

REFUGEE COMMUNITIES ADVOCACY NETWORK (RCAN)

Submission to the Parliamentary Joint Standing Committee
on Migration's Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes

Atem Atem

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
The mix, coordination and extent of settlement services available and the effectiveness of these services in promoting better settlement outcomes for migrants.....	3
National and international best practice strategies for improving migrant settlement outcomes and prospects	9
The Committee shall give particular consideration to social engagement of youth migrants, including involvement of youth migrants in anti-social behavior such as gang activity, and the adequacy of the Migration Act 1958 character test provisions as a means to address issues arising from this behavior.	13

Acknowledgements

RCAN acknowledges the hard work of RCAN Working Group to ensure that the writing of this submission is coordinated. Some members of the Working Group wrote sections of the submission while others provided feedback on the writing. RCAN also acknowledges that what went into this submission was influenced by the many conversations RCAN Working Group members had with RCAN members.

To contact RCAN Please e-mail atematem2020@gmail.com.

Introduction

NSW Refugee Communities Advocacy Network (RCAN) is grateful to the Federal Parliamentary Joint Standing Committee on Migration for this opportunity to make a submission to the inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes. RCAN is a refugee community grass-roots organization that brings refugees and former refugees from a diverse backgrounds together to present the powerful voice of refugees and their communities. In this submission the term refugees refers to migrants who came to Australia through:

- the off-shore humanitarian program,
- the on-shore humanitarian program and,
- the asylum seeker system.

RCAN members will be happy to appear in person before the Committee to give evidence.

The mix, coordination and extent of settlement services available and the effectiveness of these services in promoting better settlement outcomes for migrants

The provision of Settlement services is critical in guaranteeing positive settlement outcomes for refugees. Without the provision of settlement services, the settlement process would be much more difficult.

There is a great mix of settlement services on offer in NSW. The provision of torture and trauma services is one of the many settlement services provided to refugees when they arrive. The Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors (STARTTS) provides a mix of services that are aimed at addressing the impact of trauma on refugees at the individual, family, community and institutional levels. Other service providers in NSW such as Settlement Service International (SSI) and the various Migrant Resource Centres (most have change names) also provide a variety of settlement services. Most of these services provide information sessions, community capacity building, accommodation, youth services and casework.

Different English language support programs are available to newly arrived refugees. Navitas delivers the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) in the Sydney region while in regional NSW TAFE NSW delivers the AMEP. The Department of Immigration and Border Protection (DIBP) provides Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS).

In addition to this diverse mix of services delivered to newly arrived refugees, there are several advocacy organisations that play a critical in informing settlement service delivery and policy. For example, the Refugee Council of Australia (RCOA) works with refugee communities, settlement service providers, government departments and the wider Australian community to address issues of concerns to refugees locally, nationally and internationally. Another example, is the Multicultural Youth Affairs network (MYAN) whose focus is refugee and multicultural youth issues. Settlement Council of Australia (SCOA) is the peak body for settlement service providers and has done work such as establishing common professional standards for the settlement sector.

There are other settlement service providers who are not usually considered specialist in the settlement sector because their main purpose is not focused on settling newly arrived migrants and refugees but yet get funded to deliver settlement services, for example, charities such as Anglicare and The Red Cross to mention just two.

To complicate the mix in settlement service delivery, for-profit corporations such as Navitas deliver settlement services. Navitas provides AMEP and seems to be easily accepted in the settlement sector that is dominated by non-for-profit community based organisations. The contracting of for-profit organisations to deliver settlement services is not generally welcomed among settlement service providers. The failure of a for-profit organisation to deliver accommodation services to newly arrived refugees in the Hunter Valley in NSW a few years ago justified the objection of most settlement service providers to the inclusion of for-profit organisations in the settlement sector.

