



SNAICC

National Voice for our Children

**Baseline Analysis of Best Practice Implementation of the
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle
Tasmania**

April 2018

Introduction

This resource presents a baseline analysis of the progress of Tasmania in implementing the full intent of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle (ATSICPP) with reference to the best practice approach as set out in [*Understanding and Applying the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle – A Resource for Legislation, Policy, and Program Development*](#).

The baseline analysis considers the alignment of the five elements of the ATSICPP – prevention, partnership, placement, participation, and connection – with five interrelated system elements – legislation, policy, programs, processes, and practice. However, as the analysis reveals, there is significant interconnectedness and intersectionality of both the ATISCPP and system elements. Further, piecemeal compliance with a single or even several elements does not, and cannot, lead to the full realisation of the ATSICPP. Instead it is clear that holistic processes of reform are required to ensure full implementation and compliance with the ATSICPP's intent to keep Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children safely connected to their families, communities, cultures, and country.

It is important to note that the baseline analysis has a particular focus on child safety, protection, and family support service systems and the work of government departments with primary responsibility for those systems, and so has some limitations to its scope. For example, the prevention element of the ATSICPP covers a broad scope of systems and multiple departmental responsibilities for universal service provision in areas such as health, education, and disability; however, these broader support systems are largely outside the scope of this review. Another important caveat is that the analysis is based on available documentation gathered through a desktop review and requests to state and territories for relevant documentation. State and territory governments have had opportunity to input to each baseline as have Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander sector leaders.

The development of this resource – and equivalent analyses for each state and territory jurisdiction – has been guided by the work of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Working Group established under the *Third Three-Year Action Plan 2015-2018* for the *National Framework for Protecting Australia's Children 2009-2020*. The Working Group is tasked with ensuring implementation of the ATSICPP throughout the Third Action Plan and as part of this work seeks, through the current analyses, to establish the current status of implementation in each state and territory in order to track and measure progress towards enhanced implementation.

Overview – Tasmania

Tasmania has relatively limited alignment of legislative, policy and process frameworks to meet the full intent of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle.

While the key piece of child protection legislation – the *Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1997* (Tas) – does contain several strong principles about the importance of family and cultural connections and family participation in decision-making, there are limited enabling provisions and no mandatory requirements to ensure adherence to, or operationalisation of, these principles. For example, there are no legislative provisions requiring case or care plans, including cultural care and support elements, for any children including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children. Family group conferencing is also largely left to the discretion of Child Safety Services, Department of Health and Human Services (Department). Tasmanian legislation has recently taken a step back in terms of compliance, with the repeal of section 9 that formerly required consultation with representative Aboriginal organisations for placement decision-making.

Overall, in relation to both legislation and policy, there is a notable lack of reference, recognition and promotion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community controlled organisations (ACCOs) across all elements of the ATSI CPP, including system and service design and delivery, and participation in decision-making. While this may be an issue of current capacity and coverage of ACCOs in Tasmania, the requisite resourcing and capacity recognition/building to address this is not recognised in any available policy documents.

The Department does not provide a significant range of relevant policies, practice manuals or program guidelines on its website. The bulk of information that is available is aimed at parents and families and does not provide either high level policy commitments or detailed practice requirements. The *Practice Manual* for child protection practitioners is not publically available and limited guidance as to best practice processes can be identified.

There is also a notable lack of monitoring and reporting of compliance with the ATSI CPP by the Department. The Tasmanian Commissioner for Children and Young People has not assumed this role and there is no Commissioner for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children to perform this function.

Although Tasmania is currently in the process of redesigning its child protection system, at this stage the reform documents of *the Strong Families, Safe Kids initiative* (and the previously completed out-of-home care reform) do not set out any reference to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander self-determination or any significant emphasis on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participation in child protection decision-making or system or service design and delivery. While the stated commitment to early intervention and family support to prevent the need for child protection involvement is in line, to some extent, with the prevention element of the ATSI CPP, without a specific focus on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander partnership and participation, compliance with this or any other element of the ATSI CPP cannot be fully realised.

Currently in Tasmania, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children are 3.4 times more likely than non-Indigenous children to be in out-of-home care (OOHC), and of all children in OOHC, 25.83 per cent are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. Only 26.26 per cent of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children in OOHC are placed with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander kin or other family. These statistics – particularly the poor rate of placement with family – demonstrate that Tasmania has a significant way to go to achieve compliance with the intent of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle.

