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**The LOOKOUT model 2016**

The Youth Affairs Council of Victoria (YACVic) is the state peak body for young people aged 12-25 and the services that support them. Our vision is that young Victorians have their rights upheld and are valued as active participants in their communities.

YACVic welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Victorian Government’s consultation paper outlining the proposed structure and functions of LOOKOUT Support Centres.

The focus of LOOKOUT is on strengthening the capacity of schools, child protection, community service organisations and carers to deliver on the objectives of the Out of Home Care Education Commitment (a Partnering Agreement between DHHS, DET, Catholic Education Commission of Victoria and Independent Schools Victoria) and the aspirations of the Education State, in order to improve educational outcomes for children and young people in out-of-home care. This is an area where targeted, expert work is urgently needed. YACVic welcomes these commitments by the Victorian Government.

Significant and welcome aspects of the proposed LOOKOUT model include:

* Ensuring that schools and case managers fully implement the Partnering Agreement and Individual Education Plan for all students in care.
* Providing professional development for school staff about the impacts of trauma, and for carers and case managers about continuity of education and appropriate learning supports.
* Challenging enrolment decisions that are not in the student’s best interests.
* Facilitating opportunities for students to participate fully in school life, including camps, excursions and extra-curricular activities.
* Advocating for individual children and young people for whom there is no functioning Student Support Group, or no Individual Learning Plan, or ‘where their progress has slowed’. There will be an emphasis on ensuring that the student’s views, aspirations and needs are taken into account.
* Ensuring learning mentors are appointed by the school in consultation with the student and Student Support Group.
* Developing strategies and providing supports to avoid exclusion/expulsion.
* If mainstream school is not the best option, referring the student to a suitable pathway and monitoring attendance.
* Identifying high risk children and young people who are not enrolled or who have disengaged from school, and working on effective strategies to engage them in suitable schools and alternative educational settings.
* Supporting a ‘designated teacher’ model to promote a culture of high educational expectations for students in care, advising school staff about appropriate individualised teaching options, and helping ensure the Student Support Group and Individual Education Plan are functioning well.
* Focusing especially on strengthening educational outcomes for Aboriginal children and young people in care. This will include working with Koorie Education Support teams to provide inclusive, culturally safe environments for students and their families, linking the student to appropriate Koorie-specific programs, and working with Koorie Children’s Court to support the education of Aboriginal students in care who are facing criminal proceedings.

In this submission, we will respond to four of the questions posed in the LOOKOUT consultation paper (questions 1, 2, 4 and 5 on p.17).

1. ***“LOOKOUT Centre will need to prioritise the students who receive additional supports. In Table 1 (p.8) have we identified the right characteristics and appropriate examples of supports/interventions for all, medium and high needs students?”***

**Characteristics of young people – age range**

We noted with concern that the consultation paper states LOOKOUT will be working with ‘school age children and young people (6-17 years)’ in out-of-home care. We appreciate that 17 is the youngest age at which a student can legally leave school. However, most Victorian young people complete Year 12 at the age of 18. Eighteen is also the upper age limit for young people living in out-of-home care. The 2011 National Standards for Out-of-Home Care (Department Of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs) identified as Standard 7: ‘Children and young people up to at least 18 years are supported to be engaged in appropriate education, training and/or employment.’

If we are serious about increasing rates of Year 12 completion, promoting higher aspirations and encouraging young people who have left school early to reengage with education and training, LOOKOUT support should be available for 18 year olds too – at a bare minimum. Indeed, we would support making it available beyond that age. YACVic, along with many community sector stakeholders, has argued that removing all support from vulnerable young people at the age of 18 is counterproductive and unfair, and that young people leaving care should be able to access transitional supports until at least the age of 21.

We would support giving young people leaving care up to the age of 21 the option of accessing help from LOOKOUT, to assist them to navigate higher education or vocational education pathways and re-engage with education if they have been out of the system for some time.

**Characteristics of young people – pathways into out-of-home care**

Table 1 of the consultation paper proposes that LOOKOUT support be available to young people ‘placed in out of home care on court orders’. We submit that the support offered by LOOKOUT should also be available to young people who enter out-of-home care on a voluntary basis (i.e., where the parent consents to a voluntary arrangement with a service for the temporary care of their child) or through self-referral. These young people can be just as vulnerable as those on court orders and their educational needs just as high.

