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Preface

My statement presents evidence about Prison Officer Training as it has developed and currently exists in the New South Wales Department of Corrective Services and addresses Primary Training, In-service Training and special issues related to Training. The statement is complementary to the statements presented by Mr. D. Grant, Deputy Chairman, Corrective Services Commission of New South Wales and Mr. P.W. Crossley, Chief Administrative Officer, New South Wales Department of Corrective Services.

Through an historical analysis of the Training provided for Custodial Staff and through an analysis of specific related issues, I aim in this statement to:

a) demonstrate the difficulties that have characterized Training for Custodial Staff,

b) explain the relationship between the lack of a clear definition of the role of Prison Officers and the difficulties in providing appropriate Training,

c) draw attention to the apparently haphazard and unsystematic changes that have occurred in Training (changes that have been made without taking proper consideration of the demands of the job for which Trainees are being prepared); and

d) argue the need to develop a Training System directly linked to the preferred prison management model, to the role of the Prison Officer implied by the model and to the operational skills and attitudes required to perform the role.
In preparing this statement, personnel who have been involved in Training (including key officers who are no longer with the Department) have been consulted and their advice has been included. Documents related to Training Policy and Training Programmes, relevant sections of annual reports, and position papers prepared by consultants have been studied. Some of these documents have been submitted as exhibits while extracts from others have been included in the volume of appendices.

The interpretations and conclusions I present in this statement have been accepted by the Corrective Services Commission.
Overview

Formal Pre-service Training for Prison Officers in New South Wales has existed for thirty years. In-service Training related to promotion has been evident for a slightly shorter period. In relation to both pre-service and In-service Training, it is reasonable to expect that the Training Programmes would be systematically derived from a careful analysis of the tasks to be undertaken, the attitudes to be displayed, the management practices expected and endorsed, and changes planned. It is also reasonable to expect that the Training System would be designed to allow for the automatic review and adaptation of the programmes to respond to changes in legislation, changes in prison population characteristics and changes in Government and Departmental policy.

One of the indisputable characteristics of Prison Officer Training in New South Wales, however, has been, that at no stage in the thirty years has there been such an analysis nor has the Training System been moulded to allow for systematic, reactive or pro-active review and adaptation. These fundamental deficiencies have ensured that any relationship between the demands of the job and the content of Training has been completely accidental; that institutional staff have been left to interpret expectations for their performance by a trial and error process; and that critical developments in policy and management have at worst been ignored and at best been misinterpreted.

A second characteristic has been that throughout the thirty years distinctions among Education, Training and Development have been overlooked. The terms have often been used interchangeably and, as a result, no clear policies have been shaped to acknowledge or reject the Department's responsibility for any or all of these three, distinct processes.

A third characteristic has been the development of a sub-set of Training Programmes or special operations. Never included in the mainstream of Training, these special programmes and special trainers have acquired an aura of mystery, have escaped any professional scrutiny and have
contributed to the development of "elite" groups. This development has produced a range of critical problems. For instance, the scope of the Prison Officer's role has been reduced by the assignment of particular skills to small groups of officers. In addition, the "elite" groups have suffered by being branded by their colleagues as lacking in genuine, on-the-ground, in-the-gaol experience.

The composite effect of all these characteristics has been the production of a Training System that is diffuse, open to whimsical change and lacking in value as it is viewed as peripheral rather than central and essential to the provision of an informed, competent and professional workforce.

Development of new prison management and of an enriched career for Prison Officers will only succeed if a systematic and comprehensive training system is developed, based on a careful analysis of the occupation and of the competencies and attitudes required to succeed in the occupation. Such a system will also need to be dynamic so that review and appropriate adaptations can occur.
Section 1 – Historical Background

a) Pre 1958

Prior to 1958 there was no formal Pre-service Training for newly employed prison personnel. A new officer, if fortunate, was allowed one or two days of prison orientation before being placed on a post within an institution. However, most officers of that time report that it was common to arrive at an institution on the first day, be given a set of keys and then be pointed towards a post without further introduction. Officers were issued with *A Manual for Staff Instruction and Guidance – July 1958* (Ref. 1). The contents of the Manual became the subject of a written examination to be completed sometime during the first year of an officer’s service. The examination, known as the Probationary Prison Officers Examination, covered all aspects of prison operations including the rules and regulations governing prisoner behaviour. It is interesting to note that the Prison Officer of that day was instructed in the highly technical "art" of analysing and taking prisoner’s fingerprints. It is also interesting to note that the Manual clearly stated that officers should not speak, unnecessarily, to prisoners. The information contained within the Manual is concrete and gives the firm impression of a prison system that was very strictly and mechanically controlled.

Senior and Chief Wardens received promotion by way of an officially sanctioned seniority system. Preparation for promotion was done via an examination. Successful completion of the promotional examinations established the officer’s credentials for moving to the next rank. However, it was often years after successful completion of the examination that promotion actually occurred. It was not uncommon for officers to wait five or six years after completing the examination to achieve the rank for which the examination represented essential knowledge. Officers who succeeded in passing the Senior and Chief examinations were acknowledged by the addition of one (Senior) or two (Chief) stars on the shoulder of the uniform.
This period of history was characterised by very strict regimes in the prisons. Prisoners were regarded as having few rights and the opportunity for winning privileges was indeed limited. Training therefore was not regarded as being important. The tight controls within the prisons determined the behaviour of both staff and inmates. The Department itself was small and highly structured. It appears to have had quite a stable workforce and this, coupled with the strict adherence to promotion based on seniority, meant that officers spent many years accumulating experience at each level of rank before progression to the next.

Overview: The prison system in the period up to 1958 was strictly controlled; officers were largely "untrained" in any formal sense; promotion by seniority was the practice; progression through the rank structure was slow; and all operational information was clearly stated in the Manual for Staff Instruction and Guidance.

b) 1958 - 1968

In 1958 the first formal Pre-service Training for Prison Officers was introduced at the insistence of the Public Service Board. According to the Annual Report of 1960, the purpose of this four week, full-time residential pre-service course was "to sharpen up the recruit's physical and mental alertness and to give him an insight into the objectives of the prison system and the methods by which they are achieved." (Ref. 2)

The Public Service Board helped the Department to arrange for personnel from the Education Department to provide instruction for newly appointed officers and to conduct structured Training Courses for in-service officers. At the same time, the Department appointed its first Custodial Training Officer, Senior Prison Officer, Jack Jones. Mr. Jones was responsible to Mr. J.H.J. Collins who had previously been the Supervisor of Education (for prisoners) and was at the time an Inspector of Schools.
The four week pre-service course was developed from the Manual for Staff Instruction and Guidance 1958, with the addition of refresher English and Mathematics and a component of Physical Education. It is reported that Training Officer Jones was known for his physical fitness and ability to instruct others in this area. It could be assumed that Mr. Collins was instrumental in placing English and Mathematics instruction within the programme. It is reasonable to assume that, given his Department of Education background, he would have placed importance on the improvement of Prison Officers' general education levels.

There is little evidence that the four week programme was much more than a theoretical treatment of prison practice. However, the Comptroller General stated in 1958 that... "the effect of pre-training is gradually becoming apparent and as the pattern permeates the institutions, I believe that this will have been one of the great advancements in the Department." (Ref. 3)

By 1960 the Pre-service Training Courses had been expanded to six weeks to include two weeks of more practical content. In addition to the previous course content, new officers were given information on the historical background of prisons and a subject entitled "Mechanism Explanatory and Human Behaviour." (Ref. 4)

There was a chronic shortage of staff in 1960 so a number of pre-service courses were conducted one after the other. Of the 127 officers who were trained during that period, 112 qualified and were placed in the institutions. (Ref. 5)

The purpose of the 1960 course was described as "both to assist in the functional activities and to broaden the horizons of men engaged in the day to day coping with the multiplicity of problems within the penal institutions." (Ref. 6) The Mr. Collins referred to above was credited with having introduced the course before his death. He was
replaced by another Education Department Officer, Mr. F.J. Brown whose brief was to continue the development of Prison Officer Training. (Ref. 7)

At the same time, a Senior Wardens Course was introduced on the basis of four one hour lectures per week for fifteen consecutive weeks. Officers were required to submit a thesis as well as pass an examination at the end of this course of study. The content included such topics as Prison Management, Penalogical Developments, Prison Accounts and Calculations and Principles of Government. (Ref. 8)

No other in-service courses existed for Prison Officers until 1961 when a Chief Wardens Course was established on a two week residential basis. This course, completed by examination, became a pre-requisite for promotion to the executive ranks.

At the end of 1961, the Director of Training, Mr. F.J. Brown returned to the Education Department to be replaced by Mr. R.D. Brill also of that Department. (Ref. 9)

In 1962 the Public Service Board approved a proposal to divide the initial six weeks training period into two separate Training segments. Officers were trained for two weeks prior to entering on duty and were "called back" for another four weeks sometime prior to confirmation of appointment — usually within the first nine to twelve months of service. This change was made primarily to overcome the perceived lack of gaol experience. It would appear that gaol experience was now regarded as an appropriate basis for instruction in the practical and theoretical aspects of the Prison Officer's job.

