeting of the Justice and Human Services Cluster and Local Government Group. This was a group convened by the Department of Premier and Cabinet and contained senior executives of a number of human services agencies on the NSW North Coast.

In addition to attendance at interagency meetings, the FIP Coordinator also visited a number of agencies, including:

- Durri Aboriginal Medical Service
- Booroongen Djugun College
- Mission Australia, hosting:
  - Youth Connections Program
  - Post-Release Program
  - Kempsey Leadership and Cultural Development Program
  - Brighter Futures Program
- Kempsey Police Citizen’s Youth Club (PCYC)
- Young People’s Place (Youth Refuge)
- Kempsey Young Person’s Mental Health team
- Department of Families and Community
- Community Housing
- Macleay Vocational College
- Kemp Program (Educational & Vocational Program operating from TAFE)
- Justice Health Community Integration Team
- SHINE for Kids

Although the project was centred on clients of the Kempsey office of Juvenile Justice, between 25%-35% of these clients lived in areas outside of the Kempsey Local Government Area during the course of the FIP. Consequently, contact was also made with agencies outside of Kempsey such as Mission Australia in Port Macquarie, as well as West Port High School and Macksville High School.
A map of human services, shown in Figure 5 below, illustrates the breadth of agencies currently providing services for young people and their families in Kempsey. The map is based on the National Framework for Protecting Australia’s Children (COAG, 2009c) and approximates the public health model of prevention services, ranging from universal services, through selected services, to specifically targeted services and intervention from the statutory system. Additionally, it attempts to indicate whether the Commonwealth or NSW Government funds the agency, and whether it is operated by the public or non-government sector.

Figure 5: Funded services in Kempsey

The number of agencies providing services at different points of the intervention continuum emerged as both an enabler and a barrier to interagency collaboration in Kempsey. As noted in the DALMA community consultation report above, positive change was seen as requiring collaborative action in a number of areas. However, the report also highlighted the importance of relationship and trust. The proliferation of different programs creates a potential for mis-communication between agencies or for some services to duplicate the work of others. A strong theme emerging from the DALMA report was also community consultation and community initiated solutions, rather than a “top-down” approach to programs being imposed on the community.

For these reasons, considerable effort was made to not only identify potential collaborative partner organisations, but also to meet with agency representatives and form a positive personal relationship. Although this process was costly in terms of the investment of time required for its development and maintenance, it emerged as a crucial element in establishing and maintaining a successful collaborative enterprise in the human services area.
**FIP Steering Committee**

A key part of establishing this collaborative enterprise was the formation and regular meeting of the project Steering Committee. As described in the previous section, the Steering Committee was comprised of representatives from key stakeholder agencies and its aim was to provide strategic consultation and monitoring of the project. In a post-project interview a member of the Steering Committee highlighted the importance of case coordination and the benefits of personal interagency contacts when asked about whether their expectations about being on the Steering Committee were fulfilled:

SC1 ...I didn’t really have an expectation to be honest, I wasn’t quite sure where we were going but for me I think the something that was different, for me I found that the level of management of people on that Committee was quite high level, so you know, making decisions and stuff was pretty easy. But I think, I guess the downside of that, was that from that level did that flow back down into the people on the ground and I know for me that wasn’t the best thing occurred and again, I think because that was, you know, we only had a couple of cases so people who needed to know knew but it wasn’t widespread. But in saying that at other joint meetings that I attend the project was always talked about so it was recognised, people recognised that it was happening; it was in Kempsey and you know talking about not another committee being involved or another project being involved, that there is something happening for this person or this person so therefore we don’t need to take that case away.

I To avoid duplication ...

SC1 Absolutely yeah.

I ... that’s good.

SC1 Yeah, and I guess for me the level of commitment and I guess passion for you know, trying to make a difference for some of these kids, I was a bit surprised by that so it was really great to make some contacts on that committee, particularly Community Services. We’ve got a very nice friendly two-way thing happening now with Community Services so that’s great.

When asked about what had worked well with the Steering Committee and what should be improved, SC1 had this to say:

SC1 I think what worked well were our Steering Committee meetings. I thought they were great, like I said they were on the agenda so they were a priority and we you know, I don’t think there were many meetings we didn’t have most people at the table so that meant it was a priority for everyone so I thought that was really, that worked really well. I guess the improvements, what did I have there? I guess the point I would come back to around that is that I dearly would love to see it continued so we can get some real change occurring because I really think if we leave it now and expect someone else or to pick up and keep running with it, I’m not sure how successful that’s going to be. We really need with anything like this, someone who’s there and really running the show, so that’d be a bit of a downer I think and as much as we you know, spread our wings and we’ve done a few things and we’ve got some connections, the network’s happening, I still don’t think it’s going to be anywhere near as positive and as successful unless we’ve got ...

I Maintenance?

SC1 Absolutely.
INTRA-AGENCY SUPPORT FOR THE FAMILY INCLUSION PROGRAM – CHALLENGES AND CHANGES

Although initial referral and recruitment for the project was positive, the project faced challenges in maintaining momentum within Juvenile Justice as it continued. This was less to do with opposition or resistance to the FIP, as much as responding to the significant case management issues presented by clients, as well as dealing with the challenge of staff turnover in regional areas.

The key role of the Aboriginal Juvenile Justice Officer in Kempsey was vacant from shortly after the start of the FIP due to personal issues. Another Juvenile Justice Officer suffered a non-workplace injury in early 2011 and was unable to perform fieldwork for several weeks. There is little that can be done to prevent such circumstances, and, indeed, Juvenile Justice sought to remedy the situation as best it could by providing an additional staff member above establishment levels to support the work of the FIP. The inevitable consequence, however, was some loss of momentum as the philosophy and aims of the FIP had to be explained to new staff and new relationships formed with clients and their families.

The process of developing relationships with key agency stakeholders described above was also followed with regard to Juvenile Justice staff in Kempsey. For this reason, key Juvenile Justice staff were involved in the planning phase of the FIP, even some 12 months before funding could be identified for the project to go ahead. The key stakeholders were identified as the Juvenile Justice Officers of the Kempsey office, the Assistant Manager of the Mid-North Coast, the North Coast Area Manager and the Regional Director of the Northern Region of Juvenile Justice. Unfortunately, in the period just prior to the start of the FIP in August 2010 through to its completion in July 2011, all of the above positions, with the exception of the Regional Director and one JJO, were vacated and subject to various recruitment and backfill arrangements of differing lengths of time.

Staff turnover was also identified by a member of the Steering Committee as an inhibiting factor in interagency collaboration:

SC1 I guess for me with other agencies there seems to be a lack of consistency in personnel who are on the ground, that’s always a worry with us. I mean it’s a bit similar to us but I think, you know, as an agency we’re a lot more stable than other agencies so it’s the people being in the positions and if they are when we go to work with someone they’re on leave so the support is fragmented as well, I know that’s a really big thing.

To mitigate against the effects of staff turnover and also to improve engagement with Aboriginal families, an application was made under the Communities for Children Plus funding scheme for an Aboriginal Family Engagement Officer to be added to the staff of the Family Inclusion Project. The application was made in May of 2011 and although the application was successful, the project concluded before the application could be ratified.
**Research Question 2: What factors support or inhibit the engagement of young people and their families with the model?**

**Client and Family Characteristics**

Eight families were invited to participate in the Family Inclusion Project. Of these eight families (five Aboriginal), five accepted the invitation (three Aboriginal). Of these, four families (two Aboriginal) progressed to engage with the project. There were no notable differences in the characteristics of those families who did and didn’t engage with the project.

All Juvenile Justice clients were male and aged 14 years at the time of referral. Despite their young age, all had previously been placed in detention either as a result of being refused bail or having previously been sentenced to a Control Order. One client had first been sentenced at 12 years of age, another at 13 and two were 14 when first sentenced. Their criminal histories predominantly contained property offences, such as stealing from shops or homes, as well as breaking and entering and some drug offences. One client also had a history of assaults and reckless wounding in company.

Most clients had experienced significant adversity during their young lives. All clients had experienced parental separation, with one client suffering the loss of his mother and unborn sister in a motor vehicle accident when he was aged seven. He was also an occupant of the car but escaped serious physical injury. Another client had experienced the traumatic death of an older sibling.

Two clients lived with their fathers, one lived with his mother and one had predominantly lived with his mother but had recently lived for a short period with his father. One participant had recently moved back to his mother’s care after having been placed in the care and protection of Family and Community Services when he was aged nine. File information indicated he had witnessed significant and sustained episodes of domestic violence perpetrated by his father against his mother. Three clients had parents who were receiving services from mental health professionals and a fourth parent was referred to mental health services as part of the Wraparound case plan.

Three clients had younger siblings. All had older siblings and two had older siblings who were either serving periods of detention or imprisonment or had previously been sentenced to periods of detention. One client had a parent that had served periods of custody as a juvenile and was also on bail for adult criminal charges during the period of the project.

Participation in the project ranged from seven months, for one of the first clients to be referred to the project, to six weeks for the last client to be referred.

**Existence of Prior Relationships**

Referral and recruitment to the FIP was greatly assisted by the existence of prior relationships between Juvenile Justice staff and clients and client families. Juvenile Justice Officers had sometimes supervised the older brothers of clients referred to the FIP and, in addition, one Juvenile Justice Officer had grown up in Kempsey and knew several families from other contexts. A prior positive relationship between staff and clients and client families supported the engagement of clients with the program.
**Program Rationale**

Many families also appreciated the program rationale – that targeted assistance delivered to the family was likely to help both the family and the young person. The program rationale was easily understood by families and those with positive previous experiences of Juvenile Justice were likely to consent to being part of the program. In addition, frequent contact with clients and their families in their homes or assistance with transport to appointments helped to build credibility with families and increase their engagement with the project. One parent mentioned frequent contact as being a factor that helped them feel included in the process of mapping out a case plan for their son:

I Okay, and so to what extent have you actually felt included in that process?
P1 Yeah, pretty well included, I mean you’ve contacted me by email and phoned me and yeah, I’ve been – have felt free to phone to you if I’ve needed your support or your help on issues.

I Yeah, yeah so apart from email and contact is there any other ways that you felt included or ...  
P1 Ah, just the fact that you guys showed up here sort of on a regular basis, that was good.

I Mmm, mmm so when you say here you mean at your home?
P1 Yeah.

One family, however, after initially consenting to being part of the project did not make itself available for further involvement. This was despite numerous contacts with the family by both the Juvenile Justice Officer and the project coordinator. Attempts were made to engage the family via telephone, home visit and written correspondence. A number of appointments were made with the family to begin the engagement and assessment process, but after arriving at the family home it was discovered that the family was not there or that the time was not suitable. The family did not respond to invitations to meet at the office of Juvenile Justice. Three months after initially agreeing to participate in the project, the young person was placed in custody after further offending and his parents had separated.

Another parent, despite feeling included in the planning process and having meetings in her home, was nevertheless disappointed at the level of service the family received.

I Mmm, mmm okay. Now what’s been easy about being involved in the FIP and what’s been hard; so this is probably a good question for you to kind of help us know what your experience was like.
P2 Okay, well it’s easy to be involved ...  

I Well could you tell me how or what made that easy?
P2 It was easy to be involved because, yeah it was easy to arrange meetings; times and meetings and places for those so that part was easy to access. What’s been hard? What’s been hard has been willing to participate in a program that was promised to offer everything it did and services and connecting services and but that not actually happening. So going through that whole, basically well it’s a process but time wasting and also going through all that energy that I put in about telling my story; inviting people into my home; sharing like personal things about our family and it was actually to absolute no avail. So it was very disappointing and frustrating and absolutely useless and at a time when you’re seeking help and support and you’re trying to access services and things in the community that are going to help you and you’re just reaching dead ends, it was just another – a dead end and just, ah look this is the system; it’s frustrating because the school, the law can be frustrating, society, community, communication with people and yeah...
**Trying to Manage a Changing Situation**

In this case, an initial Wraparound plan developed around the client with a parent in one location. The client, however, then moved to another location to live with the other parent. The Juvenile Justice Officer in this case described some of the challenges of trying to manage a changing situation and the divergent views about the best way to assist the client:

I Yeah, so I guess thinking about those three different clients and families, what things do you think made it easy or difficult for clients and their families to engage with the FIP; so I’m guessing that there maybe different difficulties or levels of ease with different clients?

