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1. Background and Terms of Reference

This review of the provision of education and training in NSW Corrective Centres was established by the Commissioner of Corrective Services, Dr Leo Keliher in October 1998, with the general aim of providing advice which would help to develop future directions for education and training of inmates in this State.

The terms of reference for the review were taken from the Letter of Understanding pursuant to the 1996 consent award (Crown Employees [Education Staff Salaries Department of Corrective Services] Award). The reason for selecting the 1996 consent award as the basis for the review’s terms of reference stems from the origins of the review, arising as it did out of industrial issues. The essence of the industrial issue was, to quote the NSW Department of Corrective Service’s Comments on the Draft Report of this review—

"on the one hand, the industrial demands for permanency for all contract teachers, separate operational agreements for educational staff with a dedicated recurrent budget and separate corporate structure for the management of education and vocational training within the Department and, on the other hand, the Department’s commitment through the Inmate Management Division to provide an integrated model for the planning and delivery of services and programs to inmates informed by the principles of case management, designated program pathways and the corporate goals of in offender management and reducing offending behaviour."

The Department and the NSW Teachers Federation agreed to the appointment of an independent person with expertise in education to chair the review.

Instead of a series of questions confined to educational issues some of the terms of reference focussed on specific industrial issues. Still others of the terms of reference could not be regarded as terms of reference at all but principles underpinning the overall framework for educational delivery in DCS.

From the beginning then, the review faced the serious difficulty of unclear terms of reference and differing perceptions of the members of the Committee about the focus of the review. It was agreed after a number of meetings of the committee of review (the Committee) that the full range of issues in the terms of reference should not be examined and that this review should concentrate on educational issues only. Originally it had been intended that the review be undertaken by the whole of the committee, presumably along the lines of a Senate Inquiry.

However, it soon became clear that the combination of industrial and educational issues within the terms of reference made progress difficult. Hence it was agreed after a number of meetings that the Chair should undertake the review and submit the report to the Committee for consideration and feedback. This report, written by the independent chair of the committee, reflects that decision.

It is important to state at the outset that this report does not arise out of a full-scale review of education and training in the Department of Corrective Services (DCS). Such a review would need clear terms of reference, adequate resourcing and a time frame which allowed for an in-depth investigation of actual
provision, submissions from interested parties outside the Department, a thorough investigation of the international literature and, possibly, visits to other correctional systems to examine best practice. Given the recency of the Senate Review, however, and the quite recent review in Queensland, it was felt by a majority of the members of the Committee that this was not necessary.

With the above issues in mind, and read as a whole, the terms of reference contained in item 1, (see attachment 1) question the appropriateness of the current arrangements for education. In essence the terms of reference ask: Is what the DCS is delivering, the kind of education that is appropriate for inmates (taking into account the developments in educational thinking and reforms outside the correctional system as well as the Senate Inquiry recommendations) and is it succeeding in its aims?

Specifically, the terms of reference can be seen to ask questions about: educational aims/philosophies (a to i), methods of delivery (g), success – the extent to which it improves inmates’ capacity to integrate into the community after release (e), and finally, the appropriateness of the relationships between the various parts of the IDS program (f, h).

2. Process of undertaking the interim review

The Review Committee met on six occasions and membership of the committee included:

Mr. Marty Burgess (NSW TAFE Teachers Association)
Mr. Kevin Finnerty (A/Principal AEVTI, DCS)
Ms. Jenny Furber (Director, Access Education Services NSW TAFE)
Mr. Peter de Graaff (Senior Education Officer, MMTC, CSTA)
Prof. Andrew Gonczi (Dean, UTS Faculty of Education and Independent Chair)
Ms. Diane Hague (NSW Teachers Federation)
Ms. Maree O’Halloran (Teacher, Long Bay CSTA)
Ms. Deirdre Hunter (Manager Industrial Relations, DCS)
Ms. Kay Lord, Executive (Director Human Resources Management, DCS)
Ms. Catriona McComish (Assistant Commissioner Inmate Management, DCS)
Mr. Dudley Jennings (SEO, MRRC)
Mr. Wayne Ruckley (Director, Corrective Services Industries)[member for three meetings]

The Chair undertook visits to MRRC, Silverwater, Mulawa, Lithgow, Bathurst, Oberon and Kirkconnell correctional centres. In each of these institutions there were scheduled meeting with the Governor, Educational and other IDS staff – CSI Overseers, Program Managers, Senior Education Officers/Education Officers/teachers and with inmates. Discussions were held without any other member of the committee being present to promote the facilitation of full and frank discussions with key stakeholders, including inmates.

The chair met as a group and individually the following members of TAFE involved with correctional programs:

Ms. Jenny Ferber, (Director Access Educational Services Division)
Ms. Pam Gill (Manager Aboriginal Programs Unit)
Ms. Gloria Provest (Team Leader, Aboriginal Programs Unit)
Ms. Sue Read (Aboriginal Coordinator, Western Sydney TAFE)
Ms. Inez Gededes (ICCLO, Hunter Institute)
Mr. Peter Quaas (Teacher Carpentry and Joinery, Cessnock College)
Mr. Alan Miller (ICCLO, Western Sydney Institute)
Mr. Ray Mouthaan (Head Teacher Bricklaying, Bathurst College)
Ms. Manon Sheridan (Teacher Welfare, Bathurst College)
Mr. Martin Hollings (ICCLO, Sydney Institute)
Ms. Nina Waker (Teacher Job Skills)
Mr. John Rankin (Teacher, Blue Mountains College)
Ms. Carol Crennan (Project Officer Access)
Ms. Lynn Godrick (ICCLO, OTEN)

The Chair released a draft report in September 1999 and this was sent out to all the parties. Responses were received from AEVTI, NSW Teachers Federation, TAFE and The Department of Corrective Services (see attachments 2, 3, 4 & 5). In addition, a further response from TAFE was received commenting on points made in the other responses to the draft report (see attachment 6).