LEGISLATION

Refers to the *Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1997 (Tas)* unless otherwise stated

PREVENTION	PARTNERSHIP	PLACEMENT	PARTICIPATION	CONNECTION
<p>Tasmanian legislation strongly recognises the primary role of family in ensuring a child’s care and well-being (s10C) and the ‘responsibility’ of the State to assist families ‘if required’ (s10B). There are strong provisions safeguarding, in principle, against removal – a child should only be removed if there is ‘no other reasonable way’ to safeguard well-being (s10C(3)); a child’s best interests involves ‘the least intrusive intervention possible’ (s10E(m)) – and promoting continued family connections and reunification in the event of removal – if a child is removed, regard should be had, in line with best interests and as far as practicable, to encouragement of contact with family (s10C(4)(a)) and to the principle that ‘eventually the child should be returned to reside within the family’ (s10C(4)(b)). The legislation provides only limited safeguarding against long-term guardianship orders that permanently separate children from parents. Section 42(6) requires the court to be satisfied that ‘all reasonable steps’ have been taken to provide services required to enable a child to be safely cared for by a parent (or existing guardian) before making an order that places a child under the guardianship of Department or other person until the child is 18 years. However, section 49 trumps this restriction, requiring the court to consider making a guardianship until 18</p>	<p>Tasmanian legislation contains a relatively weak recognition of self-determination and has recently rolled back representative Aboriginal participation in child protection decision-making (see repealed section 9). Section 10G(1) merely states that Aboriginal families, communities, and organisations have a ‘major self-determining role’ in promoting the well-being of Aboriginal children. While section 106 provides that the Minister may declare an organisation a ‘recognised Aboriginal organisation’ after consultation with Aboriginal community, there is then a limited role for such organisations in decision-making. There is no legislative requirement for the participation of a recognised Aboriginal organisation (that may be an ACCO) in placement or other significant decision-making. At most, the legislation provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a kinship group, Aboriginal community or organisation representing Aboriginal people nominated by family ‘should be allowed to contribute’ to decision-making (s10G(2) – there is no reference to recognised Aboriginal organisations in this provision); • in family group conferencing, a facilitator ‘must consult’ with an appropriate recognised Aboriginal organisation as to who is to attend the conference, and the time and place of conference (s32); 	<p>Section 10G(3) sets out the placement hierarchy in a way that predominately aligns with best practice. Despite only requiring placement in order of priority ‘as far as practicable’, s 10G(3) does then correctly require placement in order of family, an Aboriginal person in the child’s community, another Aboriginal person, and lastly a non-Indigenous person who in the Department’s opinion is sensitive to the child’s needs and capable of promoting ongoing affiliation with community and, if possible, ongoing contact with family. Further, ‘as far as is practicable’, a child who is removed from family and community should be placed in closed proximity to them (s10G(4)). Notably, and against best practice, there is no requirement for ACCO participation in the making of a placement decision.</p>	<p>Tasmanian legislation contains several provisions that allow and encourage child and family participation in decision-making. Section 10D(3)(c) provides that all decisions, ‘as far as practicable’, should be made with the ‘informed participation’ of the child, family and other significant persons. The importance of a child’s participation and views in decision-making is confirmed by section 10F. Family group conferencing ‘may’ be initiated by the Department or ‘must’ be held if court ordered or according to section 53 (this includes if the child or two family members request such). Family group conferencing initiated by the Department is described as an opportunity for family to make recommendations and review arrangements about the care and protection of a child (s31(1)). The facilitator of family group conferencing must consult with an appropriate recognised Aboriginal organisation as to who is to attend, and the time and place of the conference (s32). In court proceedings, the court must not proceed with a hearing unless the child is legally represented or the court is satisfied that the child has made an informed decision to not be represented (s59). Guardians (who may be parents) are parties to proceedings (s64) but a hearing may occur in the absence of a party (s66).</p>	<p>Tasmanian legislation recognises the importance of a child’s family and cultural connections but does little to actively protect and ensure these. The legislation sets out as principles to be ‘upheld’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • family is entitled to bring up a child in language, tradition and culture (s10C(2)); • all decisions are to be consistent with a child’s culture (s10D(3)(b)); and • a child’s best interests include consideration of family relationships, spirituality and culture (s10E(d)(e)(g)(j)). <p>For a child under the guardianship of the Department, the Department must make provision for the physical, intellectual, psychological and emotional development of the child (s69). Contact or access with a child (for example, by family) may be court ordered on final and interim orders (ss42(4)(e) and 46). Reunification is prioritised by the principle that in line with best interests and as far as practicable, if a child is removed, ‘eventually the child should be returned’ (s10C(4)(b)). The only operational safeguard against permanent removal by a guardianship until 18 years order is the requirement that before such an order is made ‘all reasonable steps’ be taken to provide services to enable the child to be safely cared for by a parent (s42(6)). However, ‘in the interests of securing a settled and</p>