CW1 Yeah, the family dynamics had a big role to play in of how things worked ...

I Tell us a bit more about it.

CW1 ... because you’ve got families where you’ve got one parent and is geographically located in one position, you’ve got another parent both of them have equal stakes and shares in the role of what’s going to happen to the young person because it’s their son and they both had their views and of course they’re both looking for assistance and supports and sometimes they were at, you know trying – they got the idea of what was happening with it and on some occasions one would run - one of these parents would go and canvass for more supports without really consulting us, thinking that you know, “This is how the project works”, although you know that person’s help was quite helpful, sometimes it created a bit of confusion for the young person because you know we’ve got a group of people here and the young person, suddenly instead of having one JJ worker and mum and dad, all of a sudden there’s someone from the Department of Education; we’ve got someone from FIP; we’ve got the school counsellor; we’ve got the clinician you know, then we may have someone from Housing then there’s a lot of people in the room and they were interested or concerned stakeholders and all of a sudden the young person’s you know, this is bigger than me, you know? It can be, you know, perhaps a bit awing for the young person because there’s a lot happening, particularly when you look at this particular young person without mentioning names, was generally quite a shy young person; a quiet person was experiencing some relational problems with one parent, sometimes the other parent, not to the same extent, and we did get some good work, well good results with him. I actual fact I haven’t heard from him for a while, that’s really good yeah, oh not so much for him, I think, it’s the parents, they’ve are, I think the parents have, ah they have, they’re a lot more relaxed. It was, there was a time when we were all, it seemed to be competing with a lot of issues and it has since with time it’s settled down, they’ve seen that we – you know we could do the things to assist them like with the bail; the different addresses, not only that but we also worked together, we were more productive than when we work up against one another, it was really good.

I Mmm, mmm so I guess what you’re saying, or what I’m hearing you say, is that having more agencies and more people involved is good from one point of view but it’d also be a bit hard to manage perhaps or ...?

CW1 Yeah, it’s not so much hard to manage but it can become quite involved and generate you know, from that you generate a lot of work and of course you have to be mindful of our clients, yeah all of a sudden they’ve had, you know, they’ve been involved with the police; the court and then there’s all these people coming here influencing and describing and tell them what we’re going to do; what we should do and plan all this and all of a sudden it’s like we’re taking, you know we’re taking your responsibility away from them, this is how we’re going to – we’re going to manage you and the kids so all of a sudden it’s seems like you know, from their perspective all of a sudden there’s a lot happening and at first they didn’t really realise, you know, how much work was involved and how much you know.
**Mismatch of Expectations**

In this case there was a clear mismatch between the expectations of the parent and the Juvenile Justice Officer about “how the project works.” This may possibly have been due to the relative inexperience of the Juvenile Justice Officer in working with a Wraparound model. Far from taking parental responsibility away from families, the model seeks to improve family functioning and agency. Another Juvenile Justice Officer with more experience with the model described her experience like this:

CW2 More widely, okay, I think the concept of wrapping services around the family has a better, a more holistic look on the young person because like when you just look at the offending behaviour with clients, a broad range of clients there’s – they usually comes with other needs or risks that are involved in it and including the family more closely lets them empower and take some of the power back to – and responsibility, to step up and actually parent the child. So but having support services for them to do that is, I suppose the important part of the Wraparound approach. At the moment just dealing with the offending behaviour side and I was dealing one on one using internal programs and like CHARTS or AOD counselling and they sort of isolate the parent in some way and take away that responsibility and I suppose we, you know we don’t want them to be dependent on our service for their parenting so you know, education in that process or early intervention and I could see the Family Inclusion Program or that wraparound concept being a good value for early intervention stuff so identifying clients at an early age; at an early yeah to work with the family and then give them some of that control back on their young person or their child.

A third parent, who had substantially less direct contact with the project than P1 and P2, expressed a somewhat surprising degree of satisfaction with their experience of the FIP:

I Is there – has there been anything easy or difficult about being involved in this project that you can tell me about?

P3 Well, I just basically found everything the same, like with housing and you know ...

I Has it been different at all to your other experiences of working with Juvenile Justice?

P3 Oh it has yeah, I found it a lot better.

I Yeah, okay could you help us to understand in what ways it made it might have been better?

P3 Well, like actually getting help and the support that we needed and you know, people were actually sit there and talk to and discuss yeah, I felt comfortable with, yeah.

I Okay, that’s great so that’s been a positive thing by you felt comfortable with talking to people about things?

P3 Mmm.

I Because say, (parent’s name), like, I think, I wish we could have done more, I don’t feel like we’ve done as much as we could for your family. Is there anything you can think of that we could have done more of, or would have been more helpful?

P3 No, as far as I’m concerned I don’t know if youse could do any, yeah.
Broader Social and Domestic Context

Other major factors which may have inhibited engagement of clients and families with the model related to the broader social and domestic contexts of some client’s families. Some families struggled with day-to-day functioning due to parental mental health issues and financial pressures due to accumulated debts. One family did not have either a landline or mobile phone or a car. As a result, all communication with the family had to be done via a home visit, resulting in many missed appointments. Some clients came from families with high levels of interpersonal conflict and this conflict sometimes led to clients leaving the family home and staying for a while with friends or extended family. The level of mobility of some families was illustrated in this post-project interview with a client:

I: Mmm, okay so your dad’s obviously not here at the moment.
C1: No.
I: Is he still in – is he in Kempsey at the moment?
C1: Yeah, he’s in Kempsey.
I: Oh good, okay because it would be good to chat to him at some stage as well.
C1: Mmm, no he just – we just found out yesterday because our younger brother went up to Queensland and he didn’t even know and then found out...
I: You’re younger brother went to Queensland ...
C1: Yeah with my uncle.
I: With your uncle?
C1: Yeah.
I: Yeah okay but your dad didn’t’ know about that.
C1: No, but its ‘right.
I: Well I guess ...
C1: He was freaking out he was.
I: Ah okay, did he know like, I mean was he freaking out because he didn’t know ...
C1: Yeah, he didn’t know where he was yeah, like he thought he was up (nearby town) yeah, because that’s where he was, but they should be back here tomorrow.
Reducing, rather than adding to obligations

All families were clients of services other than Juvenile Justice and in the general chaos of some family’s lives it was sometimes difficult to schedule appointments for Wraparound meetings in such a way that it took away, rather than added, to the list of onerous tasks and challenges faced by the family. In some cases it was also difficult to determine when being persistent became unduly intrusive:

I Yeah, I mean I guess in that particular family you had the opposite situation where with the first one you had a mum that was a very proactive and had particular ideas about what should happen and then the other one you had a mum who seemed to be reluctant to kind of get involved in the process.

CW1 Exactly.

I Yeah, with that second family, when you have parents that may be reluctant to be involved can you think of any things we could have done better or you know, ways that we could have encouraged them more?

CW1 I think the difficulty, I think getting her away from home would have been a big start yeah, but unfortunately we also have to respect the privacy, she made it clear at one stage that there was a medical crisis or something and be mindful of her right to confidentiality and privacy, which was pretty hard to motivate her because we didn’t really understand what was happening and she wasn’t prepared to let us know that there was something going on with her and her health so we had to respect that which sort of meant that we had sort of had a little bit more hands free, to take a step back. Because at the end of the day it being a Wraparound it still shouldn’t be putting pressure on the families, we need to respect the fact that it’s voluntary; they’ve agreed to participate in it but if we start being over assertive or over intrusive we could offend and cause other issues and so we need to respect that because we’re dealing with people who aren’t accustomed to having this much intervention or support, you know it’s something they’re not normally used to, we’re coming across, “We want to help you, we want to do this and this and this”, and they’re not sure how to accept it or how to say “No, I’m right!”, I think that’s what was happening with that particular family.

Again, the lack of familiarity of the Juvenile Justice Officer with a Wraparound model is evident. One of the first tasks in the Wraparound model is to “understand what is happening” for the client and their family.

Cultural Competency

In the above case, there were also significant challenges to overcome. The client and family had initially been allocated to the Aboriginal Juvenile Justice Officer who became ill and had to take extended leave. When the client was allocated to CW1, he therefore faced challenges to do with culture (being non-Aboriginal but working with an Aboriginal family), gender (being male but working with the client’s mother) and a new casework model. Despite these challenges, however, the parent ultimately reported feeling comfortable in talking to Juvenile Justice staff and felt it was an improvement on her previous experiences:

I Has it been different at all to your other experiences of working with Juvenile Justice?

P3 Oh it has yeah, I found it a lot better.

I Yeah, okay could you help us to understand in what ways it made it might have been better?

P3 Well, like actually getting help and the support that we needed and you know, people were actually sit there and talk to and discuss yeah, I felt comfortable with, yeah.

This highlights the need for Juvenile Justice staff to be culturally competent in working with a diversity of clients and families and also the desirability of having an Aboriginal Family Engagement Officer as part of the project.
Evaluation of Program Development and Implementation

Research Question 3: How does involvement in the development and/or implementation of a Wraparound model within a regional community impact on the attitudes, capacity and practice of interagency collaboration amongst the service professionals in that community?

Perceptions of interagency collaboration and case planning

A total of 34 caseworkers from seven human services agencies provided pre intervention data on perceptions of interagency collaboration and case planning. These agencies were involved in the delivery of ten different programs catering for young people and families in Kempsey, including Juvenile Justice clients. At follow-up, 22 caseworkers from the same agencies were available to provide post-project data.

Data were collected via administration of the Collaborative Partner Questionnaire (CPQ) between October and December 2010 and again in June and July 2011. This survey assessed participants’ attitudes, capacity, current practice and previous experiences regarding interagency collaboration in relation to young people (and their families) involved with Juvenile Justice.

Cronbach’s alpha levels for the attitudes section of the CPQ was .92 at both baseline and post project measurement. Cronbach’s alpha for the obstacles and benefits scales at baseline was .71 and .84, respectively and .88 and .94 at follow-up. These results suggest that a high degree of confidence can be placed in the reliability of the measure.

Baseline measurement of the attitudes section of the CPQ in Table 3 below indicated a high level of willingness to work with Juvenile Justice clients, with slightly lower levels of confidence and knowledge about the client group. There were no significant differences between baseline and post-project measurement but the scores were trending in the desired direction. It is also noted, however, that there is likely to have been insufficient power to detect significant differences due to the small sample size.

