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Introduction

About the newsletter

This is the third edition of the new quarterly Community Corrections newsletter. The purpose of the newsletter is to provide a mechanism for communicating relevant research, statistics, updates and ideas, as well as information about Community Corrections and other areas within CSNSW. More detailed information, such as the full text of research articles, will be made available on the intranet.

Management of parolees

This edition of the newsletter looks at issues related to the management of parolees. Although individual risk and needs are not something which is determined by the type of order, there are other factors which alter how risks is assessed and managed. Parolees as a group tend to have more serious offending histories and more serious offences – which is why they were given a custodial sentence to begin with. Because they are serving a custodial sentence the consequences of breach on parole are also more significant that for the average community based sentence, with imprisonment for either 12 months or the remainder of the sentence a likely outcome.

Since the murder of Jill Meagher in Victoria in late 2012, and the high profile release and reoffence of Terrence Leary in NSW in 2013, parole has also been pushed more into the awareness of the media and the public. As shown by recent BOCSAR research, and indeed by the independent inquiry into the Leary case by Justice Wood, these cases are neither indicators of failure of the management of parole or of deficits in the wider system within NSW. Most parolees do not offend while on parole, very few commit violent offences, and those offenders released to supervised parole reoffend less than those without supervision. Further, contrary to popular sentiment, the research shows that supervision which incorporates rehabilitation is more effective in protecting the community than supervision centred on compliance.

The Law Reform Commission is currently in the process of finalising a review of the parole system in NSW, and preliminary consultation indicates that the rehabilitative risk management approach will be supported in the final report. The professionalism and skill set of the Community Corrections officers who prepare these offenders for release and supervise them in the community are integral to building on this support to better educate the public and increase confidence in the ability of the justice system to reduce overall risk for the thousands of parolees released each year.

Request for submissions from staff

From the next edition the newsletter will be expanding to include a new section featuring contributions from staff. Staff are asked to submit:

- Examples of their work or that of their colleagues that either show good offender management strategy and practice, or cases which provided a good learning experience irrespective of the final outcome (indeed some of the best learning experiences may have negative outcomes). This could be a particular case, an effective work practice or interview technique, or a single interaction with an offender.
- Information regarding service providers, in particular any positive experiences with providers or tips which are likely to be helpful to colleagues in finding and accessing quality providers, or obtaining better service.

To contribute to the newsletter, email jason.hainsworth@dcs.nsw.gov.au with the subject line of ‘Newsletter’. If you don’t have time to write in detail, provide a contact number and someone will call you back to get details over the phone. All information pertaining to offenders will be de-identified, and no articles will be published without the consent of the staff member(s) involved.

Each quarter the Assistant Commissioner Community Corrections will give out two $25 book vouchers which will go to staff members who are the subject of submissions which demonstrate initiative, professionalism, and willingness to share experiences which may assist others in developing their skills and knowledge.
Re-offending on Parole
(Weatherburn, Ringland, 2014, NSW)

Method
A sample of 9,604 offenders released to parole in NSW in 2010 and 2011 was analysed to measure the rate of re-offence while on parole, and look at predictors for general and violent re-offence. Dependent variables included re-offence on parole (identified by an offence proven in court), return to custody while on parole and prior to re-offending (breach), and no re-offence or return to custody while on parole.

Results
28.4% of the sample re-offended on parole, including 7% with a violent offence. A further 10.8% returned to custody on a breach of parole without re-offence. Predictors for general and violent re-offence were similar. Parolees were more likely to re-offend on parole if they were male, indigenous, young, had spent less than 180 days in custody, had a higher LSI-R score, had a non drug offence (ie supply/possession) as the principal offence, had 6 or more prior court appearances, had been imprisoned previously, had prior convictions for drug use/possession. Violent offending predictors also included a prior conviction for a serious violent offence.

Comments
This study provides several indicators for offenders more likely to re-offend, violently or otherwise. These are useful to keep in mind when assessing risk and developing case management plans. One limitation of this study is that looking at the parole period only does not account for variation in length of sentence; ie it is more likely that the longer orders will have more offences than short orders. It is therefore not possible to draw conclusions about the general effectiveness of parole from this data.

But Some of Them Don’t Come Back (to Prison!)
Resource Deprivation and Thinking Errors as Determinants of Parole Success and Failure
(Bucklen, Zajac, 2009, United States)

Method
The study looked at reasons why Parole Violators (defined as return to custody for a new offence or a breach of parole) return to custody and Parole Successes (defined as being on parole supervision for at least 3 years with no violations or return to custody) do not. Data was collected from offenders via self-administered surveys focusing on post release experiences such as living arrangements, employment, financial situation, AOD, health, attitudes to community based supervision and a range of others. This was followed by focus groups and interviews with participants from both groups.