LEGISLATION

Refers to the *Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1997 (Tas)* unless otherwise stated

PREVENTION	PARTNERSHIP	PLACEMENT	PARTICIPATION	CONNECTION
<p>years order if a custody or guardianship order has been in place for a continuous period of 2 or more years and there is an application for an extension of that order before the court.</p> <p>Section 17A allows Department to refer a risk notification to a Community-Based Intake Service, which seek to provide referrals to enable 'early intervention in support of families' (s53E).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in court proceedings, a recognised Aboriginal organisation may seek to be heard and give evidence (s51); • for children under the guardianship of Department until 18 years, Department must periodically review their circumstances and provide a report to an appropriate recognised Aboriginal organisation. <p>There are no specific provisions allowing or encouraging ACCO case management or ACCO custody and guardianship.</p>			<p>permanent living arrangement', this requirement can be overlooked where a child has been living in OOHC for a continuous period of 2 or more years (s49(5)).</p> <p>Significantly and concerning, there are no provisions requiring care plans or cultural support plans or similar to be developed and maintained for any child.</p> <p>Again, there are no specific provisions allowing or encouraging ACCO case management or ACCO custody and guardianship.</p>

POLICY

PREVENTION	PARTNERSHIP	PLACEMENT	PARTICIPATION	CONNECTION
<p>The <i>Strong Families, Safe Kids</i> initiative seeks to redesign the Tasmanian child protection system. The <i>Strong Families, Safe Kids Implementation Plan 2016-2020</i> (Plan) sets out a focus on support for children, families, and communities to ‘promote health and wellbeing, prevent problems and enable early and effective intervention when problems do escalate’.¹</p> <p>The <i>Plan</i> commits increased funding for intensive family support services for families on the brink of entering the statutory child protection system. Another key initiative is to ‘develop and consider future investment in assertive family support, in consultation with the nongovernment sector, which enables children to remain safe in their family home where possible, without the need for removal and entry into the out-of-home care system’.</p> <p>According to the <i>Plan</i>, the child protection intake system will be refocused to provide a broader advice and referral service that will act as a ‘single front door’ to the child and family service system. The <i>Plan</i> commits funding for Department Aboriginal liaison workers in the advice and referral service.</p>	<p>There is very little Tasmanian policy emphasis on partnership. The <i>Strong Families, Safe Kids</i> initiative does not refer or commit to co-design of legislation, policy or services with ACCOs or similar. After the <i>Strong Families, Safe Kids</i> redesign report considered the role of peak bodies, including an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peak body, and concluded that this ‘may not’ be the best option for Tasmania,² the <i>Plan</i> refers only to the establishment of a cross-sectoral child wellbeing consultative committee.³ In terms of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander specific consultation, the <i>Plan</i> merely states there will be further consultation with the Aboriginal community regarding the proposed new Aboriginal liaison officers within the new advice and referral service. The consultation paper for the new advice and referral service states that Child Safety Services ‘must involve the community in a meaningful way in planning and program development processes’.⁴</p> <p>There are no available policy documents – reform documents or otherwise, including the recent OOHc reform agenda⁵ – that commit to or promote self-determination, partnership, ACCO participation or ACCO capacity.</p>	<p>There are no available policy documents – reform documents or otherwise – that emphasise preference for high priority placements, recognise or promote family and/or ACCO participation in placement decision making, or otherwise set out best practice.</p>	<p>There are no available policy documents – reform documents or otherwise – that provide for culturally safe and/or ACCO supported family group conferencing (there is no Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Family Led Decision-Making (ATSIFLDM)).</p>	<p>The <i>Strong Families, Safe Kids</i> child protection system redesign report states as one of its intended outcomes that children in OOHc experience ongoing family and community connections. The reform initiative also highlights the need for clear and consistent reunification practices, restructuring the child protection system to include a reunification team that will work closely with services across government and non-government sectors (ACCOs are not expressly referenced).⁶</p> <p>While case or care plans – that may include cultural care and support elements – are not referenced in legislation, the redesign report does call for ‘better integrated’ case and care plans.⁷ Notably, there are no specific references to any cultural care or support elements of case or care plans – or the plans themselves – in any available Tasmanian policy documents.</p>