It was also in 1962 that the Senior Wardens Course became a two week full time residential programme in which officers from various institutions were able to study together. A qualifying examination for admission to this course was taken by officers in their own time with study assistance provided by the Training Unit. The content of the course did not change. (Ref. 10)
The Chief Wardens Course was introduced along similar lines but its content was more advanced and included supervision and basic psychology and "other subjects which bear directly upon the officer/prisoner relationship." (Ref. 11)

In support of these developments, the Annual Report of 1962 states: "Prison work is a unique occupation in that there is no generally accepted course which would qualify a person in the skill of prison management". (Ref. 12) The Report goes on to state that while there may have been some scepticism about the Department's ability to develop Training Courses to meet its own needs, "It is gratifying to record that participation in the courses has created an atmosphere in which training has become fully acceptable to the staff and the result of this acceptance must become increasingly beneficial as the years pass." (Ref. 13)

There was little change to the format and content for formal Prison Officer Training Courses between 1962 and 1968. It is reported that in 1963-64 special courses were offered to officers in Effective Reading and Study Skills and in Physical Education. (Ref. 14) A major development in 1968 was the establishment of a Board of Studies "to examine and determine the training course content in the light of contemporary needs and the varying stages of the officers' development". (Ref. 15) This may have been the first organised attempt to establish appropriate and sound Training for officers. The Board of Studies continued to operate until 1971.

Overview

During this period the first formal Pre-service and In-service Training Programmes were established. The prison system remained essentially the same as before and it appears that few fundamental shifts in policy or philosophy were introduced as far as management of prisons or prisoners were concerned. The seniority system of promotion was still strictly enforced and progression was relatively slow. The major change in policy towards giving pre-service and
in-service officers formal Training did not necessarily mean that the training was valued by all staff in the Department. In fact it could be said that longer serving officers were somewhat disadvantaged and therefore less than supportive of the new Training initiatives. This conclusion is drawn primarily from the fact that the number of officers passing the admission examination for the Senior Wardens Course was significantly less than the number of officers who sat for the examination. In 1965 it is reported that of the 15 officers who sat the admission examination only five officers were accepted into the course. (Ref. 16) This may have created a general feeling of discontent and suspicion about Training in general and the Senior Wardens courses in particular, in the minds of some of the more experienced officers.

c) 1968-1978

As pointed out in the previous section, the Public Service Board had approved in 1962 of the Primary Training Course being split into two sections: two weeks of Training prior to assignment to a prison; and four weeks of Training after some continuous work in a prison, usually before the end of the first year of service. These two Training segments became known as the "A" School (the two week segment) and the "B" school (the four week segment). In 1969-70, a further reorganisation occurred and each of the "A" and "B" Schools became a three week segment. (Ref. 17)

The reorganised "A" School now included two weeks of classroom instruction and one week of supervised on-the-job Training. (Ref. 17.a.) The reorganised "B" School included a pre-course assignment, an in-course assignment, classroom instruction and a final examination. The pre-course assignment was related to the work experience officers had acquired during their nine to twelve month prison placements and the "B" School contained no on-the-job component because of the work experience already acquired. (Ref. 18)
The Board of Studies, established in 1967, continued to meet as required but its brief appears to have been reduced to the consideration of policy and not the determination of content. After 1971, references to the Board of Studies disappear from Departmental Annual Reports altogether.

A significant development for Prison Officer Training came in late 1970 with the establishment of a Training Unit in the Long Bay Complex. This facility was used for Prison Officer Training as well as for Probation and Parole Officer Training. (Ref. 19)

A review was commenced by the Training Staff in 1971. The object of the review was to evaluate the Training Programmes for their "relevance and effectiveness" (Ref. 20). It is stated that, as a result of this review, modifications were made "to ensure the maximal provision of skilled personnel" (Ref. 21). It has not been possible to determine how this review and the subsequent modifications were carried out. Certainly it does not appear that the Department had available to it personnel qualified to conduct scientific analysis, evaluation or research (least of all within the curriculum analysis/evaluation field). Thus, in the absence of any detailed records about the review, it seems reasonable to assume that the decisions made about Training content, format and evaluation arose from the value judgements of the Training Staff rather than from objective analysis.

During this period, it appears that the most significant characteristic in relation to Staff Development opportunities for officers was the availability of scholarships from the Public Service Board for staff to undertake tertiary level studies at Mitchell College of Advanced Education. However, the 1970-71 Annual Report of the Department records that only two Prison Officers were enrolled in the courses.
A complication for Training that occurred in 1970, was the publication of the *Manual of General Information - Custodial Division*. (Ref. 22) Included in the Manual were the Prisons Act 1952-68 and the rules and regulations made thereunder; summaries of other pieces of legislation affecting the work of Prison Officers; and "instructions in greater or less detail to cover the situations arising from the day-to-day operations of the prison" (Ref. 23). This document was issued by the Commissioner of the time, Mr. W. McGeechan, and was intended to replace the earlier *Manual for Staff Instruction and Guidance - 1956*. However, the earlier Manual was never formally terminated and the complication for Training Staff and Trainees was that the two sets of often competing instructions and directions were followed within the prisons. The decision about which one, or which part of which one, was to be followed in each institution appears to have been made by individual Superintendent's choice. This situation was noted in the Nagle Royal Commission Report (Ref. 24), where criticism is expressed about the confusion and conflict that resulted.

Such confusion and conflict made the dichotomy between the 1956 and 1970 Manuals impossible to reconcile within a Training context. Trained under the 1970 Manual, officers often worked in situations where the 1956 Manual took precedence and this led to lack of confidence in the relevance of the Training Programme. Such lack of confidence in the relevance of the Training Programme has continued to plague Trainers and is symptomatic of the ambiguity and general lack of clarity about what constitutes the role of a Prison Officer.

Between 1970 and 1974, in-service courses for Seniors and Chiefs were lengthened to three weeks. The course content appears to have remained essentially the same in scope but perhaps extended in depth of treatment. (Ref. 24.a. and 24.b.)
Although one can make few judgements about any increase in the quality of Training during this period, statistics quoted in the Annual Reports for these years indicate an increase in the quantity of officers receiving and completing Primary and Promotional Training. It would appear from the available statistics that in this period (1970-74):

- 751 Officers passed through the "A" School
- 467 Officers passed through the "B" School
- 182 Officers attended and passed the Senior Wardens Course
- 139 Officers completed the Chief Wardens Course

Quantity seems to have been a primary measure of success during this period as little more than a numerical breakdown is included in the Annual Report presentation for these years.

A noteworthy development during this time appears to have been an effort to augment the Pre-service and In-service Training provided within the Department by making external Training Courses and Workshops available to Prison Officers. For instance, twenty-five officers were released to attend a two day seminar on "Emergency Situations - Prevention and Control of Disturbances" at the University of New South Wales in 1971; and one Superintendent was sponsored to attend the Sixth National Conference of the Australian Crime Prevention, Correction and Aftercare Council. (Ref. 25) However, the pattern changed shortly thereafter, with such opportunities being made available more and more to non-uniformed staff and less and less to Prison Officers.

A similar pattern emerged in opportunities for tertiary studies. In 1973, there were twenty-eight Departmental Officers enrolled in tertiary studies via the Public Service Board’s scholarship and traineeship schemes. Of these, only three were Prison Officers, all of whom were enrolled in the Diploma of Criminology at Sydney.
University (Ref. 26). Custodial Officers who were studying at that time have described the difficulties they experienced in arranging their working schedules to fit with the demands of a tertiary study course. Although there was a suggestion that tertiary qualifications would be highly valued by the Department in filling promotional positions within the executive ranks, the practical support given to officers to undertake external, tertiary studies was negligible. It was not until 1977 that Prison Officers were able to take advantage of the Public Service Board Study Time provisions.

The Department did, in 1974, attempt to establish an Executive Development Course in conjunction with the Public Service Board’s Personnel Assessment Centre. Unfortunately, the selection processes and planned course activities were never implemented. (Ref. 27)

The turmoil that existed within the prison system at this time is well known and thoroughly documented in other places. However, it is important to examine how this turmoil affected or was reflected in the Training Programme. In 1973, Judge W.J. Lewer was appointed to conduct an industrial inquiry into an incident at the Long Bay Complex of Prisons during which some prisoners had been injured. An industrial dispute followed. Part of Judge Lewer’s report (Ref. 28) put the spotlight on a major dilemma in Training: the development of Training Programmes based a properly defined and analysed set of behaviours required for successful job performance; and the number and quality of officers recruited into the Service. He recommended that the training of Prison Officers be reappraised taking heed of these potentially conflicting issues.

The Minister of the day, commenting on the Lewer Report stated that "the content of courses depends entirely on the quality and type of person attracted to the Department". He also commented that "...more important is to identify the personal qualities and characteristics which are ideal in the Prison Officer". (Ref. 29) The formal recognition of the need for such analysis, clearly stated in this Report of 1973, has not yet been translated into action.
Another point worthy of note during this difficult and disturbed period in the Department's history was the decentralization of Prison Officer Training in 1974 (the same year as the burning of Bathurst Gaol). Regional Training Centres were established at Long Bay, Silverwater, Goulburn and Cessnock. Each Regional Centre was under the control of a Regional Training Officer (Principal Prison Officer rank). (Ref. 30)

The Deputy Commissioner of this period (1971-78), Mr. W. Weston, reports that the creation of the Regional Training Centres was accompanied by a proposal to extend the Pre-service Training Courses (then six weeks) to an eighteen month Training Programme, thus replacing the existing "A" and "B" Schools. The extended programme was to include a staged progression through the security levels of institutions with formal on-the-job Training segments at each point. Also implicit in this proposal was the concept of accelerated progression through the rank structure and direct placement into institutions most suitable to the Trainees. The proposal failed to see the light of day because of the problems it would have caused in staffing and rostering and because of the overwhelming financial and industrial implications.

The motivation to find a way of improving the Training of Prison Officers at this time appears to have been a reaction to the Bathurst riots and some other major incidents indicative of an uneasy prison system.