Recommendation

1. Settlement services should be delivered by non-for-profit community based organisation. The most of the current participating non-for-profit community based

organisations such as Migrant Resource Centres (MRC) have been initiated in the 1970s/80s for the sole purpose of serving refugees and migrant and so have accumulated useful corporate knowledge and expertise over the years that can be lost by opening up the settlement sector to for-profit organisations who have no expertise whatsoever in refugee and migrant settlement and are only interested in making profit. Settlement is a complex process and should not be exposed to failure through for-profit organisation as the Hunter Region Experience in accommodating refugees has shown in the past.

Moreover, refugee communities and their own organisations provide services that are mostly not funded by government. The contribution of refugee communities in assisting members of their own communities settle is not formally recognise (see more on this below).

The coordination of services in the settlement sector is difficult and in most cases is non-existent. Before 2013, the Department of Immigration was in charge of delivering the entire mix of settlement services. It was then easier to coordinate settlement services since one department was in charge. In 2013, settlement services including accommodation, complex case management and the Settlement Grant Program (SGP) were moved to the Department of Social Services. The Migrant Adult English Program (AMEP) was moved to the Department of Employment and Training and then to the Department of Education. These changes make coordination of settlement services very difficult. The Departments that are currently in charge of settlement services have no expertise in managing settlement services. It is very difficult for these departments to link up with communities that receive settlement services. Building relationships with refugee and migrant communities takes a long time as these relationships are built on trust. What this means is that community capital that was built over the years by the Department of Immigration is lost. Service providers are unsettled by these changes and the transition was very stressful as settlement services lost staff and funding. It also takes some time for government departments to get their head around such a complex sector.

The diverse mix presented above also provide challenges for coordinating settlement services. The sector is a mix of mainly non-for-profit community based organisation with diverse philosophies and ways of delivering services to charities whose main role is not the settlement of migrants and refugees, to for-profit organisations that are more concerned with

the bottom-line for their stakeholders and to complicate it all refugee communities provide settlement support services to their own communities that are not funded or even recognised. Differences among settlement service providers do create tension in the sector and further diminished sector's capacity to work together in coordination.

The various funding sources that settlement service providers have to obtain funding from provide another example where the coordination of settlement services is a difficult task to accomplish. The Commonwealth is the major source of funding for the settlement sector. State governments also fund settlement services and services that are aimed at providing support for the settlement and integration of refugees and migrants. For example, the NSW government funds Multicultural NSW (formerly known as Community Commissions Relations) a statutory agency that promote multiculturalism in NSW and provide services that refugees and immigrants needs. In addition, Multicultural NSW is the agency that in charge of monitoring the implementation of Access and Equity Policies across NSW government departments and agencies. In 2013, NSW Auditor General reported that the NSW government failed in its responsibility to coordinate settlement services in NSW to improve outcomes for those refugee settling in NSW.

At the national level, a National Settlement Framework is proposed to allow senior bureaucrats from various Commonwealth departments responsible for settlement of refugees and migrants to meet with their state and local government counterparts to coordinate settlement of newly arrived migrants and refugees. The implementation of this National Settlement Framework is difficult to comment on as information hard to come by. In any case, such a settlement national framework as proposed leaves out service providers and refugee and migrant communities. This is already a gap as the inclusion of settlement service providers and refugee and migrant communities who are directly impacted by this decision likely to be made is very critical to a national settlement framework.

Recommendations

2. It is a welcome development that the current NSW government has appointed a Coordinator General for Settlement services to assist in coordinating settlement services in NSW for additional 12 000 Syrian and Iraqi refugees of which a large proportion of will be settled in NSW.

3. The initiative above bring settlement services, community organisations, corporate sector and government together to better improve the coordination of settlement services over the next four years or so.
4. Such as initiative as above should have included grass-roots community organisations like RCAN and many others to further improve coordination.
5. The above initiative should be expanded ensure the settlement of all humanitarian entrants in NSW is equally coordinated. In this case the other Commonwealth Departments responsible for the settlement of new refugees and migrants be made a coordinating partner.
6. To facilitate coordination, all settlement services need to come under the responsibility of a single Commonwealth Government department.
7. The National Settlement Framework proposed must be expanded to include settlement service providers and refugee and migrant community representative especially from those communities that are currently directly receiving settlement services.
8. Information about the operation of the National Settlement Framework if already established and in operation, need to be made public so that interested parties like RCAN can view the information and make a positive contribution on behalf of refugee communities.