**Characteristics of young people – disability**

We note with some concern that young people with disabilities are not mentioned in this consultation paper, beyond the generalised ‘medium need’ categories of ‘Demonstrating issues with social and cognitive development and wellbeing’ and ‘Demonstrating significant barriers to development, wellbeing or engagement’ (Table 1).

In a detailed literature review, the CREATE Foundation observed that while there is considerable disagreement about the prevalence of disability amongst children in out-of-home care (estimates range from 4% to 70%), yet ‘it is generally accepted that children with a disability are overrepresented within child protection services’. This cohort can be highly vulnerable to poor education and life outcomes.[[1]](#footnote-1) The 2012 report *Desperate Measures* by the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission (VEOHRC) traced strong links between school/educational crises and the relinquishment of children with a disability into state care. Meanwhile, VEOHRC’s 2012 report *Held Back* highlighted the inequalities and discrimination faced by many students with disabilities in primary and secondary schools.

We recommend that LOOKOUT identify young people with disabilities in care as one group who are disproportionately likely to need support with their education. LOOKOUT’s work should then be guided by the relevant recommendations of the two VEOHRC reports, and by the research compiled by CREATE.

**Characteristics of young people – place of residence**

The consultation paper proposes that the initial LOOKOUT centre will support school-aged children and young people in care in the South Western Victoria Region (SWVR).

While south-western Victoria is very large, the question remains of how young people’s access to LOOKOUT support might be affected in the event of moving to another region or being housed in one region and educated in another. (For example, a young person housed in the City of Yarra and studying in the City of Melbourne.) Young people in care can be transient in terms of their housing and schooling, not the least due to shortages of care placements. Prior to the rollout of LOOKOUT centres around Victoria, we submit that it would be optimal for LOOKOUT to continue to monitor the progress of any young people who leave the south-western region (in collaboration with relevant local workers) and continue to offer them support.

**Levels of support – ‘all’, ‘medium’ and ‘highest’ need**

Young people in care have different experiences of education and need different forms of support. We welcome Table 1’s recognition of this. However, we would query the desired outcome of dividing young people into the categories of ‘all’, ‘medium’ and ‘highest’ need.

For one thing, young people can move rapidly between these categories, and the distinctions can be blurred. For example, Table 1 places young people who are making the move from primary to secondary school in the category of ‘medium’ need, but all young Victorians are supposed to make this transition (although some do not), which would mean this cohort of students should also be situated in the universal, lower-need category of ‘all’. Similarly, Table 1 describes young people as having ‘medium’ needs if they are displaying bullying behaviours or making little educational progress, but in our experience such young people are often at risk of suspension or exclusion from school – which would locate them in the ‘highest’ need category.

An alternative approach might be to articulate the outcomes which LOOKOUT proposes to achieve (e.g. increase in Year 12 completion, reduction in suspensions/exclusions, improvements in school attendance and achievement, strengthening of protective factors), and align these with the relevant interventions by LOOKOUT at preventative, early intervention and secondary intervention levels.

However, if LOOKOUT’s work is to be guided by the categories of ‘all’, ‘medium’ and ‘highest’ need, we submit it is important to articulate approximately what percentage of time and resources will be dedicated to each category. (At present this is not articulated.) As part of this, we would caution against a sole focus on crisis management. While targeted interventions are certainly needed for young people who have disengaged completely from education (those in ‘highest’ need), it is equally important to devote time and resources to preventing disengagement in the first place, and intervening early to address problems before they become critical.

**Examples of support – health and community services**

The consultation paper provides examples of the support which LOOKOUT could offer to students in out-of-home care, including:

* Working in partnership with Student Support Services and school-based wellbeing staff to support students in out-of-home care.
* Working with the Student Support Group and school to develop strategies and provide supports to maintain school engagement.
* Linking the school to development and wellbeing supports.
* Linking the child’s case manager/carer to relevant school personnel and programs.
* Supporting teachers working with students with behavioural difficulties or performing below expected levels to understand the impact of trauma.
* Ensuring students receive the priority access to supports available as currently intended. These include Student Support Services (psychology, speech pathology, social workers).