In July of 1976 a new approach to Prison Officer Training was implemented. The previous "A" and "B" Schools were replaced with a twelve week Training Programme. (Ref. 31) For the first time trained Prison Officers were exposed to structured content in the areas of Human Relations, Criminology and Sociology. The programme included four weeks of rostered duty as an on-the-job Training component. This component of the Training Programme was later changed at Union insistence to give Trainees supernumerary status in the institutions.
Treatment of Training issues in the Royal Commission Report caused consternation in the Department. As has been pointed out, significant changes to the length and content of Primary Training had been introduced prior to the appointment of the Royal Commission. However, criticisms within the Report and the fact that the primary witness called on Prison Officer Training had ceased to be responsible for it one year earlier, have caused those associated with Training at the time to assess the Report as being inaccurate and unfair. Certainly it may be justifiable to claim that the criticism was not based on any objective evaluation or analysis. However, it would also be justifiable to state that the changes that had been introduced and which were perhaps overlooked by the Royal Commission were not based on objective evaluation and analysis either.

What is indisputable is that changes had occurred in content, format and length of programme. It is also indisputable that these changes were conceived as a response to the turmoil within the prison system in the early 1970's. The positive attributes of the new twelve-week programme included an increase in the number of hours devoted to Human Relations (12 hours vs 7 hours in the earlier programme); the introduction of sessions on Sociology and Criminology; the introduction of accredited courses in Life-sustaining Procedures; and the opportunity provided in this longer programme for Training Staff to closely assess the suitability of Trainees for the demands of the Prison Officer role.

The actual structure of the revised Training Programme, already in place when the Royal Commission commenced, was remarkably similar to that proposed by Justice Nagle in the final Report of the Royal Commission. Justice Nagle suggested a breakdown of four weeks theory, four weeks on-the-job Training and four weeks theory. The Programme in place at the time consisted of six weeks theory (including weapons), four weeks on-the-job and two weeks of theory.

There are two additional issues arising out of the Nagle recommendations that affected the state of Training in the Department.
at the time. Firstly, Justice Nagle commented negatively on the qualifications of the Regional Training Officers without specifying appropriate ones. This must have had a deleterious effect on the officers in those positions in terms of their commitment to the job and their ability to function effectively. As they had been performing the Training role for some two years before Nagle's findings were passed down, this experience would have been particularly demoralizing. Secondly, Justice Nagle recommended that all Prison Officers should be trained at the Malabar Training Unit. This may have seemed logical but failed to take account of the inadequacy of that facility for the Training Programme as it was structured. The wisdom of the suggestion that the Regional Training Structure be dismantled appears to have been equally questionable. The Regional Training Officers' duties included not only the provision of In-service Training for promotional purposes and some Primary Training, but also for the conduct of specific Staff Development Programmes in the prisons of the region and for directing officers towards appropriate tertiary studies. The Regional Training Centre Structure had in fact been the first tentative step towards a comprehensive and integrated Training and Development Service within the regions.

In May, 1977 the Public Service Board extended the provision of Study Time to General Division Officers. Thus, it then became possible for Prison Officers to undertake approved external courses of study at tertiary institutions without having to pursue qualifications in their own time at their own expense. This was a positive step in providing Prison Officers with the opportunity to develop their professional standing if they so desired.

Overview

The decade 1968 - 1978 was an important one. There was increased activity in the area of Training and Development. During this period a Board of Studies was established, a centralised Training facility was developed at Malabar, a Regional Training Unit Structure was
implemented and a twelve week Primary Training Programme was incorporated into the overall Training and Development package for Prison Officers. The Public Service Board agreed to extend Study Time provisions to Custodial Officers and the Nagle Royal Commission was established and submitted its Report on the New South Wales Prison System to the Government.

Promotion by seniority was still in force and only cosmetic changes occurred to the in-service promotional courses, i.e. Senior and Chiefs courses.

Ambiguity and confusion surrounding the existence of two rather different sets of operational references (i.e. 1956 Manual for Staff Instruction and Guidance, and the, 1970 Manual of General Information) began to take a toll on the preparation and Training of officers newly recruited to the Department as well as those who had been in the Department for some time.

During this period the Department was subject to all types of scrutiny from various sources. The political climate in New South Wales changed in 1976 and together with the riots of 1974, the Department and particularly Prison Officers were condemned for the ways in which prisoners were managed. The inevitable changes that were to flow from the Royal Commission were imposed upon a demoralized and resistant work force. The Training regime, because of its susceptibility to fluctuations in organizational focus and climate, was not geared to address the issues of morale. Prison Officers were not exposed to Training processes that could have assisted in the management of changed conditions within the prison system.

As many Prison Officers perceived it, the 1968-1978 decade closed with a feeling of general discontent because of an apparent shift in emphasis towards a prisoner controlled environment.
D) 1978-1988

On the basis of the Royal Commission's findings in relation to training, a Task Force was established in 1979 to advise the newly appointed Corrective Services Commission on Prison Officer Training. The members of the Task Force were:

Mr. Earle Turner - Staff Development - Health Commission
Mr. John Wellings - Board of Adult Education
Mr. Daryl Douglas - University of Sydney
Mr. Kurt Kaszony - Chief Staff Development Officer - Corrective Services

The Task Force completed its deliberations in a month and submitted some twenty-seven recommendations for consideration by the Commission. The Task Force Report (Ref. 32) described the future direction of Prison Officer Training and Development. Amongst other things, the Report identified the need to place Training and Development personnel within institutions. An emphasis on ensuring that Training Staff were fully trained and skilled to operate in a Training role was given particular attention throughout the Report. The Task Force also found that the existing Training Programmes were not educationally sound and required restructuring. This comment was made in relation to both the pre-service and in-service programmes. It also recommended that additional courses be provided for Prison Officers in inter-personal skills. The Training facility at Malabar was severely criticised and described as being totally inadequate.

The Department, acting on the advice of the Task Force, re-affirmed the Regional Training Officers' positions and added responsibility for Staff Development together with a reduced face-to-face Training role. Despite the regional focus of Training, the majority of Training activity took place at the Malabar Training Unit and at the newly acquired space at the Goulburn College of Advanced Education.
The Task Force advocated a revised Training schedule to cater for a series of recall weeks of Training during the probationary period. This new Training format involved an initial nine weeks of Training followed by a week of Weapons Training and First Aid at week 19; an Institution Procedures Module at week 25; an Escort Procedures Module at week 41; and finally a Weapons Training and Security Module at week 56. Underlying the Task Force's recommendations was the belief that the Primary Training of Prison Officers should take place over the first year of service in the Department.

At the same time as these changes to the Programme were occurring, the Malabar Training facility was closed for renovation and Sydney-based Training was moved to premises in Foster Street leased by the Department. The Foster Street facility was totally inappropriate in terms of its capacity and its distance from the institutions where the structured on-the-job Training component was being conducted. At one stage, a Trainee Prison Officer could expect to undertake the first twelve weeks of Training at Foster Street in a building where Training rooms had been developed by converting office space. All of this was later changed to involve Trainees in an induction week at Roden Cutler House followed by weeks two to nine at Goulburn College of Advanced Education, two weeks on-the-job Training at the Gaol of employment and recall weeks 25, 26, 45 and 46 at Goulburn.

In-service courses were also undergoing major changes at this time. The three week Senior and Chiefs Courses were replaced by seven one week Modules (Modules Four to Ten) and a new requirement for promotion to First Class Prison Officer was introduced via Modules One, Two and Three. Modular Courses One to Seven were conducted at either Foster Street or the Regional Training Units. Modular Courses Eight to Ten were conducted only at the Goulburn College of Advanced Education.

The new Training Programme structure recommended by the Task Force placed considerable pressure on the Department's physical resources. It was stated that "the facilities existing at Malabar and Foster..."
Street would not be sufficient for this purpose (Pre-service and In-service Programmes). The location of the facility at Foster Street does not provide adequate infra-structure to support the proposed programme. In addition, classroom size and the existing partitioning disallow separate courses to be conducted adjacent to each other. Aesthetically speaking, Foster Street is an appalling 'window' to this Department. (Ref. 33) These views, expressed by the Chief Staff Development Officer of the time, eventually resulted in the establishment of a semi-permanent Training facility at Goulburn College of Advanced Education. Between 1980 and 1982 most Primary or Pre-service Training was conducted at Goulburn. In-service courses (modules) were held at Foster Street or Goulburn.

During this period, the Commission encouraged the development of course content considered to be more appropriate to the needs of Trainees given the changing direction of the Department. For example, week nine of the Primary Training Programme was structured as a separate Module on issues in Human Behaviour. This Module, of one week's duration, covered areas such as Communication, Group Dynamics, Institutionalization, Aggression and Violence, Sexuality, Emotionally and Mentally Disturbed Inmates, Conflict Resolution, Ethnic Minorities, Assertiveness Training, Stress Management, and Equal Employment Opportunities. The components of this Course, while probably useful in their own right, were presented over one week in a Module that was placed outside the framework of the rest of the Training Programme. This Module was not subject to examination whereas material covered in the 'main' Training Programme was. The superficial coverage and the non-examinable nature of the material, meant that these components were not seen as important. (Ref. 34)

In 1980, the Department joined the rest of the Public Service in focusing on the latest advances in Human Resource Development. The Executive Development Programme was established and a proposal to create six custodial positions as Executive Assistants to Superintendents was discussed with the Public Service Board and the Public Service Association. (Ref. 35) At the same time, a new Staff
Appraisal system was implemented. It is interesting to note that these developments took place in almost complete isolation from each other and were not connected conceptually to the overall Training and Development function of the Department. Further comment regarding these programmes can be found in a later section of this document.

The Corrective Services Commission was moving rapidly to implement the recommendations of the Nagle Royal Commission in other areas as well. Within institutions major changes were taking place in prisoner management and prison operations generally. In the absence of an effective mechanism to manage change, officers were being required to perform new duties and functions in an environment characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity. The philosophy of imprisonment as the loss of liberty only was being manifested in the freedom of prisoners to move about institutions without physical barriers (e.g. gates).