Results
Neither the Violators nor the Successes considered any individual domain to be the key post release stressor. Instead, the researchers suggested that cumulative stress affecting several domains may lead to parole violations. Unrealistic post release life expectations, antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs, poor coping or problem-solving skills characterised by impulsivity, failure to generate alternatives, failure to recognise consequences of choices, keeping problems to ones’ self, failing to take steps of avoidance led to parole breach and re-offence.

Comments
This suggests that supervision work that focusses on how to build better coping mechanisms and pro-social behaviours and attitudes are more likely to be successful at preventing re-offence or breach. Development of realistic and achievable expectations for both the offender and officer are particularly important.

Recidivism Among Participants of an Employment Assistance Program for Prisoners and Offenders
(Graffam, Shinkfield, Lavelle. 2014, Victoria)

Method
600 program participants in a long term employment assistance program were compared to 600 non-participants. Comparisons included reoffending across employment outcomes, and community based or custodial participation.

Results
The overall rate of reoffending among program participants was 7.46%. The inmate participant re-offence rate was higher than parolee participant re-offence rate. Rates of reoffending were low for both participants regardless of whether they were placed in employment (6.40%) or not (7.73%). Both overall reoffending and other indicators including frequency and severity of offences suggested reductions in offending for program participation.

Comments
This study provides support for the efficacy of employment assistance programs, particularly in the community. Interestingly, the outcome of actually gaining a job did not seem as important as engagement with the program, and may reflect differences in motivation and attitudes, such as valuing non-criminal lifestyles. This may also explain to some extent why overall research is not consistent in the benefits of employment.
Research and Literature

Parole Supervision and Reoffending
(Wan, Poynton, van Doorn, Weatherburn, 2014, NSW)

Method
Data was gathered from CSNSW and the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research’s Reoffending Database to provide information on a sample of 7,494 offenders released to parole in NSW between 1 January 2009 and 30 June 2010. The independent variables were post-release supervision (contrasted with unsupervised parole or completed sentences) and supervision intensity. Supervision intensity was further defined according to a rehabilitation or compliance focus (based on management by the then COS and CCMG respectively) and high and low levels of supervision intensity type.

Results
Offenders subject to parole supervision upon release from custody took longer to commit a new offence, were less likely to commit a new indictable offence and committed fewer offences than offenders who were released unconditionally into the community. Supervision reduced recidivism only for the rehabilitative group; compliance focussed supervision had no impact.

Comments
This study supports the principle that incorporating intervention based practices such as motivational interviewing and rapport building into regular supervision interviews will have more of an impact on an offender’s likelihood of recidivism than a focus on compliance. Although the study reported a positive finding, the effect is much less than what has been achieved in other studies.

The Revolving Door at the Prison Gate: Exploring the dramatic increase in recalls to prison
(Padfield, Maruna, 2006, United Kingdom)

Summary
A dramatic increase in prison numbers in the UK has drawn academics to examine reasons for the increase and compare this to a similar increase in the USA.

A contributing factor to the increase has come from parolees returning to custody during their period of conditional liberty. Many of the offenders recalled (close to half the total percentage of recalls) were due to technical violations of an order rather than re-offence.

A comparison is drawn to the USA which notes the costly financial and social impact of state recall policies and practices, and the ineffective impact these have upon reducing recidivism.

The authors conclude that further research into offender recalls and the use of discretion within the criminal justice system would be worthwhile.

Comments
Some research (for example Wilson, 2005, Bad behaviour or bad policy? An examination of Tenness release cohorts, 1993-2001) has suggested that how technical breaches are managed in policy and legislation can play a greater role in whether offenders return to custody than any change in the offender’s behaviour. In NSW a relevant example is that imprisonment is increasing even though most categories of crime are either stable or falling.

Discussion
The factors impacting on parole success or failure are varied. In addition to reoffending, technical violation and return to custody on breach is a significant factor for parolees; as the data on page 8 shows, this accounts for a growing proportion of parolees in NSW and the overall impact of these and other community based orders on prison numbers is substantial. Despite this, the available evidence indicates that overall rates of offending are lower than is often assumed. Most parolees do not reoffend whilst on parole. More importantly, even though longer term rates of return are higher, parole supervision appears to be effective in reducing the rate of reoffending, particularly when that supervision balances compliance and rehabilitation. The findings of the Bucklen and Zajac study in particular may give a clue as to why this is so, with offender attitudes and beliefs being the key component associated with failure or success. When considered in the context of research regarding offender / officer interactions such as that by the Canadian STICS model, or by Trotter in Victoria, supervision is most effective when it targets these same factors. As also suggested by the Victorian employment study (and other similar studies), a more tangible and easily measured outcome such as employment may be secondary to the change in offender attitudes and beliefs which is engendered by successful engagement with a program that in effect promotes a positive law abiding lifestyle.
**In Practice**

**Decision making and parole breaches**

Breach of parole policy was updated in February 2015. The primary change is the introduction of the *Breach of parole notification*. This notification may be submitted to SPA instead of a *Breach of Parole report* providing:

- The parolee is generally compliant with case management strategies;
- There are no significant concerns regarding community safety;
- An appropriate response to the breach can be implemented locally (such as a warning or change to case management strategies); and
- The recommendation will be for no action.

