

9

Young people who have been in state care and protection are over-represented in the homeless population. In the 2006 census of homeless school students, some 15 per cent of students had been in care and protection. In Project I, about one in five of the young people entering SAAP were estimated to have been in care and protection. An RMIT study found 42 per cent of young adults and other adults in SAAP had been in care and protection. Often these young people's family situations have deteriorated well before they become teenagers. They are a particularly vulnerable group. In every hearing, the systems of care and protection in the different jurisdictions were reported as being under-resourced and under-staffed. This resulted in priority allocations that focus on younger children, creating major issues of access for older youth. In a significant number of cases, the failure of the system is a part of the problem. The Commonwealth has had little responsibility and state care systems are in crisis. The NYC has called for a Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission inquiry into care and protection in Australia, to expose the extent of the problems and provide a basis for national action. Despite some positive effort, there is an urgent need for numerous improvements, including a universal leaving care entitlement. The total investment will be considerable, but it would have a major impact on youth homelessness in the medium- to long-term future.

Chapter 9 | State care and protection

I was in family and children's services care from the age of two, and in full care of the Minister until the age of sixteen. When I turned sixteen, Family and Children's Services had enough of me ...¹

Introduction

9.1 In Australia, the responsibility for child protection and the care of children unable to live with their families for reasons of abuse and neglect lies with the state and territory governments. Children who are unable to live with their families are placed in out-of-home care services of various kinds. A common form of out-of-home care is foster care where the child is placed in the care of a volunteer. Another common type of out-of-home care is residential accommodation where a small group of children or young people are placed in a property owned or rented by an agency with employees caring for the children around the clock.

9.2 Young people with a 'care background' are over-represented in the youth homeless population. The 2006 national census of homeless school students found that close to 15 per cent of homeless students may have had an experience in state care. In Project i's sample of 200 young people entering SAAP services in Melbourne about one in five had been in care and protection at some point. Chamberlain and Johnson found that 42 per cent of adults and young people in SAAP have been in state care at some stage of their lives. UnitingCare Burnside (NSW) suggested several reasons for this:

Young people in care or those who have been in care have a heightened vulnerability to homelessness due to:

- lack of or disrupted familial connections;*
- childhood trauma which in some cases may lead to learning disabilities and early*

disengagement with the education system;

- difficulty in finding foster carers for young people, particularly those with difficult behaviours arising out of their pre-care experience;

- multiple placements resulting in a lack of community connections.²

9.3 The issue of state care and protection was raised at the hearings and in submissions to the Inquiry for two main reasons. The first was the perceived failure of the state and territory systems to adequately care for all children in need, particularly children who come to the attention of protective services aged 12 to 16 years with the result that they end up in homelessness services. The second reason was the lack of after care support services that meant young people leaving care as a young adult became homeless and reliant on supported accommodation and other services.

9.4 The issue of state care is complex because of the age and vulnerability of the children and young people involved. The State's responsibility beyond legal statutory responsibility once wardship has expired is being debated under 'leaving care'. If the state is the parent in the absence of other adult 'parental' carers, what should be done to assist a young person after the statutory period? The link between state care and homelessness was well established during the HREOC Inquiry and since. This Chapter discusses these issues as causes of youth homelessness in Australia.

Child Protection Services and SAAP

9.5 The Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) is Australia's primary response to homelessness (see Chapter 14). It funds accommodation and support to homeless people of all ages.

9.6 SAAP is not meant to replace any state or territory government program according to the relevant legislation. Section 10(1) of the Supported Accommodation Assistance Act (1994) (Cwth) states that:

Except with the joint written consent of the Minister and the State Minister of each participating State, a form of agreement specified in an instrument under section 6 must provide that SAAP will not replace or duplicate a service that is already provided by, or is the responsibility of, any other government, program or organisation.³

9.7 Further, the legislation states that the SAAP agreements between the Commonwealth and the states and territories may specify services to meet the specific needs of '... independent young people above the school leaving age for the state concerned.'⁴

9.8 These two sections of the Act imply that homeless young people below the school leaving age are not the responsibility of SAAP funded organisations but are responsibility of the state and territory governments' child protection authorities.