In the past, prisoners had been confined to yards or workshops and Prison Officers were in total control of movement throughout the institutions. Quite the opposite was the case from 1980 onwards. Prison Officers on the ground were now expected to supervise prisoners who were not restricted to yards and who had access to them as well as to other prisoners. The vast majority of Prison Officers were not prepared for this new regime. Formal Training to support this change in working conditions was not made available to officers who had been working in the Department for some time. The only officers who may have been exposed to the new philosophy, through the content of week nine of the Primary Training Course, were those new to the Department and with the least power to have any influence. The problems described above were further exacerbated by extended hours out of cells for prisoners.

For the most part, changes to the Prison System were communicated to staff by way of Departmental circulars. Opportunities to debate or discuss the changes were certainly over-shadowed by the speed with which the Department moved ahead with the thrust of the Nagle Royal Commission Report. The pressures at work during this period
compounded the anxiety felt by officers who had previously been confident of the parameters of their jobs.

In 1982 the Training facilities at Goulburn College of Advanced Education were closed, primarily because of changes in the status of the College. The Department's use of Goulburn was terminated to make way for the establishment of the N.S.W. Police Academy. (Ref. 36) During the time that Prison Officer Training was conducted at Goulburn College of Advanced Education a number of custodial staff who possessed little if any Training experience or qualifications were introduced and expected to perform the highly skilled function of Training. With the exception of Weapon's Training Staff and the then Regional Training Officer, the Training staff were inexperienced. Most of the experienced Training staff were located a Foster Street at a time when Training activity in Sydney was being scaled down. Many years of experience in Training were not put to their optimal use in the area where the majority of Training was taking place.

Further, the facilities at Goulburn were subject to the priorities set by the administration of the Goulburn College of Advanced Education. In other words, the Department's Training operations were forced to 'fit into' the local arrangements of the College. In some instances this meant that Trainee Prison Officers were accommodated in less than satisfactory conditions (e.g. heating was turned off during College semester breaks even though a full Training Programme was in progress). In relation to the costs of the College, the Department was required to pay $75 per person per week for full board. Additional costs were incurred through travel expenses for both Training Staff and Trainees. Difficulties were experienced by Trainees forced to be separated from their families for an extended period. The disadvantages of the Goulburn location, the high cost of using the facility, and the impending transfer of the facility to the Police Department caused the Department to move to return Training to Long Bay.
Another pressure on the Training Programme during this period was the existence of two groups of officers in the Department, subject to different progression requirements. In January, 1982, the Department had Prison Officers who had commenced employment prior to 30th June, 1976, whose progression requirements were specified by the Public Service Act 1902, Regulation 279B. This Regulation provided for the completion of in-service courses prior to promotion. At the same time, Prison Officers employed on or after 1st July, 1976 were required to obtain tertiary qualifications to gain promotion. This was further complicated by the introduction in 1980 of progression requirements based on tertiary qualifications plus completion of the requisite in-service Modular courses. (Ref. 37)

This change caused the Training Unit to organize a range of Training events to cater for officers whose Primary Training experience varied down from twelve weeks to six weeks ("A" and "B" Schools). The content of the various courses had to be carefully managed to ensure that officers with limited exposure (i.e. six weeks programme, pre 1976) were not disadvantaged. In essence, the Training Unit was obliged to process the pre-1976 officers through the Modular courses as quickly as possible with the primary aim of getting rid of the old system of progression. Industrial requirements took precedence over the Training needs of officers. With the changed circumstances, demand for inclusion on Modular courses outstripped the ability of the Training Unit to provide courses. This, together with limitations on Training facilities, led to another change in 1982.

This change sent the Modular Course requirement for promotion to the next rank (i.e. pre-promotion requirement, to one of a post-promotion requirement). From 1982, it was no longer possible for officers who might expect promotion to be included on Modular courses. Course attendance was based exclusively on the attainment of the rank for which the courses were prescribed. Prior to this last change, officers who had commenced with the Department before 1976 and held certificates from the Senior and Chiefs Schools were able to enrol in the new Modular courses on a standby basis, which allowed them to
update their knowledge and skills. When this option was removed in 1982, many officers were cut off from any possible future In-service Development.

Once again in 1984, the progression requirements were changed to accommodate the removal of the Higher Grades barrier that had operated in the Public Service for many years. In addition, it was thought that a uniform system of In-service Training, not based upon date of entry into the Service, would be more in keeping with the requirements of the Public Service Board Policy. The Department indicated that the completion of specific Modular courses to attain promotion would not be required but that the completion of appropriate Modular courses would become desirable for promotion. Further, it was announced that upon promotion the required Modular courses for that rank would become compulsory and must be completed by the successful officer within twelve months of gaining the promotion. In effect, this meant that Modular courses were no longer essential for promotion but were essential for incremental purposes. It is interesting to note that this procedure remains in place today. (Ref. 38)

However, the progression system does not operate effectively for the following reasons:

1. Officers are receiving their increments without completion of the relevant Modular courses because of:

   a) the concentration of resources on Primary Training;

   b) the staff shortages inside the gaols;

   c) the overtime limitations imposed on Superintendents; and

   d) the absence of any Training component in the staffing formula.
2. Officers who have met previous requirements (i.e. before 1976), are not obliged to participate in any form of In-service Training.

A conclusion that may be drawn from this, is that vocationally based Training does not appear to be regarded as necessary for the efficient and effective functioning of the Department. In fact, the essential nature of Training in the Department is devalued and made redundant by its non-essentiality. Given that there is no objective, systematic process by which the Modular courses can be evaluated at this time (i.e. no Appraisal System based on Occupational Analysis), the desirability of the Modular courses for promotion and hence the contribution they may make to improving performance is questionable.

Between 1980 and 1984, the Department's response to the need for Officer Training and Development was subject to a number or reviews. These reviews almost inevitably led to changes in content and/or format and in some cases the actual location of Training. Once again, the changes that were made to Prison Officer Training were not based upon occupational analysis but rather on the beliefs of individuals acting in-committee. For the most part, the Review Committees were composed of officers concerned with Training and Development but who were not representative of the institution base of the organisation for which officers were being trained. (Ref. 39)

In 1983, a research project was initiated to investigate the effect of Training on the nature of Prison Officer/Prisoner relationships, to test whether Training could change the way this relationship was developed. Preliminary research findings indicated that discussions with Prison Officers found that some officers felt that there was a lack of communication and consistency between ranks and between officers of similar ranks. The end product of this inconsistency was manifested in the officer/prisoner interaction which included hostility and distancing. For example, some officers related instances where they (as Probationary Prison Officers) had handled situations according to the rules they had learned in Training. This course of action was then negated by a more senior officer and in some
cases an even higher ranking officer reversed that action. The result was confusion and a sense of helplessness. This phenomenon was labelled "learned helplessness". The research report concluded that, as one of three options, further research needed to be conducted into a needs analysis to better match Training with job needs. This option was not taken up as far as can be ascertained. (Ref. 40)

In October 1984, the Primary Training Programme was shortened by two weeks to address the problems being experienced in institutions by officers having to attend four recall weeks of Training during the probationary year. The initial block of Training was extended from nine weeks to ten weeks and the four weeks of recall was reduced to one week. This change was approved by the Chief Administrative Officer who had taken over responsibility for Prison Officer Training from the Commissioner.

While these and other changes were undoubtedly made for sound administrative reasons, the Training Unit found itself operating a "dual" system of Training yet again. Those officers who had commenced duty with the Department before the change was implemented were still required to complete four weeks of Recall Training. The Training Unit, then, was involved in providing course-work for these officers as well as for those who started their employment under the revised Training Programme.

During 1984, the Department undertook an intensified recruitment drive. This recruitment strategy included direct recruitment to both Bathurst and Goulburn Gaols. In order to meet the Primary Training schedule, the Department sought assistance from retired senior officers to deliver the Primary Training Programme at those locations. In the main, these officers were inexperienced in Training techniques and were placed in a situation where their prison based experience was the only background upon which they could draw. Despite opposition to the arrangement from the regular Training staff, the Department's concern to meet recruitment quotas became the overriding factor in the Training process. Unfortunately, the Department in achieving its
recruitment requirements, completely negated the importance of Training as a skilled and professional activity. As a consequence the Training received by officers in these direct placement programmes was devalued.

Late in 1984, some Primary Training was conducted at the Periodic Detention Centre facility at Merinda by qualified and experienced Training staff. Once again, the decentralization of Training was provided to meet the recruitment levels at the time. This arrangement existed for some nine months alongside the operation at the Malabar Training Unit.

In August 1984, the Department sought the services of an external consultant to "conduct an independent review of recruitment, selection, induction and Primary Training of N.S.W. Prison Officers". In April 1985 McCallum Consultants, the successful tenderers produced a report of this review (The McCallum Report tendered as Exhibit 96.) The major findings in relation to Training were:

1. That Training course content was only marginally relevant to the job of Prison Officers.

2. That Training had only a slight impact on preparing people for their actual prison role.

3. That Training reinforces the largely custodial basis of the Prison Officer's role.

4. That some Training course content was poorly presented and of little relevance to base-grade Prison Officers.

The McCallum Report made many important recommendations about the Primary Training of Prison Officers touching on:

a) The ongoing supervision of Trainees i.e. on-the-job Training.
b) The provision of Training Officers within institutions.

c) The Recall Training.

d) The funding of Training.

e) The location of Training.

f) Staffing levels.

g) Management structure.