The purpose of the notifications is to provide a mechanism for reporting minor matters to SPA with minimal impact on workload, and to allow the focus on case management to continue.

In the Jul-Sep 2014 issue of this newsletter decision making and risk was explored. One of the key points was to look at why you are working with the offender, with a range of questions to consider in terms of the outcome. These same questions may be applied when thinking about why and when to breach an offender and what action to recommend.

In particular;
- What outcome are you trying to achieve?
- What information do you have to base your decision on?
- What are the likely risks both now and in the future; and what are the likely consequences?
- What course of action best balances all of the relevant risks?
- What would a different decision mean?
- What are the requirements of policy and legislation?
- Could you justify the decision later on if you had to, irrespective of the outcome?

A common example is where a parolee moves accommodation without prior permission from the supervising officer. While this technically breaches the parole order, it may also provide the offender with a more stable location to live and may not impact negatively on the risk of re-offence or harm to others.

Even if the address move was not ideal in terms of providing a stable environment, consider what the alternatives are, and their consequences. For example, if the offender returned to custody, would the impact of reincarceration be better or worse than having allowed the offender to remain where they were?

Much of the ground work of case management may be lost, with a significant delay in gaining these resources and opportunities again. Needs such as employment, education, family ties, mental health and alcohol/drug treatment will be impacted by revocation. The offender’s motivation and future attitude towards supervision may also be negatively affected.

Notwithstanding the above, there may be some circumstances where the change of address indicates unacceptable risk (for example, due to victim access). Of course, these risks may be present whether the offender has changed address or simply spends time at the other location during the day. The key point is not whether the decision is ‘correct’, but whether it is made for the right reasons, and with due consideration of all relevant risks. Providing these reasons in reports to SPA will enable them to make better decisions as well.

Although many parole breaches require a mandatory report or notification to SPA, this does not mean that revocation (or a warning) must be recommended, or that case management should stop. Indeed, continuing case management could assist in preventing revocation.

**Determining what recommendation to make**

Always consider the relationship of the breach to the risk to the community, to the original offence for which the offender is on parole, and what the possible outcomes would mean both short and long term. What constitutes a minor breach for one offender may be a matter of serious concern for another.

A formal warning from SPA may be requested where there is persistent non-compliance and the offender has not responded to warnings by the supervising officer, or where there is a more significant breach which warrants a strong response but revocation is not considered appropriate. It is not necessary to request a warning if the officer has already effectively dealt with the matter; no action is an acceptable response. Indeed, this could result in an offender being warned after they have begun to comply, and may be counter-productive.

A stand over should not be requested for case management purposes. If there is uncertainty regarding an offender’s ongoing response to supervision a recommendation either for no action or a warning may be appropriate. This removes the need to provide an update report if case management strategies are successful. Likewise, if the recommendation following new charges would still be no action if a conviction were to result, this can be made in the initial report rather than waiting for the result.
In Practice

Verification of information

Verification is sometimes perceived as a ‘tick-a-box’ task for monitoring purposes only. However, verification has a much greater use in case management practice. In verifying information from family members, employers and service providers (both internal and external) an officer has the opportunity to gain further insight into the offender's attitudes, values and beliefs, problem solving abilities and ability to form positive and supportive relationships. This information can be used effectively in case management to focus supervision interviews on areas in which the offender may need greater assistance, and check whether attitudes and behaviours are changing. Verification can also provide an opportunity to engage with third parties who can assist in implementing the case plan or supporting the offender.

Regular verification is most important where the consequences of failure are highest. Although this can become monotonous in some circumstances, regular contact is necessary to ensure early identification of any changes and allow rapid intervention when there is indication of increasing risk. Bear in mind that Service Delivery Standards should be met where reasonable and practicable. If it is unreasonable to maintain high levels of contact with third parties lower levels can apply, provided relevant risks are otherwise being managed and reasons are detailed in an approved case plan.

Reasonable directions

The concept of a ‘reasonable direction’ is heavily relied upon in the management of supervised offenders as a catch all condition on nearly all orders, but is poorly defined in law. Although some guidance can be taken from related legal concepts such as the reasonable person and reasonable force, reasonable direction is yet to be adequately tested in the courts. The ordinary dictionary definitions of reasonable include ‘having sound judgement, fair and sensible, based on good sense, in accordance with reason’. As a starting point, the obvious requirement for reasonableness is that sound reasons must be able to be given as to why the direction was imposed.

