

Appendix C:

Review scope and method

Scope of this review

Who we examined

We examined the following agencies:

Agency	Their key responsibilities
Department of Justice and Community Safety	Funding and overseeing the program.
Victoria Police	Maintaining the LEAP, which is the main central system used to record details of incidents, crimes, people and locations in support of operational policing activities. It includes all crime-related data.
12 community organisations	Implementing the program. The organisations are: 54 reasons, Anglicare Victoria, Berry Street, Banksia Gardens Community Services, Centre for Multicultural Youth, Centre for Participation, Meli, Melton City Council, Sunraysia Community Health Services, Workways, The Youth Junction Inc, YSAS.

Our review objective

To examine whether the program reduces participants' (re)offending.

What we examined

- Is the program delivering services to high-risk young people as intended?
- Is the program contributing to reducing the incidence and severity of youth (re)offending?

Why we conducted this review

As investment in new youth crime prevention initiatives increases, it is important for the Victorian Government to learn from its experience with the program.

Aspects of performance examined

Our mandate for performance audits and reviews includes the assessment of economy, effectiveness, efficiency and compliance (often referred to as the '3Es + C').

In this review we focused on the following aspects:

Economy	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Compliance
			

Key:

-  Primary focus
-  Secondary focus
-  Not assessed

Conducting this review

Assessing performance

To form a conclusion against our objective we used the following lines of inquiry and associated evaluation criteria.

Line of inquiry	Criteria
1. Is the program delivering services to high-risk young people as intended?	1.1 Community organisations select and actively engage participants who have a high risk of (re)offending.
	1.2 Participants receive safe, timely and appropriate services that address crime-related risk factors, including for education, employment and pro-social activities.
	1.3 The department monitors program delivery and acts to address issues with community organisations' performance.
2. Is the program contributing to reducing the incidence and severity of youth (re)offending?	2.1 Participants record fewer and/or less severe youth crime incidents.
	2.2 Participants' level of engagement in education, employment, family and/or community connection has improved.
	2.3 The department evaluates and continuously improves the program.

Our methods

As part of the review we:

- matched program participant names with police and youth justice offending data
- reviewed documents and data from the department and community organisations.

Level of assurance

In an assurance review, we primarily rely on the agency's representations and internally generated information to form our conclusions. By contrast, in a performance audit, we typically gather evidence from an array of internal and external sources, which we analyse and substantiate using various methods. Therefore, an assurance review obtains a lower level of assurance than a performance audit (meaning we have slightly less confidence in the accuracy of our conclusion).

Compliance

We conducted our review in accordance with the *Audit Act 1994* and ASAE 3500 Performance Engagements to obtain limited assurance to provide a basis for our conclusion.

We complied with the independence and other relevant ethical requirements related to assurance engagements.

We also provided a copy of the report to the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Department of Treasury and Finance.

Cost and time

The full cost of the review and preparation of this report was \$366,000.

The duration of the review was 5 months from initiation to tabling.