Above all, the Report identified the importance of a Training Needs and Specific Task Analysis to be conducted. It also recommended the Training of Trainers and the provision of a Training Audit. The Report was confined to the review of Primary Training and did not contemplate the in-service and developmental components of an effective Training and Development System. (Ref. 41)

The Report did not generate any direct action. A point of interest as far as this current Inquiry is concerned is that the Report recommended, "A work value study be undertaken to review base salary levels of Prison Officers. Note, that merely raising salary levels without addressing other issues within this Report will only make superficial impact on recruitment and staff retention". (See Recommendation 3.7.8. para. 1).

Perhaps the only observable outcome of the McCallum Report was the acquisition in 1986, by the Department of a new site for Training. The site was obtained from the Department of Youth and Community Services whose use for the former Boys' Detention Centre at Daruk (near Windsor) had been declared superfluous. The Department took up occupation of the Windsor facility in late April 1986, but Training was not relocated until early December 1986. Within two weeks of the Training Unit's move to Windsor, the Public Service Association insisted that, as a result of a complaint from the Prison Officers'
Vocational Branch, the facility at Windsor was inadequate and should be abandoned pending cleaning, maintenance and renovations being undertaken.

Prior to the first move to Windsor, a Departmental working party was established to ensure that the transition from Malabar to Windsor was completed as smoothly as possible. The Committee indicated in its minutes that there were numerous issues to be resolved before any move to Windsor could be considered. However, despite the concerns expressed by the Committee, the move took place and, as indicated, became an industrial matter causing Training to be returned temporarily to Malabar. (Ref. 42)

Within two months of Training being relocated to Malabar, it was, once again, decided to move back to the Windsor facility. Although information available to the Commission suggested that the problems with the Windsor facility had been rectified, in fact because many of the problems identified by the P.O.V.B. had not been completely overcome, discontent with the facility continued through 1987. (Ref. 43)

During 1987, changes were made to the structure and content of the Primary and In-service Training Programmes. Consistent with earlier trends noted in this document, these changes were made without reference to any systematic, objective analysis of the Training needs of Prison Officers. The Primary Training Course was shortened from ten weeks to nine to allow for more frequent (three weekly) intakes of Trainees. The course content was changed to accommodate the interests and abilities of the available Trainers and to the isolated location (distant from prisons and from specialist staff who could otherwise have contributed).

A formal split occurred between the Staff Development Division and Prison Officer Training when Training commenced at Windsor. The physical distance between the two operations (Staff Development in the City and Prison Officer Training at Windsor) was formalized by having
the Director of Staff Development and the Superintendent of the Correctional Officers' College (as it was named) reporting separately and directly, first to the Chairman, later to the Deputy Chairman and from June, 1987, to the Commissioner. This formal split was intensified by the differences in philosophy and approach adopted by the Director, Staff Development and the Superintendent of the Correctional Officers' College.

Disruption to the Training Programme occurred during 1986/87, not only because of the separation between Development and Training, but also because of a high turnover of Training staff. Experienced staff, some of whom had been working in Prison Officer Training for years, transferred back into institutional work: some because of the personal difficulties daily travel to Windsor imposed; some because of their disapproval of the changes made to the Programme.

In July, 1987, as a result of staff discontent and concern expressed by Superintendents about the quality of officers graduating from the College, I established a Committee to review the staffing structure of the Correctional Officers' College. The findings and recommendations of this Committee were revealing but not surprising. The location of the College was raised as being fundamental to the staffing, management and course structure problems identified by the Committee. The Commission decided to close most of the Windsor facility and again relocate Prison Officer Training to Malabar. It was intended that this relocation would be for six months, during which time an alternative, more appropriate site would be sought or basic renovations would be undertaken at Windsor. The return to Malabar occurred in December, 1987. (Ref. 44)

The decision to seek an alternative site was based on the following considerations:

1. The College at Windsor had proved to be unsuitable because of its distant location relative to Head Office, the major Training
institutions at Parramatta, Parklea, Silverwater, Mulawa and Long Bay; and the distance required to be travelled by guest lecturers.

2. The facility is poorly serviced by public transport, an impediment to the recruitment of qualified staff and of Trainers.

3. The increased costs of travelling expenses for Trainees, Recall Officers and some College Staff became a growing concern.

4. The estimated cost to upgrade the Windsor facility to a standard acceptable to the Commission was extremely high.

5. The need to address critical issues raised by the College Staffing Review, including concerns about space, location, staff and curriculum.

The Training facility is presently in its original location at Malabar on a temporary basis. To accommodate this move, the Training Programme has, once again, been altered with the Commission's approval.

It was hoped that by June, 1988, final relocation would have been possible. Unfortunately, the search for a site, more appropriate than either Malabar or Windsor and one that will address the identified problems, continues and the June deadline is unlikely to be met.

The Corrective Services Commission is committed, not only to the provision of an adequate site for Prison Officer Training but also to the construction of a comprehensive Training and Development package for Prison Officers. The Commission recognises that such a package must be built on a systematic analysis of the work Prison Officers are required to undertake, must be capable of adapting to changes in policy and prison environment as they occur, and must focus on the skills, knowledge and attitudes that Prison Officers require to be able to perform their work with confidence and satisfaction.
To this end, some initial steps have been taken, the first of which is the establishment of a small unit to undertake an objective and systematic Occupational and Training Needs Analysis. The creation of this unit has helped in the reconciliation of the Staff Development and Training functions of the Department.

Overview

The decade, 1978–1988, was marked by more unplanned changes in location, structure and content of Prison Officer Training. There seems to have been a continuing dissatisfaction with all aspects of Training and, even though more resources have been applied to try to resolve the dissatisfaction, little of substance has altered. It has been a period of reaction and unguided experimentation.

No objective, systematic Training Needs Analysis or Occupational Analysis has taken place therefore:

a) The present Programme of Training cannot be said to be better or worse than the 1978 Programme.

b) Training programmes continue to be largely influenced by the personal preferences or beliefs of the Training personnel.

c) Training programmes beyond the framework of promotional and/or incremental requirements have not been developed. As a result, there are many officers, some in very senior positions, who have not been exposed to any structured and formal learning experiences for some twenty years.

d) The relative purposes of Training, Development and Education continue to be confused and understood interchangeably. Promotional requirements, be they tertiary or in-service requirements, have been changed to suit the prevailing administrative and financial conditions of the time. The essentiality and/or desirability of promotional requirements have
also changed according to external variables (i.e. Public Service Act, Equal Employment Opportunity Policy, the institutional staffing limitations etc)

Dissatisfaction can be measured by the number of inquiries, reviews and consultancies set up during the period. Similar issues have been pursued by these inquiries, reviews and consultancies and similar conclusions have been drawn by each. However, the processes of Training, the skills of Trainers and the fundamental assumptions about Training do not appear to have developed significantly as a result of these reviews.

Experiments appear to have been inspired more by individual whim and organisational expediency than by clearly articulated purpose. Executive Development Programmes, Staff Appraisal Systems, Progression Requirements, Orientation Programmes were all subject to experimentation but were either abandoned or modified for unrelated reasons. Components of a Training and Development Package were dealt with in isolation from each other.

Dislocation and disruption had been caused throughout the decade by frequent changes in site. The following list of relocations of Training throughout this decade clearly illustrates this process of disruption:-

1978 - Malabar
1980 - Foster Street, Sydney
1980 - Goulburn
1982 - Malabar
1986 - Windsor
1986 - Malabar
1987 - Windsor
1987 to Present - Malabar
As each move has occurred, experienced, dedicated and qualified Training staff have been lost. Unfortunately officers who spend any length of time in Training often have difficulties in being accepted back into the institution at the levels they have achieved while in the Training role. This, in itself, has created an unnecessary hardship both financially and in esteem for these officers who provided loyal service to the Department. This pattern has also made it increasingly difficult to attract skilled and experienced officers into the Training arena.

The relocations have also been accompanied by a progressive lowering of standards in the Training environment. At no time, has the Training facility approached the minimum requirements for effective Adult Learning.

The difficulties mentioned above have been further compounded by the absence of any recognition, either by status or remuneration, for Training Staff. In fact, Trainers are financially worse off than their peers in institutions. Qualifications obtained to perform specific roles as Trainers are not recognized by the provision of allowances or by improvements in working conditions.

Between 1978 and 1988, the Nagle Royal Commission and the appointment of a Corrective Services Commission heralded many changes to prisoner and prison management. The major instrument chosen to communicate changed conditions in the administration of the Prison System was the formal Pre-service and In-service Training that Prison Officers received. Only those officers who were exposed to a Training programme actually came into contact with the detailed information about change. Given that many of the changes represented advantages to prisoners and therefore were interpreted as losses for Prison Officers, the communication medium of Training simply did not have sufficient "power" to overcome culturally embedded attitudes and beliefs about the nature of the relationship between prisoners and Prison Officers. It was not until 1980 that the provision of the Week Nine Module for Primary Trainees and the establishment of Modular Two
(Human Relations), Modular Four (Welfare and Counselling) and Modular Nine (Skills of the Effective Executive), addressed the emerging role of Prison Officers.

However, because of the changes in progression requirements referred to earlier, those officers who joined the Department prior to 1976, and those who joined between 1976 and 1980, and who were not required to undertake Modular courses for progression, have not yet been required to be exposed to the so-called "new" approaches to imprisonment presented in these In-service Training courses. Some, of course, have chosen to participate in these courses. However, it appears fair to say that the Department has not been thorough in its endeavours to ensure that all officers understand the changing role and conditions in the Prison System.