Table 3: Confidence, Knowledge and Willingness to work with JJ clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-FIP (October 2010)</th>
<th>Post-FIP (July 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=35)</td>
<td>(N=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to work with adolescent offenders</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of comfort/ease in working with adolescent offenders</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the causes of offending committed by adolescents</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in abilities to work with JJ clients</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of methods risk and need assessment of adolescent offenders</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>(0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about the extent of offending committed by adolescents</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of interventions with adolescent offenders</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in resources available to work with JJ clients</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseline measurement in Table 4 below was consistent with anecdotal impressions gained in interagency meetings and site visits. There was broad support for increased interagency work with Juvenile Justice clients and a high level of willingness to participate in collaborative case plans with these clients. Workload demands were seen as the main obstacle for interagency collaboration, whilst the major benefit was seen as the building of community capacity, as illustrated by this comment from the open response part of the post project CPQ protocol:

“The concept is good. It was too small a sample. The chronic under staffing and under resourcing of Juvenile Justice undermines the success of this program…. The family counselling for (client name) was awesome, it was the single best initiative to come out of this pilot.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Pre FIP (October 2010)</th>
<th>Post-FIP (July 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload demands</td>
<td>4.03 (0.72)</td>
<td>3.64 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>3.94 (0.78)</td>
<td>3.09 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources/staffing</td>
<td>3.88 (0.98)</td>
<td>3.64 (0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient training</td>
<td>3.35 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.77 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to complete agreed tasks</td>
<td>3.06 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.64 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>2.56 (1.35)</td>
<td>2.55 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>2.53 (1.16)</td>
<td>2.14 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Builds community capacity</td>
<td>4.62 (0.55)</td>
<td>4.32 (0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases local support network</td>
<td>4.59 (0.56)</td>
<td>4.32 (0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances skills/knowledge</td>
<td>4.44 (0.56)</td>
<td>4.14 (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More regular support/treatment</td>
<td>4.26 (0.67)</td>
<td>4.18 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More expedient therapeutic process</td>
<td>4.24 (0.78)</td>
<td>4.14 (0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local context informs treatment</td>
<td>4.21 (0.69)</td>
<td>4.05 (0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces travel requirements</td>
<td>3.71 (0.97)</td>
<td>4.00 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills transferred to other clients</td>
<td>4.24 (0.82)</td>
<td>4.50 (0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves client outcomes</td>
<td>4.44 (0.75)</td>
<td>4.59 (0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to work with JJ clients in the future</td>
<td>4.71 (0.46)</td>
<td>4.59 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant difference between pre and post project measurement for obstacles, benefits and outcomes interagency collaboration. Intriguingly there was a trend towards a lower rating of perceived obstacles at post-project measurement, however there was also a similar trend towards a lower rating of perceived benefits at post-project measurement. Results for perceived outcomes of interagency collaboration were mixed.

**Positive Changes in Attitudes towards Interagency Work**

Two collaborative partners were available to be interviewed during the post-project evaluation stage. Post-project interviews revealed some positive changes in attitudes towards interagency work with Juvenile Justice clients, with one collaborative partner remarking:

CP1 …my experience with JJ clients in the past has been quite frustrating and it has always felt like it’s really difficult to get JJ to be onboard and accountable in a way and to really then nail down what their role is and what we can ask of them and what we can’t ask of them. I think having this particular case-work model has really put it out on the, you know out there in the open about exactly what the JJ role is and it has made it
much more accessible to us and yeah, it has improved accountability and you know it’s worked really well.

I Excellent, I’m really pleased to hear that.

CP1 I don’t know whether this is solely to do with the model or whether it’s to do with the individual JJ case-worker that we’re now dealing with, who we’re working really well with, but I suspect that it’s because he has come in under this project.

**IMPROVED COMMUNICATION AND ROLE CLARIFICATION**

Another collaborative partner also welcomed improved communication and the role clarification that the project brought:

I So is that – how is it different to say other cases you work with and specifically with, you know, justice clients?

CP2 Okay, well the communication for instance. I found when I wasn’t involved in something like this that me and the other worker were doing the same thing, over case loading; doing referrals to the same places that kind of thing, you know, and therefore I think the communication, which is more important with this whole Wraparound thing rather than you know, just myself working with this client and then the JJ’s worker and sometimes we couldn’t get in contact with each other or whatever so we’d be both doing exactly the same sort of thing. So this was great where (JJO) could do what she had to do; you could do what you had to do and then all meet up together you know, and that’s what I really liked about it because we could all have a job, it was like going to a meeting and getting your job and then going and doing it and then come back, meeting with (client’s father) and (client) and having that involved was perfect...

Understanding the role of other agencies were also mentioned in the post-project interview with the member of the Steering Committee:

SC1 I think there’s still a lack of resources and funding available to support the clients we’re looking at; there’s a huge lack of understanding I think within our agency about what that interagency looks like and the importance of that. I know we do it and we’re starting to do it at you know, the managerial level right down to doing that in (local agency) but I still think some of our (local agencies) struggle with their part in all of that and I think the expectations of other agencies on our department on what we can and can’t do and people who don’t know what our constraints are have some fairly “out there” sort of ideals about what we can achieve. I think there seems to be a bit of a lack of ownership of some of our JJ clients, who actually owns them; who’s actually responsible for them.

**RELATIONSHIP WITH THE JUVENILE JUSTICE OFFICER**

The quality of the relationship with the Juvenile Justice Officer, as well as the Officer’s sensitivity to client needs were also identified by CP1 to be important:

CP1 I think the individual style of the case-worker has a lot to do with it, their empathy and their accessibility and their, you know their ability to come to these situations with understanding you know and I think that’s worked really well in this case, understanding to particular family needs are often transport’s an issue; communication’s an issue; access to telephones and computers is often an issue; financial constraints you know so sensitivity to those sorts of constraints is really important.

I So what things have you found made it easy or difficult for you to engage with the case-work process, the Wraparound process?

CP1 Well I found accessibility to be particularly good, so just you know generally I can just pick up the phone and talk to someone that I want to talk to who’s involved in the project, whether it’s JJ or the Family Inclusion Project, you know available straight away; they always ring back. You know, the communications been really good.
Personal Contact

Personal contact with other agencies was identified as a factor by one of the Juvenile Justice Officers that assisted interagency collaboration:

I Yeah, okay can you tell me about some of your experiences in working with other agencies with FIP clients like who they were; how did it go; was it easy to work with them; what made it easy or difficult?

CW1 Well it wasn’t, yeah the Department of Education; Housing; Centrelink, there’s been a few agencies that we’ve been involved with to assist them and facilitate the needs of our kids and they’ve been able to sit around together, talk about it and plan about it in a sensible time managed way, it was great you know, whereas normally we’d get on the phone and we’d make phone calls, we were actually having face-to-face meetings which made it more personal I suppose if you want to put it that way and because we were able to involve the kid and the kid could be – well the young person rather, the young person could be a part of it because they were participating and engaging and seeing what was involved.

Extra Time

While face-to-face meetings facilitated interagency collaboration, however, it came at a cost. That cost was extra time:

I Mmm, mmm okay so in what ways would you say the FIP meant that your casework with FIP clients was different to your normal casework; any, any specific ways that you ...

CW1 Well we probably took – we had more meetings, for starters we’d have and it’s something we don’t do with our normal clients, it revolved around a lot of network or agency meetings, we’d involve other people and we’d have meetings because we have to fit in with the other agencies so we’d all get together so there was a planning process which meant you know you couldn’t just say, “Okay, well wait, we’re going to do this and this and this today”, we had to check with this agency; can we plan a date to do this on that particular time so you’re forever planning you know and if something goes wrong well you know, then you’ve got to reorganise so it’s sometimes there’s a fair bit of time involved.

Not all Juvenile Justice Officers experienced this in the same way though:

I Okay, so can you tell me then in what ways the FIP has meant that your casework with FIP clients has been different to your normal casework; any, any specific ways that you ...

CW2 Yeah, yeah so the client with the Family Inclusion Program that had the extra support services it’s meant that it’s taken some of that workload away that I haven’t had to do myself so it’s helped in that way.

I Yeah, and can you tell me more about that?

CW2 So in relation to the young person that was on the FIP Program we had (agency) doing a lot of the liaison with the schools in the process of re-engaging the young person at the school. Now for me to be able to do that with the school and liaise with the student service officers or the home school liaison or the school principals, it hasn’t been as successful because I’ve had to start from the beginning so introducing and explaining what we’re going with the young person and what they need and that, we don’t always get calls returned or you know so you leave messages with say the student service officer which is the home school liaison, and they’d may or may not get back to you so there’s a lot of other chasing up which is more time – you know that can be more time consuming. So having, you know, (agency) with a specific worker attached to that young person that already have those connections in the schools and they have made that process a lot better and a lot easier.
**Casework Efficiencies**

Similarly CP2 found that the model produced some casework efficiencies:

> I ... yeah well sometimes with this approach, I guess what I’m getting at there is sometimes it can require more resources, not all the time, but I was just wondering if that had been, so this model of working did it require more, say more time or do you just get ....

> CP2 Oh like working with the FIP?

> I Yeah, yeah.

> CP2 No, it actually probably minimised the workload because there was a lot of us involved with him so we could all you know, put the work out there evenly so yeah, no and we weren’t all – like my job was education you know and (JJO) was that so yeah, I thought it worked really well yeah, I really did yeah no and with the resources I mean I didn’t need a lot but whenever I needed information or anything like that you guys were all, we got it done, I seemed to think it worked really well in [client’s] case.

The Juvenile Justice Officers themselves made these observations about levels of resourcing:

> I Mmm, okay so what resources have you had to assist with your casework with the FIP and have the resources been adequate?

> CW1 Well the resources you know, we have staff here at Kempsey that we can use, we’ve also had you Ian, you’ve been part of the process and but we haven’t had extra staff or you know, to take up the other loads in other words because filling in two roles is a bail intake and JJ there’s prioritising work, there’s always that in the background there’s that you know urgent jobs that have to be done so you’re balancing you know, good casework with, “I’ve got to get this done”, because you’re trying to prioritise things that are urgent so you’re always mindful of prioritising you work which sometimes means you’re not able to put you know, as much as you should do you know, when you haven’t got any other pressure on you can sit there and you go through it and focus and work with the kids , it’s really good. Though we’ve had meetings with the Department of Education; we’ve had counsellors; we’ve had other involved parties and youth organisations come in, it’s been great where we’ve all been able to sit around and do that but you know that takes a significant time of our case planning and our time out for the rest of our client’s and if we have a lower client rate well, we’ll be able to do that with everyone, it would be great.

> I Mmm, good. I’m interested in what you think about the resources that are required with the FIP and particularly, I guess the resources that initially you’ve had to assist you with your casework with FIP clients and whether or not the resources have been adequate and I guess by resources I mean pretty broadly.

> CW2 Pretty broadly, okay I suppose the biggest thing on case managing young people and when you’ve got a higher caseload of a – and a mixture of FIP clients and other case clients it’s, the FIP is more it takes a little bit more time so there’s a little bit more involvement, a young person that’s on a say a similar order and similar needs or requirements so and then able to get allocated the time or adequate time to be able to do all the work with that young person. On paper, you can put the time down but in reality it hasn’t quite worked out that way and that’s just because of the yeah, the amount of clients we have.

> I Mmm, so you feel there’s – using these, the wraparound model requires more time?

> CW2 Only initially, once it’s all set up I think, I think you know once it’s all set up and running and you get all the agencies involved in those first initial engagement stage introduce, you know introducing people into the program that is the most time consuming bit of it. Once that’s done and everybody’s involved and knows what they’re doing and what their role is in that process then it can alleviate off so maybe more time allocated at the beginning and then you know back to whatever’s needed after that so yeah.
CW2 was asked about the challenges and benefits of working with a Wraparound model:

I ... what were some of the challenges; the benefits or whatever; easy or hard things.

CW2 I think having a good understanding of the program and the way it worked from the very beginning and committing to that process makes it easy yeah, if you come in where you haven’t had a good understanding of how the program worked it can, yeah it just makes it a bit more difficult.

**Requirements for Greater Effectiveness**

CW2 was also asked about what would need to happen within Juvenile Justice for the FIP to be more effective:

I Yeah, so what about – what would need to happen within the agency within JJ itself for it to be more effective?

CW2 To be more effective; I think open it more broadly; have it more accessible to more offices; have it as a separate program like a Community Orders like Intensive Support Programs; having extra community liaison staff that deal with or have involvement with the family so we particularly talk about the Indigenous, young Indigenous kids and having somebody that they, the Indigenous community feel comfortable with and then able to work with, particularly if it’s not juvenile, you know an Aboriginal juvenile justice officer so yeah, just to build those connections yeah, those and confidence yeah.