At the settlement service provider level there is little coordination. Service providers are forced to compete against each other and as a result find little motivation in coordinating service delivery. Settlement service providers are also limited to the local area they serve. Consequently, there is no pressure on them to seek other settlement service providers to coordinate service delivery. However, in more recent years the rhetoric in the settlement sector at least in NSW has been that service providers should work in partnership. This rhetoric is given some momentum by funding models that encourage service providers to tender for funding as consortia. This is a welcome move but cooperation and coordination is limited to services delivered as part of the consortium agreement. Another example where settlement service providers in Sydney try to work together in coordination is the Settlement Services International (SSI) initiative Youth Collective. This initiative brings youth workers from settlement services together to help coordinate service delivery to improve outcomes for refugee and migrant young people. The problem with this initiative is that settlement service providers involved have varied levels of commitments. Some youth workers who are

participants in this initiative have little time or no time to engage with the initiative as they are overwhelmed with work.

Recommendations

9. Settlement Council of Australia (SCOA) be funded to develop a framework for the coordination of settlement services.
10. Funding bodies fund settlement services to build coordination capacities across the sector. Funding interagency meetings is the first step in this process.

Refugee community organisations offer a large range of settlement support services to own members. Most of these services are not funded by government. However, from time to time community organisations get small grants to run events. The spectrum of services offered by refugee community organisations ranges from individual support services, to family mediation, to community engagement and youth services such as sports and language services. These services are group specific and little coordination with other refugee community organisations occurs. Sometime sports activities are coordinated in gearing for a multi-group tournament. In addition, there is no coordination between these services and those offered by the formal settlement service providers.

Recommendations

11. RCAN be funded to develop a refugee communities' services coordination framework aimed at improving the coordination of service delivery among refugee community organisations.
12. Refugee community organisations need to be acknowledged formally as settlement service providers and funded accordingly.
13. Commonwealth Department of Social services fund refugee communities' centres which provide office spaces for community groups with access to computers, printing, phone, meeting rooms and a fulltime paid centre manager and a receptionist. The use of such centres should be free for community groups and organisation. This would help community groups to develop capacity in a way that works for them. It also left a burden off the shoulders of community leaders as expenses such as making phone calls, access to the internet, printing, etc. are covered by community leaders.

The effectiveness of settlement services is difficult to assess. This is because it is not clear on what basis such assessment should be made. However, if the mix, coordination and the extent of settlement services is taken as the basis on which to assess the effectiveness of settlement services, it can be said from the above that there is much more that needs to be done in terms of the mix and coordination of settlement services.

Recommendations

14. Settlement and settlement outcomes are difficult to define. A consultant should be engage to design a process that ensure that all stakeholders participated in an exercise that culminates in a clear and agreed upon definition of settlement and settlement outcomes. Concepts such as settlement need, successful settlement and other related concepts that might be used to define settlement be individually defined and clarified.
15. The above definition of settlement should be operational so that tools can be developed as part of the above process that evaluate the effectiveness of settlement services.
16. Such tools developed as above must focus the assessment on outcomes for clients and their wellbeing.
17. Effectiveness of settlement services should be about building on the strengths that refugees bring with them and build on that.