9.9 Despite this, SAAP services and others told the Inquiry that their clients include a significant number of young people who are or should be under the care and protection of the relevant state or territory authority. For a variety of reasons the out of

home care system cannot support these young people and SAAP services are called upon for assistance. For example, Karinya Young Womyn's Service, a SAAP funded service in Tasmania, wrote that:

*Our service is frequently called upon to accommodate young people under guardianship orders with the Department.*⁵

9.10 The Executive Officer of Caretakers Cottage in Sydney, told the Inquiry that:

*We have a fairly high proportion of young people who are subject to care orders, doing DoCS care. I think it is something like 27 per cent.... And, so I guess we are a crisis repository for young people who are in the DoCS system for whom our [out of] home care system can't adequately cope.*⁶

9.11 Child protection workers refer young people to SAAP for a variety of reasons. SAAP workers told the Inquiry that they believed difficult clients were often referred to SAAP. For example, Karinya Young Womyn's Service (Tas) told the Inquiry:

*The most common causes being difficult and challenging behaviours and the inability of Department facilities to cater for these.*⁷

9.12 Young people with challenging behaviours go through a lot of out-of-home care arrangements and yet SAAP services are meant to be able to manage the same young people without a mandate and without targeted resources. This is despite the fact that funding for SAAP is less than funding for out-of-home care residential services. Some informants suggested that cost savings are the driving force behind a reliance on SAAP as opposed to out-of-home care.

9.13 The Inquiry was told that the child protection systems across the country prioritise young children over adolescents to the point where they won't accept adolescents over the age of around 12 years (depending on the jurisdiction). For example, the housing manager of Barwon Youth (Victoria) told the Inquiry that:

*The emphasis on the care and protection system is very much at the under 12 age group, it's not at the post 12 age group.*⁸

*It is true overall that some 70 per cent of children admitted to care and protection orders were under the age of 10 years and one quarter (24%) were 10-14 years of age.*⁹

9.14 A similar point was raised by UnitingCare Burnside, in NSW, who wrote that:

*The Department of Community Services is stretched and unable to respond equally to the needs of both children and young people. Younger children under the age of 11 are likely to be prioritised based on their vulnerability.*¹⁰

9.15 Apart from problems of access, once in care there are issues about how adequately the systems work with challenging young people over the age of 12 years. There was evidence that the models of intervention and care are less than adequate for this adolescent group. Anglican Community Care in Mt Gambia (South Australia), has been trying to establish an appropriate service for 14 to 16 year olds to fill the service

gap. They believed that the problem was one of resources and priorities for Families SA (the child protection authority):

*All unaccompanied children who present in housing crisis must be referred to Families SA but the local office is kept busy with babies and children under 14 who are at risk. They do not have the resources to adequately service 14 to 16 year olds who are not under care, while those over 16 may have options such as access to the SAAP service and Centrelink support.*¹¹

9.16 Sometimes a young person who is the victim of abuse will present to a SAAP service, which then notifies the relevant child protection authority. However, in a combined submission, the Council to Homeless Persons (Vic), the Youth Affairs Council of Victoria and Project i advised the Inquiry that they believe that the policies and procedures of child protection authorities in many cases decide not to investigate or attempt to substantiate a notification unless there is evidence of sexual or physical abuse. They wrote:

*Child Protection has been reluctant to accept notifications relating to unaccompanied young people under 16 who are at risk of harm, unless there is evidence of physical or sexual abuse. Accordingly, considerable numbers of young people between 12-15 years are reportedly screened out, the threshold for Child Protection intervention being too high and the protective concerns not considered serious enough.*¹²

The most recent data from the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare substantiates this claim. The AIHW report stated:

Rates of children who were the subjects of one or more substantiations of notifications received during 2006–07 generally decreased with age. In all jurisdictions, children aged under 1 year were most likely to be the subject of a substantiation and children aged 15–16 years least likely (Table 2.7). For example, children aged less than 1 year were at least 2.3 times as likely to be subject to a substantiation as 10–14 year olds. (2008, p 26)

9.17 One young woman told the Inquiry how she slipped between the child protection and SAAP systems. She wrote:

*I was 13-14 when on the streets – too young for hostels and too old for fostering I was told.*¹³

9.18 Over the past decade or so, child protection has become a more prominent issue and there has been wider public acknowledgement that child abuse and neglect occurs in all parts of our society. Expectations that children should be protected from abuse and neglect have risen and as a result the child protection services are receiving a larger number of notifications. Due to changes in reporting systems it is not possible to compare notifications over an extended period. However, the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report the number of child protection notifications increased by over 33,000 from 219,384 in 2003–04 to 252,831 in 2004–05. The number of notifications in the latest report for 2006–07 was 309,517, a 56,686 increase in the most recent year for which there is data.¹⁴

9.19 As a result of this increase in notifications and increased pressure on the child protection agencies, some SAAP services believe they have become a ‘stop-gap’ child protection service because there are not enough services focused on working with adolescents. For example, Anglicare Tasmania’s Accommodation Support Service told the Inquiry that:

*Tasmania as a state is putting more and more legislative requirements on the child protection workers, non-government workers, schools, etc. There’s this swamp of referrals to child and family services, and even though we are, in our case, a six-week shelter, the easy response for child and family services is: ‘Well, they’re with you, they’re at least safe there at the moment’.*¹⁵

9.20 In the light of large increases in reports and enhanced public expectations, state and territory governments have focused their efforts on those children they perceive as the most vulnerable, children under the age of around 12 years (the specific age varies between jurisdictions). There are good reasons for focusing on the younger age groups. Early intervention and prevention, by working with young children and their families, is preferable to picking up the pieces later on during adolescence. Intensive family support is one of the models used for this group, but it is less frequently offered to older children. The AIHW data indicates that approximately two-thirds of the children receiving intensive family support were younger than ten years of age. However, the younger group should not be prioritised at the expense of the older group who may also need intensive family and other support services, particularly in the areas of appropriate mental health, alternative education and out of home care expenses. Relying on SAAP is not an adequate response especially considering that SAAP is running at capacity as it is (see Chapter 14 Supported Accommodation).

Leaving care

9.21 Research conducted by the Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare (Vic) in 2005 showed that young people leaving care are at risk of homelessness:

*... the life outcomes for many children and young people leaving care in Australia each year are particularly poor. A significant proportion of children and young people who have left care experience homelessness, poor physical and mental health, substance abuse, very low income levels, poor employment and educational outcomes, early parenthood, involvement with the criminal justice system and prostitution.*¹⁶

9.22 When a young person has been living in care there is a clear need for support to extend beyond the period in care because these young people do not have the family supports most home-based young people receive during their transition to independence. As UnitingCare Burnside (NSW) put it:

*Young people leaving out of home care can rely on little, if any direct family support or other community networks to ease their transition to independent living.*¹⁷

9.23 Home-based young people typically rely on their families for advice and assistance (often monetary) well into adulthood. This might include simple things such

as access to a free clothes washing machine and a free meal to assistance with bond and rent. In medical or other emergencies parents can be relied upon to assist.

9.24 The experiences of witnesses to the Inquiry from across Australia supported the research showing young people leaving care are at risk of homelessness. Many SAAP services told the Inquiry that significant proportions of their clients were formerly in the care system. For example, Barwon Youth (Vic) told the Inquiry that:

*... at any one time over a third of our clients would meet that profile, but I think they're taking up about two-thirds of the staff time.*¹⁸

9.25 The witnesses from out-of-home care services also recognised the problem. For example, Aurala (Queensland) confirmed that some out-of-home care clients went from the residential care setting to homelessness services such as SAAP.¹⁹