The committee of review played an important role in determining appropriate directions for the review, thus acting more as a steering committee for the Independent Chair throughout the process of data gathering and analysis. All members of the committee of review provided a list of resources, including articles, statistics and course materials which were examined during the course of the review.

After the release of the draft report the chair met with the following members of AEVTI:

Mr. Kevin Finnerty (A/Principal, AEVTI)
Ms. Dina Petrakis (SEOMRRC)
Ms. Janet di Carlo (AEVTI Teacher MRRC/Mulawa)
Ms. Denise Lutui (AEVTI Aboriginal Teacher, Goulburn)
Mr. Frank Pietsch (AEVTI/TAFE Teacher, Cessnock)
Mr. Kevin Sheppard (Manager, Vocational Training, AEVTI HO)
Mr. Michael Stephens (A/SEO, ITC, Long Bay)
Mr. Graham McFarlane (Information/Resource Officer, AEVTI)
Mr. Steven Jenkin (State Manager for Health and Fitness, AEVTI)

The meeting with AEVTI staff was very valuable and resulted in a number of changes in emphasis in the final report.

3. Description of current educational provision

The Adult Education & Vocational Training Institute (AEVTI) provides specialist adult education programs for the NSW corrections context. AEVTI is a registered training organisation (RTO) with the NSW Vocational Education Training and Accreditation Board (NSW VETAB). At present AEVTI is responsible for the delivery of accredited vocational education to offenders across the 26 NSW correctional centres. TAFE NSW gives advanced standing to students who have successfully completed AEVTI courses. AEVTI, TAFE NSW and CSI aim to equip inmates with skills which will enable them to participate effectively in the workforce on their release from custody.

Full time and contract teachers, education officers and TAFE NSW teachers deliver accredited programs in literacy, numeracy, vocational training, life skills and recreation. Corrective Services Industries (CSI) assist in facilitating vocational training opportunities in consultation with AEVTI. Specific educational programs are dedicated to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander inmates, women and people from non-English speaking backgrounds.

AEVTI was formed only five years ago after the investment of considerable resources. It has set up most of the systems/processes for the delivery of education which are currently in place and has been instrumental in greatly improving the delivery and quality of education in the Department. Prior to the setting up of AEVTI, the delivery of education relied almost exclusively on the preferences and capacities of individual teachers. Assessment was inadequate (or non existent) and there few quality assurances processes in evidence.

With the adoption of the Certificate of General Education for Adults (CGEA) three years ago, a flexible framework curriculum was available for the first time. AEVTI staff in their submissions have pointed out the potential of this certificate, when well implemented, to cater for individual differences and needs and to provide immediate reinforcement for inmates through the provision of statements of attainment for individual modules.

Importantly, they have also suggested that the CGEA has the capacity to be fully integrated with vocational courses and work based education. Some AEVTI staff suggested that the best way to use the course is in a multi-disciplinary way in conjunction with practical courses and activities and to avoid a typical classroom approach which was inappropriate for most inmates. Three example of the use of the CGEA in appropriate ways are in association with the CSI at MRRC, the permaculture course at Mulawa and in association with the fitness program at Cessnock (two of these programs are more fully described in section 7.1.6).

Senior Education Officers in AEVTI play the major role in the management of the CGEA by helping staff to develop curriculum and assessment tasks and in coordinating an extensive moderation scheme. They are also a vital link in developing cooperation with external providers and in ensuring a coordinated educational provision for inmates. Internally they serve on committees as well as managing inmate case files. Overall they have an important long term planning role.

In June 1999, there were 7350 full time inmates in 26 New South Wales correctional centres. The correlation between low socio-economic status and imprisonment is well documented. One of the key challenges is to meet the enormous needs of a diverse population and to develop and deliver programs and therapeutic interventions to address some of the issues relating to offending behaviour.

To this end, the DCS has targeted resources in prioritised areas of need and the following strategies have been implemented:

- screening and assessment on reception to identify those at risk of self harm and suicide
• case management and the introduction of individual program pathways for inmates.
• restructuring within prisons and community corrections to facilitate integration.

Inmate Development Services is therefore made up of the following branches:

• AEVTI
• Welfare Services
• Psychological Services
• Alcohol and Other Drug Services
• The HIV & Health Promotion Unit

4. The positions/philosophies of DCS, Teacher Federation and TAFE

Each of the stakeholders listed in the title of this section provided the chair of the committee with a statement of philosophy/recommendations as to future educational provision in the Department. Only those parts of the submissions which relate to educational issues have been considered. These positions are summarised below and are followed by comments of the independent chair of the committee.

4.1 Department of Corrective Services (DCS)

The DCS argues that the major aim of the whole of the Inmate Development Services (IDS) program is the development of social attitudes, behaviours and skills which lead to a successful return to the community, thereby reducing the likelihood of offending behaviour and consequently a reduction in recidivism. Recent research suggests that success in achieving this overall aim depends on integrated programs which include education but which place it within a wider range of services, through taking a case management approach.