PROGRAMS

PREVENTION	PARTNERSHIP	PLACEMENT	PARTICIPATION	CONNECTION
<p>Tasmania proposes to establish a state-wide advice and referral service with links with the broader child and family service system.⁸ The consultation on the new service notes ACCOs are key service providers to be engaged in the referral process. The consultation sought feedback about how the service can work with ACCOs and whether Aboriginal liaison workers within the service should be recruited from ACCOs.⁹ The new structure of Child Safety Services (the Department) includes reunification teams that will ‘work in partnership with services across government and the community sector’.¹⁰ There is no specific reference to ACCOs.</p> <p>There are limited Department funded and ACCO run family support services – the Department Annual Report 2015-2016 lists only one ACCO funded to deliver community support programs.¹¹ Signs of Safety meetings – operated by and through the Department – involve family members in risk assessment, strength identification and safety planning.</p> <p>Family group conferencing is available early if initiated by the Department (see ‘Participation’) though this program is not designed or delivered as ATSIFLDM or in any specific culturally safe way by ACCOs.</p>	<p>Following the lack of legislative and policy focus on partnership and participation of ACCOs, there are no Department established programs for ACCOs to participate in child protection decision-making, assist or lead in family participation through family group conferencing (there is no ATSIFLDM), or take up case management, OOH management, or custody and guardianship powers and functions. As set out in ‘Prevention – Programs’, there is only one ACCO funded by the Department to deliver community support programs.¹²</p>	<p>There are no Department established programs that align with best practice – for example, kinship and family scoping programs, placement identification, assessment and support programs, ATSIFLDM for placement identification and decision making, or reconnection programs.</p>	<p>Signs of Safety meetings operate to involve family members in risk assessment, strength identification and safety planning.</p> <p>Family group conferencing also offers family members an opportunity to participate in decision making. These conferences can be initiated by the Department, held by court order or according to other legislative provisions (see ‘Legislation’ above). However, these conferences are not designed or delivered as ATSIFLDM or in any specific culturally safe way by ACCOs. In fact, the Department states very clearly that it is responsible for delivering family group conferencing.¹³ General legal services and an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander legal service may provide government-funded legal advice and representation to children, parents and family members in child protection matters.</p>	<p>Family group conferencing – notably, not ATSIFLDM – may be initiated by the Department or may occur by court order or in other circumstances (see ‘Participation’) and may assist in ensuring cultural care elements in case or care plans, and reunification and reconnection efforts. However, no Department material clearly or specifically states or suggests that family group conferencing can, should, or is designed for any of these purposes.</p> <p>There is limited information about the Pathway/s Home reunification program that appears to be established by the Department or at least operates by referral from the Department.¹⁴ Again, as set out in ‘Prevention – Programs’, there is only one ACCO funded by the Department to deliver community support programs.¹⁵</p>

PROCESSES

PREVENTION	PARTNERSHIP	PLACEMENT	PARTICIPATION	CONNECTION
<p>There are no publically accessible child protection practitioner processes or procedures though a <i>Practice Manual</i> does exist to assist practitioners.</p> <p>The <i>consultation paper</i> on the new advice and referral service states that at a practice level, Department staff must ensure that cultural identity is determined at point of referral into the service, that is, at intake.¹⁶</p> <p>The <i>consultation paper</i> also confirms that the proposed advice and referral service is structured as a differential response system, offering a pathway to support services.¹⁷</p> <p>While the Signs of Safety meetings do not specifically reference or offer culturally safe or appropriate risk assessment tools, they do involve family in risk assessment and safety planning.¹⁸ Similarly, the limited available information about family group conferencing does not set out any culturally specific processes, only specifying that at the discretion of the facilitator, a representative from an Aboriginal organisation may be invited to the conference.¹⁹</p>	<p>Following the lack of legislation, policy and programs regarding partnership and participation of ACCOs, and with the lack of public accessibility to the <i>Practice Manual</i>, there are no identifiable processes that demonstrate best practice.</p> <p>For family group conferencing, the Department website – in the context of offering information for families and the public – does state that a facilitator of a family group conference ‘may’ invite a representative from an Aboriginal organisation to attend the conference.²⁰ An information sheet for parents with children in OOHC states that parents have a right to involve an Aboriginal organisation if they identify and are recognised as Aboriginal.²¹</p>	<p>As there are no publically available procedures or guidelines– there are no processes that can be identified as meeting best practice in terms of placement.</p> <p>At most, the <i>consultation paper</i> on the proposed new advice and referral service states that at a practice level, Department staff ‘must demonstrate an understanding of Aboriginal practices and kinships groups’.²² There is no further detail about what this is or involves.</p>	<p>As there are no publically available procedures or guidelines, only minimal processes can be identified that seek to enable family participation in decision making.</p> <p>The Signs of Safety meetings involve family in risk assessment and safety planning but there is no available information specifying any culturally safe or adapted processes.²³</p> <p>Family group conferencing also involves family in decision making and in fact may be initiated by family in some circumstances (see ‘Legislation’ above). Although there is reference to the a family member’s ‘right’ to be fully informed at the conference, there are no available processes to ensure this or other elements of best practice.²⁴</p>	<p>There are no publically available procedures or guidelines about case or care plans, including what cultural care and support elements, if any, should be identified, implemented and reviewed. At most, an information sheet for parents about their rights if their child is in OOHC states that they have right to be involved in care planning.²⁵</p>