9.26 Melbourne Youth Support Service told the Inquiry that out-of-home care often referred young people to SAAP as a first option:

*In most instances when young people's care orders end they are referred to community based organisations and provided very limited follow up care. It is unreasonable to exit a young person from care to a homeless service or the SAAP system as an initial option. If leaving care placements break down there is an understanding that these young people may need to access support from community-based organisations, however, this is an unreasonable first option.*²⁰

9.27 In Western Australia the situation seemed particularly bad because care periods last for only two years irrespective of age although they can be extended. Young people aged 15 to 18 whose care orders are not extended often end up homeless. The Salvation Army Crossroads West (Western Australia) told the Inquiry:

*We have a case of a young girl, recently 16 who was homeless who has minimal disabilities and minimal drug and alcohol [problems]. We were excluded from the exit-planning meeting, but we were told afterwards by this young woman - and we've got notes to it - she pleaded within this case conference to remain in care of the Department because she was homeless and she had no supports. Bear in mind, these children have been placed in the care of the State because they had no family supports, so the family have not been able to provide adequate care and protection for them. They do not have a backup that they can go back to. So we have young people who are 15 and 16 who have no family support networks. If they have been moved around, which often they have been moved around, they establish no support networks within the community, they establish no networks within the educational community and are often left alone to fend for themselves.*²¹

9.28 The Inquiry heard three main reasons why young people leaving care become homeless. These are their lack of:

- living skills;
- education and hence poor employment opportunities; and

- support as young adults.
- pre-existing mental health issues

9.29 As the Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare (Vic), put it:
*... many young people leaving care are experiencing multiple disadvantage across a range of life domains, that significantly heightens their risk of homelessness.*²²

9.30 Anglicare NT told the Inquiry that at the age young people leave care they have few living skills, which is probably a result of the lack of nurturing in the out-of-home care system.²³

9.31 The CREATE Foundation (Tasmania) suggested that it was almost inevitable that young people leaving care without support end up in the homelessness system:
*... where would any one go at ages 16, 17, 18 who have had limited experience and limited opportunities to develop life skills, where do they go other than eventually on to the streets and into homelessness?*²⁴

9.32 As was discussed in Chapter 8 Labour Market Marginalisation, young people without sufficient education or training have limited opportunities for employment. Many young people leaving care also have limited education and training. This is especially true where young people have had a large number of care placements and, as a consequence, been required to move school regularly.²⁵ Salvation Army Crossroads West (WA), told the Inquiry that:

*The majority of them [young people leaving care] do not complete their Year 10 or Year 12 education. We did know of a case where a young person had graduated with the Year 12 Certificate without being able to read and write.*²⁶

9.33 Young people and youth workers across Australia told the Inquiry that young people leave the care system without support and accommodation. As a result these young people end up in the homelessness support system. The case of one young person from Darwin highlights this issue. This young person told the Inquiry:

*When I turned sixteen, Family and Children's Services had enough of me, and so they said, look, you're sixteen. They knew for a fact that I couldn't be independent, but they were smart enough to be able to convince the courts that I could be independent, so they said, you know, goodbye and after that I was just basically out on my bum. Nobody is going to do anything for me now.*²⁷

9.34 The Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare (Vic) wrote that:
*In Victoria approximately one fifth of young people leaving care are doing so without any plans for their future in place, with around one third of young people case managed directly into homelessness services on leaving care.*²⁸

9.35 However, the Inquiry was told that the situation in Victoria is changing.²⁹ The Children, Youth and Family Act 2005 now gives the Secretary of the Department of Human Services the responsibility to:

... provide or arrange for the provision of services to assist in supporting a person under

the age of 21 years to gain the capacity to make the transition to independent living where the person—

- (i) has been in the custody or under the guardianship of the Secretary; and
- (ii) on leaving the custody or guardianship of the Secretary is of an age to, or intends to, live independently.³⁰

9.36 The Victorian Government is currently developing a state-wide framework for leaving care support. The Office of Housing (Vic) told the Inquiry that the new model of support:

... has a much stronger, developmentally based focus on preparing young people for independence throughout their time in care, and providing post care support specifically targeted to strengthen their ability to live independently. New funding in all DHS regions is scheduled to be rolled out in the second half of 2007.³¹

9.37 Legislation is not sufficient in itself. In NSW the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998 (NSW) states that:

The Minister is to provide or arrange such assistance for children of or above the age of 15 years and young persons who leave out-of-home care until they reach the age of 25 years as the Minister considers necessary having regard to their safety, welfare and well-being.³²

9.38 Despite this legislation, young people in NSW are still leaving care without adequate support or preparation.³³ For example, housing is not seen to be a right³⁴ and young people leaving care are not automatically placed on the public housing waiting list, meaning that they are likely to need private rental accommodation on leaving care.³⁵ Many will struggle to maintain rent payments especially if they lack secure employment.

9.39 In Western Australia, the Children and Community Services Act 2004 states that the people formerly the subject of a protection order are entitled to appropriate social services until the age of 25 years³⁶. However, the Inquiry was told that not every young person leaving care is referred to the funded leaving care program nor is it determined on the basis of need, where those with the highest needs are given priority. According to an out-of-home care service, Salvation Army Crossroads West (WA), which young person is referred:

... depends on the local office and it depends on the local officer. If the local office of DCP [Department of Child Protection] worker knows of our service and works with us [he or she] would be more likely to keep referring people.³⁷

9.40 The Tasmanian Government told the Inquiry of their Leaving Care and After Care programs for young people who are in or have recently left out of home care. The aim of these programs is to:

... ensure a smooth transition from out of home care to independent living, thereby reducing the risk of homelessness for these young people.³⁸

9.41 The Tasmanian Leaving Care program includes case planning and information, while the After Care program provides assistance with educational support, financial support and other case management activities.³⁹

9.42 In South Australia, the Minister for Youth's Youth Council told the Inquiry that there had been a renewed emphasis on improving services for young people leaving care. Specific developments include:

Youth Support teams in the metropolitan area offer assistance with the move to independence

The Leaving Care Kit and accompanying procedures is nearing completion

The Rapid Response Commitment includes improved access to further education and housing. There is a formal agreement between Families SA and Housing SA to smooth the referral and response to requests for housing assistance

*Planned post-care support service available partly through the Youth Support teams and a centralised information and advocacy service.*⁴⁰

9.43 The Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare believes that:

*By adequately preparing young people for leaving care and supporting young people post-care, we believe we can reduce the numbers of young people experiencing homelessness upon leaving care, resulting in considerable reduction of personal trauma, as well as a significant cost saving to government.*⁴¹

9.44 The Centre has estimated the costs and benefits of an integrated approach to a leaving care support system. They estimated that without any supports a young person leaving care is likely to cost the state government \$740,000 per year in costs related to unemployment, crime, health, housing and child protection costs of the next generation. This compares to an estimated cost of \$81,000 per year for an integrated model of leaving care support.⁴²

Conclusions and Recommendations

9.45 At every hearing serious issues were raised about the treatment and experience of young people in state care and protection. The cases of system failure, where the problems of some young people were exacerbated through their time in state care were too numerous to be relegated to isolated instances. The Inquiry was not in a position to quantify the extent of failed outcomes for young people passing through care and protection, however, a link with homelessness has been firmly established. This Inquiry considers that the treatment of young people in state care and protection has human rights implications and should be independently examined against established human rights standards. There have been various reviews and inquiries, however governments remain sensitive to media interest, defensive about reformist criticism, with a minimalist approach to providing information to the public and apparently unable to consider radical measures for reform along with the resources required to redress this area. An independent inquiry, supported by all Australian governments could be the watershed process to bring much needed reform to this area.

Recommendation 9.1

The NYC Inquiry recommends that the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission [HREOC] consider a national inquiry into care and protection. The Inquiry should:

- review policy and practice on care and protection from a human rights perspective;
- consider new Federal-state cooperative programs and initiatives, especially early intervention and prevention in terms of family and community support;
- advise on what reforms, structures and processes are required;
- provide advice on how change might best be implemented and the scale of reforms and resources needed.