The type of educational provision most likely to help to achieve this overall aim must follow the overall departmental assessment of the individual’s needs and must reflect standards/directions for education outside the corrective system. This means, in the context of the national training framework, that there should be a concentration on providing education that will equip inmates for employment through developing vocational and personal work related competencies. It also means that courses should be competency based, recognised by industry, accredited, modular and presented flexibly, taking into account the difficulties of the context.

There is a strong suggestion in the DCS submission that educational choices for inmates should be guided by the wider case management process and that educational options need to be limited to those which can establish their contribution to reintegrating the inmate to the community. This excludes, in the DCS view, personal development programs unless they are part of an integrated program approach.

The DCS is critical of the extent to which current educational arrangements have, to date, planned the educational provision for inmates. A suitable planning framework would include a range of factors which link inmate education to such things as correctional work options and post release employment options.
The DCS is also critical of absence of performance indicators for education and evaluation of outcomes against these indicators.

It recommends that in the future, there be an integrated holistic approach to education in the corrective setting, that education staff work within the case management approach and that AEVTI develop statewide policies to reflect this approach. It suggests that given the rapid changes to inmate population and employment opportunities outside gaols that education must be able to adapt quickly and questions whether the current administrative arrangements can enable this.

4.2 The NSW Teachers Federation (the Federation)

The Federation's submission argues, following the Council of Europe and the UN, that all inmates have a right to education of the broadest kind — including creative, cultural, religious and social as well as literacy, basic and vocational education. These rights, it points out, are included in the DCS's own (1951) Regulations and the recently revised Corrective Services Act.

The submission points out that the inmate population has very low educational levels and that, following the views expressed by Nagle, it is vital to provide inmates with literacy/numeracy and pre-vocational skills as well as skills to help cope with life outside gaol.

It suggests that in recent years AEVTI has worked with TAFE to develop plans for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander inmates, have developed materials for inmates and have received awards for excellence in adult education. The creation of AEVTI, it is argued, has been a major force in improving quality of provision and standards of qualification and expertise of education staff. The submission argues that campuses of AEVTI should be clearly designated in correctional centres. It argues further that the importance of the educational provision and its relationship to the NSW Equity Charter is such that AEVTI should stand separate from the DCS organisational structure and the Principal of AEVTI should report directly to the Commissioner of Corrective Services.

Other organisational matters are raised, and though they could be considered industrial issues, are also likely to have an impact on educational provision. Specifically the Federation argues that SEO's should not report to Program Managers but to the gaol Governor.

The Federation proposes a set of standards for use by correctional organisations, (similar to those developed in the United States) which covers operation, funding, governance, staffing levels, staff development and evaluation amongst other things. It argues such standards would enable the DCS to encourage high quality educational provision for inmates. Finally it is argued that an AEVTI Board be legislatively constituted and be the chief forum for determining educational directions in the DCS and developing and implementing quality assurance/monitoring procedures.

4.3 NSW TAFE (TAFE)

In its submission TAFE comments on each of the individual statements/questions contained in the first term of reference.
TAFE argues that all TAFE curriculum is accredited, that they can provide the same programs for inmates as are provided for the wider community and that these are provided by educators who have teaching qualifications. In addition TAFE supports these staff by use of liaison officers. TAFE also provides resource packages to assist staff delivering programs.

The submission points out that DCS and TAFE have worked together to develop and implement many initiatives though commonwealth funding grants and that while all their courses are customised to meet inmates needs they are all nationally recognised and within the National Training Framework principles.

The TAFE submission argues that any personal development program needs to be integrated with the employment needs of the inmates. It points out that there is substantial scope for developing relationships between vocational skills development and other activities in the goal such as work in CSI and improvements to gaol infrastructure. It also makes the point that the strong links of TAFE to the community can be utilised in any integrated pre and post release program to ease inmate's transition into the community, employment and further education.

TAFE points out it has special expertise to help inmates with special needs and/or disabilities.

5. Points of agreement and disagreement between the parties

It is important to point out that during the meetings of the Committee a number of the issues were clarified and therefore helped to develop the points of agreement between the parties that are outlined below. Thus the final report itself is only part of the outcomes of this review.

As a result of discussions emerging out of the meeting of the Committee and after a reading of the various submissions, it appears to the independent chair that there are a number of areas of agreement between the parties:

• that there is a need for close co-operation between educational provision in prisons as coordinated by AEVTI and the wider IDS program.
• that the macro aims of education programs as a whole in prisons are not clearly articulated and there is not substantial agreement about these aims across the range of prison staff. This is so not with standing the fact that the CGEA has clear aims.
• there is need for better coordination of training of custodial and IDS staff. There was agreement that where custodial staff and IDS staff work together that outcomes for prisoners are enhanced. Joint staff development needs to be enhanced.
• notwithstanding the existence of a quality assurance framework for educational programs and the carrying out of individual duties by educational staff, there are inadequate performance indicators for educational outcomes and insufficient evaluation of outcomes.
• co-ordination of education between prisons is inadequate and that part of the reason for this is the lack of a developed electronic database on prisoner's educational progress.

• pre and post release programs are inadequate and TAFE provision is essential for linking education in prisons to wider educational and employment opportunities outside prison.