YACVic supports LOOKOUT working in all these areas. However, we would note that much of this work is contingent on having appropriate support services available on the ground for students, carers and school staff to access. The Victorian Government has made very substantial and welcome investments in equity and wellbeing funding for schools. However, young people’s access to expert support in areas such as mental health, family violence, disability and Aboriginal cultural safety still varies considerably around the state.

For example, a number of schools, especially in rural areas, do not have adequate access to counsellors, psychologists, school nurses or wellbeing coordinators with sufficient training and supervision to deal with the complex issues that can arise for young people in care. In response, YACVic has recommended (amongst other things) that the Victorian Government extend the Secondary School Nursing Program and improve the ratio of Student Support Services to students in areas of high need. School wellbeing teams, especially in underserviced areas, should have greater access to secondary consultation and external clinical supervision, and specialist mental health staff from regional and metropolitan services should be supported to work part-time in rural communities, with an emphasis on sharing expertise and upskilling local workers. This whole process might also be supported by greater transparency around how schools allocate student equity funding.

We submit that part of the role of LOOKOUT could be to work with local stakeholders such as the School Focused Youth Service (SFYS) and local government youth development units to broker stronger relationships between schools, GPs, mental health services and youth services. We know of cases, for example, where such stakeholders have negotiated for GPs and psychologists to offer regular, bulk-billed services in local secondary schools.

As part of such collaborative work, we would welcome further details about how LOOKOUT will align and collaborate with SFYS, given their historical role in brokering partnerships between schools and community-based health and wellbeing services, and their upcoming focus on preventing or intervening early to prevent school disengagement.

Meanwhile, support for student transitions between primary and secondary school also varies a great deal between different communities. While the transition from kindergarten to primary school is supported by a standardised Transition Learning and Development Statement for all children, and a range of early childhood programs are funded by DET, there is no equivalent mandatory planning process for students moving into secondary school. Victoria has no specific middle years education framework or funding for middle years transition programs. Currently, transition materials take very different forms, with varying degrees of detail and adequacy, and schools report struggling to manage transitions.[[2]](#footnote-2) A mandatory, consistent model of transition planning is needed, with adequate support for schools to understand their obligations, including around appropriate disclosures of information.

Part of LOOKOUT’s advocacy role could be to identify where service gaps exist for young people in care and promote targeted resourcing to address this.

**Examples of support – combatting suspensions and exclusions of students**

The consultation paper notes that LOOKOUT’s role will include ‘working with schools in instances of very challenging behaviour and when suspensions and expulsions are being considered, and where appropriate advocating to ensure children and young people receive adequate support’. LOOKOUT will ‘Develop strategies and provide supports to avoid exclusion/expulsion in partnership with the school, case managers and DET regional office.’ (pp.9, 11)

We welcome this undertaking. However, we submit that combatting the exclusion of young people from their schools should be given more prominence, as the demand for support from LOOKOUT in this area is likely to be high.

Young people in care face disproportionately high rates of school exclusion (formal and informal).[[3]](#footnote-3) Sometimes this is for ‘very challenging behaviour’ (which is often trauma-related) – but many young people in care face in-school or out-of-school suspensions for minor infractions such as lateness, breaking uniform codes or missing school to care for younger siblings. In addition, many young people in care have had a disrupted education, missing school due to placement changes, court attendance, health problems and a history of transient housing with their families. This means some of them struggle to follow class content, which reduces their self-esteem and increases their risk of disruptive behaviour or truancy. These behaviours should be seen not as ‘disobedient’, but as symptoms of hardship, family conflict and unstable living circumstances.

YACVic is undertaking research into suspensions and expulsions at present, and would be delighted to share the results of our work with the LOOKOUT team.

**Examples of support – vocational education and training (VET) pathways**

YACVic maintains that schools have strong responsibilities towards all their students. We do not support the practice by some mainstream schools of trying to use flexible learning and VET settings as ‘dumping grounds’ for students whom the school has failed to educate. The LOOKOUT consultation paper asserts that while LOOKOUT will assist some young people in care to re-engage with education via flexible or training settings, this should only be a short-term measure; re-engagement into mainstream schools will be the ‘end goal’. In many ways, YACVic would support this.