**Requirements for Wider Implementation**

When asked what it would take for the FIP to be more widely implemented, CW1 remarked:

CW1 Well for one way for starters is you need more time; you need to access you know, realistically you know that reflects on the project, you know, it’s a good project but, you know, when you’re looking at 25 plus or more clients you know, and you’ve only got so much time allocated to each one and then of course FIP, with respect, you know, can involve a lot of hours depending on the needs of the – each family’s different, you’re trying to fit it all in you know, it’s like how many school interviews did I do to get the young person back into school, well one of them must have been four, we had him sitting in here and the other one I actually sat with him in the NAPLAN school exam so he could do that and get back into school so, we did go the extra yard, we did a lot and I enjoyed doing that but, you know it’s certainly that it was quite time consuming, but it was rewarding too because they were getting back in but yeah, time’s something you need more of.

I Yeah, yeah that’s good and is there anything else you can tell us about the project or anything else that would be good for us to know?

CW1 No, I think I enjoyed working with the project, I’ll be the first to admit that it was good, I can see its value and its merits and I think you know, the stand out is you know it doesn’t matter where the people are you know, every government agency have different requirements and the paperwork, particularly with our clients because, you know, Housing, Centrelink’s the same, all the forms, one thing our clients need is they need assistance with a lot of it because the people we get, the clients we have they come from you know disadvantaged education and schooling backgrounds, they need help and the more help we can give the better it assists them and that means time, someone that’s able to do it.
Research Question 4: How does involvement in a Wraparound model impact on the young people, and families, being supported?

Levels of Client Engagement in Supervision

Baseline levels of client engagement were measured by Juvenile Justice Officers at Kempsey via the Therapeutic Engagement Measure (TEM) for a random sample of 16 (non-FIP) clients. The original measure included 11 items, one of which was removed for the purposes of the present project. This was an item that rated a client’s compliance with medication. As it was unknown whether many of the Juvenile Justice clients had been prescribed medication and it was unable to be reliably measured for those who had, this item was dropped from the scale. Cronbach’s alpha for the remaining ten items was .92, indicating the removal of the item did not diminish the reliability of the measure.

Baseline measurement, outlined in Table 5 below, indicated moderate levels of client engagement with most responses close to the agreement level of “sometimes”. The small number of FIP clients precluded any statistical significance testing of post-project measurement of levels of engagement. It is encouraging, however, to see most measures heading in the desired direction.

Table 5 Levels of client engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline Measurement (N=16) Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>Post-Project (N=4) Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appointment keeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Without support</td>
<td>2.81 (1.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 (0.82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) With support</td>
<td>4.31 (0.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75 (0.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Client-caseworker interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of relationship</td>
<td>3.63 (0.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25 (0.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communication/Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Personal feelings</td>
<td>3.06 (1.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50 (1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Personal Problems</td>
<td>3.00 (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Family Problems</td>
<td>3.19 (0.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Client’s perceived usefulness of supervision</td>
<td>2.94 (1.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collaboration of supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with supervision</td>
<td>3.75 (0.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with supervision</td>
<td>3.56 (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25 (0.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active involvement in treatment</td>
<td>3.25 (0.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two clients were available for post-project interviews. It appeared from these interviews, and anecdotal observations, that the level of client engagement varied between clients and also at different stages of the project. Some clients regularly attended supervision meetings with their Juvenile Justice Officer but were reluctant to engage in other aspects of their case plan such as regular attendance at school. One client was candid about his lack of enthusiasm for supervision:

I: Is there anything that was unhelpful about it?

C2: Oh I don’t know, I didn’t like meeting like every week because I, like when I met with (JJO) and you I didn’t – even (JJO), I hate meeting every week because it’s, I don’t know, I have to be there at a certain time and I have to wait for it and I can, yeah, it was good when you come in the mornings and that.

I: Mmm, because we’ve got it out of the way and then have the rest of the day?

C2: Yeah, I like having heaps… I don’t know, I just like being with my mates heaps yeah.
Another client was initially engaged in his case plan, which included participation in a three-month residential drug rehabilitation program, but appeared to become less engaged with his supervision on his return home.

Can you think of any times that you’ve been helped to come up with new ideas or to do things differently or whatever when something wasn’t working well in your life?

Ah like (JJO) helped me out like pick a decision like when I was doing the right thing and the wrong thing sort of or ...?

Yeah, yeah, well anything else like that?

Yeah, a couple - he’s been good to me like staying away from my friends and stuff and ... them ... you know, helping me out with everything like I’m just trying to think, he helped me out with everything since I’ve come home but it’s just that like I haven’t been thinking, I’m not in the right place at the moment I’m still not....

You don’t feel like you’re in the right place at the moment?

No, no I just don’t feel like there’s nothing ...

Can you tell me a bit more about that?

No, just it feels like nothing in Kempsey, we’re just doing the same thing every day and me and the boys are, you know, sick of it you know, that’s it yeah.

Mmm, you feel like you’re doing the same thing every day.

I am doing the same thing every day.

Yeah, and you wish you were doing something different?

Yeah, or something like I like doing or stuff like that.

Similar to the strategy for measuring client engagement referred to above, the measurement of parenting practices via administration of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire did not result in reportable data being collected. For this reason, the parents of clients were asked to participate in a post-project interview. Three parents were available for interview. A prominent theme in the interview with C2’s father was feeling powerless in the face of his son’s defiant behaviour. For him, the FIP provided back-up and support in his efforts to raise his son:

Yep, and tell me what’s been easy about being involved in the Family Inclusion Project and what’s also been hard about it?

Ah, I guess the easy part is of this is it’s easy accessible and you know easy to talk to; pretty understanding, I guess the downside is that you just feel like your hands are so tied when it comes to you know, when it comes to (son), your kids yeah.

Mmm, so is there any difficult or hard things about this particular project that we’ve both been involved in?

No, no it’s sort of been yeah, probably maybe that you guys seem to probably don’t have enough, you know, maybe input as well. I don’t know if that makes sense, maybe you need a bit more input; more I don’t know power, whatever I don’t know. I can’t think of the word for it but you know ...

So input into what?

Ah, just that what goes on with them and , yeah.

Mmm, do you mean with the young people?

Yeah, mmm, (son) and yeah all young people in need sort of, they just need that extra – I just found we’re all there, it’s just its hitting home more if we’re all there with (son).

So, tell me some more about that.
P1 Ah, just that yeah, sort of it wasn’t just me sitting there trying to tell him or trying to explain how things work and yeah, so I had that backup which was good you know.

I Okay. So when were those times?

P1 Oh well every time you visited virtually yeah.

I Yeah, so then when we visited and also (JJO) came along as well yeah, so I guess – well I think I’m hearing you say is that at those times you felt that it wasn’t just you that was saying these things but other people were saying the same thing that you were saying to him.

P1 Yeah, and that’s exactly it, I think sometimes even though he pretended he wasn’t hearing it or half pretending he wasn’t hearing it he – I think some of it, somewhere in the back does, they know, you know, like when they hear it from someone else it’s not just dad going on you know so...

I Yeah, so I guess what I’m hearing you say is that – what I’m hearing a lot is this idea of power and a certain sense of powerlessness that you have felt at times.

P1 Oh yeah, look I felt totally, almost totally powerless, you know, and I think the kids learn that and yeah, you just where can you go, once they sort of learn that, “Hey dad can’t touch me; dad can’t do anything if I don’t want to to ....”, you know then they sort of learn to manipulate your love for them against you, it’s and the law seems to, or the system seems to back that up, it seems to protect them so that you can’t enforce anything if that’s – I don’t know whether I’ve explained myself right yeah.

I Yeah, yeah no, no I understand that. Yeah, and so it sounds like the things that you felt were positive about the project were that you felt slightly more empowered by having perhaps other people on your side ...

P1 Oh for sure, especially when you’ve got split up families and you’ve got one style of parenting versus the other style and you’ve sort of got that huge contrast and when you’ve got other people that are in an authority sort of figure saying, “No, this is the way it is”, then you’re getting that backup yeah, it’s great to sort of have, you know.

I Yeah, so it’s great although obviously in this particular case it didn’t follow through to I guess the outcome that we were hoping for, particularly with (son) staying at school and staying on the straight and narrow.

P1 Mmm, yeah no that’s sort of, yeah it’d be nice if you guys were still there to sort of now when he comes back to sort of push that along then and have another go at pushing him back there and getting him to do the right thing you know, so like if I’d ring him he sort of would back down a bit more, if I said, “Well I’m ringing Ian”, when he didn’t want to go to school that time that sort of made him think twice, you know.

I Yeah, I remember speaking to him that morning, yeah.

P1 Yeah, so that was just to have that extra backup you know like.

I Mmm, yeah mmm good.

P1 And he seemed to sort of listen and respect what you had to say sort of more than me, I don’t know why but yeah. I mean maybe to do it I had to come in the real heavy and I hate going in real heavy and even then if he calls me on a bluff he’s out the door and gone and I can’t do anything so just having that extra backup is really...
Relationship with Father
An important part of C1’s case plan was to improve his relationship with his father. A referral was made to the local mental health service and C1 and his father attended the first session together:

I Yeah, so has being involved with the project helped you and your family to meet other people who would support you when the supervision was finished?

C1 Yeah, yeah the counsellor at the hospital yeah, yeah the counsellor and yeah dad, well he talks about it all the time, it’s just like with all the like counsellors and stuff, he talks to them as well.

C1 saw this as being different to his previous experiences of supervision with Juvenile Justice:

C1 Like what’s the difference like from last time when I was on parole with bail and stuff like that?

I Mmm.

C1 Well it’s been like a big help with my dad and that, like more connection with my dad, it’s just bought us a bit closer together than we used to, that’s like the only thing.

I Can you tell me a bit about that, how that started?

C1 Like we talk more now but after, when before mum passed away we always just, we never used to talk about, like never used to talk about anything but when my new step-mum came along like you know, just talk about anything me and my brother and dad and now we’d, like you know this Family Inclusion Program is bringing us closer. We talk about more stuff like my issues too, our issues together and how we feel about each other and stuff ... yeah.

I So one of the main things you’ve noticed is that you have a bit more of a yarn to your dad more than you used to?

C1 Yeah, he’s starting to trust me and stuff too, like yeah. So that’s the main, it’s been a big help to him yeah.

I Can you tell me some more about it, has does he show that he trusts you?

C1 Like he’s like, when I [indistinct] he used to give me money like when I’d go and buy for drugs and stuff like that but now he just gives me like money and like, “Yeah, go and do this and go and do that!”, you know like that stuff like that yeah.

School Attendance
Despite the young age of clients, by the conclusion of the project all had effectively exited the mainstream education system. Two clients had already exited the mainstream education system at referral and support for their attendance at an alternative vocational training college was a key feature of their Wraparound case plan. All clients had been remanded in custody either immediately prior to referral, or, in two cases, during participation in the FIP. Meaningful comparisons between number of days at school in the term prior to referral were therefore somewhat difficult to make.

Two clients were assisted with re-enrolling in a state high school after being released from custody. For one of these clients, C2, his continued enrolment at school was a key part of a successful bail application made with the assistance of the FIP. Neither of these two clients, however, re-engaged with the school environment. C2 stopped attending school after only a few days and consequently had his bail revoked and the other client continued to breach school rules and was twice suspended from school. By the end of the project both of these clients were considering alternate educational or vocational training pathways.
C2 reluctant to re-engage at school:

I Mmm, mmm yep, and for a while there you were involved in a school as well and the school knew that you were involved in Juvenile Justice...

C2 Yeah.

I ... and was that a good thing or not such a good thing?

C2 Oh I don’t know, no I don’t know, it didn’t really worry me.

I It didn’t matter much either way?

C2 No.

I Okay, so did the school make it – do you think the school made it easier or harder for you to keep your conditions at all?