Within the context of case management, one further test might be whether the supervising officer would be comfortable in justifying the reasons for the direction to the court which had imposed the sentence. In doing so, particular consideration must be given to whether the direction is fair to the offender, and whether a less onerous or less punitive alternative could achieve the same outcome. For example, directing an offender to attend residential rehabilitation may be unreasonable where their level of drug use is low and could just as easily managed through outpatient treatment.

Also consider the relationship of the behaviour to the current offence. If the offender drinks heavily, but this has no connection to their offence it might be unreasonable to direct them to treatment. This is because the court's sentence is not to mandate intervention in other areas of the offenders life that do not contribute to their original offence or ongoing risk of offending, even if the behaviour might be harmful in other ways. Consider for example whether it would be reasonable to direct an offender to stop smoking tobacco. Also bear in mind that it is unlikely to be reasonable to direct an offender based on suspicion of illegal behaviours (such as illicit drug use or links to organised crime) if they are not linked to convictions. Any significant suspicions of serious offending must be reported to police.

Conversely, if the drinking is clearly associated with offending, there can be little dispute that such a direction would be both appropriate and fair. The connection may of course not always be clear. For example, the drinking may be unrelated to their offending, but is a responsivity issue inhibiting their ability to engage with other interventions, such as always being intoxicated when attending group. Even more problematic is determining the relevance of historical offences, such as a prior child sex offence, where the current order is for something completely unrelated. Whilst policy requires that the previous offence must be considered as part of the risk assessment, it is important to distinguish this from case management action, which must still be congruent with the current order and conditions for each offender.

LSI-R updates in OIMS

OIMS allows LSI-R information already recorded to be re-populated at the yearly assessment timeframe by clicking the copy latest button. Although this provides a quick and easy shortcut, it is still necessary to ensure the information is reviewed and verified to confirm it remains accurate.
### Community population

As at 1 March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total offenders</strong></td>
<td>13696</td>
<td>2295</td>
<td>16026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active offenders only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court based parole</td>
<td>2149</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA parole</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bail supervision</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive correction order</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service order</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>2478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home detention</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug court</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other (eg federal recog, interstate)</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total supervision</strong></td>
<td>9937</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>11640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total community service work</strong></td>
<td>3209</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total offenders is the count used in the Offender Population Report, and counts all orders active in OIMS, including suspensions, expired orders, and orders that have not yet commenced. Active offenders excludes these orders. Note that some offenders may have multiple orders, and are counted once in each category, and once in the overall total.

**Includes a small number of offenders where gender has not yet been recorded.

### Institutional population

As at 1 March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total offenders in custody</strong></td>
<td>10374</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>11153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td>6895</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>7332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All offenders in custody, including those with no Community Corrections contact

### Reports

Average reports per month, April 2014 to March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court advice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full pre-sentence</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short pre-sentence</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICO assessment</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD assessment</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre release</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full pre release</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How breach and reoffence impacts on return to prison

The first chart below shows the average rate of return to custody (for any reason) in 12 months for 19,512 offenders who commenced orders in 2013. The second chart shows the overall average number of days spent in custody within the same 12 month period, for both all offenders and for just those who returned to custody.

High risk offenders on average returned to custody at close to 11 times more often than low risk, and as a group spent 25 times longer in custody. Even when only counting the average for the 7% of low risk and 76% of high who came back into custody, high risk offenders spent almost twice as long in custody per offender. This underscores the relevance of providing throughcare for offenders returning to custody, not just those being released. It also highlights the potential Community Corrections has to impact reoffending by working with these offenders, particularly high risk.

Parole breaches and SPA decisions

The total number of parole revocations has been increasing steadily over the last 10 years for both reoffence and technical breach. This is in part due to a corresponding increase in the total number of parolees, as well as increases in the breach rate since around 2008, particularly for technical breaches. This may reflect increased detection rather than a change in behaviour, particularly given research indicating lower reoffending for supervised parolees.
Tumut

Location

Tumut is located in the Riverina region of NSW. It is 400km south-west of Sydney, with the closest regional centre being Wagga Wagga. Tumut has a population of 6,500. The main employment industry is the softwood forestry industry.

Staff

Manager – Jillian Hume;
3 x Community Corrections Officers (CCO) (1 CCO with 3.5 years’ experience; 2 CCOs with 2 years’ experience);
1 x Administrative Assistant;
1 x part-time Community Service Order (CSO) Administrative Assistant.

Offenders

As at February 2015, there were 130 offenders on the Tumut Community Corrections Office (Tumut Office) caseload. These included offenders subject to parole, CSOs, Intensive Correction Orders (ICO), and bonds. Current and historical caseloads indicate that offenders managed by Tumut Office are generally male with domestic violence, driving, and alcohol/other drug (AOD)-related offences.

In addition, Tumut Office services Mannus Correctional Centre (Mannus). Mannus is a minimum security correctional centre with approximately 95% of inmates at the centre requiring parole intervention.

Tumut Office manages a high percentage of offenders who identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (ATSI).