It needs to be stated here that the AEVTI and the Federation response to the draft review report suggests that there is only a degree of agreement about dots points 2, 4 and 6 rather than absolute agreement. Each of these points has been reexamined and the relevant changes made.

On the other hand there are a number of areas where there is not agreement, though some of these areas seem to be characterised by differences of degree rather than absolute opposition.

• the right of inmates to choose the type of education they may access in prisons.

• whether the implementation of case management should determine readiness for education.

• the use of recidivism as the major performance indicator (or the only indicator) of successful inmate education.

• the extent of integration of education with IDS and particularly CSI.

• the need for flexibility in staffing - particularly the need for casual/permanent staff in educational delivery.

6. Views of the independent Chair

The following views are those of the independent chair and are based on a reading of the various submissions (including those additional to the official submissions), published reports, visits to correctional facilities, interviews conducted during visits, and examination of various documents and articles. After the production of a draft report a range of further submissions were presented to the Chair and further consultations took place with the Committee and AEVTI staff. These have been taken into account in this final report.

6.1 Praise for work of educators in difficult environment

Nothing in these comments should be taken to be critical of the work of individual educators in the prison system. These educators are dealing with the most disadvantaged section of the Australian population and one which often suffers from a range of drug related and psychological problems. Teachers have to deal with what is, in some ways, a heterogeneous population included in which there are dangerous and disturbed individuals and where the personal safety of teachers is an important consideration.
Moreover, the ways some of the correctional facilities are organised both operationally and physically is almost completely inimical to learning. The education staff sometimes contend with a lack of understanding and sympathy and even hostility towards the role of education from non-educational staff. All of the educators interviewed were deeply committed to providing opportunities for inmates aimed at improving their lives both within the correctional setting and outside and are to be admired for their dedication, idealism and capacity to deal with a very complex and difficult job.

6.2 History of educational provision

The history of education and training in correctional settings in Australia is documented in a number of reports, most recently the Senate Inquiry into Education and Training in correctional facilities. As the Senate report points out, while educational provision could be fairly described as a disgrace for most of the last 140 years, since the 1970's much has been done to reform prison education. This is particularly the case in the last few years, and is a point supported by Semmens (1998), who has described the changes in the last decade in Australia as "a very active and positive period of reform."

Some of the major changes over the last decade have been the developments of a general education pathway leading to a qualification, developments of high quality resource packages specifically designed for inmates, a far closer alignment than previously between national education policies and prison programs, a greater concern for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander inmates and a recognition of the need for high quality pre and post release programs. However, as all commentators have noted, much remains to be done. Most of the Senate proposals, for example, have not been implemented and many of the new ideas, like community reintegration, which are linked to education and other in-gaol programs have only just begun to be considered.

Even a brief reading of the changing paradigms of correctional programs over the last 50 years indicates the difficulties of achieving the aim of rehabilitation and reintegration of inmates into the wider community. While many approaches have been tried in various countries over this period, recidivism has remained high.

This has led on the one hand to the recent (re)emergence of a biomedical approach to criminality which links criminal behaviour to bio chemical and possibly genetic disorders. The implications of this approach would suggest chemical and or surgical rather than educational/therapeutic solutions. Given the current lack of evidence to support this approach, however, other innovative approaches have begun to be considered.

The most recent of these approaches in the United Kingdom, Canada and parts of the USA has been the 'integrated' approach (Foster, 1998). The essence of this approach is the linking of the various parts of prison life - work, cognitive behavioural programs, health education, exercise, domestic life, etc, and in particular, linking the programs provided within the custodial environment to programs and services post-release.
6.3 Research on education in prisons

Some of the recent literature suggests that there is a need for a multifaceted/integrated approach to reducing offending behaviour (Foster, 1998, NCVER literature review, 1999). So far this does not seem to have been based on empirical research but rather, is argued from the commonsense notion that the problems faced by inmates are multiple and complex and that most of the approaches tried in the past have not been particularly successful. A paper by McLaren (nd.1991?) identifies sixteen principles for effective correctional interventions including the need for a combination of intervention tools where "a multiple modality approach is used with combinations of intervention types such as vocational or academic training and groups counselling being used as the same time or successively".

A well conducted meta analysis of the Canadian and US literature on education in prisons (and vocational education in particular) [Gerber and Fritsch 1995], indicates that contrary to the Martinson report’s (1974) findings, education programs do lead to fewer disciplinary problems during incarceration, increases in educational participation after release and reductions in recidivism. So far as vocational education was concerned, for this to be achieved there was a need to ensure that the skills were relevant to the contemporary job market.

The NCVER review of literature (1999) suggests that vocational programs might have some success in reducing recidivism, but that there is a need for a link between in-gaol vocational programs with employment and support networks after release.

However the empirical evidence in Australia for the success of vocational education, of itself, reducing recidivism is slight and the most important recommendation of this literature review is that more research and evaluation needs to take place. Unfortunately there appears to be few good evaluations of educational provision – or indeed, other programs – in Australia either in the past or currently. This is not surprising given the difficulty of defining what might constitute success of this provision and the wider lack of consensus about the aims of imprisonment. But it does mean that, at this stage, decisions about the nature of educational provision need to be based on criteria which are not derived from strong evidence of success of rehabilitation.