C2 Oh, no not really but they just said if I wrap up, that as soon as I wrap up I’ll be out here.

I As soon as you, what, sorry?

C2 As soon as you wrap up like if you do anything bad you’ll be straight out.

I Yeah, that wasn’t why you ended up leaving the school though was it.

C2 No, I just didn’t want to go and just couldn’t be bothered and I just wanted to smoke pot.

C2’s refusal to attend school put him in breach of his bail conditions. He also reoffended and therefore spent over three months in detention.

I Mmm okay good, so I was going to ask whether you’d been able to keep the conditions of your order but I guess the fact that we’re having this interview here means you weren’t able to keep the conditions of your previous order yeah, I guess can you tell me a bit about what’s made it – what made it easier or more difficult to keep your order last time?

C2 Like on bail like ...

I Yeah, okay.

C2 ... I didn’t like, I don’t know I don’t like having a curfew and I wanted to stay at my mates house you know.

I Mmm, mmm yeah can you tell me some more about that?

C2 Well I just didn’t like going home early, I wanted to be out on the weekend and all that with my mates.

I Mmm, mmm yep, yep so you had a curfew which said you had to be home at a particular time ...

C2 Yeah, I think it was about 6.30 something, 7.00.

I Mmm, mmm and I guess you knew that if you’d broke the bail you’d end up getting locked up.

C2 Yeah.

I Mmm, I’m kind of curious to know, did you do some kind of sort of weighing up what would be better sort of thing? Because, I guess, eventually you broke bail didn’t you?

C2 Yeah, I just thought I’d be better off getting locked up than it is on bail.

I You thought it was better to be locked up than to be on bail?

C2 Yeah because I was getting angry, I didn’t want to be on bail and they adjourned it for another month then I’d, another two months when I went to court so.

I Mmm, mmm, mmm so the thing you were thinking was that you’re being sick of being on bail and having a curfew ...

C2 Yeah.

I ... and so you were kind of annoyed by that and you felt that it would be better to just be in detention.
C2 Yeah.
I Okay, now how long have you been in detention for now?
C2 Three and, three months and two weeks, about three months and two weeks.
I Mmm, so almost four months.
C2 Yeah.
I Right, that’s been quite a long time.
C2 Yeah.
I So do you still think it was you know, bail was worse than being in detention?
C2 No not really, no.

C2 was not very committed to re-engaging with the mainstream school system, but he had this to say about his reluctance to return:

I ... as well yeah, so and you know there was (collaborative partner) and myself and people from the school (name) involved and everything who got you back into school but I guess, you know, but everyone was kind of keen for you to go to school except for you, yeah. Can you help us understand some more about that, but that I guess if we look at it from a project’s point of view that kind of didn’t work very well ...
C2 Yeah.
I ... but the reason it didn’t work very well is because, you know, the key person involved, yourself ...
C2 Yeah, I didn’t want to go.
I That’s right yeah, so I’m kind of curious to know if we could have done anything differently or... so I guess the difficulty is that by the law you have to go to school yeah.
C2 Yeah, I don’t know, not really, I would have liked to have just go a few days a week and go to something else like Links to Learning or that Tutor Centre which I might be going there when I get out.
I Ah, ha yeah.
C2 Yeah, ... and the rehab.
I Yeah.
C2 Instead of just being there like five days a week or whatever.
I Mmm, mmm so can you help me understand what might have been different about going for a couple of days where you went to a school and doing other things like going to Links to Learning or the Tutor Centre?
C2 Ah, I would have been just more, I don’t know, because it was a bit weird about going straight into school after I haven’t gone for so long.
I Mmm, how long have you been out of school before then?
C2 Oh I think it might have been a year and a bit or maybe even more and I felt weird just going back into a classroom when I haven’t been for so long.
I Mmm, yeah help me understand some more about the weird feeling; was it a feeling of like did you not feel welcome or ...
C2 Yeah, it was kind of like that I didn’t feel alright there.
I Mmm, mmm you didn’t feel alright.
C2 Yeah.
I Mmm, mmm, mmm did you know anyone else at the school?
C2 No, not really.
I Okay, were you worried about the sort of work that you’d have to do?
C2  Ah, no not, not about really not about the work, I don’t know, I just felt uncomfortable going to school and not knowing anyone there.

I  Mmm, mmm, mmm did you think the people might not be friendly to you perhaps?

C2  No, I don’t know, I didn’t like them.

I  Mmm, mmm so basically you just – you really didn’t want to be there?

C2  Yeah.

I  Mmm, I guess it was, and I mean it’s difficult because that was a condition of the bail which, I guess at the time you went for bail that you were kind of agreeing to it, but at that time you were in detention.

C2  Yeah.

I  Yeah, so I guess it was one of the conditions that you can come out of detention, but you have to go to school and then initially that was okay so you went to school for a few days, but then after that like, you know, stopped going to school, so you broke bail, ended up back here. I guess looking back on it now, if you had your time over again would you still do things the same way or not?

C2  No, probably not.

I  No, what might you have done differently do you think?

C2  To try to keep my bail and go to school.

I  Mmm, mmm so how do you think you could have got over the feelings that you had about being at school?

C2  I don’t know, start meeting them and ...

I  Like meeting other people from the school perhaps?

C2  Yeah.

I  Yeah, but I’m wondering if it’s ...

C2  I didn’t know where to sit at lunch, I didn’t know who I wanted to sit with or you know so I just sort of ...

I  Oh, okay so when you got there you sort of felt a bit alone even though there was lots of people around you?

C2  Yeah, I just didn’t want, like I knew some people there but I just didn’t want to sit next to I don’t, I don’t know.

I  Mmm, so it was partly a very strong feeling of not wanting to be there ...

C2  Yeah.

I  ... but also a strong feeling of kind of not fitting in there perhaps?

C2  Yeah I don’t, yeah I don’t like talking to anyone.

I  What was that, sorry?

C2  I don’t like talking to any of them I don’t know, I just have my own mates like you know.

I  Mmm, mmm, okay.

C2  Like at (other) school it was good because I knew people and that at (other) schools and then when I got into the [new] schools it was completely – I didn’t know anyone.

I  Mmm, okay so it sounds like knowing people at the school and that would kind of help you feel a bit more like that was – that you had a place to be, like you’d feel a bit more maybe welcomed or a bit more, kind of you fitted in more or something like that.

C2  Yeah.
Although we have reported C2’s comments at some length, it is necessary in order to get a full understanding of his perception of the situation. As noted above, considerable efforts were made to re-engage C2 in school. It appears, however, that insufficient efforts were made to enlist his support and cooperation with this aspect of his case plan. The collaborative partner, CP2, was from an agency that specialises in assisting young people who are at risk of leaving school. She gave this perspective on C2 and his engagement at school:

I: Mmm good, look as you know, in some ways (C2) was probably the least – oh, how should we say, um, enthusiastic part of the whole process. I’m curious to know what you think may have made it difficult for him to engage with this kind of model. Yeah, any thoughts there?

CP2: I don’t know, main – I think it’d be more with him, like his self esteem and like his communication levels and that kind of thing. I think he at the start, but towards the end he was really obliging, like at the start he might have been a little bit intimidated by us all but I think towards the end he felt we were all there to help. I reckon… what would have probably worked better? Maybe.. I don’t know...

I: I don’t know, because if you think about it we did go to a lot of trouble to get him enrolled into school ...

CP2: ... enrolled into school. We did, we did we got him yeah, that took a lot didn’t it?

I: It did, it did ...

CP2: It did.

I: ... and then I guess the thing was that we were under the impression that that’d had worked and that he was going to be okay with that ...

CP2: Yeah, and he needs to not tell us what we want to hear. Tell us what he wants, not what we want and so that way if it’s, you know if he – he’ll probably be more obliged to come onboard then like make it all about him next time, I don’t know – let him make the rules. I don’t know but I found in some regards, apart from the school, once we got him in then he went a couple of days but then he backed off ...

I: That’s right, and unfortunately we didn’t know that he wasn’t going.

CP2: No, and we didn’t, and that something that could probably be improved, our communication with the school. That could maybe be a lot better if, when we get back into the school or whatever let them know like it’s quite important for them to call us if he’s not and the same with (father), just to let us know because it took, like a couple of times there I saw him going to school, literally with my own eyes but then went in there and he wasn’t there but I saw him going, like ...

I: On the school bus.

CP2: ... yeah, yeah.

I: So he’d obviously sort of not gone in the front gate or he’d ...

CP2: Yeah, something happened on the way there. So he’s gone, “No, we’ll go this way”.

I: Yeah, I think you’re right, I mean, it would have been important to have been able to recruit someone from the school to be on the Wraparound team as well.

CP2: Yeah, I think so yeah.

I: Certainly we had that good contact with the principal but obviously he can’t be part of the Wraparound team but it would have been good to make sure that he delegated that role to someone else.

CP2: And because of his attendance we never got him there to have that meeting ...

I: That’s right.

CP2: ... what we wanted to have after him being there for two weeks. Which then probably would have got us a support person but I think in future that we have a support person there straight away not, you know wait for two weeks and do what we said and then
CP2 later expressed the dilemma of deciding how much contact with a client is helpful and at what point it can become overly intrusive:

I And it’s difficult if he doesn’t want to be at school it’s very difficult to sort of, you know
CP2 Exactly, you can’t take a – well you can take a horse to water but you can’t make him drink. And, you know, we got him all the – we got him sorted out with a uniform. Dad sorted him out with that. Yeah, so what other – I think, like, with us involved in that, I just thought for the time being I thought that might have been enough, I didn’t want to sort of over case him you know, like sometimes you can do that and then it’s like, you know
I Too many appointments.
CP2 Yeah, like and I didn’t want to do that to him, not when he first settled in. Like maybe after him finding this, but then maybe that’s where we - I did go wrong but maybe, I don’t know I just like to give them a bit of breathing space because you know, I’ve been hammering them and then I finally get him into school and I thought, “Right, now you’re in, I’ll just leave you for a week and then come back”, but that, he didn’t ...
I Yeah, during that week he didn’t go over.
CP2 Yeah, yeah and I know that I should have just went in every day but I didn’t want him to think, “Oh not her again”; you know because I didn’t want him to think that I didn’t trust him because, you know, that’s a whole - you’ve got to build a bit of rapport there ...
I Absolutely.
CP2 ... and I didn’t want him to think that. So, I think we did everything we could at the time. In hindsight and hindsight’s always a great thing, isn’t it?

CW2 was the Juvenile Justice Officer for C2. CW2 agreed that more frequent contact with C2 would have been desirable:

I Yeah, look I mean and I’ve spoken to the dad and I’ve spoken to the other caseworker involved and pretty much everyone’s very positive about that case but it’s a bit of a case of, you know the operation was a success but unfortunately the patient died, in that there was a lot of effort and a lot of goodwill and everything went in but the reality is the boy is still I think in detention at the moment for reoffending so looking back on it what could we have done differently or what extra could we have done do you think?

CW2 I suppose having things happen a bit more quicker so as far as the appointments between (other agency), the school and having a more vigilant approach to that and involving maybe the school principal or deputy I think was involved at that time yeah, acting on that a bit quicker so that the – it was a fair period of I think about three to four weeks of not knowing exactly if he was or wasn’t at school so monitoring that a little bit better; having regular, more regular appointments with a young person in the initial stages and yeah, and interagency meetings with a young person yeah, a bit yeah.

I So when you say regular how regularly were they happening? Do you think …

CW2 They were happening once a week with the young person; father; yourself and me I don’t – I didn’t have an actual meeting where (other agency caseworker) was there so yeah.

I Mmm, it was difficult to schedule everyone’s ...