Major issues and challenges

The boundary lines of the Tumut area stretch over a 250km radius, with offenders residing at the farthest points in all directions! Travelling to Mannus to undertake parole-related work is a particular challenge. The journey is a 200km round-trip, and is hazardous owing to the brumbies that roam the area, and the black ice that often covers sections of the roads in the winter months.

Tumut’s unemployment rate is high, much like that of most smaller towns throughout the country. This has a significant impact on offenders, and many of the offenders attached to Tumut Office have experienced long-term unemployment. Because of the relatively small population, many of the residents are known to each other, and so potential employers are often aware of an offender’s criminal antecedents and are unwilling to provide them with employment opportunities.

Because of the vast geographical area covered by Tumut Office, and the fact that public transport options within this area are very limited, offenders are often unable to attend Tumut Office. To overcome this problem, Tumut Office has established agreements with local public service organisations which have allowed reporting centres to be created at court houses, police stations, and other appropriate public places.

Local Initiatives and Achievements

Tumut Office has an exceptional working relationship with the AOD Team from Tumut Community Health. The AOD Clinician attends Tumut Office on a fortnightly basis to provide individual AOD counselling and educational sessions specifically for offenders attached to Tumut Office. On 24 February 2015, a 4-month trial commenced, involving the AOD Clinician facilitating regular groups, AOD counselling and education sessions to enable a greater number of offenders to be provided with targeted and appropriate intervention.

Owing to the small population of Tumut, there are relatively few services locally available to address offenders’ criminogenic needs. Tumut Office is required to source providers of these services in Wagga Wagga and other major town centres. To ensure ongoing provision of services, partnerships have had to be developed. Tumut Office has been successful in facilitating offender access to outreach programs through partnerships with Mission Australia, Relationships Australia, and Head Space.

Recently, Tumut Office has been successful in securing a number of new agencies to provide work for CSO and ICO offenders. The Manager of Tumut Office has recently met with new magistrates in the area to discuss the increased capacity for placement with community service work agencies.
## Fairfield

### Location

Fairfield City is located in Sydney's south-western suburbs, about 32 kilometres from Sydney City. Fairfield Local Government Area (LGA) covers an area of some 104 square kilometres, incorporating 27 suburbs, including Fairfield and Cabramatta which are a hive of activity most days, and semi-rural suburbs such as Horsley Park where there are working farms and bushland. The Fairfield LGA is one of the most culturally diverse cities in Australia with more than half of all residents having been born overseas, 50% in non-English speaking countries.

### Major issues and challenges

The Fairfield LGA is known for the presence of certain ethnic-based gangs. There are many offenders on the caseload who are members of a gang or associates of a gang. There is regular consultation with the NSW Police Gang Squad and Local Area Commands regarding gang activity. Also on the caseload are offenders with outlaw motorcycle group affiliations, including the Rebels, Comancheros, Hell's Angels, and Brothers For Life.

Due to the demographic of the population in the Fairfield LGA, there is a high number of offenders on the caseload who are from non-English speaking backgrounds, with limited literacy and numeracy.

An ongoing issue in managing offenders in the Fairfield LGA is the communication barrier with many offenders and their families. As noted, the culturally diverse nature of the LGA means that many offenders and their families are not conversant in English, and their literacy and numeracy skills (in English) are poor to nonexistent. The presence of multi-lingual CCOs is helpful, however, staff resources do not permit CCOs to always be on hand when a translation need arises.

### Local Initiatives and Achievements

#### Riverkeeper Program

Fairfield Office has been involved in the Georges River Combined Councils - Riverkeeper Program (Program) for some time. The Program won awards in 2011 and 2013 for waste management, environmental protection and community partnerships. Offenders undertake bush regeneration and rubbish pickup duties from Thursday to Sunday each week.

#### Offender Programs

Fairfield Office has successfully facilitated the Open Training and Education Network (OTEN) program in partnership with TAFE NSW for over 2 years. This is a literacy and numeracy program for all offenders who need support in this area. The OTEN assists in tackling the communication difficulties referred to above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager – Donna Shaw; 3 x Unit Leaders; 14.5 x CCOs; 3 x Administrative Assistants; 1.5 x CSO Administrative Assistants; 1 x Vietnamese Client Service Officer; 1 x CCO position is the CSO Organiser; 1 x CCO position is the Court Duty Officer; Of the 14.5 CCO positions, 2 are trainees. The Vietnamese Client Service Officer facilitates the Vietnamese Getting SMART program, undertakes case management consultation, and initiates community consultation and partnerships. Fairfield Community Corrections (Fairfield Office) has a number of staff who are bilingual. Languages include Vietnamese, Filipino (Tagalog), Greek, Cantonese, Arabic, Croatian and Indian (Punjabi).</td>
<td>Fairfield City is located in Sydney's south-western suburbs, about 32 kilometres from Sydney City. Fairfield Local Government Area (LGA) covers an area of some 104 square kilometres, incorporating 27 suburbs, including Fairfield and Cabramatta which are a hive of activity most days, and semi-rural suburbs such as Horsley Park where there are working farms and bushland. The Fairfield LGA is one of the most culturally diverse cities in Australia with more than half of all residents having been born overseas, 50% in non-English speaking countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Offenders

Fairfield Office manages between 580 and 630 offenders per month.