Developments in educational theory outside the correctional system have relevance for policy within correctional settings. Probably the most interesting of these in recent years is what has been called the "new psychology" – essentially a refinement of cognitive psychology. The adoption of a social constructivist approach to learning is based on the notion, now well established through research, (see, for example, Brown, Prawat, Lave and Wenger, Resnick, Educational Researcher – various articles) that learning through experience is a far better way to deep understanding than more passive approaches.

The use of apprenticeship models for the development of cognitive skills is currently being tried in a range of educational settings. This thinking is based on two elements, first, that all meaning is ‘constructed’, i.e. individuals make personal sense of data, ideas, experiences and, secondly, that most learning occurs in a social setting and that emotional and other factors (e.g. cultural –
organisational and sociological) are usually involved. Individuals, it seems, cannot develop their cognitive structures without active engagement with and application of ideas.

Thus, in broader educational settings there has recently been a much closer integration of education with practical experiences, workplaces and other out-of-institution settings than has been the case in the past. This is true of TAFE but also school and University curriculum. It is also in line with the views of at least some AEVTI staff that there is a need to use the CGEA in combination with other educational experiences which lead to the development of practical and vocational skills which could be of use in the post-gaol environment.

Given the multiple disadvantages of most inmates and their multiple emotional and psychological difficulties, the gaining of vocational and personal competencies will take a good deal of time and can only be achieved through a coherent and integrated program which includes work experience, support of various kinds, (both in gaol and post-release) and other programs which concentrate on the psychological development of inmates.

This certainly is in line with the suggestion in the DCS submission to the interim review – that provision of education and training possibilities will not automatically lead to successful outcomes for inmates. The implication of this is that an integrated case management approach, in which education plays a major part, is needed if inmates are to learn the competencies needed to make a successful transition to life outside gaol. This does not appear to be in dispute. The Inmate Services and Program Plan (ISPP) is acknowledged by all parties as having the potential to increase cooperation between all area of the IDS and at least to partially achieve this overall aim.

However, the different representatives of the review committee dispute the question of how this integration is to be implemented and whether it restricts the rights of inmates to education and/or reduces the choice of the type of education they receive.

6.4 Conclusion

The conclusion reached by the Chair of the Committee is that there is a need to develop an integrated approach to the development of inmate services – an integrated case management program. Education is a vital ingredient of this approach and needs to be linked to other activities to reach its full potential in helping to reduce offending behaviour. Ideally all staff in correctional facilities should participate in this approach. Questions as to the content, delivery, organisation and evaluation of the educational element of the overall program are considered below.

In summary it is felt that the core, but by no means all, of education provision in correctional facilities should be in the area of vocational education, where possible accredited. See below for further discussion of this point. The process of developing and managing such a provision should be through AEVTI working with a number of external providers- primarily, but not exclusively, TAFE. Wherever possible this should include work-based activity (e.g. incorporating CSI, traineeships) which will help to develop skills needed for employment in the wider community. Literacy and numeracy education and
ESL are vital elements of the educational programs but they should be undertaken largely within the context of vocational courses, broadly defined as those leading to some possibility of employment.

Much educational evidence (e.g. see Street 1999, Lytle and Schults 1990) suggests that adult language, literacy and numeracy is best developed in the context of concrete activities such as work or work related studies. Similarly social education/life skills/communication competencies should be integrated into vocational courses, wherever possible, and into real work undertaken in CSI.

In some instances accredited vocational education will not be immediately appropriate for inmates (e.g. those with especially bad experiences of education in their lives). It was argued by a number of AEVTI staff that most inmates are in this category – that accredited vocational education is suitable for relatively few inmates. Even if this is true it is not an argument against the provision of accredited vocational education, however, but rather against its immediate introduction and to the exclusion of all other forms of education.

In those cases where inmates have no immediate interest in undertaking an accredited vocational course, a gradual educational process starting with seemingly non-vocational courses (e.g. fitness) can develop interests which ultimately lead to development of vocational skills (e.g. those of a gym instructor).

It is worth making the point that the distinction often made between vocational and recreational/personal development courses is not as clear as often believed. Research in the TAFE and community education sectors (McIntyre 199) indicates that many recreational courses have vocational outcomes. Courses in art for example can potentially have as significant a vocational outcome as a course in bricklaying – often the only distinction is the reason for taking the course.

The key is for AEVTI’s SEO’s/teachers to recognise the potential of any course (e.g. an ostensibly personal development/recreational course) to lead to a vocational outcome and to develop a strategy and pathway from such a course to vocational courses, preferably accredited ones. One example of such a pathway is cited below in examples of good practice.

It is important to state here, explicitly, that there will continue to be a need for both internal full-time educational staff in the DCS and external providers. Internal providers are certainly needed to customise “pre-vocational” (though mainly practical) courses for inmates who do not desire to undertake accredited courses and to develop pathways to the accredited programs and other vocational programs, and external providers will be needed to provide the core of the accredited vocational program.

A problem identified during visits to correctional institutions was the number of special categories of inmates e.g., protected prisoners, within a facility. These groups, even individuals, should have the opportunity to participate in education of the kind outlined above– but the small numbers make this very difficult financially. There is a need therefore to develop policy to clarify the nature of these groups and the extent of the funding available for them.
7. Strengths and Weaknesses of the current provision of Education

There are many strengths of the current provision of education and a number of problems – the following examples illustrate these strengths and weaknesses. Criteria on which judgements have been made about strengths/weaknesses are:

1) **Overall program coherence**
   The extent to which there is a close link between the various activities designed to enable inmates to address their offending behaviour. This is based on the principle that coherence is important to any program seeking to change behaviour and that it is unlikely that single and/or uncoordinated activities will succeed in achieving this.