CW2 Schedule yeah, yeah.
Although C2 did not remain at school, CP2 believed that it would have been much more difficult for him to be enrolled in the school in the first place, had it not been for his involvement in the project:

CP2 Yeah, I really liked it and when my boss, and it’s unfortunate she’s not here because she’s away on holiday’s, because she thought it was brilliant and just the fact that you know, when we weren’t over casing him, you know, and the fact that if we could have similar clients, the referrals you know, that kind of thing and like and too if we have children or clients like this again we’ve got the knowledge that we can do this so I think it was really good. And it’s a shame, really, that you’re going because yeah, I thought I had a great rapport and you know you’re, you being onboard and the Family Inclusion Project and having dad, I honestly believe that was the turner to get (school principal), to get him into the school. I honestly believe that, that with you guys and because I’ve gone up there before with kids in similar situations and he hasn’t budged.

I Mmm, do you mean he hasn’t been prepared to enrol other students ...?

CP2 Mmm, he hasn’t been prepared.

I ... because there hasn’t been that show of support?

CP2 Not a lot of support no, just like one worker wherefore you know, yourself was involved with (dad) and having (dad) come up and that kind of thing, normally it was just myself; the client and another worker. No parents. No, you know? And I think that the family thing is brilliant and you guys did that well and that’s somewhere where us as (name of agency) can struggle, because we’re with the client only and we often need mum and dad’s input but it’s very hard to get them involved. And you had already had that in place, then you came along, gave me the details and already had the rapport there and it was ready to roll and I think that’s what worked so well about it all, and fact that we had a good working relationship, and yeah, we all – we were on the same page too, I think that was important, all of us caseworkers were on the same and wanted the same outcomes.

The example of C2 underlines both the potential and the challenges of a Wraparound model. C2’s father greatly appreciated the extra support in his efforts to re-engage his son at school and CW2 and CP2 were able to work collaboratively with each other and the school to have C2 re-enrol. Despite this, insufficient efforts were made to engage C2 in the case plan and motivate him to remain at school. It may have been possible to motivate C2 to remain at school, but this would likely have required a greater investment of time with him and his father. Given the costs of detention, however, it would have been a beneficial investment.

IN VolvEM ENT IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES
At intake, none of the clients were involved in any structured community activities. As part of the Wraparound case plan, one client was referred to Midnight Basketball. This is a program run on a Friday night at the local PCYC but for which young people need to register and participate in a number of personal development and life skill workshops before they can play in the tournament. Dinner and free transport to and from the venue are provided. Although the client attended the first session, his attendance thereafter was sporadic.

Another client was interested in playing rugby league for a community club but was unable to register as he did not have a birth certificate. Of his five siblings, only the first had had their birth registered and therefore received a certificate. The family reported that a number of other agencies had attempted to help the family obtain birth certificates but had been unsuccessful.
Obtaining the birth certificate for this client became one of the early objectives of the Wraparound case plan for the family. It was eventually achieved but not before overcoming a number of significant challenges. Firstly, the appropriate form had to be obtained from the Attorney General’s Department and the hospital where the client was born had to be contacted to establish what records they had on hand. Unfortunately the client’s mother was deceased and was therefore unable to either verify the circumstances of her son’s birth or to vouch for the identity of his father. In addition, the relationship between the client’s father and his deceased wife’s family had become strained following her tragic death. The Juvenile Justice Officer therefore had to make contact with the deceased mother’s relatives and ask them to sign a statutory declaration regarding the identity of the father before his signature could be added to the birth certificate application. Eventually, the Juvenile Justice Officer had to arrange to meet the maternal relatives on one of their infrequent visits to Kempsey and convey them to the local Court House for them to swear the statutory declaration, add the father’s signature to the form and attach another form to arrange for payment for the birth certificate before it was finally received in the post a couple of weeks later. Only after all of these outcomes were achieved could the client register for rugby league and join the team for training and competition. Unfortunately, by the time he received the certificate he was unable to join the team, but he recognised that the birth certificate was important for other reasons:

C1 Ah been waiting about a couple of years for um to get my birth certificate and (JJO) and Dad been, and you, actually, yeah been a big help in getting it and I got it and but the thing it was at the time I didn’t sign on, I still had to sign up and because like things and stuff.

I Sign up for what sorry?

C1 Footy it was too late to start it yeah.

I Oh okay but that’s why it was important.

C1 Yeah.

I Were there any other important reasons why it was important to have a birth certificate?

C1 Yeah, I can open my own bank account and stuff like that now and all that stuff yeah, I’ve got my own Proof of ID and stuff which is good, that’s a good thing Proof of ID and stuff yeah.

Efforts were made to help C1 become involved in other community activities:

I Yeah, alright, so have (JJO) and I helped you to be involved in any other activities that you like and that you do well? Apart from footy, anything else?

C1 Well he tried to get me into the PCYC, I turned that down and, pretty dumb idea but anyway, yeah I turned it down yeah and every other thing I sort of, I can’t think, I know there’s been heaps of things, um, the PCYC; footy; school he got me back into school, he linked me up with school; my own lifestyle my own, like my own like my own time and stuff ...

I Your what, sorry?

C1 ... my own time, like my own time when I come home at the moment, he’s helped me out with that stuff.

I He helped you out with your own time.

C1 Yeah, like family time, I just can’t remember, there’s a couple of things.
C1 was candid about his own responsibility for his behaviour, but also identified the impact of family pressures on his state of mind.

I Yeah, okay, so is there anything else you can tell me about your supervision, like what’s gone well or what hasn’t gone well or what could be improved; how could Juvenile Justice help you to stay within your order better?

C1 Oh well it’s not really, youse, it’s me, like, I’m doing the wrong things and not making the right choices and stuff.

I Mmm, so is there anything we could do to help you to do the right things or to make the right, better choices?

C1 Just life, just my life family problems and stuff yeah, just taking over my mind and stuff yeah.

**Frequency and Severity of Offending**

Two clients (50%) reoffended during their referral the FIP. One client (C1) pleaded guilty to an affray (being involved in a public brawl) and another client (C2) pleaded guilty to entering enclosed lands (entering a shopping centre from which he had previously been banned), damaging property with others and shoplifting with others (a laptop computer and alcohol).

C1 was charged with offences in January 2011 and was remanded in custody before being granted bail at the end of February. He was not charged with further offences during the remainder of the Family Inclusion Project, nor were the two other project clients. C2 was remanded in custody for three weeks in February 2011 before being released on bail. He breached his bail and reoffended and returned to custody in the first week of April. C2 remained in custody for the rest of the period of the Family Inclusion Project.

C1 may be considered to have committed a less serious offence than his previous offences, while C2 continued to commit similar offences to those he had previously committed. The other two clients who did not reoffend were clients of the FIP for seven months and eight weeks, respectively.

As detailed above, C2 returned to custody for breaching his bail conditions and reoffending. At post-project interview, C2 was somewhat philosophical about his return to custody:

I Yeah, I mean (name) it seems like in this particular situation, the thing you most like doing in life is being with your mates and smoking dope ...

C2 Yeah.

I ... and in order to do that, you’d often steal stuff to get the money to smoke dope.

C2 Yeah.

I And that’s kind of meant that you had to – you kept on getting arrested and being put on bail and then, even though we did try very hard to get you into the school, at the end of the day you didn’t really want to do that and you kind of what, like weren’t too fussed about being back in here?

C2 Yeah, I’m not, I don’t know, it didn’t really bother me, like, it’s not hard going, like, I don’t know.

I Mmm, yeah do you mean being in here is not so bad or ...?

C2 Like it’s bad because it’s like it’s not good being here, but, like, it’s easy, it’s not as hard, it’s easy going, you get out and do school and your own stuff that I got my OH&S in here, my barista course and I’ve done some mad paintings, so yeah.
C2’s offences were at the less serious end of the offending spectrum however he was persistent in his defiance of any adult-imposed boundaries, whether imposed by his father, the police or the Court. While he expressed a preference for continuing his vocational training on “the outside”, the possibility of losing his liberty for short periods did not appear to have been a sufficient motivation in the past for him to significantly modify his behaviour.

DISCUSSION

The aim of the FIP was to trial a Wraparound casework model with Juvenile Justice clients in order to reduce juvenile recidivism and improve collaborative casework practices with other agencies. In doing so, the following research questions were explored:

1. What factors (historical, structural, political, systemic, skills, training, etc) support or inhibit effective interagency collaboration in the development and implementation of a Wraparound model aimed at reducing youth recidivism?
2. What factors support or inhibit the engagement of young people and their families with the model?
3. How does involvement in the development and/or implementation of a Wraparound model within a regional community impact on the attitudes, capacity and practice of interagency collaboration amongst the service professionals in that community?
4. How does involvement in a Wraparound model impact on the young people, and families, being supported?

A research strategy was adopted that involved the concurrent implementation and evaluation of the Wraparound model with clients of Juvenile Justice, their families and collaborative partner agencies.

The evaluation of the project revealed high levels of support for the Wraparound casework model among Juvenile Justice caseworkers, collaborative partners and clients of Juvenile Justice. The long-term impact of the project on both clients and agencies, however, was more difficult to estimate because of the short duration of the project and the small number of families referred to it. There is some evidence to suggest clients had higher than normal levels of engagement, at least as far as keeping appointments and relating well to their Juvenile Justice Officer. One parent reported feeling greatly supported by their involvement, another parent reported the opposite and a third parent reported their involvement was better than previous experiences of supervision. Efforts to engage clients in education or vocational activities met with limited success and two of the four clients were charged with further offences for which they served periods of time in custody on either remand or control.
ENABLERS AND BARRIERS OF THE WRAPAROUND MODEL

The National Wraparound Initiative in the United States provides extensive resources for the development and implementation of Wraparound systems of care models in communities. Among these resources is The Resource Guide to Wraparound (Bruns and Walker, 2010). This guide suggests at the system and community levels there are six main areas of support that are essential for the implementation of a Wraparound model. These are:

- **Community partnership**: Representatives of key stakeholder groups, including families, young people, agencies, providers, and community representatives have joined together in a collaborative effort to plan, implement and oversee wraparound as a community process.

- **Collaborative action**: Stakeholders involved in the wraparound effort work together to take steps to translate the wraparound philosophy into concrete policies, practices and achievements that work across systems.

- **Fiscal policies and sustainability**: The community has developed fiscal strategies to support and sustain wraparound and to better meet the needs of children and youth participating in wraparound.

- **Access to needed supports and services**: The community has developed mechanisms for ensuring access to the wraparound process as well as to the services and supports that wrap-around teams need to fully implement their plans.

- **Human resource development and support**: The system supports wraparound staff and partner agency staff to fully implement the wraparound model and to provide relevant and transparent information to families and their extended networks about effective participation in wraparound.

- **Accountability**: The community implements mechanisms to monitor wraparound fidelity, service quality, and outcomes, and to oversee the quality and development of the overall wraparound effort.

In terms of these six areas, perhaps the clearest finding from this evaluation is the widespread support for the first two: community partnership and collaborative action and the fourth, access to needed supports and services. In contrast, barriers were identified in the areas of fiscal policies and sustainability and human resource development and support. Opportunities were identified in the area of accountability.

Support for the implementation of a Wraparound model was evident from the senior management level of human service agencies in the region, through to the Steering Committee, at the local community level of agencies in Kempsey and to individual caseworkers on the ground. Willingness to work with adolescent offenders was rated by other agency caseworkers in Kempsey at just over four out of five at baseline measurement and remained at this level at follow-up seven months later. The passion and level of commitment among agencies for trying to make a difference for this client group was remarked on by the Steering Committee member as something that came as a surprise. Clearly, notwithstanding the significant challenges of delivering services to Juvenile Justice clients in Kempsey, there is a lot of good will to be harnessed from other agencies that have over-lapping agendas in working with clients of Juvenile Justice in Kempsey.
Factors that enhance this goodwill appear to be related to the quality of relationships among agency partners. Meeting with other agency partners at the Steering Committee led to one representative remarking that they now had a “very nice friendly two-way thing happening ... with Community Services”. Similarly, the importance of reciprocity in communication was highlighted by another collaborative partner: “I can just pick up the phone and talk to someone that I want to talk to who’s involved in the project, whether it’s JJ or the Family Inclusion Project, you know, available straight away; they always ring back. You know, the communication’s been really good”. Another collaborative partner remarked: “… and I think that’s what worked so well about it all, and fact that we had a good working relationship, and yeah, we all – we were on the same page too”. There was also a suggestion that the FIP was responsible for fostering some of this improvement in communication and collegiality among collaborative partners.