Approximately 15% of the caseload is of South East Asian origin, mostly Vietnamese. There are approximately 120 offenders on the caseload who identify as ATSI.
Overview of Standards and KPIs

The Standards for Community Operations (the ‘Standards’) and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were first developed in 2012 to assist managers and staff to enhance quality service delivery to offenders in the community. They also form the basis for assessment during reviews undertaken by the Operational Performance Review Branch.

Standards and KPIs are grouped into six key areas, including Assessment and Planning, Supervision, Reports, Community Service Work, Administration and Record Keeping, and Office Management.

The Standards are outcome focused and are intended to assist staff in moving away from process driven work practices to a culture of contemplating why they are performing a task, and what they are trying to achieve. The Standards have been developed to allow scope for personal work practices and professional judgement and do not generally provide a prescriptive framework for offender management. In some areas such prescription may however be given within policy.

Below is an overview of the Standards and KPIs relating to information verification and order compliance. The full Standards documents provide more detail, and can be found online via the Community Corrections homepage.

It is particularly important to emphasise that verification is relevant to all goals of supervision, not just compliance. Contact with third parties will often serve a dual purpose of confirming information provided by the offender as well as engaging other parties who may be able to assist the offender and more effectively implement the case plan. The Standard below must be viewed in the context of the full suite of supervision standards, as supervision focused only on compliance is not effective in reducing re-offending.

2.4 Order Compliance

Outcome
The offender’s compliance with conditions of the supervision order is monitored and verified, and court/releasing authorities notified promptly of any no-compliance and / or significant events

Benefits
- Sentencing authorities have an expectation that offenders will comply with the conditions of their legal orders, and that non-compliance will result in prompt notification.
- Offenders understand the ramifications of non-compliance with their legal order.
- Knowing that information will be verified by other sources, may dissuade offenders from providing false or misleading information.
- Verification of information provided by an offender is essential for maintaining the credibility and integrity of supervision.

Risks
- Significant non-compliance of the offender remains undetected and un-actioned, placing the community and CSNSW at risk.
- The administration of the order fails to comply with the expectations of the courts/releasing authorities and the community.
- Failure to enforce order compliance may lead the offender to develop a poor impression of the seriousness of the order and continue to engage in non-compliant behaviour.

Standards
2.4.S.1.1 Monitoring of the offender’s compliance or non-compliance with an order is based on verified information.

KPIs
2.2.K.1.4 All offender and 3rd party contact occurs within supervision guidelines.
**SMS technology**
SMS texting to contact offenders has been used at a small number of locations, having been first piloted at the then Newtown District Office some years ago. The web based technology used to facilitate the SMS allows for text messages to be scheduled and then automatically sent out to either individuals or groups, allowing application such as sending reminders for programs, community service work and attendance at appointments. The project was recently resurrected and it was agreed by all Community Corrections Directors to roll out a state wide implementation. It is hoped that this will assist in improving attendance rates by offenders, reducing the amount of time spent chasing offenders and writing breach reports. Training in the use of the system will be delivered locally, and further information will be issued in the near future. In the first instance priority should be given to using the system for offender programs, due to falling attendance rates across the state.

**Additional staffing**
As a result of increasing inmate numbers, temporary funding has recently been approved for CSNSW to manage the growth. This has included Community Corrections, both in relation to parole unit workload and flow on effects to the community. 10 additional positions are being created including Community Corrections Officers, Unit Leaders and an Administrative Assistant. These positions are being allocated to locations identified as in highest need, with relief officer funds continuing to be used to finance temporary support via additional case managers in other locations.

**New research project – input sought from staff**
The current body of research on vocational and educational programs for offenders is limited and does not tend to show conclusive results. Corporate Research, Evaluation and Statistics (CRES) are about to commence a study to look at the impact of vocational training in custody on offenders released to parole in NSW. In addition to statistical analysis of factors such as reoffending, the project will include in depth interviews with offenders and their supervising officers around the integration of custodial training programs with post release supervision and employment opportunities. The research officer undertaking the study, Kym Lindeman, will be in contact with a number of staff who supervise offenders identified for inclusion in the treatment group. Staff are encouraged to participate in the study in order to assist in building up a better picture of the strengths and challenges surrounding post release employment for parolees.

**New Legislation**

**Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Amendment (Classification and Placement) Regulation 2015**
Commenced on 13 February 2015. Clarified that classification, placement, and case plan decisions take place in that order and that the only purpose of classification is security, and introduced a requirement that consideration be given to whether the inmate is likely to be removed from Australia when making a classification decision.