However, we also recognise that some young people in care will want to take a vocational pathway which their local secondary school does not offer. Here, they can face a number of challenges, which LOOKOUT will need to be responsive to.

The VET in Schools (VETiS) subsidy is reportedly too low to cover delivery costs, and a number of school principals told the 2015 Victorian VET Funding Review that their schools were ceasing to deliver VETiS due to cost barriers.[[4]](#footnote-4) At other schools, the gap in costs is reportedly being passed on to families. While it is hard to measure, the popular idea of VET as a ‘lesser’ (or traditionally working-class) option also appears to make some schools disinclined to offer or properly support VET subjects. Meanwhile, community VCAL does not seem to be funded at a level which adequately reflects its role in re-engaging vulnerable young people. At the same time, young people undertaking a VET qualification through TAFE are likely to find that their access to student support services is curtailed due to the strain placed on the TAFE sector in recent years and the pressure for TAFEs to emulate private providers. All of this has ramifications for young people living in, and leaving, out-of-home care.

As such, we recommend that TAFEs and community providers of vocational education be recognised as stakeholders in the LOOKOUT model. (At present, the consultation paper does not mention them explicitly.)

We also recommend that LOOKOUT partner with schools and VET providers to ensure that young people in care who are keen to take a vocational pathway have greater support to access work placements, career counselling, and assistance to understand the labour market and build networks with mentors, community leaders and future employers.

The consultation paper stresses the role of LOOKOUT in ensuring that secondary school students in care can access the right services to keep them engaged in learning. We would add that LOOKOUT should also work to ensure that equivalent supports are available to secondary-aged young people in VET settings outside of mainstream schools. They are the same age cohort, some of whom have had a worse experience of education than their peers who are still engaged in mainstream schools. Part of LOOKOUT’s work could involve brokering, coordinating or supporting partnerships between VET providers and community service organisations to address student wellbeing issues and to ensure that secondary-aged VET students in care can access counsellors, youth workers, disability support, and assistance around housing and family breakdown.

Part of the advocacy role of LOOKOUT might also be to identify the gaps in access to high quality VET for young people in care, and support targeted interventions to address this. This might involve addressing the real costs of VETiS and community VCAL delivery.

In addition, we note that Victoria’s upcoming Tech School model is not mentioned in the LOOKOUT consultation paper. As Tech Schools will be established in three communities in the south-western district (Wyndham, Ballarat and Geelong) in 2017 and 2018, we submit that they should also be named as stakeholders. Planning should be undertaken to ensure this exciting new model is available to young people in care who want a secondary education with a strong focus on technology.

**Examples of support – flexible learning options**

YACVic supports the development of mainstream schools to make them more responsive, engaging and welcoming to all students. However, we also recognise that this will not happen overnight. Some young people in care will find their mainstream school so inappropriate to their needs (for reasons which might range from bullying to caring responsibilities to mental health problems) that an alternative learning setting is crucial to keeping them engaged with education here and now.

The LOOKOUT consultation paper notes that one of the roles of LOOKOUT will be ‘If mainstream school is not the best option, refer to a suitable pathway and monitor attendance’ (Table 1). However, at present few details are provided.

In particular, we would welcome more details about how LOOKOUT will align and collaborate with the Navigator pilot, which has been funded for two years to work with disengaged young people aged 12-17 to support them to return to education and training. The South-Western Region will include two Navigator sites, in Western Melbourne and Central Highlands.

It is also important that other flexible learning options be recognised as stakeholders in LOOKOUT’s work. We note the work of Associate Professor Kitty re Riele in identifying the characteristics of successful flexible learning programs, and her development of the Framework of Quality Flexible Learning Programs (FQLP). One role of LOOKOUT could be to help ensure that flexible learning settings which support young people in care are working within such a strong quality assurance framework.[[5]](#footnote-5)

**Examples of support – access to school uniforms**

The LOOKOUT consultation paper does not mention the need to support young people in care to access the right school uniforms in a timely way. This is a small, specific issue, but one which can have a significant impact on a young person’s attendance and inclusion in a school community. YACVic welcomed the Victorian Government’s commitment of an additional $15.7 million for the State School Relief Fund for school uniforms, and their commitments to the Camps, Sport and Excursion Fund. But we note that schools tend to play a pivotal role in ensuring these sorts of products are actually delivered to students. For example, applications to State Schools’ Relief must go through principals, assistant principals and welfare coordinators.