Turmoil, tension and discontent have affected the Department throughout the period. Symptoms have been separations, industrial disputes, unclear role definitions, disunity, increasing assault levels, closer scrutiny from external bodies, deteriorating attendance patterns, low morale, cynicism and resistance to change. All of the above, combined with the expansion of the Department and the loss of a solid and continuous experience base, have led to a reduction in the level of experience at the various ranks. Training has simply not kept pace, both in quality and quantity, with work performance demands. It is little wonder that our system continues to seek ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of contemporary Prison Administration. It is clearly time for a new direction in Prisoner and Prison Management. The Commission endorses that all the issues raised in my evidence will be addressed as we move towards the introduction of a new model of Prison Management.
Section 2 - Related Issues

In describing the history of Training and Development I have intentionally not dealt with specific issues to any depth, in order to allow for the chronological flow. The evidence that follows is presented to highlight and give some deeper meaning to the problems associated with Training and Development through the years.

This Section will address the following issues in turn:

(a) The Executive Development Programme

(b) Staff Appraisal System

(c) Training, Development and Education

(d) Specialist Functions

(a) The Executive Development Programme

As mentioned previously, the Department attempted to establish an Executive Development Course in 1974. However, this course, which was to have been conducted through the Public Service Board's Personnel Assessment Centre, achieved nothing more than assessment feedback to a few Custodial Officers. The planned course activities were never implemented.

In 1980, a new scheme was introduced inside the Department and it aimed to identify, prepare and assess present employees for management positions. The original objective of the 1980 Executive Development Programme was: "...to raise the level of effectiveness by improving the performance of incumbents in their present jobs. From this immediate effort, individual development is facilitated and opportunity is created to continually assess the individual's future
job potential. The long range objective is to prepare those with recognised potential for future advancement and responsibility in proportion to their capabilities*. (Ref. 45)

The Programme was not limited to the Custodial Division but allowed employees from any section of the Department to compete for inclusion in the Programme. It was expected that those who were selected for the Programme would later be able to compete for a wide variety of senior management positions in the Department.

There were three phases to the Executive Development Programme: Advertising; Assessment; and Assignment.

Advertising

The first group of participants sought entry to the Programme through meeting predetermined criteria. Custodial Officers were required to have qualified to the rank of Principal Prison Officer whilst officers from other Divisions required a Higher Grades qualification or salary equivalent of the higher grade for the Professional Division.

The criteria for the second group was changed to place more emphasis on academic achievement rather than years of service. Custodial Officers eligible for the Programme had to have completed the first two years (part-time) of a degree or diploma, and officers from all other Divisions had to have actually completed one or the other. These criteria remained in force for the duration of the Executive Development Programme. However, applicants for assessment were selected not only on the basis of their academic achievement but in addition were required to complete a comprehensive questionnaire and be subject to a performance assessment by their Divisional or Branch Head (Ref. 46).
Assessment

The assessment phase was a carefully designed set of management exercises, psychological tests and interviews. It was conducted during a three day residential course. Twenty management abilities were assessed and a personality profile established on each participant. The Assessors went to considerable lengths to identify those persons they thought would benefit from inclusion on the Executive Development Programme.

Assignment

The assignment phase was tailored to the individual needs of those participants who were recommended and accepted by the Commission. Each individual programme was constructed by the Senior Psychologist (Recruitment and Staff Development) with each successful participant.

There were four (4) aims to the assignment phase:

1. To round off the participants' knowledge and experience of the Department and their familiarity with senior level administrative problems.

2. To round off their academic preparation and increase their knowledge of management theory.

3. To further assess their competence in handling developmental work and day-to-day administration in real-life situations, at a fairly senior level, prior to their receiving substantive appointments at that level.

4. To provide on-going feedback and guidance to the participants in their development.
Various obstacles frustrated the achievement of these aims. The structure of the Department, with a multiplicity of Divisions and Branches, made the establishment of a series of short-term appointments and projects extremely difficult. Because Divisional Directors and Branch Heads were not convinced of the importance of the Executive Development Programme, they were reluctant to release some of their most able officers to work for periods in other sections. Resentment developed because some operational positions had to be sacrificed to allow for the creation of Special Project positions. Projects of an investigative nature, exploring issues across Divisions and Branches, met with resistance because they cut across traditional upwards reporting lines.

In spite of these organisational problems, at the height of the Programme thirty-eight staff members were participating (including the current Deputy Chairman, David Grant). Custodial representation on the Executive Development Programme was less than one-third (11 officers of the total of 38).

Hand-in-hand with the Executive Development Programme, a scheme was designed to create six Executive Assistant positions to work with Superintendents for one year. It was expected that these positions would be open to participants in the Executive Development Programme as well as to other Prison Officers and non-uniformed staff. It was also intended that, after successful completion of the twelve month assignment, the Executive Assistants would be invited to compete for selection for vacant executive positions in Custodial Services. The Executive Assistant positions were advertised in September, 1981. However, that was as far as the plan went. Industrial response to the proposal caused the abandonment of the established positions which were then absorbed for other purposes.
The Executive Development Programme was conceived and designed in isolation from main Training and Development activities within the Department. This alone made the Programme so exceptional that the plan to mainstream it, and the Executive Assistant positions, was doomed.

The Executive Development Programme was terminated in early 1986. It had deviated significantly from its original intention and had lost its focus and impetus. Each stage of the Programme had changed significantly and there was confusion as to the precise purpose of the Programme.

The overall objectives of the Programme, as previously stated, were not being achieved. It was not certain what percentage of Executive Development Programme members were improving their performance as a direct result of the Programme. There were people on the Programme who had achieved accelerated promotions. However, it could be argued that these people would have achieved their promotions regardless of the Executive Development Programme. Perhaps the greatest failing of the Programme was its inability to attract and meet the needs of Custodial Officers. Applicants from the Custodial Division tended to be junior officers and once accepted into the Programme there were extreme difficulties in arranging suitable placements, projects and seminars for them because of overtime constraints and manpower shortages.

The selection phase of the Executive Development Programme was time-consuming and costly. Applicants and their supervisors were required to complete lengthy application forms which totalled some twenty pages. These applications had to be studied by a five person Selection Committee.

The rank/grade of those officers eligible to apply for the Executive Development Programme had changed covertly since 1980. In fact, the ranks/grades indicated in the advertisement, previously described, were used as broad guidelines only. For example, officers in the
Administrative and Clerical Division and the Probation and Parole Service below Grade Six were admitted to the Programme. More importantly, the greatest change in applicants' rank was in the Custodial Division. Most applications were drawn from Base Grade, First Class and Senior Prison Officers. The Programme attracted very little interest from Custodial Staff at the rank of Assistant Superintendent or above.

The assessment phase of the Programme was also a costly exercise. The assessment period spanned a full three days for applicants and five days for the Assessors. On the basis that there were three assessment groups each year, up to 129 working days were consumed by the Executive Development Programme. Added to these were costs such as typing, editing time, travelling time for officers, overtime costs, and pre and post meeting of Assessors and participants. Given that the assessment methodology had never been validated nor the entire Programme evaluated, the use of such resources was extremely questionable.

The criteria for inclusion into the Programme changed significantly over the years. This was not surprising considering the fact the specific executive positions were not the basis upon which the Executive Development Programme was designed.

It was difficult to assess the benefit derived from attendance at various courses and seminars provided to the Programme participants. Indeed, some participants regarded such exposures as merely a forum for cross Divisional communication whilst others were critical of the content and presentation of some seminars. Certainly, the fact that a person was an Executive Development Programme member ensured that an application to participate in external programmes received sponsorship from the Department.

This assignment phase of the Programme suffered because of limited opportunities for Executive Development Programme participants to undertake special projects. It can be said that the Probation and
Parole Service was most successful in this area because it had established two positions specifically for Executive Development Programme special projects. The opportunities for Custodial Officers to complete the assignment phase was almost non-existent since pressure from the Prison Officers' Vocational Branch led to the discontinuation of the Executive Assistant scheme. Job assignments outside the Department never eventuated. It could be said that had the Executive Development Programme never existed the Department could have created similar positions/opportunities under a different guise (e.g. Special Projects Officers) and selected the same officers to complete the projects.

There was very little monitoring of the performance of participants in the Programme. There was never a thorough evaluation of either the participants or the Programme itself. The Senior Psychologist allocated to the Executive Development Programme was moved back into the Psychology Division and therefore there was no person whose responsibility it was to monitor and evaluate.

Finally, there was no real mechanism for participants to leave the Programme other than by voluntary withdrawal. Once accepted into the Programme participants stayed in it for the duration. The duration, however, was never prescribed or determined on the basis of achievement or completion. Consequently, the pool of officers on the Programme increased as each assessment phase finished and disenchantment resulted when opportunities did not eventuate.

The Executive Development Programme required significant resources to operate and the benefits to individuals and/or the Department were intangible. It could be argued that many of its intended benefits could have been achieved by sound management practices such as the extensive use of rotations, acting in higher capacity and secondments. Any future attempts to establish programmes for Executive Development must learn from this ill-fated experiment.
(b) **Staff Appraisal System**

Formal and structured Staff Appraisal appears, through the evidence available, to have been introduced into the Department in the early 1970's. The first Staff Report Form was primarily used for promotion and incremental purposes. It attempted to measure eighteen dimensions of behaviour and performance on a four or five point rating scale (Ref. 47)

It would certainly not appear that this Appraisal System was in any way used for Staff Training and Development purposes. The Report was completed by Deputy Superintendents for all officers as their increments became due. There was no consultation with the officer before or after completing the Report and officers were not informed about the dimensions of behaviour and performance being assessed. The officer on whom the Report was prepared was asked to sign it and was allowed to make written comments if he/she so desired. Thus, an opportunity for officers to discuss their performance with their supervisors and for supervisors to discuss expectations for behaviour and performance with their officers was lost.