9.46 The Federal government has until recently been exempt from any major responsibility for care and protection, which has been almost solely a state and territory jurisdiction. The Australian Government's entry into Indigenous care and protection should not be restricted to Indigenous issues but embrace care and protection overall.

Recommendation 9.2

The NYC Inquiry recommends that the Federal Government become a co-partner with the states and territories in reforming Australia's care and protection sector.

9.47 Many young people leaving care are not being given the support they need to prevent homelessness. While most of the child protection authorities are trialing new leaving care arrangements, there are still insufficient supports in place for these young people to maintain their accommodation and prevent homelessness. ; Leaving care support is not regarded as a needs-based entitlement available over an extended period of time, for all young people who leave care.

Recommendation 9.3

The NYC Inquiry recommends needs-based support for all young people leaving care. Since not all issues are present at the point of leaving statutory care, support should be accessible on a flexible basis at any time up to 24 years of age and under exceptional circumstances outside that age range.

9.48 Young people in care frequently have a range of complex and challenging behaviours which current models of out of home care, education and mental health are ill-equipped and under-resourced to deal with. An example of one important resource for workers, families and young people involved with the care and protection system to address the mental health needs of young people in Victoria is Take Two. This is an exemplary initiative, which has been well resourced for the purposes for which the agency was created. In addition there is a need for integrated models of accommodation, education and mental health support.

Recommendation 9.4

The NYC Inquiry recommends that all jurisdictions develop identify and fund models of exemplary practice (such as Take Two) to significantly improve the capacity of the

care and protection system to meet the complex needs of young people in the areas of accommodation, education and mental health.

9.50 Despite positive work in many areas, there remain many indicators that care and protection systems are both under-resourced and suffering an acute workforce crisis. Early intervention and prevention in child protection, while laudable, is being prioritised at the expense of support for older children who are being regarded as ‘less vulnerable’. In another practical sense, they often seen as too difficult to deal with and manage and a drain on limited resources. As a result of what can only be described as system neglect, these children and young people are experiencing homelessness and reliant on the SAAP system for support. This is despite legislation that is meant to give responsibility to the state and territory child protection authorities for young people under the school leaving age. Many witnesses pointed out that it was difficult to retain experienced staff in the care and protection systems and that a lack of resources was driving many decisions at a practice level. There have been various jurisdictional reviews and reforms, but the provision of services remains uneven and problematic. Care and protection remains a politically sensitive area of policy and practice, which tends to inhibit the searching public debate required to make real headway in this area.

Recommendation 9.5

The NYC Inquiry recommends that all jurisdictions urgently review the level of funding provided to their care and protection programs, and develop a remedial strategy for addressing the selection, training and support of staff as well as the real need for care and protection services in the community.

9.51 The jurisdictional issue of which authority is responsible for young people under the age of 15 has been laid down in the youth protocol, however, the problems of access to Care and Protection and the way that priorities are being decided in a resource limited environment mean that there is a continuing stream of under-age young people entering SAAP because they have no immediate alternative. Community placement options such as ACP in Victoria are a part of the answer but not the whole answer. Recruiting carers remains a problem. Such arrangements seem to often work well, but are not available in every jurisdiction. Another approach might be to expand access to SAAP support for young people in Care by funding care and accommodation for this statutory group.

Recommendation 9.6:

The NYC Inquiry recommends that community placement models, including support to families supporting ‘couch-surfers’, be nationally implemented, following a review of existing initiatives.

9.52 Through the SAAP National Data Collection, there is comprehensive information on clients of SAAP, their needs and the outcome achieved at the point of leaving SAAP. National and state and territory reports as well as occasional topic reports are published. Agencies receive reports number and characteristics of their clients. No such detailed client information is available for Care and Protection, particularly data

which identifies outcomes at the point children and young people are discharged from care.