PRACTICE

PREVENTION	PARTNERSHIP	PLACEMENT	PARTICIPATION	CONNECTION
<p>The proportion of Tasmanian spending on intensive family support services and family support services in relation to total child protection spending has risen only very slightly from 15.38% in 2011-2012 to 15.67% in 2015-2016.²⁶</p> <p>There is no available data on the proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children in Tasmania commencing intensive family support services each year.</p> <p>In Tasmania, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children represented 25.83% of all children in OOHC as at 30 June 2016, an increase from 21.01% as at 30 June 2012.²⁷</p> <p>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children were 3.4 times more likely than non-Indigenous children to be in OOHC at 30 June 2016, an increase from 2.7 times as likely at 30 June 2012.²⁸ As at 30 June 2016, 2.72% of all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children in Tasmania were in OOHC, an increase from 2.04% at 30 June 2012.²⁹</p>	<p>Currently, the only 'recognised Aboriginal organisation' in Tasmania is the Tasmanian Aboriginal Corporation Inc.</p> <p>There are no available measures of practice of partnership, however, it is clear from the lack of strong legislation, policy, programs and processes that practice is poor.</p> <p>In fact, compliance with partnership has gone backwards with the repeal of section 9 that previously mandated consultation with and consideration of submissions of a recognised Aboriginal organisation when making a decision about where an Aboriginal child lives.</p>	<p>The proportion of Tasmanian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children placed with Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander kin or other family, or an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander home-based carer fell significantly from 44.81% as at 30 June 2012 to 38.05% as at 30 June 2016.³⁰</p> <p>In terms of the first preferred placement, as at 30 June 2016, only 26.26% of children were placed with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander kin or other family, a fall from 33.49% at 30 June 2012.³¹</p>	<p>There is no reporting by the Department or otherwise on the use of the Signs of Safety meetings or family group conferencing as means of family participation. The <i>Strong Families, Safe Kids</i> redesign report merely states that the Signs of Safety meetings 'have had some positive outcomes'.³²</p>	<p>There is no reporting by the Department or otherwise on the completion, quality, or implementation of case or care plans, the rate of reconnection or contact with family.</p> <p>A right to information decision document available on the Department website provides some data on reunifications – 38 reunifications occurred between 1 July 2015 and 30 June 2016, falling from 89 between 1 July 2014 and 30 June 2015, and 119 between 1 July 2013 and 30 June 2014.³³</p> <p>There are no details about the timeliness of the reunifications or whether the figures include Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and families.</p>

¹ Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Tasmanian Government, *Strong Families, Safe Kids Implementation Plan 2016-2020*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/220696/0032_Strong_Families_Safe_Kids_-_Implementation_v9_final.pdf

² DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Redesign of Child Protection Services Tasmania – Report March 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/214356/Redesign_of_Child_Protection_Services.pdf

³ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Strong Families, Safe Kids Implementation Plan 2016-2020*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/220696/0032_Strong_Families_Safe_Kids_-_Implementation_v9_final.pdf

⁴ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Advice and Referral Service Consultation Paper – December 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0005/238046/Advice_and_Referral_Service_model_consultation_paper_-_Dec_2016_-_Final_.pdf

⁵ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Strategic Plan for Out-of-Home Care in Tasmania 2017-2019*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0017/244403/Out_of_Home_Care_in_Tasmania_Strategic_Plan_2017-2019.pdf