National and international best practice strategies for improving migrant settlement outcomes and prospects

Best practice in settlement should be about the active engagement of refugees and their communities in service delivery and delivering the desired outcomes. However, the vital role refugee community organisations play in the settlement of their community members in Australia is generally ignored as pointed out already. Refugee community organisations play an important role in supporting the social participation, economic wellbeing, independence, personal wellbeing, life satisfaction and community connectedness of new refugee communities. The Settlement Outcomes of New Arrivals report found that 21.4% of

humanitarian entrant respondents had accessed support through “cultural organizations or community group” in the past six months, compared with 4.3% of family migrants and 3.1% of skilled migrants. However, refugee community organisations, playing such a critical role in the settlement of humanitarian entrants, are not recognised by government and receive very little funding.

In the context of forced migration, it is natural for refugee communities in host countries to seek what is familiar to them in order to build bridges that help them understand their new reality drawing strength from their shared experiences, language and cultural understandings. The loss of self-determination is an impetus for refugees to seek a sense of belonging within their communities and draw from internal strength, which in turn allows for collective structures such as refugee community organisations to emerge. The high level of volunteering and a genuine desire to give back to other new arrivals and the broader Australian community play a particularly important role. These roles include building bridges at the early stages of settlement as new arrivals navigate the complex challenges in finding their way. These community structures evolve and remain relevant for a long time after initial settlement. Some of the things refugee community organisations do include provision of interpreting services, orientation, information sessions, employment support, short term accommodation. Such support dramatically bridges the gap for bi-cultural facilitators and interpreters as the community organisations can directly draw cultural knowledge from their own members. The ethnic community structures and their reach is essential to refugee community members to draw a sense of being settled and belonging from. Refugee community organisations can also emerge to fill gaps in mainstream service provision.

Recommendations

18. There is a need to shift the paradigm of governments, host communities and settlement service providers to recognise the role played by refugee communities as agents for the settlement of new arrivals and as instrumental in development across the world.
19. The strength within refugee communities should underpin the principles of settlement.
20. Refugee community based organizations, individuals and groups need to be seen beyond service recipients. They should be seen as vital aspect of the settlement process.

21. Capacity building initiatives be considered that focus on refugee community leaders and supporting the development of robust community structures.

Local, state and federal governments must consider ways of critically engaging refugee community leaders in decision-making. The role of refugee community leaders is vital for the success of refugee community organisations in mediating the settlement process. Refugee community leaders are volunteers. This means that their commitment to serving own communities comes under pressure as they have to find employment to take care of themselves and family.

To ensure that community leaders are engaged in decision making, it is important to understand refugee community leaders. The profile of a community leader is determined somewhat by where they are in their journey of settlement. This means that communities that are being settled to Australia for the first time will have more traditional leaders who might have been leaders at refugee camps or displaced people camps where their communities resided before coming to Australia. These leaders have lots of Authority in their communities. However, they are less recognised by service providers and policy makers. In a general sense, some of these leaders are sometimes clients or former clients of settlement service providers. A number of these community leaders cannot articulate issues well enough in English, but have incredible insight into issues in their own communities or groups. These types of community leaders are expected by their communities to keep the status quo in a foreign country and to also help them navigate the system in Australia to a lesser extent. This type of community leaders in refugee and migrant communities can be critical at the initial stage of settlement and if they are recognised and supported they can be most effective in supporting the integration of their communities into the Australian society.

Recommendation

22. Community leaders from newly arrived refugee communities should be supported through capacity building, introduced to important networks that they will need to access to be more effective in achieving results for their communities, and linked up with other refugee community leaders and grass-roots organisations such as RCAN.

The other type of community leaders can be described as truly bicultural people who have amazing knowledge of the Australian system and also of the communities they represent. They act as an important bridge between their “communities” and “mainstream” Australia. This type of leaders gains authority from being considered very resourceful. They become more prominent as the community stays longer in Australia. They might not be in elected positions, but they are still considered powerful and useful. Most of these leaders work with elected leaders to help their own communities and end up being authorised through election to lead these communities in many cases. If this happens, they become even more powerful. This type of leaders to a greater extent produces the best settlement outcomes for their communities. These bicultural community leaders, who are very educated, experienced, and future oriented, like their traditional leaders, provide services for free to their community. This type of a community leader would demonstrate their capacity to articulate and to assist in addressing issues that their community faces.