This changed somewhat in 1974 when a revised Appraisal Form (Ref. 48) was introduced. Different forms were used for officers up to and including First Class and for Senior Prison Officers through to Superintendents. A revised rating scale was used for the more junior group and for the more senior group a commentary replaced the rating scale. Common to both groups was an Appraisal Interview. For the junior group there was an interviewing panel of three. For the senior group, it was normally only the supervising senior officer that was involved. A post interview written commentary was required in both situations and the officer being assessed was asked to sign. The acknowledged purpose of this process was for confirmation of appointment and payment of increments. However, given the discussion that was built into the process, clarification of issues related to behaviour and performance was possible.
A further change occurred in 1980, when a new Appraisal System was introduced for officers up to and including the rank of Senior Prison Officer. (Ref. 49) The new system was based on the use of the Prison Officer Job Performance Rating Schedule taken from work that had been done in the Western Australian Prison System and modified for the New South Wales System. This system was more sophisticated than its predecessors and required immediate supervisors to establish a Diary system for performance assessment. The Diary allowed for regular assessment to be conducted on every serving and new officer. Unlike previous assessment schemes, Training in the use of this system was given to Superintendents via Training Seminars, and Superintendents were required to ensure that further Seminars took place to train their own staff.

This new system was used for assessing Probationary Officers for permanency; permanent officers for promotional purposes; and for interviewing where an officer's behaviour or performance was causing concern. It was also used for Trainees who had been allocated an "assessable field experience period whilst in Training". (Ref. 50)

In spite of the good intentions associated with this scheme, within twelve months it was being used almost exclusively for assessment for permanency. Two reasons for its failure are obvious: first, the time required to properly complete the process was seen as too great a burden on executive staff without additional resources available to them; and second, there was no planned follow-up procedure to assist officers who were assessed as having deficiencies, to make good these deficiencies.

In 1983, yet another Appraisal system was introduced. (Ref. 51) This system borrowed elements from the Appraisal materials used by the New South Wales Police Department, the Australian Defence Forces and Customs Officers. Although this system was supported by both the Corrective Services Commission and the Prison Officers' Vocational Branch, it did not have the full support of Superintendents.
This system was by far a simpler one and allowed for a more equitable distribution of the assessment workload. Basically, immediate supervisors were required to assess the officers under their direct supervision. Appraisals were conducted six monthly on all staff from Prison Officer to Assistant Director. This system, like the others that preceded it, has never been used consistently or effectively.

It is generally accepted that Staff Appraisal systems have the following aims:

1. To systematically and accurately collect and collate information on the job performance of officers and thus facilitate decision-making by management.

2. To facilitate the task of managers in allocating officers to areas which are most compatible with their abilities and motivation, thus ensuring optimal use of staff resources.

3. To provide feedback to officers on the level of their performance as measured against the most desirable performance required by management... and give them a measure by which to gauge their own prospects of advancement and the level of management’s satisfaction with their performance.

Of course, all of these aims assume that managers are able to define clearly the performance criteria for use in any assessment procedure. These aims also assume that managers are subject, in some way, to Appraisal themselves.

In the case of this Department, there has been no systematic attempt to measure the ability of managers as Appraisers of staff performance. The 1980 Appraisal System attempted to introduce Training for managers in conducting Appraisals. However, in the absence of monitoring the efficiency of this Training, the Appraisal System floundered. For instance:
a) There was no guarantee that the Appraisal skill would flow down from the Superintendents to the lowest level Appraiser (i.e. First Class Prison Officer).

b) There was no reinforcement of the need to appraise and, in fact, no real benefits of Appraisal had been demonstrated.

c) The Training and Development Programme for Prison Officers was not flexible enough to allow for assessed performance weaknesses to be remediated.

d) The Appraisal System was not linked to either established management procedures or the Training and Development Programme so that the information collected from Appraisals could be used by the organisation to affect performance and eventually cause Prison Management change.

While the concept of Staff Appraisal has been accepted within the Department, the major flaws in design and practice have effectively prevented its use as a management tool. There have been many attempts to use Performance Appraisal but they have not been successful in providing benefits to individuals, groups and the organization. For many officers, the Appraisal process has been added to, rather than structured into their day-to-day duties. Often the Appraisal was viewed as a form-filling exercise with no tangible results coming back to the person being appraised. In the past ten years three different schemes have been used, none of which has been tied into a systematic approach to Human Resource Management. The effectiveness of the Appraisal System has been further curtailed because of the absence of a comprehensive Analysis of Occupations within the Department, and because Appraisal has never been used as an instrument of Training and Development.
Throughout my evidence I have referred to the Training and Development of Prison Officers. I have also mentioned that tertiary qualifications have been part of the promotional requirements for Prison Officers. Tertiary qualifications, of course, refer to courses of study offered through institutions of Higher Education like Colleges of Technical and Further Education (T.A.F.E.), Colleges of Advanced Education and Universities.

I would now like to address the Inquiry in terms of the Department's long-standing confusion regarding these three inter-related but distinct concepts – Training, Development, and Education. It is important that these terms be understood clearly so that their different outcomes can be related to past and future efforts to create an efficient, effective and professional workforce.

Training, Development and Education have, as a common and universal product, changes in behaviour as a result of learning. However, each is different in focus, emphasis, methodology and purpose.

Training focuses on the acquisition of skills and knowledge to meet the minimum standard of job performance. Training emphasises, through practice and experience, the concrete expression of learning. Its primary aim is to prepare individuals to perform tasks that contribute to the work of the organisation and its goals and objectives. Training is usually structured, sequenced and relies on instructional technology. The individual and organisational benefits of Training are immediate and provide insurance for survival in the present job.

Training takes place when there is a need to ensure that performance corresponds to the requirements set by the organisation. By and large, Training is carried out by Trainers who have determined what must be known or performed. In spite of its weaknesses the
Department's Primary Training Programme for Prison Officers largely conforms with these characteristics.

Historically, the Training of Prison Officers has been designed to meet specific performance objectives. Procedures, rules, regulations and administrative processes have all been included in the Primary Training Programme. Trainee Prison Officers have been instructed in the basics of the job — whatever its parameters have been. Trainees have been assessed, examined, appraised and reported on to ensure that they have learnt how to do the job. The impetus has been from the Trainee’s need to know how to do some task in the job array and the Department’s need to have that job done.

Primary Training, because of its focus on the concrete level of operation, has been regarded as the fundamental learning experience for Prison Officers. Whatever has been learned in the Primary Programme has, to a large extent, covered the basic ground adequately. While it has been common for Trainee Prison Officers to be told to forget what they learned in the Training Programme, the informal network in the organisation has ensured that any gaps have been filled by Training on-the-job.

The content of Primary Training has been relatively consistent since 1958 when the first Pre-service Programme was established. The elements of the Programme are much the same now as then. While the management of prisoners has undergone many shifts in philosophy, the fundamental Training of Prison Officers has remained essentially unchanged. There have been no radical departures from established practice even though conditions within the organisation have altered dramatically. The major shift in philosophy from 1978, did not change the content or emphasis of Primary Training very much at all. New elements were certainly added (e.g. Human Relations), but all of the original content was retained. The Prison Officer's primary function — to provide security — has always been strongly and consistently reflected in the basic Training Programme.
Training, at least at the base-grade level, has been operationally focused and rigorously pursued. It has not been successful in helping the Department manage change, because Training at the bottom can impact only as far as the prevailing culture of the time will allow. In this sense, Primary Training has achieved as well as could be expected.

The other types of "pure" Training that have existed within the Department for Prison Officers can be analyzed along similar lines. Weapons and Riot Control Training arose from a perceived need to increase the skill level of officers in a particular operational aspect of prison work. The Training of Emergency Units and Transport Unit staff has evolved to meet a set of specific performance objectives. The quality of these Training efforts aside, the purpose has been to provide a highly skilled group of officers to "operate" within the prison environment; to respond to perceived organizational needs of the time; and to ensure that certain behaviours and values are embedded in the work roles of officers. Training, then, serves an important purpose in maintaining, rather than changing, the way in which individuals and groups approach their work within the Department.

Having said that Training is purposeful and structured toward meeting a minimum acceptable standard in present-day job performance objectives (i.e. survival), I would like to turn the discussion to Development. In doing so, the role of Development in the Department must be treated distinctly but still as part of the Human Resource Management system.

Development focuses on the acquisition of knowledge and, to a lesser extent, skills required to move beyond the minimum standards of job performance to higher levels of understanding and awareness. Developmental activities are usually associated with the future requirements of the organization and the individual. Learning, in a Development sense, is expressed through the generation of ideas, initiatives, new ways of doing things. Development serves to prepare
individuals and the organization for what may lie ahead. It is, in
many ways, an investment in the future.

Unlike Training, Development emphasizes the cognitive processes that
go along with the performance of tasks. Its basic aim is to allow
individuals to discover themselves in the context of the organization
and to make contributions back to the organization at some future
time.

Developmental activity is usually flexible in structure and operates
most effectively through group interaction, with the Training and
Development practitioner acting as a facilitator rather than
instructor. The onus of responsibility for learning lies much more
with the individual than with the organisation and this feature of
Development is consistent with more self-directed learning.

Development programmes in the Department have neither focused on the
needs of individuals nor of the organisation. The early Senior and
Chiefs Courses were simply a means by which any eligible officer could
achieve a qualification. The number of officers attending the Courses
bore no relationship to the actual needs of the Department in terms of
the positions available. The Officer undertaking the Courses did so
on the basis that it was his or her turn and not on the basis of being
able to use the experience in the short or medium term.