2) **Co-operation /understanding between staff dealing with inmates**
   The extent to which all staff coming into contact with inmates understand and try to reinforce the aims of other staff – particularly the extent to which custodial and industry staff work with IDS staff to help inmates address their offending behaviour.

3) **Transition arrangements**
   The extent of the link between activities carried out in gaol and post release programs/employment.

4) **Reflect the best adult education practice theory**
   The extent to which programs use an experiential approach to learning informed by social – constructivist theory. Also the attempt to integrate literacy, numeracy and other communication and social competencies into practical pre-vocational or accredited vocational courses.

7.1 Examples of good practice

There are many examples of excellent practice in the delivery of inmate education. A small number reflecting the criteria outlined above have been selected for consideration in this report.

It is recognised that there are many different types of prisoners and that what is possible for low security inmates may not be possible for other classifications. However the principles that underpin good practice in one setting should equally apply in other settings, though how these are carried out in practice are likely to differ. As is stated in the AEVTI response to the draft report, its role in the development of these programs below has been significant.

7.1.1 Oberon program

The integrated case management approach for offenders at Oberon correctional facility where vocational education delivered largely by TAFE is combined with outdoor adventure programs and self help living, is an excellent example of combining different programs to encourage inmates to confront their offending behaviour and develop skills toward independent, social and community living.

---

The Young Adults Program at Oberon is aimed at addressing the specific needs of young adults in an integrated manner. The Program focuses on five major functional areas. These are work, accredited vocational training, developmental/life skills, educational and recreational programs.

The core program components are provided within the program areas of employment/work skills, vocational training, educational, developmental, recreational and pre-release programs. All operate whenever possible within an established accredited framework.

The program is structured so as to take account of an offender’s total experience and interaction during the whole period of their incarceration. It includes group learning situations as well as one-on-one sessions with, for example, a welfare officer, and individual interaction with each member of staff during the day to day routine.

Individual case management, area management, pathways for inmates and the structured day requires a holistic approach to inmate management. For meaningful learning to occur, and for the process of changing attitudes to begin, integration of the various areas of the program is essential. This involves the use of mentors, prioritising the professional development of all staff involved in the program and cooperation between program managers, education staff, custodial staff, industry staff and the Governor.

Thus the Oberon program is characterised by the following features:

- coherent program planning, integration and developmental sequencing
- experiential education
- use of mentors
- excellent relationships between custodial and IDS staff
- support from the Governor
- professional development for staff
- provision of accredited vocational courses incorporating personal development, etc
- individual case management

7.1.2 The Nangy Kangar initiative at Cessnock: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Program

This is an excellent example of an integrated case management approach. Its features are:

- close connection between AEVTI, TAFE and Alcohol & Other Drug (AOD), Psychology, Welfare and inmate classification.
- innovative inmate classification, breaches and wage fixing processes
- linking inmates in the community through projects needed in local community.
- integration of pre and post release schemes into the overall program
- cooperation between local and commonwealth authorities

The focus of the program is to effect a smooth transition of inmates into the community. This has required a change in classification procedures, reducing the time from many months to a relatively short period and changes to
breaches procedures. Prior to the implementation of the program very minor breaches of prison rules led to a transfer to another correctional centre. This process has been significantly modified and now inmates who start the program are kept in the facility to ensure continuity, unless there is a major concern.

Inmates are met on arrival by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander workers from the centre and the region, including the pre and post release officer, IDS staff and the TAFE liaison officer. They are presented with the case management plan which links all the various services in a variety of ways. Then they decide if they wish to participate in part of the plan or the whole program.

Inmates who are classified Cl (first level of minimum security) undertake building projects and theory classes in the gaol. Projects include such things as garden retaining walls through to a full building. In the undertaking of these projects these inmates complete the bulk of a TAFE carpentry and joinery course. Those with C2/3 classifications undertake building work outside the facility in areas of community need. The inmates are presented with a substantial toolbox upon completion of the program and at the conclusion of their sentence.

Another innovation has been the review of the inmate wage structure, resulting in a reduction of the gap between a working wage and the undertaking of the traineeship. This was negotiated by the Regional Commander and demonstrates the degree of cooperation between various classifications of staff.

Unlike most facilities where the TAFE vocational teachers come into the correctional facility on a part time basis, in this case the TAFE teacher spends five days in the facility. This has proved to be important because the inmates/students are able to follow through their studies in a far more intense way than is usual. Seven to eight modules are covered in one year which is better than the usual progress for students in TAFE colleges. Most inmates will leave the facility with only six months of the course to complete.

Alongside this vocational program which is the core of the education program there are some other educational courses, a mentor program and the range of other inmate services such as AOD programs.

This program took three years of negotiations to set up due to the range of people involved the AEVTI SEO, DEETYA, TAFE and the variety of classifications of staff in the DCS. However it has now been widely publicised and is now very well supported in the DCS. It is an excellent example of cooperation between external and internal staff leading to an integrated program which delivers accredited training.