**Crimes (High Risk Offenders) Amendment Act 2014**
Commenced 7 January 2015. Included a number of amendments such as increasing the maximum penalty for breach to 5 years, establishment of a High Risk Offenders Assessment Committee, and creation of Emergency Detention Orders which provide up to 5 days imprisonment without breach, on application to the Supreme Court.

**Recent Memoranda**

- 2015/01 Introduction of new electronic monitoring equipment
- 2015/02 New breach of parole report templates
- 2015/03 Invitation for Senior Community Corrections Officer Intake
- 2015/04 Electronic monitoring of parolees
Initial Transitional Service

Background
Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW) provides funding to Non-Government Organisations (NGO’s) via the Funded Partnership Initiative (FPI) to deliver transitional support services to higher risk parolees in the community. The FPI is monitored and managed by the Partnerships and Community Engagement (PACE) unit. One of these services is the Initial Transitional Service (ITS) which started in October 2014 and is funded to 30 June 2017. The main objective of ITS is to decrease the risk of re-offending and increase the offenders’ capacity to reintegrate by having the NGOs working collaboratively with Community Corrections.

- Three NGOs service 14 Community Corrections offices across NSW – Salvation Army, arbias/Australian Community Support Organisation (ASCO) and CRC.
- ITS providers assist offenders in areas identified in the Community Corrections case plan.
- The supervising officer delegates tasks/areas of focus; coordinated case management is a key feature of ITS.
- The first 12 months particularly will involve constant feedback, reviewing and refinement of the ITS model.

ITS in action - Bathurst
- The ITS provider for Bathurst ComCorr is arbias. ITS is operating particularly well in Bathurst, with arbias successfully linking offenders with various supports and services in the local area.
- The ITS worker co-locates in the ComCorr office at least one day a week and his office is next door the rest of the time, enabling a highly collaborative and flexible approach
- Bathurst ComCorr covers the outlying areas of Mudgee and Oberon. The ITS worker has recently obtained access to a business vehicle and is now able to service these areas.
- Following the initial 12 week ITS period of support, several offenders have continued to receive additional support (not via ITS) directly through arbias, which enables more higher risk parolees to receive ITS.

Case Study – Paul*

Situation (S) Paul is an older Aboriginal man who received a back dated sentence and was released at short notice to court based parole. Paul has a long history of complex offending and transience and he had nowhere to go post release. Paul was released to temporary motel accommodation in the Bathurst area which was funded by Emergency Accommodation. When interviewed by his CCO on the day of his release Paul presented with mental health and gambling issues and was also in need of assistance with food and clothing.

Task (T) Paul’s CCO immediately identified the need for additional support. The referral was made on the online portal and arrangements made for the meeting with the ITS worker to occur immediately. Accommodation support and emotional personal (mental health) were identified as the key case plan issues for ITS focus.

Achievement (A) ITS met Paul and helped him obtain clothing and food parcels, as well as helping him fill a prescription for his mental health condition. Paul wanted to relocate to Moree Plains to live with family, so over the next two weeks, (in consultation with the supervising CCO) the ITS worker helped Paul make appropriate public transport arrangements for his relocation. The ITS worker also contacted several service providers in the new area to connect Paul with supports including housing, mental health and living skills.

Result (R) Paul was subject to a very short parole order and due to the ITS referral being made the ITS worker was able to provide support and address the needs identified in a timely manner. The critical issues were referral to ITS at the earliest point in the circumstances. Where more time is available, the parole unit can also flag ITS when arranging reporting with the community office.

Paul successfully completed his parole order. He had remained engaged with a community based mental health service, his mental health remained stable and his accommodation was stable.

*The offender's name has been changed.

For more information on ITS, emergency accommodation or other services under the FPI, go to the Community Corrections intranet site, and select Partnerships and Community Engagement Unit.
Probation and Parole Officers Association

The Probation and Parole Officers’ Association of New South Wales was established in 1975. An executive body is elected annually to champion the aims and objectives of the association which is to:

- Deal as a representative body, at appropriate levels with matters of concern and interest
- Participate and facilitate the exchange of information and ideas around community offender management and other Australian states and international jurisdictions
- Publish all material for circulation amongst members
- Increase knowledge and theory of the methods of Probation and Parole within the correctional sphere
- Increase public awareness of the scope and content of Probation and Parole practices
- Liaise with relevant bodies and individuals in the interests of the Association and Probation and Parole

This year the Association turns 40 and to mark the occasion the executive are planning an event to celebrate the milestone. The event will comprise of a Development Day on the Friday, including the AGM. The evening will see the annual awards presentation and celebratory dinner and entertainment.

Watch this space and lock the date in. 16 October 2015 at the Swissotel Sydney.