The current service delivery model gives funding to large organisations at the first instant and nothing to small emerging community organisations and groups for fear that they do not have the capacity to manage funding and deliver services to their people. This creates a self-fulfilling prophesy between the service providers and the funding bodies on the one hand and the communities on the other. Majority of service providers would want to deliver services themselves “to” communities or “with” communities depending on their individual organisational philosophy. This abdicates communities from accountability in relation to the settlement outcomes expected to be produced by the funded service providers.

Many bicultural community leaders are employed as project workers by service providers to deliver services “to” or “with” not only their community but also other multicultural communities. This is great for the individual, but their ability as community leaders is curtailed by the processes and the workload of the organisation that pays their wages. It is obvious that if these people continue to be leaders in their own communities, they will not do well as project officers and if they absolve themselves from leading issues in their communities, then communities are disempowered.

Recommendations

23. Governments need to consider more dedicated bicultural workers to work with their own newly arrived communities and jointly supervised by a dedicated service provider and a representative/community leader from that community. This person or persons will be able to co-ordinate myriad services toward their community for a specific time, say 5 years.
24. Provide funding to small and emerging communities to support small projects. This will help these communities build capacity in governance and service delivery. The chances are that they will produce more and useful outcomes for their communities.

The Committee shall give particular consideration to social engagement of youth migrants, including involvement of youth migrants in anti-social behaviour such as gang activity, and the adequacy of the Migration Act 1958 character test provisions as a means to address issues arising from this behaviour.

Social engagement is critical in the settlement process. Settlement as a process is about newly arrived refugees and their communities learning to re-engage with society. Refugees generally come to Australia with the hope of making Australia a home and social engagement is usually a priority. People with refugee background generally state that one of the major reasons why they come to Australia is to secure the wellbeing of their children and young people. Refugee parents and communities perceive the wellbeing of their children and young people in terms of education and social engagement with the wider Australian community as critical. Parents expect their children to attain high educational levels. Children and young people in refugee communities are perceived as a social bridge between refugee families and communities and the wider Australian society as it is expected that refugee young people, in addition to education, gain social engagement skills quickly.

For refugee young people in Australia to achieve educational and social engagement outcomes that their parents and community aspire for them and they themselves aspire for, there are a number of barriers that they need to overcome at least initially:

- Learning the English language
- Transitioning successfully to school
- Accessing support services
- Stereotypes of a refugee young person
- Discrimination and racism and
- Drawing on internal resources to build resilience

In NSW, newly arrived refugee young people attend English classes. In NSW high schools, refugee young people are entitled to a maximum of five school terms of intensive English classes. The aim of the intensive English classes is to assist refugee young people to learn English so that by the time they leave the Intensive English program they have gained enough functional English that would enable them to cope with school work when they transition to school. Some of these Intensive English programs are also tailored to support settlement outcomes. The settlement support aspect of the program varies from school to school depending on the resources available and how well integrated individual Intensive English programs are into the wide settlement sector.

Five terms of Intensive English are not long enough for most refugee young people. Refugee young people come to Australia with different educational backgrounds and different abilities to learn English at a functional level. What this means is that there is usually a considerable number of refugee young people who still need more time at the intensive English program beyond five school terms to get them to a level where they can function competently when they transition to school.

Recommendation

25. Increasing time spent at the Intensive English programs on a need basis to a maximum of ten school terms.

Refugee young people will benefit from making more resources available to Intensive English programs. This enables schools to provide more activities that support English learning. For example, school can use alternative learning such as learning English through music and lyrics or through getting the refugee young people to perform classic English dramas and so on. Refugee young people can learn about Australian government and the political system through visiting parliament house or visiting the local council chambers.

Recommendation

26. Increase funding for Intensive English programs to enable these programs to provide creative and alternative ways of learning not only the English language but also the various cultural and institutional and artistic aspects of the English language that can only be learnt through directly engaging with them.