Anecdotally, we know that such processes work faster and more efficiently in some schools than others. Young people in care who do not have a strong advocate can find themselves waiting a long time just to be able to dress like their peers. We suggest that LOOKOUT may need to play an advocacy role here.

We refer here to the advocacy of the Victorian Council of Social Service (VCOSS) around children and young people’s access to education (notably their work concerning the Education Maintenance Allowance and subsequent models) and the right of all young people to an education.

**Examples of support – tutoring/mentoring**

The LOOKOUT consultation paper does not discuss young people’s access to tutoring, academic mentoring, homework clubs or similar. We submit greater supports are needed in this space. Many young people in care have had a highly disrupted experience of schooling, and have missed out not only on specific knowledge but also on the chance to develop basic study skills. This means some of them struggle with homework on a nightly basis, or give up on it altogether. The Out-of-Home Care Education Commitment (Partnering Agreement) specifies that part of the role of a Student Support Group should be to facilitate a student’s access to tutoring and mentoring where relevant (p.40), but our experience is that for many students in care this is not happening. LOOKOUT could play an additional role in helping this to happen.

1. ***“What critical information should be shared between DET, DHHS and CSOs to ensure that the care and education status of children and young people can be monitored?”***

**Key knowledge to be shared**

Unfortunately the process for collecting information for this initial consultation was not made as clear to the community sector as it could have been. As such, we’re concerned that a number of stakeholders who might have made useful contributions did not get notified in time to, especially as the paper is not online.

In the first instance, we would expect that the design and evaluation of LOOKOUT would include close collaboration with key government and community advocacy bodies, including the Commissioner for Children and Young People, VCOSS, the Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare (the peak body for child and family services in Victoria), and the CREATE Foundation (the national peak consumer body representing the voices of children and young people with an out-of-home care experience). We note that the implementation of LOOKOUT will be overseen by a state-wide steering committee comprising central and regional office representatives from DET and DHHS, and that this steering committee will establish working groups to provide expert advice on particular topics. We suggest there should be key roles for community sector representatives within this structure. They should not merely be asked for their input after major decisions have already been made.

We also urge that the Victorian Government articulate how LOOKOUT will be informed by the work of the Child and Youth Area Partnerships and Youth Partnerships. Youth Partnerships (2011-2014) was a Victorian Government initiative that designed and tested new ways for services to work together in a collaborative way to provide the necessary holistic support for vulnerable young people aged 10-18. Projects undertaken as part of Youth Partnerships included the Out-of-Home Care Learning Mentor Training (North Western Victoria Region) and the Outreach Teacher Project which modelled innovative flexible learning for young people in residential care (Barwon South West). We trust the findings of this work will inform LOOKOUT’s planning.

**Improved data gathering and analysis**

As part of LOOKOUT’s data gathering and analysis, we urge that educational outcomes for young people in rural, regional and metropolitan communities be disaggregated and considered, and that the findings be used to inform how LOOKOUT works in the future. At present, it is not entirely clear how LOOKOUT will work geographically, other than that the staff will be based in DET regional offices, operating as a networked team.

The South-Western Victoria Region is very large and includes densely populated areas with youthful populations and high levels of need, such as the City of Wyndham, Greater Geelong and City of Ballarat. Under such circumstances, there is often a risk that a program like LOOKOUT will become ‘absorbed’ into larger centres, and that access to the program for smaller or isolated rural communities will be scarce.