More information will be uploaded to the www.ppoansw.com.au web page and the Facebook page and all members will be directly emailed with information such as cost and event options as it becomes available.

The 2014 Development Day lectures are now online and are available to view under Videos at the bottom of the www.ppoansw.com.au home page. These include presentations by David Tait, Jason Hainsworth, Karl Roberts and Robert Cosman on topics including stalking based violence, directions for Community Corrections, mandatory sentencing, and parole.

These videos are a great resource and can be accessed by all Community Corrections staff.

For more details please visit www.ppoansw.com.au, and follow us on Facebook for updates.

Public Service Association

On 27 March 2015 the Community Corrections (Vocational Branch) Advisory Group held its 2015 Annual General Meeting, for the first time at Unions NSW in Parramatta. A number of Community Corrections staff attended as well as representatives from Sydney Credit Union and Wage Cover. Two new delegates were elected at the meeting: Alan Perry and Ross Bambrick. At the meeting the Chair, Carmen A. Wells, provided members with an outline of what has occurred over the prior 12 months in relation to industrial matters within CSNSW.

Currently the CC(VB)AG is working with CSNSW on a range of issues including Home Detention / Extended Supervision Order workload and service delivery standards, and a re-visit of general workload issues such as unit leader workload and accounting of manually recorded hours. The CC(VB)AG look forward to working with CSNSW over the next 12 months to address some of the ‘big ticket’ items that affect the membership on a wider scale. Members are reminded that the CC(VG)AB is always available to provide advice where appropriate in respect of individual matters. Please contact Secretary Ben Gilles at Bathurst Community Corrections for a comprehensive contact list of delegates in your area.
## Community Corrections Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>(02) 6058-8100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armidale</td>
<td>(02) 6772-2073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>(02) 9707-2144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batemans Bay</td>
<td>(02) 4472-4987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>(02) 6332-2737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bega</td>
<td>(02) 6492-3144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>(02) 9854-5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourke</td>
<td>(02) 6870-8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowral</td>
<td>(02) 4861-3777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Hill</td>
<td>(08) 8082-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwood</td>
<td>(02) 8775-4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
<td>(02) 8796 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>(02) 6662-4311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td>(02) 4991-1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>(02) 9265-7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City - court duty</td>
<td>9287-7118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffs Harbour</td>
<td>(02) 6652-6933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooma</td>
<td>(02) 6452-1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coonamble</td>
<td>(02) 6822-1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Why</td>
<td>(02) 9982-7266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbo</td>
<td>(02) 6883-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>(02) 8717-4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>(02) 6851-9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Innes</td>
<td>(02) 6732-2644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosford</td>
<td>(02) 4324-3744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>(02) 4824-2299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>(02) 6643-2585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>(02) 6964-2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnedah</td>
<td>(02) 6742-5220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>(02) 9479-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurstville</td>
<td>(02) 9579-6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverell</td>
<td>(02) 6721-0309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>(02) 6561-3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Macquarie</td>
<td>(02) 4956-5533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>(02) 9508-2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>(02) 6623-7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithgow</td>
<td>(02) 6352-1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>(02) 9612-0800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Bay Parole Unit</td>
<td>9289-2172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland</td>
<td>(02) 4933-4333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moree</td>
<td>(02) 6750-7800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Druitt</td>
<td>(02) 8886-6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muswellbrook</td>
<td>(02) 6549-0600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>(02) 4918-7998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowra</td>
<td>(02) 4424-6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>(02) 6361-4666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>(02) 9685-2666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>(02) 4777-8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Macquarie</td>
<td>(02) 6583-6677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queanbeyan</td>
<td>(02) 6229-7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater</td>
<td>(02) 9289-5945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>(02) 9521-3544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>(02) 6763-3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taree</td>
<td>(02) 6552-7599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumut</td>
<td>(02) 6947-4104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagga Wagga</td>
<td>(02) 6932-7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>(02) 6845-4311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>(02) 4571-6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>(02) 4267-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyong</td>
<td>(02) 4355-7700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>(02) 6382-3599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>(02) 9804-5444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balund-A</td>
<td>(02) 6660-8600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td><a href="mailto:child.protection@dcs.nsw.gov.au">child.protection@dcs.nsw.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO team</td>
<td>(02) 9854-5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC&amp;T helpdesk</td>
<td>(02) 8346-1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miruma</td>
<td>(02) 4993-2212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunyara COSP</td>
<td>(02) 9289-2950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRB (Standards/KPIs)</td>
<td>(02) 8346 1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
<td><a href="mailto:comcor.policy@dcs.nsw.gov.au">comcor.policy@dcs.nsw.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Disabilities</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sds@dcs.nsw.gov.au">sds@dcs.nsw.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>1300 363 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:StaffSupport@dcs.nsw.gov.au">StaffSupport@dcs.nsw.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## General inquiries:

communitycorrections@dcs.nsw.gov.au