English intensive programs can also help address some of the settlement needs that arise for refugee young people. However, Intensive English programs rarely engage with settlement services that have expertise in addressing the settlement of newly arrived refugees. Some Intensive English programs link up with settlement services and ensure that their students get extra help on the school site therefore improving the young person's experience of the Intensive English program. This leads to a better outcome for refugee young people. Intensive English programs don't have the capacity in most cases to engage with the settlement sector. The settlement sector doesn't see Intensive English programs as potential partners and therefore rarely reach out to them for collaboration.

Recommendations

27. Intensive English programs develop the capacity to engage with the settlement sector and drawn on settlement services available for refugee young people for free to improve their English learning outcomes.

28. Similarly, settlement service providers should keep wellbeing of refugee young people at the centre and work closely with other service providers including schools and other institutes offering English language services. This collaborative approach should be mandated by the government / funding bodies and form part of the KPIs.

Transitioning to school from Intensive English programs is a difficult process for refugee young people. Refugee young people, after five terms of intensive support, are passed on to the school system. There is very little support available to refugee young people at high school. Some schools have rudimentary classes of English as a second language. These classes are poorly funded and funding is precarious. The settlement needs of refugee young people at school are not addressed leaving refugee young people frustrated.

Due to little understanding of the school system and school social environment, refugee young people become quickly isolated. It is difficult to make friends at school for some refugee young people. Difficulty in communicating in English, bullying, and discrimination eventually complicate the situation for refugee young people.

Teachers struggle to make sense of refugee young people and to provide them with the kind of support they need to enable them cope with pressures at school. For example, teachers don't know how best to respond when refugee young people claim that they feel hurt by a joke made by other students that on the surface seems harmless.

Some refugee parents find it difficult to raise issues of concern on behalf of their children with schools. Some refugee parents find it difficult to join the Parent Teacher Associations (PTA). However, when they join the PTA they find that they have no voice to express concerns.

Recommendations

29. Schools in areas with high refugee young people should receive extra funding to ensure that intensive school transition support is provided.
30. English as a second language program in schools must be properly resourced so that refugee young people can continue developing vital English language skills that would facilitate their learning.

31. Teachers need to have specialised training to enable them deal with students with refugee background. Such training should be about raising awareness among teachers about the refugee experience and the issues refugees and young people face as they settle. This training should also be about gaining skills in cross cultural communications so that teachers are in a better position in communicating with refugee young people.
32. The cross-cultural training proposed above can be delivered by experts from the respective communities, people with refugee-lived experience with relevant expertise or settlement service providers at school.
33. Schools to ensure that refugee parents are engaged with schools through holding regular special meetings with refugee parents. Some schools open their doors to refugee communities so that they can use facilities the schools have such as meeting rooms. This is a good example of how schools could encourage the participation of refugee parents through building stronger relationships that facilitate communication.
34. Schools need to be well resourced to address bullying and discrimination among students.

Refugee young people struggle to access support services. Settlement services do provide some youth activities and programs but they are generally not designed to address youth settlement needs. Settlement youth activities are sporadic and are not well coordinated.

Mainstream youth services are not equipped to deal with refugee young people. There is very little understanding by mainstream youth services about the refugee experience and staff have no expertise in dealing with refugee young people.

Refugee young people have little or no understanding of support services general and as a result don't access them even when they are available to them for free.

Refugee community organisations do step up to fill this gap. For example, most refugee community organisations including youth specific organisations organise successful sports activities aimed at keeping their young people off the streets. Some of these sports programs also incorporate character coaching, mentoring and even case management to address issues refugee young people bring with them. These refugee community organisations never get recognised for the work they do and therefore never get funded and supported to continue providing youth services and to improve quality of their work.