Recommendation 9.7

The NYC Inquiry recommends that all jurisdictions support the development of a comprehensive national data collection for young people passing through care and protection, including foster care in Australia.

Recommendation 9.8

The NYC Inquiry recommends that a national project be undertaken to develop a comprehensive suite of care and protection indicators, which would be publicly reported so that system and program performance can be adequately monitored.

9.53 Fixing the adequacy of the care and protection system to meet the complex needs of young people subject to abuse and neglect and/or without an effective caregiver and to provide ongoing support to those leaving care will go some way to reducing the number of homeless young people who are either unsupported or relying on the SAAP system. It is not possible at this point to estimate the overall cost of doing this, however it is likely to be multiple times current under-expenditure.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Young Person, Darwin Day 4, 04-04-2007.
- 2 Submission 78, UnitingCare Burnside.
- 3 Supported Accommodation Assistance Act 1994 (Cwth).
- 4 S.13(b)(iii) Supported Accommodation Assistance Act 1994 (Cwth).
- 5 Submission 32, Karinya Young Womyn's Service.
- 6 L. Mathews, Caretakers Cottage, Sydney Day 8, 16-04-2007.
- 7 Submission 32, Karinya Young Womyn's Service.
- 8 M. Douglas, Barwon Youth, Geelong Day 1, 26-03-2007.
- 9 AIHW (2007) Child Protection Australia 2005-06, Canberra: AIHW
- 10 Submission 78, UnitingCare Burnside.
- 11 Submission 3 Anglican Community Care.
- 12 Submission 85, Council to Homeless Persons with Youth Affairs Council of Victoria and Project i (Key Centre for Women's Health in Society).
- 13 NYC Youth Survey, 12.
- 14 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) (2006) Child protection Australia 2004–05. AIHW cat. no. CWS 26, (Child Welfare Series no. 38), AIHW, Canberra.
- 15 S. Weinert, Accommodation Support Service, Anglicare Tasmania, Hobart Day 17, 03-05-2007.
- 16 Submission 64, Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare.
- 17 Submission 78, UnitingCare Burnside.
- 18 M. Douglas, Barwon Youth, Geelong Day 1, 26-03-2007.
- 19 T. Phillips, Aurala, Save the Children Fund (Queensland Branch), Brisbane Day 5, 10-04-2007.
- 20 Submission 27, Melbourne Youth Support Service.
- 21 S. Mollasi, Salvation Army Crossroads West, Perth Day 19, 07-06-2007.
- 22 Submission 64, Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare.
- 23 K. Holliday, Connect, Anglicare NT, Darwin and Palmerston, Darwin Day 4, 04-04-2007.
- 24 S. Donnet-Jones, CREATE Foundation, Hobart Day 17, 03-05-2007.

- 25 Mendes, P. & Moslehuddin, B. (2006) 'From Dependence to Interdependence: Towards Better Outcomes for Young People Leaving State Care' in Child Abuse Review, Vol 15, pp110-126.
- 26 S. Mollasi, Salvation Army Crossroads West, Perth Day 19, 07-06-2007.
- 27 Young Person, Darwin Day 4, 04-04-2007.
- 28 Submission 64, Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Section 16(1)(g) Children, Youth and Families Act 2005 (Vic).
- 31 Submission 39, Office of Housing, Department of Human Services, Victorian Government.
- 32 Section 165 Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998 (NSW).
- 33 K. Day, Southern Youth and Family Services, Wollongong, Sydney Day 8, 16-04-2007.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 K. Crowe, Southern Youth and Family Services, Wollongong, Sydney Day 8, 16-04-2007.
- 36 Section 98 Children and Community Services Act 2004 (WA).
- 37 S. Mollasi, Salvation Army Crossroads West, Perth Day 19, 07-06-2007.
- 38 Submission 69, Tasmanian Government.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Submission 57, Minister's Youth Council, Office for Youth, South Australian Government.
- 41 Submission 64, Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare.
- 42 Ibid.