The Executive Development Programme failed to meet its developmental
purpose because it was insufficiently focused on the needs of the
Department. At an individual level, the Programme was not structured
to consider career-path planning in relation to Occupational Analysis
data. In other words, the Programme did not identify the
competencies, skills and attitudes necessary for effective performance
in a particular position or set of positions. Nor did it attempt to
focus or "fit" the participant's competencies or strengths into a
planned and mutually agreed upon learning programme.
Developmental programmes need to be flexible without sacrificing an agreed upon direction. It is neither efficient nor effective to provide Developmental opportunities to officers when such opportunities are not strongly related to the human resource needs of the organization.

Education, like Training and Development, is concerned with the outcome of some learning process. Education focuses on broadening the knowledge base of individuals and implies that knowledge will be used to clarify and expand thinking. The base of Education is broad, global in perspective, and largely conceptual in nature. Education is important in providing a learning environment in which critical analysis, assessment, evaluation, innovation, and creative problem-solving can take place. Its major purpose is to allow organizations and individuals to feel secure, confident and to view growth and change as challenges to be met and not forces to be resisted. Education is not particularly concerned about the way things are now, except in so far as this information can be used to predict and describe the future. Educated staff are not necessarily expert performers - Training is essential to ensure performance - but they may be expert thinkers and analyzers.

The Department has always felt, at some level at least, that Education is an important part of the Human Resource Development System. Officers have been encouraged to get involved in Educational pursuits. At times, the Department assumed that Educational qualifications were superior to any Training that it could have or should have provided, and that tertiary studies could be substituted for In-service Training and Development activities. Of course, it is well known that study, especially in an academic setting, is not a substitute for practice and experience. An academic course of study, while valuable for its own reasons, is not necessarily the most effective tool for putting theory into practice.

The Corrective Services Commission is determined to improve the quality and availability of Training so that Prison Officers not only
know what is expected of them in performing their tasks but are also equipped to meet these expectations. The Commission is also determined to provide a range of Development programmes that will enable Prison Officers to improve the quality of their performance. Finally, the Commission is also determined to encourage Prison Officers to improve their Educational qualifications so that their confidence in being able to analyse situations and develop problem-solving strategies will be increased.

(d) Specialist Functions

Throughout my evidence I have referred to the lack of clarity regarding the role of Prison Officers. I have also illustrated how Training and Development processes have had, at best, a neutral effect on resolving inherent role ambiguities.

There is another important factor to be added to my discussion at this point. I refer to the on-going and progressive reduction in the skills base for the majority of Prison Officers. Certain functions that were performed by Prison Officers have either been eliminated from the role altogether, reduced in substance, or transferred to specialist units outside the mainstream of day-to-day prison operations. Up until recent times, a Prison Officer could expect, during the course of his/her service, to be involved in the following activities: Transport/Escort duty; Gaol Recording; Stores Duty; Peace-keeping Operations; some Industrial and Maintenance duties; and Prisoner Welfare. The introduction of non-custodial professional staff into service delivery in institutions has had a significant effect on the nature of the relationships between Prison Officers and prisoners. As a consequence, Prison Officers have experienced a reduction in their scope for contributing to the overall life of institutions. To illustrate this I will trace the history of Gaol Recorders, the skills and knowledge required to perform that role and the disappearance of the position.
The position of "Gaol Recorder" has been filled by penal authorities throughout the World since long before the first convicts arrived in Australia. From the time of the establishment of a criminal court in this country until 1986, Custodial Officers carried out the Gaol Recording function.

In 1986, the Department of Corrective Services underwent a financial rationalisation programme. One of the results of this programme was the abandonment of the Gaol Recording structure as it was. The various duties carried out by the Gaol Recorders were distributed between clerical staff and the Attorney General's Department. Many Prison Officers had gained useful experience and job enrichment from spending time as Gaol Recorders.

Some of the skills required by a Gaol Recorder were:

- ability to present evidence in a concise, unambiguous manner.

- loading procedures of escort vehicles, taking heed of details such as separation of various classes of prisoners.

- ability to communicate at a sophisticated level with the legal profession and other involved parties.

- interpretation of warrants, orders, and other formal, legal documents; and

- ability to guide the Judiciary through the various areas of Corrective Services, in order to clarify the impact of the Judges' comments and recommendations.

Gaol Recorders needed a working knowledge of:

- Bails Act
- Child Welfare Act
- Mental Health Act
- Prisons Act
- Crimes Act
- Justices Act
- Probation and Parole Act
- Community Service Orders
- Recognizances
- Court Procedures and Protocol
- All Warrants including Section 44's, Committal and Remand Warrants
- Remission Calculations

The duties performed by the Gaol Recorder were wide and varied and well received by the Court authorities. (Ref. 52)

There are many other examples of decisions that have resulted in functions being removed from the general role and duties of Prison Officers and elevated to the status of special functions. As these special functions have evolved, the perception has grown that specialist personnel are required to perform them. For instance, the appearance of the Transport Units, Emergency Units, Internal Investigation Unit, and Weapons Training Unit have contributed to this perception. These units have, in some cases, developed sub-specialists (e.g. the Hostage Response Group as sub-specialists within Emergency units).

The development of specialist groups within the Department has been accompanied by the development of specialist internal Training Programmes. This development has taken place outside the framework of the Department’s Training and Development sections. At no time has any of this Training come under the umbrella of either the Staff Development Division or the Officers’ Training School. Consequently, the content, structure and methodology used have been derived entirely from within these specialist units and have not been linked into the existing structures.
The formation of "elite" specialist groups, accompanied by the mystery surrounding their in-house Training processes, has, at the very least, reduced the range of skills required by the average Prison Officer and his or her confidence to act in a range of predictable situations. The reduction in variety of work and opportunities to experience "time out" of the normal prison routine has added to the general malaise and negativity presently existing in our institutions. This is evidenced by poor staff morale and attendance patterns, high attrition rates and increasing levels of "burnout".

Of serious concern to the Commission is the problem of "burnout" amongst Prison Officers. In a study conducted by Gerstein L.H, Topp C.G. and Correll G, on "The Role of the Environment and Person when predicting Burnout among Correctional Personnel", the problem is identified:

"The term burnout has been defined as emotional and/or physical exhaustion, lowered job productivity, and overt depersonalization. It has also been conceptualized as a psychological strain present in work environments, resulting in apathy, alienation, dissatisfaction, and a lack of enthusiasm and concern about the clients one serves". (Ref. 53)

The Gerstein study goes on to reveal that, "the nature of the correctional institution environment contributes more to burnout experienced by correctional staff than does personal information about such staff members". (Ref. 54) The results of their study indicated that, "in general, although the personal and environmental variables are linked to stress, this stress is more closely tied to the nature of the working environment. In particular, it seems that the most important contributor to fostering or reducing staff burnout in correctional institutions is the staff's relationships with the inmates. This is not surprising if we assume that the most stressful feature of such an environment is working with this group. Interactions with this group contribute to burnout especially when these interactions are negative, unrewarding, and draining. If staff
members believe that they cannot bring about a change in an inmate's behaviour and if they believe that the inmate is unmotivated to change, then they will feel exhausted, helpless, and lacking in self satisfaction. (Ref. 55)

The Commission is convinced that an approach to prison management based on improving relationships between officers and inmates is essential. This position is supported by the finding of Gerstein et al. in that, "... individualized institutional programmes need to be designed to enhance the quality of the relationship between staff and inmates... Programmes involving inmates and staff in co-operative recreation and maintenance activities would be beneficial". (Ref. 56)

In 1981 a significant development occurred in this Department: the opening of the Special Care Unit at Long Bay. Of major significance was the fact that basic to the programme in this Unit is the enhancement of the quality of the relationship between staff and inmates. Set up as a Therapeutic Community in which prisoners, after being evaluated for their potential to benefit from the programme, contract to address specific problems in their attitudes and behaviour (problems they have identified themselves), the Special Care Unit is dependent on all staff becoming active participants in all aspects of the community life (group sessions; recreational activities; educational programmes; welfare issues etc.). Also of major significance is the fact that providing appropriate Training for staff working in the Unit, both at the point of entry and weekly thereafter, has been given the same importance as the programme for prisoners.

The Unit has almost completed seven years of operation. While many officers have now passed through periods of employment in the Unit and have operated very successfully in this interactive, participatory fashion while there, their impact on the Prison System as a whole has not been obvious. While aspects of the Training provided within this Unit will be addressed in more detail in my second set of evidence, it is important to note here that the special Training provided to enable
Prison Officers to operate differently has succeeded within the Unit itself but there has been no capacity to transport this model into the larger Prison System. This is not to say the Special Care Unit or the staff Training it provides have failed. Rather, it again demonstrates that the general system is unable to accept, as generally applicable, skills that are regarded as being location specific and foreign to the culture of the mainstream institutions.
Conclusion

In my evidence I have attempted to describe the pathway followed by Prison Officer Training through the thirty year period during which such Training has existed in this State. The evidence, I believe, demonstrates that there have been obstacles, that on occasions the pathway has forked in many different directions, that on other occasions the pathway has doubled back on itself and that on others it has run in circles. I have also attempted to address some particular issues that have been significant to the operations of the Department as a whole and to the Training of Prison Officers in particular.

The evidence shows that for thirty years each successive administration has acknowledged the need for training staff to work in prisons. It has also shown that dissatisfaction with the location, structure and content of Training has also been displayed by each successive administration. Experiments have been launched and, almost always, quickly abandoned. Resources have been applied and then withdrawn.

It is my contention that satisfaction with and confidence in Prison Officer Training will only occur when that Training is built upon a comprehensive and structured analysis of what the inter-related components of the Prison Officer's work is. Prison Officers will only become satisfied with their work, and confident to perform it, when they are able to relate their Training to the tasks they are asked to perform, and when they can rely upon additional Training sessions and Developmental opportunities being regularly available to them.
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