Recommendations

35. More funding for youth programs in the settlement sector be provided. This will allow the expansion of youth settlement specific programs. This focuses settlement service providers' attention on young people and organisational capacity is built accordingly.
36. One of the aims of the above proposal is ensuring that refugee young people receive more support especially in terms of building their capacity in navigating service systems.
37. Mainstream youth services need to be equipped and their capacities built to ensure that they too can serve refugee young people effectively. Some of the increase in funding proposed above (35) should be directed into settlement services developing resources that will help mainstream youth services build capacity in working with refugee youth.
38. Refugee community organisations need to be funded to deliver youth programs. They also need to be acknowledged as playing a key role in addressing the challenges refugee young people face as they settle.
39. Grass-roots community development should be an important aspect of the settlement process.

Refugee young people are misunderstood and their public image generate fear. A good recent example is South Sudanese young people in Melbourne who are painted by the media as dangerous and as something to be feared. It is likely that a small number of these young people have been involved in anti-social behaviour like other young people do. However, the media blows this out and places all refugee young people in the same basket. Another example is the comments made about the Lebanese young people in relation to terrorism. Although Lebanese young people in question are not refugees themselves, their parents arrived in Australia in the 1970s as refugees. The message again here is that young people with refugee background are dangerous and need to be feared.

This media portrayal of refugee young people contributes so much in the marginalisation of refugee young people. Social engagement with the wider Australia community become almost impossible as refugee young people avoid the public for self-preservation.

Recommendations

40. Mainstream media needs to change the way they report on refugee young people so that the reporting is balanced. One way this can be done is for the media to also report on the great things the majority of refugee young people do.
41. Refugee young people be supported to showcase their talents and skills for the public to see.
42. Creating more opportunities for the public to see refugee young people in a positive light.

Discrimination and racism also get in the way of refugee young people as they try to engage with the wider society. One way through which social engagement can be intensified is through employment. Refugee young people find it difficult to find employment. Many refugee young people looking for work complain that they can't find work because of discrimination and as a result their ability to social engage is reduced as the option of employment is taken away.

Because refugee young people are out and about all the time, they are more likely to face racism. Refugee young people are racialized based on racial, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds. Events overseas or even in Australia that have nothing to do with refugee young people are sometime used to justify racism against them.

Recommendations

43. The national anti-racism strategy funded by the federal government should be funded permanently (ongoing funding) to continue educating the public about racism and the misunderstandings that lead to racism.
44. State governments need to invest permanently (ongoing) in anti-racism strategies and bodies. These bodies need to be empowered and made visible to enable them to engage actively with refugee and migrant communities as well as the wider Australian community.
45. Refugee young people and communities must be actively engaged in any anti-racism strategy or policy formulation. The current anti-racism strategy has little capacity to engage with refugee young people and their communities. More funding should be provided to ensure that refugee young people are active participants in guiding the strategy.

Refugee young people have internal resources that they can draw on to enable them cope with the difficulties of settlement in Australia. However, for these resources to be drawn upon it is important that the available support recognises this and works in such a way that refugee young people's internal resources are unlocked and built upon. These resources include discipline, hard work, ambition, preparedness to raise up to meeting challenges, humility, doing the right thing, ingenuity, and resourcefulness. The rediscovery of these resources by refugee young people within themselves is critical in promoting social engagement among them and eliminating any tendencies towards anti-social behaviours.

Recommendation

46. Refugee youth programs should be built on the idea that refugee young people have internal resources or strength from within that needs to be mobilised and awaken so that refugee young people can draw from these internal resources helping them settle successfully in Australia.

In conclusion, settlement outcomes are about young people actively participating in social engagement that is positive for them and for the wider Australian society. A positive social engagement for young people can be generated by properly investing in settlement youth programs, refugee communities, schools, and in rediscovering and building on positive internal resources that refugee young people bring with them to Australia. This is the only way anti-social behaviours like those reported in Melbourne by South Sudanese young people can be eliminated. The use of tools such as Migration Act 1998 Character Test do not address itself to the root of the problem. The use of such punitive tools will only create further marginalisation and fear in the community.