7.1.3 The use of overseers within the CSI workshops in inmate education at MRRC

The essence of this innovation is the participation of custodial and industry staff in the education program through the presentation of a TAFE textile certificate in the CSI workshops.
The major features of this program are:

- the cooperation of custodial and industry overseers with education staff and TAFE
- linking of AEVTI, TAFE, CSI and Cortex staff in the delivery of the TAFE Certificate 1 in textiles
- the training of the custodial and industry staff in TAFE and their participation in TAFE staff development network

On the initiative of the Education Officer at MRRC, TAFE sent out a fashion teacher to examine the potential to run a TAFE course at the gaol. This teacher decided that there was the potential to run the certificate in textiles, given the large textiles workshop in the centre and worked with the CSI overseers to develop the course. The inmates who had been working in the workshop were given a Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) assessment and the rest of the course was provided largely by the overseers. These overseers obtained trainer qualifications and have joined the TAFE teachers staff development network.

Again it needs to be stated that AEVTI initiated this program which is a demonstration of the creative use of the integration of the CGEA with other educational activities.

7.1.4 Traineeships at Kirkconnell

The linking of CSI with the AEVTI and custodial staff in the development of a traineeship is another example of co-operation which serves the interests of inmates. Inmates were involved in the planning of the traineeship as were custodial staff. The scheme operates with a peer tutoring system, an integrated literacy program and TAFE assessment on site each week. Many of the inmates have jobs waiting for them as local job agencies are also involved.

7.1.5 High Security prisoners

Prisoners who are difficult to control and those who are in various forms of protection present a more difficult problem for IDS staff. Here, too, there are examples of dedication and success in the most difficult circumstances imaginable for educators. Individual members of education staff (for example at Lithgow) through the offering of recreational programs have established excellent relationships with inmates who are in some cases confined to their cells. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this has had a significant effect in reducing difficult behaviour in the prisons.

7.1.6 Fitness courses and the CGEA at Cessnock

Prior to the introduction of the CGEA in 1996 there was a fitness course offered at Cessnock Gaol. However there were no longer term benefits and no connection between the course and the development in inmates of vocational skills.

Since the introduction of the CGEA however, there has been a structure which has enabled the delivery of short courses based on the interests of inmates (in this instance Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders) to be linked to longer term vocational skills.
AEVTI teachers introduced a short course of some six to eight weeks based on fitness, which was then accredited via an in-house certificate – often the first reward for an educational program these inmates have received. During this first course, which is highly practical, topics such as heart rate are introduced which lead to the introduction of numeracy concepts.

At this stage discussions about future courses are initiated. Courses on first aid are introduced next, ostensibly related to fitness but having the potential to provide some vocational skills. By the end of the second course inmates have completed a module in the CGEA which is now introduced more directly in conjunction with a sports management course and later a coaching course which is far more theoretical and includes aspects of physiology. In effect inmates have undertaken a pre CGEA course leading to the CGEA and then in some instances to an accredited TAFE course.

Such subtle and sensitive developments of inmate interests leading to accredited vocational course could only be done by full time staff in gaols. There is also the advantage with such staff in that they are aware of any developing problems in the gaol, thus making a direct contribution to dynamic security.

7.2 Problems/Issues which need to be addressed

7.2.1 Lack of consensus about role of education in prisons

One area of discussion during Committee meetings has been the philosophy of prison education. Submissions from the Federation have stressed the UN and Council of Europe recommendations which see inmate education (envisaged as the full range of vocational, literacy, religious, cultural, creative, higher, social and physical education and libraries) as a fundamental right.

Principles of this level of generality, however, are often desirable aims and in the real world where there are always resource restrictions it is widely recognised that they can only be put into practice in a diluted form. It is possible, therefore, to agree with the general principle but recognise that its full implementation would not be possible. For this reason, a more productive question than whether the right exists, is what does education in prisons seek to achieve and what form should it take? In any case, it is clear that the range of educational issues covered in the UN statement are covered by a number of the other sections of IDS.

There appears to be agreement that, along with other services, education should seek to rehabilitate and to reduce offending behaviour. There appears to be a lack of consensus, however, about how education can contribute to this aim – what form it should take.

If it is accepted that education needs to operate within a framework of coherent, mutually reinforcing integrated provision of services, there is a need to articulate and embed this emerging approach in the gaol/DCS culture. The development of clear purpose is a prelude to the development of appropriate performance indicators and outcome statements and a quality assurance system for inmate education. It is not a fair criticism of educational staff that
there has been no systematic evaluation of educational programs when their purposes have not been clear. This is discussed in more detail below.

Some suggestions as to possible outcomes for prison education are provided by Gerber and Fritsch (1995). They make the point that rather than asking what works for offenders as a whole there is a need to ask what methods work best for which kinds of offenders and under which conditions. Nevertheless there are four broad types of outcomes which they suggest education might be judged against –

- do inmates who participate in education programs while incarcerated have lower recidivism rates than non participants?
- are participants more likely than non participants to enrol in educational programs upon release?
- after release, do participants have better employment records than non participants?
- while incarcerated do participants exhibit fewer disciplinary problems than non participants?

There are currently few Australian studies which deal with these issues and they could become the focus of future research.

7.2.2 Development of performance indicators for educational provision

Notwithstanding the point above that there are no clear performance indicators in place for educational programs in the DCS, it would be desirable to review the overall quality assurance framework for educational provision. Some elements of such a system are already in place. The moderation procedures in the CGEA, for example, are of a very high standard. The fact that teachers need to be qualified is also an important marker of quality. However there are too few agreed indicators of what would count as success of the whole of the educational provision. Without these indicators it is difficult to evaluate success.