The only stand-out exception to the requirements of community partnership and collaborative action, however, is the involvement of the Police force in Kempsey. Despite a number of efforts to engage Police in the project and attract senior Police officers to be members of the project Steering Committee, there was only one occasion on which the Police force was represented at the Steering Committee by a junior officer. It is likely that any future Wraparound model in Kempsey would benefit from more active Police involvement.

There appears to be some way to go in terms of the third area of support referred to above: development of fiscal strategies to support and sustain a Wraparound model in Kempsey. The main barriers identified in this evaluation for the use of a Wraparound model were related to issues of resourcing. While willingness to work in an interagency context with this client group was the highest scoring item on the CPQ at baseline and follow-up, confidence about having the resources available was the lowest scoring item on the CPQ at both baseline and follow-up. The need for higher levels of resourcing was consistently reported by collaborative partners in the post-project interviews, as well as by a member of the Steering Committee and the Juvenile Justice Officers. There was a divergence of views about the amount of extra time required for using a Wraparound model, with one Juvenile Justice Officer reporting it taking a great deal of extra time, while the other Juvenile Justice Officer believed that the extra time was only required at the start of the case planning process. Collaborative partners welcomed the use of the Wraparound model, but also expressed the view that it required a specific position to support and sustain the process of implementation.

The Family Inclusion Project was made possible through of the willingness of the Commonwealth Government to provide funding. Efforts were made to secure Commonwealth funding to expand the project via the addition of an Aboriginal Family Engagement Officer. Such funding was contingent, however, on State Government funding also being available to continue the FIP coordinator position. Unfortunately, for reasons outlined previously, this funding was not forthcoming.
In June of 2011, the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia released a report on Indigenous youth in the criminal justice system entitled *Doing Time, Time For Doing* (Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, 2011). The report made 40 recommendations, including number 39:

The Committee recommends that the Commonwealth Government work with state and territory governments to coordinate sustained and flexible funding support for a range of youth justice diversion and rehabilitation services which are developed with and supported by local Indigenous communities.

and number 32:

The Committee recommends that the Commonwealth Government commit further resources to evaluate the effectiveness of Indigenous youth justice and diversion programs and that the findings be published on the Indigenous Justice Clearinghouse and the Closing the Gap Clearinghouse websites.

It is hoped that after the finalisation of the NSW State Budget in September 2011 it may be possible to identify appropriate fiscal strategies that could support and sustain a Wraparound model in Kempsey via funding from both the Commonwealth and State Governments. It is also hoped that once established and further evaluated, Wraparound may be implemented in other similar rural areas and become integrated into the regular operations of human service agencies in the region.

Another barrier identified in this evaluation to the implementation of the Wraparound model in Kempsey is related to the fifth area of support: human resource development and support. The project was originally designed to have the project coordinator train and mentor the two Kempsey Juvenile Justice Officers in the Wraparound model and to evaluate its effectiveness. One of the Juvenile Justice Officers was an Aboriginal person who lived and grew up in Kempsey. Unfortunately, when this officer had to take unexpected leave, levels of referral from Aboriginal families diminished and the officer’s cases were eventually allocated to a non-Aboriginal Juvenile Justice Officer. This required the project officer to take a more “hands-on” role in working with clients, as well as providing on-the-job training for the new Juvenile Justice Officer in the philosophy and methods of the Wraparound model. This undoubtedly led to the very low level of satisfaction expressed by one parent involved in the project.

High levels of staff turnover and a difficulty in filling identified Aboriginal positions are a fact of life for most human service agencies in Kempsey. Having a larger number of staff trained in the practice and philosophy of Wraparound, however, would help to mitigate against this reality. Additionally, there is considerable potential to provide a stream of employment-ready graduates from Southern Cross University via the development of work placement schemes in various undergraduate courses at the university. Some of this potential is already being harnessed via SCU students being involved in the NSW Government Indigenous Cadetship scheme. Both of these strategies to enhance human resource development are revenue-neutral and require only moderate amounts of planning and liaison between the university and Juvenile Justice.
The continued collaboration between the Centre for Children and Young People and State and Commonwealth governments presents an excellent opportunity for securing the final area of support considered essential for the implementation of a Wraparound model: mechanisms to monitor wraparound fidelity, service quality, and outcomes, and to oversee the quality and development of the overall wraparound effort. The initial trial of the Family Inclusion Project has demonstrated that it is not only feasible, but highly effective for these three agencies to collaborate on their over-lapping agendas to the benefit of all concerned.

**IMPACT OF THE MODEL ON CLIENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES**

The evidence regarding the impact of the Wraparound model on clients and their families is limited by the small sample size and the fact that only three of four parents and two of four clients were available for post-project interview. Two of the parents expressed satisfaction with their involvement in the project and one parent commented that it was more helpful than her previous experiences of her son being supervised by Juvenile Justice. One parent was quite critical of the FIP and described it as “absolutely useless.”

A number of factors are likely to have contributed to this parent finding that the project was not helpful. This family was the last family to be referred to the project in May 2011. Although the family initially engaged with the project and a Wraparound case plan was established, there was considerable indecision within the family about where the client would reside and which school he should attend, and if he would continue to attend school at all. Combined with a Juvenile Justice Officer who was relatively new to the process of Wraparound, this level of indecision led to the Wraparound plan being unable to get traction before the client decided to move and reside with his father. By this stage, in June 2011, the project was beginning to wind down and the client reverted to supervision as normal by Juvenile Justice.

The experience of this family, however, appears to have been significantly different to that of the other families involved in the project. The other families and clients expressed positive, and in some cases very positive, views about the impact of the model. One father commented that it was very helpful to have the support and back-up of other adults in trying to have a positive influence on the behaviour of his son. Another client (C1) commented that the project had led to his father receiving help from the local mental health service, which subsequently led to a significant improvement in their relationship.

It is important to note that the benefits of a Wraparound model extend to children beyond the nominated Juvenile Justice client. In the case of C1, the benefits of his father receiving services from mental health are also likely to flow on to C1’s younger siblings. Three of the four clients in the project had younger siblings.

Two of four clients had further proven charges during their participation in the FIP. For one of these clients, C1, the precipitant to the charges was a heated argument with his family. This occurred prior to him and his father being referred to mental health services. The other client, C2, continued to attend shopping centres from which he had been barred and continued to steal goods from shops, truant from school and associate with other delinquent children and smoke marijuana. For C2, the loss of liberty in a detention centre and the emotional pain caused to his father did not appear to present a sufficient deterrent to him continuing to break the law. Two other clients were not charged with further offences during their involvement with the project.
It is important to note that a recent Australian study on the specific deterrent effect of detention on juvenile reoffending found there was no association between the imposition of a custodial penalty and post-sentence reoffending (Weatherburn et al., 2009). This study was consistent with other research in noting that some previous Australian studies had actually found that juvenile detention was criminogenic. It also suggested that custodial penalties should be used very sparingly with juveniles.

It is important to stress that young people who enter juvenile detention come from a range of backgrounds and experience detention differently. Therefore, C2’s response to, and experience of, detention should not be generalised to be representative of all young people. It does serve, however, to illustrate the limitations of using detention alone as a means to change the behaviour of adolescent boys. Considering the costs of keeping young people in detention and the relatively less serious nature of the offences committed by C2, the funding used for his incarceration could perhaps more profitably have been reinvested in better resourced community-based efforts to help his father develop more effective parenting strategies.

To the extent that recidivism is used as a program performance indicator, it must be conceded that the Family Inclusion Project did not prevent two of its clients from reoffending during the short time period in which the project operated. It should also be noted, however, that recent literature on program outcome studies have highlighted the limitations of using recidivism as a sole, or even key, performance indicator. For example, Cunneen and Luke (2007) argue recidivism needs to be considered in a broader context of evaluative tools, including qualitative measures. They also argue that relying on recidivism outcome measures can obscure other important outcomes such as social integration and personal change processes, factors associated with goals such as desistence from crime in the long term.

**PROJECT AND EVALUATION LIMITATIONS**

There are numerous limitations to the Family Inclusion Project, and therefore to this evaluation. The scope of the project, both in terms of its time period and number of participants, limits the confidence that can be placed on the extent to which its findings can be generalised. The consecutive, rather than concurrent, process for obtaining ethical clearance from SCU and Juvenile Justice to run the project meant that it did not begin to receive referrals until three months after the project began. The need to conclude the project by the end of July 2011 meant referrals could not be received after May 2011. As a consequence, the operating period available for the project was only seven months.

Not allowing enough time to implement a Wraparound intervention is acknowledged by the National Wraparound Initiative as a pitfall to avoid:

**Failing to allow enough time.** Building collaborative action that creates support for wraparound implementation takes time and commitment. Managers and leaders must be prepared to stay connected with the project through its early implementation, and continue to stay involved as the project matures, expands and adapts. Be prepared to dedicate time to understand how the project is operating, as well as creating mechanisms to assure that administrators have a significant understanding of the child and family’s experience. (NWI, 2011)
A related limitation was therefore the planned evaluation strategy. It was originally anticipated that the project would attract more referrals and the evaluation strategy was predominantly designed to collect and analyse quantitative data. The post-project interviews were added as an evaluation strategy shortly before the conclusion of the project and the limited time available to conduct the interviews meant that not all participants were available to be interviewed.

Given these limitations though, it is encouraging to see the positive support for the Wraparound model and the generally positive response to the model by project participants. The project has assisted understandings of how a Wraparound service model could be implemented in regional NSW. It has provided insight into the complex lives of clients and their families, pitfalls to be avoided in implementing Wraparound and pathways to success. Among these would be allowing a greater length of time to develop, implement and evaluate the Wraparound model, develop a more balanced evaluation strategy including both quantitative and qualitative strategies, and recruiting and training more staff to implement the project, with a special emphasis on recruiting Aboriginal staff.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and discussion presented throughout this report, the following recommendations are offered towards exploiting the potential of a Wraparound interagency model to reduce youth recidivism:

1. The Wraparound service model warrants further exploration and implementation over an extended period of time in Kempsey. There is widespread support for the model among human service agencies in Kempsey and it is consistent with the Juvenile Justice Corporate Plan 2010-2013, specifically with regard to the outcomes associated with Community Based Services – Increased use of family-focused programs and interventions. Additionally, the model is consistent with previous imperatives for the government to invest in collaborative and community-based programs to address juvenile offending and Indigenous over-representation e.g. Murphy et al. (2010) and Richards et al. (2011).

2. The Commonwealth and State Governments should commit to funding an expanded trial of Wraparound. The current project has suggested the potential of the model to improve service delivery to Juvenile Justice clients, including those from an Aboriginal background. The recent Commonwealth Parliamentary Inquiry into Indigenous youth in the criminal justice system has recommended that the Commonwealth Government work with state and territory governments to coordinate sustained and flexible funding support for a range of youth justice diversion and rehabilitation services which are developed with and supported by local Indigenous communities (Recommendation 39). The Inquiry also recommended that the Commonwealth Government commit further resources to evaluate the effectiveness of Indigenous youth justice and diversion programs and that the findings be published by the Indigenous Justice Clearinghouse and the Closing the Gap Clearinghouse websites (Recommendation 32).