LOOKOUT should be planned in consultation with local service providers in different communities in the south-west. Evaluation of the program should consider how LOOKOUT addresses vulnerability not only in numerical terms, but also in proportional terms – i.e., rural communities will inevitably show smaller numbers of young people in care, but their vulnerability may be high and their access to local support services may be poor. Planning of LOOKOUT should take into account the sometimes higher delivery costs and lower economies of scale in rural communities. (Here, it might be useful to refer to some of the formulae developed in the health system, to identify and address factors such as degrees of remoteness, time/cost/distance of service delivery, rates of SES disadvantage, percentage of the client group without access to transport, and percentage of the client group who are Indigenous, young parents, or vulnerable on other indicators.)[[6]](#footnote-6)

1. ***“What kind of professional development has proven most effective for schools, CPP and CSO case managers and carers to promote awareness and understanding of the education needs and experiences of children and young people in out of home care?”***

There is a strong emphasis in the LOOKOUT consultation paper on advocacy and professional development to strengthen the practice of school staff and other stakeholders when working with young people in care. This is very welcome, and we note that there are some excellent resources available which could be utilised, notably *Calmer Classrooms*,developed by Berry Street Victoria for the Child Safety Commissioner, which supports teachers and other school staff to understand traumatised children and develop relationship-based skills to help them.

However, we are concerned that on a very basic level some schools do not appear to understand or abide by their obligations under the Out-of-Home Care Education Commitment (Partnering Agreement).

Anecdotally, we also hear that it is not uncommon for young people in care to be given implicit (or explicit) messages from their school that they are not fit to take part in VCE or post-secondary study. This has serious impacts on their confidence, aspirations and engagement. These foundational problems will need to be addressed. It is worth considering, for example, how LOOKOUT could collaborate with universities offering pre-service teacher training to raise awareness of issues for young people in care.

Moreover, while there is great value in educating teachers about working with young people in care, it is our experience that teacher PD must be part of a broader process of relationship-building between schools, DET, community services, students, carers and families. This process must be properly supported. PD which is offered as a ‘one off’ or in isolation from their ‘normal’ work is not necessarily welcomed or taken on board by teachers. Furthermore, there will still be ongoing demands for specialist assistance for some students, which must be met.

We note with interest LOOKOUT’s Designated Teacher model, and would welcome more information about what qualifications this teacher will have, what their other responsibilities will be, and how their role will relate to that Learning Mentors.

1. ***“How would you like to see the views of young people regarding their educational needs and aspirations captured and used to inform LOOKOUT operations?”***

We welcome the consultation paper’s recognition of the need to engage fully with young people in care regarding their own education. We were pleased to note that Victoria’s new Framework for Improving Student Outcomes, a key step in the Education State reforms, included ‘Empowering students and building school pride’ as one of its six evidence-based initiatives. As such, we would like to see active engagement with young people in care recognised not merely as one small aspect of LOOKOUT, but rather as a key value in line with the principles of the Education State.

To begin with, we would like to see the planning of LOOKOUT informed by work which has already been undertaken on the views and experiences of young people in care in the education system.

Significant works include those by the CREATE Foundation[[7]](#footnote-7) and researchers such as Assoc. Professor Philip Mendes (Monash University), as well as a major project currently being undertaken between the Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare, Federation University Australia and La Trobe University, in collaboration with Anglicare and MacKillop Family Services, to improve educational outcomes for young people in out-of-home care.

If fresh consultations with young people are found to be useful to inform the LOOKOUT model, YACVic would be happy to support such a process. Supporting young people’s participation and self-advocacy is a core part of our organisational mission, and our youth engagement resource, *Yerp*, sets out essential principles and practices for engaging young people in ways which are active, appealing and meaningful.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Ensuring that LOOKOUT works with young people in care in meaningful and empowering ways will have to be an ongoing process too. Here, we note that many young people may struggle to form an instant, trusting and communicative relationship with a new LOOKOUT advocate, especially since these advocates will have to cover a quarter of Victoria. The scope of LOOKOUT’s work raises questions about the time and energy their team members will be able to devote to building relationships with individual young people. LOOKOUT will have to be flexible enough to identify and work closely with significant people in the young person’s life, such as carers, mentors, generalist youth workers, community service providers and/or school wellbeing staff.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues further. Please contact our CEO Georgie Ferrari on [gferrari@yacvic.org.au](mailto:gferrari@yacvic.org.au) or 9267 3711.
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