⁶ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Redesign of Child Protection Services Tasmania – Report March 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/214356/Redesign_of_Child_Protection_Services.pdf

⁷ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Redesign of Child Protection Services Tasmania – Report March 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/214356/Redesign_of_Child_Protection_Services.pdf

-
- ⁸ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Strong Families, Safe Kids Implementation Plan 2016-2020*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/220696/0032_Strong_Families_Safe_Kids_-_Implementation_v9_final.pdf
- ⁹ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Advice and Referral Service Consultation Paper – December 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/238046/Advice_and_Referral_Service_model_consultation_paper_-Dec_2016_-_Final_.pdf
- ¹⁰ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Redesign of Child Protection Services Tasmania – Report March 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/214356/Redesign_of_Child_Protection_Services.pdf; DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Strong Families, Safe Kids Implementation Plan 2016-2020*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/220696/0032_Strong_Families_Safe_Kids_-_Implementation_v9_final.pdf
- ¹¹ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Annual Report 2015-2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/233252/DHHS_Annual_Report_-_2015-16_-_FINAL.pdf
- ¹² DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Annual Report 2015-2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/233252/DHHS_Annual_Report_-_2015-16_-_FINAL.pdf
- ¹³ See http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/children/child_protection_services/family_group_conferencing
- ¹⁴ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Redesign of Child Protection Services Tasmania – Report March 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/214356/Redesign_of_Child_Protection_Services.pdf; Anglicare Tasmania website: <https://www.anglicare-tas.org.au/service/pathway-home>
- ¹⁵ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Annual Report 2015-2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/233252/DHHS_Annual_Report_-_2015-16_-_FINAL.pdf
- ¹⁶ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Advice and Referral Service Consultation Paper – December 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/238046/Advice_and_Referral_Service_model_consultation_paper_-Dec_2016_-_Final_.pdf
- ¹⁷ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Advice and Referral Service Consultation Paper – December 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/238046/Advice_and_Referral_Service_model_consultation_paper_-Dec_2016_-_Final_.pdf
- ¹⁸ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Signs of Safety – Pamphlet*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/186242/Signs_of_Safety_Family_Meeting_Phamphlet.pdf; DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Signs of Safety – Fact Sheet*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/186241/Signs_of_Safety_Family_Meeting_Fact_Sheet.pdf
- ¹⁹ See http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/children/child_protection_services/family_group_conferencing/information_for_approved_facilitators including *Family Group Conferencing Practice Advice*
- ²⁰ See http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/children/child_protection_services/family_group_conferencing
- ²¹ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Rights of Parents of Children in Out-of-Home Care – An Information Sheet for the Public*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/62990/Rights_Parent_Children_Care.pdf
- ²² DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Advice and Referral Service Consultation Paper – December 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/238046/Advice_and_Referral_Service_model_consultation_paper_-Dec_2016_-_Final_.pdf
- ²³ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Signs of Safety – Pamphlet*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/186242/Signs_of_Safety_Family_Meeting_Phamphlet.pdf; DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Signs of Safety – Fact Sheet*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/186241/Signs_of_Safety_Family_Meeting_Fact_Sheet.pdf
- ²⁴ See http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/children/child_protection_services/family_group_conferencing/information_for_family_members
- ²⁵ DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Rights of Parents of Children in Out-of-Home Care – An Information Sheet for the Public*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/62990/Rights_Parent_Children_Care.pdf
- ²⁶ Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, Productivity Commission, *Report on Government Services – Chapter 16 – Child Protection*, 2017, Table 16A.1
- ²⁷ Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, Productivity Commission, *Report on Government Services – Chapter 16 – Child Protection*, 2017, Table 16A.17
- ²⁸ Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, Productivity Commission, *Report on Government Services – Chapter 16 – Child Protection*, 2017, Table 16A.17
- ²⁹ Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, Productivity Commission, *Report on Government Services – Chapter 16 – Child Protection*, 2017, Table 16A.17 and Table 16A.34
- ³⁰ Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, Productivity Commission, *Report on Government Services – Chapter 16 – Child Protection*, 2017, Table 16A.23
- ³¹ Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, Productivity Commission, *Report on Government Services – Chapter 16 – Child Protection*, 2017, Table 16A.23
- ³² DHHS, Tasmanian Government, *Redesign of Child Protection Services Tasmania – Report March 2016*, available at http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/214356/Redesign_of_Child_Protection_Services.pdf
- ³³ See http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/227592/RTI201617-027_-_Online.pdf