3. Any future Family Inclusion Project should include an identified Aboriginal Family Engagement Officer. The project demonstrated the crucial role played by Aboriginal staff in this model and the importance of mitigating against staff turnover or attrition.

4. Any future Family Inclusion Project should delineate the responsibilities of the FIP facilitator and evaluator. The research integrity of any future FIP would be strengthened by ensuring the FIP facilitator is not also responsible for the evaluation of the project.

5. The ethics review process of Southern Cross University and Juvenile Justice should be more closely coordinated. More time could be invested in the operational aspects of any future project if the ethics review processes of SCU and Juvenile Justice were concurrent, rather than consecutive.

6. That Southern Cross University and Juvenile Justice continue to identify opportunities for collaboration that result in improved understandings in responding to the needs of Juvenile Justice clients and their families and communities. The project has demonstrated the value of Southern Cross University and Juvenile Justice collaborating in areas of overlapping agenda. It is likely that other opportunities exist for further collaboration that would be of benefit to both Juvenile Justice and Southern Cross University.
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## APPENDIX A: ALABAMA PARENTING QUESTIONNAIRE

Different families have different ways of relating to one another.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell us how often the following things take place in your family?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. You have a friendly talk with your child.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You let your child know when he/she is doing a good job with something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You threatened to punish your child and then do not actually punish him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You volunteer to help with special activities that your child is involved in (e.g., sports, Scouts, church youth groups).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You reward or give something extra to your child for obeying you or behaving well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your child fails to leave a note or to let you know where he/she is going.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You play games or do other fun things with your child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Your child talks you out of being punished after he/she has done something wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. You ask your child about his/her day in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Your child stays out in the evening past the time he/she is supposed to be home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. You help your child with his/her homework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. You feel that getting your child to obey you is more trouble than it's worth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. You compliment your child when he/she does something well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. You ask your child what his/her plans are for the coming day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. You drive your child to a special activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. You praise your child if he/she behaves well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Your child is out with friends you do not know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. You hug or kiss your child when he/she has done something well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Your child goes out without a set time to be home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. You talk to your child about his/her friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Your child is out after dark without an adult with him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. You let your child out of a punishment early. (e.g., lift restrictions earlier than you originally said).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Your child helps plan family activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. You get so busy that you forget where your child is and what he/she is doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Your child is not punished when he/she has done something wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. You attend P&amp;C meetings, parent/teacher interviews, or other meetings at your child’s school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. You tell your child that you like it when he/she helps around the house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. You don’t check that your child comes home from school when he/she is supposed to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. You don’t tell your child where you are going.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Your child comes home from school more than an hour past the time you expect him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The punishment you give your child depends on your mood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Your child is at home without adult supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. You spank your child with your hand when he/she has done something wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. You ignore your child when he/she is misbehaving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. You slap your child when he/she has done something wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. You take away privileges or money from your child as a punishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. You send your child to his/her room as a punishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. You hit your child with a belt, stick, or other object when he/she has done something wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. You yell or scream at your child when he/she has done something wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. You calmly explain to your child why his/her behaviour was wrong when he/she misbehaves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. You use time out (make him/her sit or stand in corner) as a punishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. You give your child extra chores as a punishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B: THERAPEUTIC ENGAGEMENT MEASURE

For each area please circle the number that best describes your client at the current time.  
Terminology: ‘Supervision’ refers to the whole supervision package.  
‘Caseworker’ refers to the person most involved with the client, this will usually, but not always, be the juvenile justice worker.

### Area 1) Appointment keeping

*Include attendance of supervision appointments and keeping other appointments i.e. being at home when arranged*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Support: (i.e. without caseworker bringing them)</th>
<th></th>
<th>With Support: (i.e. caseworker bringing client to appointments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never keeps appointments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rarely keeps appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rarely keeps appointments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes keeps appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes keeps appointments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Usually keeps appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Usually keeps appointments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Always keeps appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Always keeps appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Even if client attends without support, please rate what their attendance would be like with support)

### Area 2) Client-caseworker Interaction

*Quality of Relationship (The extent to which the client relates well with therapist, giving rise to a positive atmosphere during sessions)*

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never relates well with caseworker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rarely relates well with caseworker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes relates well with caseworker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area 3) Communication/Openness

*The extent to which client volunteers relevant personal material, is open in discussing feelings, problems and current situation*

#### a) Personal feelings (i.e. anger, depression etc)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never discusses personal feelings with caseworker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rarely discusses personal feelings with caseworker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes discusses personal feelings with caseworker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b) Personal problems (i.e. difficulties in current life situation)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never discusses personal problems with caseworker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rarely discusses personal problems with caseworker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes discusses personal problems with caseworker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### c) Family Problems

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never discusses family problems with caseworker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rarely discusses family problems with caseworker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes discusses family problems with caseworker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area 4) Client's perceived usefulness of supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never perceives supervision as useful</td>
<td>Rarely perceives supervision as useful</td>
<td>Sometimes perceives supervision as useful</td>
<td>Usually perceives supervision as useful</td>
<td>Always perceives supervision as useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area 5) Collaboration with supervision *(The extent to which client agrees to proposed intervention, as stated in their caseplan, and is involved in carrying it out i.e. keeping appointments, attending other services etc.)*

#### a) Agreement with supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never agrees with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Rarely agrees with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Sometimes agrees with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Usually agrees with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Always agrees with proposed intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b) Involvement in supervision i.e. carries out ‘homework’ etc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is never involved with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Is rarely involved with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Is sometimes involved with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Is usually involved with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Is always involved with proposed intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### c) Active involvement in treatment *(Active involvement: Client clearly wants to involve themselves in the supervision process)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is never actively involved with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Is rarely actively involved with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Is sometimes actively involved with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Is usually actively involved with proposed intervention</td>
<td>Is always actively involved with proposed intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area 6) Compliance with medication *(The extent to which client agrees to take medication and takes it freely.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never complies with medication</td>
<td>Rarely complies with medication</td>
<td>Sometimes complies with medication</td>
<td>Usually complies with medication</td>
<td>Always complies with medication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: COLLABORATIVE PARTNER QUESTIONNAIRE

Firstly, some questions about yourself:

What agency are you from and what is your role within it?
And can you tell me a bit about your work with children – how long you’ve been doing it, the settings you’ve worked in, that sort of thing?
What can you tell me about your current experiences of working collaboratively with other agencies who may also be working with one of your clients?

Now, thinking about working with juvenile justice clients:

1. How confident are you right now in your abilities when working with juvenile justice clients?
2. How confident are you right now that you have the kind of resources available that allow you to effectively carry out your job of working with juvenile justice clients?
3. How much knowledge do you have right now about the extent of offending committed by adolescents?
4. How much knowledge do you have right now about the causes of offending committed by adolescents?
5. How much knowledge do you have right now about assessing the risks and needs of adolescent offenders?
6. How much knowledge do you have right now about intervention with adolescent offenders?
7. At present, how comfortable/at ease are you when dealing with adolescent offenders?
8. At present, how willing are you to work with adolescent offenders?

To what extent do the following factors present obstacles to collaborative partnerships?
1. Limited resources/staffing
2. Workload demands
3. Time constraints
4. Insufficient training
5. Failure to complete agreed tasks
6. Lack of confidence
7. Confidentiality

To what extent are the following factors benefits of collaborative partnerships?
1. Enhances skills/knowledge
2. More regular support/treatment
3. Local context informs treatment
4. More expedient therapeutic process
5. Increases local support network
6. Builds community capacity
7. Reduces travel requirements

To what extent do collaborative partnerships improve outcomes for clients?

To what extent do collaborative partnerships help you to transfer knowledge and skills from the partnership to your work with other clients?

To what extent would you be willing to work collaboratively with juvenile justice in the future?
Appendix D: Post Project Interview Schedules

FIP Debriefing Questions - Young Person

This interview will be conducted by the FIP coordinator who knows each of the participants and has been involved with their supervision for the last few months. As there is already a level of rapport, the interview moves quite quickly into the matters at hand.

Thanks for agreeing to speak with me. As you know, JJ has been trying a new way of working with young people and it has been called the Family Inclusion Project. This is why I have been seeing you and your family, along with your JJO. You have been involved in this project. I wonder if you can tell me a bit about your experiences of being involved in the project? For example, what can you tell me about any differences between your experience of supervision this time compared to any previous supervision?

Have you been able to keep to the conditions of your order? What has made it easier or harder to keep to your conditions this time?

What is different about being on an order this time?

What people are involved in helping you to keep to your order?

Does your mum or dad know what the conditions of your order are? How are they involved in helping you to keep to your conditions?

Does the school know that you are involved with Juvenile Justice? Is this a good thing, or a not so good thing?

In what ways has the school made it harder or easier to keep your conditions?

Have (JJO name) and I helped you to get involved in activities that you like and do well? Can you give me some examples?

Do (JJO name) and I help you to come up with new ideas when something in your life is not working well?

Do you feel like important decisions about you and your family are made by (JJO name) and I when you are not there? Can you tell me more?

Has being involved with (JJO name) and I helped you and your family to meet people who will support you when your supervision is finished? Can you give me some examples?

Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your supervision, such as what has not gone well or what could be improved?

FIP Debriefing Questions – Caregiver

This interview will be conducted by the FIP coordinator who knows each of the caregivers and has been involved with the supervision of their child for the last few months.

When you were first interviewed about the FIP, were you given time to talk about your family’s strengths, beliefs and traditions?

At the beginning of the FIP, did you have a chance to talk about what things have worked in the past for your son and family?

To what extent have you felt that there was a plan to assist your son and family?

To what extent have you felt included in planning to help your son and family?

Has being in the FIP resulted in your family being connected to supports and services apart from Juvenile Justice? Can you give me some examples?

Are important decisions made about your son and family when you are not there?

Are any of the supports or services recommended by the FIP difficult for your family to access?

Has being involved in the FIP helped your son to make friends with other youth who will have a positive influence on him?

Do you know who from the FIP to contact about your son if a problem comes up?

What has been easy about being involved in the FIP and what has been hard?

What has been positive about being involved in the FIP?

Is there anything else that you could identify that would make it easier for us to support you with your son?
**FIP Debriefing Questions – Caseworker**

This interview will be conducted by the FIP coordinator who knows each of the participants and has worked with them on the FIP for the last few months.

As you know, we have been trying a new way to work with JJ clients for the last several months and you have been involved with the Family Inclusion Project. We have been trialling a Wraparound casework model.

How do you think a Wraparound model is similar or different to normal casework practice?

In what ways has the FIP meant that your casework with FIP clients has been different to your casework with other clients?

What resources have you had to assist you with your casework with FIP clients? Have these resources been adequate? Can you tell me more?

Can you tell me about some of your experiences in working with other agencies with FIP clients? Who were some of these agencies? Was it easy to work with them? What made it easy or difficult?

What things do you think make it easy or difficult for young people and their families to engage in the FIP?

What things do you think make it easy or difficult for other agencies to engage in the FIP?

What things do you think make it easy or difficult for caseworkers in this agency to engage in the FIP?

How do you think the FIP impacted on the clients and families that you worked with?

What do you think worked well and what would need to improve about the FIP for it to bring more benefit to clients and their families?

**FIP Debriefing Questions – Steering Committee Member**

As you know, we have been trying a new way to work with JJ clients for the last several months and you have been involved with the Family Inclusion Project. We have been trialling a Wraparound casework model.

Can you tell me a bit about the Wraparound casework model? How would you describe it?

What factors do you think support or get in the way of effective interagency collaboration with JJ clients in Kempsey?

In what ways do you think the FIP has impacted on the attitudes, capacity and practice of interagency collaboration among services in Kempsey?

What surprised you about being on the FIP steering committee, or what was something that was different to what you expected?

What was something that was hard or frustrating about being on the steering committee?

What do you think worked well and what would need to improve about the FIP for it to bring more benefit to clients and their families in Kempsey?
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