It will be a difficult process to develop performance indicators for prison education. The population is not homogeneous despite the common thread of low educational attainment prior to incarceration. There are many variables which affect educational performance of inmates and it would be dangerous to rely on single measures (such as recidivism rates) for indicators of success. Nevertheless it is vital that indicators of performance be established. Education staff need to be able to demonstrate they are succeeding if in this period of fiscal restraint they expect funding to continue or grow. It might be useful to start with the four broader areas outlined by Gerber and Fritsch above.

7.2.3 Link between education programs and CSI

The example, cited above, of the linking of TAFE courses at MRRC with the textile and laundry industries provides at least a partial model of what might happen in the future. As stated above, the linking of custodial staff with TAFE teachers and the provision of an accredited course overcomes one of the problems which restricts the appeal of education – the amount of money earned by inmates. It also provides an excellent way to develop literacy social and vocational skills in an integrated manner. In addition the use of qualified
trainers working begins to build in the gaol as a whole a culture which values education.

Another problem however is the nature of the industries in the gaols and the current imperative to generate funds. Further, if education is to be more closely linked to CSI, something which is highly desirable in theory, there would need to be far more consideration given to the nature of the skills in the employment market outside the gaol in choosing the kind of industries in the gaols. Also the production targets would need to reflect educational as well as industry needs.

While it is recognised that there are agreements in place which prevent CSI competing with industries outside correctional centres, it would be desirable to investigate the development of industries which can nurture skills appropriate for the labour market but which do not directly compete.

7.2.4 Effect of inmate movement on educational outcomes

While it is clear that for various reasons some inmates need to be moved from one facility to another fairly regularly, there is not always a good reason why their education programs are so disrupted. Where inmates are moved to a facility where a course of study is not offered there is at least the possibility of accessing TAFE's distance provision. Also there were many instances cited in interviews of a prisoner's files taking very long periods of time to arrive at the new facility and serious interruption to their studies as a result.

There is an urgent need to develop an electronic data base of demonstrated competencies which enables prisoners to continue their programs after being moved. Even in the specialised young adults program where inmates follow a well-planned path from Parklea to Oberon and back, there are serious problems with co-ordination which were not able to be satisfactorily explained.

7.2.5 Range of different groups in gaols

In a number of facilities there are what was termed "gaols within gaols", e.g. areas for maximum security inmates, protected prisoners. This leads to serious resource questions which need to be recognised by the DCS. AEVTI staff have been developing initiatives to improve access to isolated prisoners. This appears to be a policy issue which is outside the scope of this review.

7.2.6 Involvement of TAFE teachers in case management

In many instances TAFE teachers were not involved in the case management approach as they came into facilities on a sessional basis only. The practice at Cessnock in the Nangy Kangar program demonstrates the advantages of involving TAFE and of having some TAFE teachers undertaking a full time teaching program in gaols. The advantages of using TAFE teachers in this way will enable there to be a better link with the outside community than currently exists. TAFE obviously has extensive local and statewide contacts with industry and this could lead to better transition/post release arrangements than currently exist.
TAFE have pointed out that this would require a time commitment from their staff and that this would require funding. Whether this is possible is outside the scope of the review.

7.2.7 Literacy/Numeracy/EFL courses.

Currently some such courses are undertaken in traditional classroom/general education settings, though many clearly are not. Most educational research (see, for example Street 1999, Gee 1990, Sola and Bennet 1994, and all the recent literature on workplace learning, e.g. Boud and Garrick 1999) indicates that more learning takes places in applied and authentic settings. It is strongly recommended that consideration be given to integrating such courses with vocational courses where possible.

7.2.8 Libraries/Computer access

While there has been some progress in developing library resources in recent years, most of the libraries visited were inadequate by any standards. Equally, given the need for all members of society to have some knowledge of computers, there is a need to upgrade computer facilities.

7.2.9 Custodial staff development

Given what is perceived by some educational staff to be the lack of sympathy with and understanding of the aims of the educational provision by custodial staff, there appears to be a need for substantial staff development and a need to include in recruitment criteria a capacity to operate within the case management approach.

7.2.10 Traineeships

Where possible traineeships should be developed for inmates engaged in vocational educational programs.
8. Recommendations

8.1 If a full scale review of educational provision in the DCS is to take place in the future it needs clear terms of reference, adequate resources and a time frame which allows for an in-depth investigation of actual provision, submissions from interested parties, a thorough investigation of the international literature and possibly, visits to other correctional systems to examine best practice.

8.2 While it is essential to have staff inside the correctional facilities who have educational expertise related to prison education and who are advocates for inmates, there is also a need to have external educational providers who have extensive local and state wide links into the community. It is also vital to further develop the relationship between the various elements of inmate services. Hence:

8.2.1 AEVTI should retain its position in the DCS but should not attempt to stand separate from other inmates services. The intent of this recommendation is to enable IDS to undertake a more integrated and coherent provision of inmate services. Some of the examples of good practice above could form the model of such an integrated provision across the DCS.

8.2.2 The core, but by no means all, of the educational provision should be vocational education and where possible this should be accredited training. Much of this vocational education should be provided by TAFE.

There needs to be provision for non TAFE providers of accredited training in those cases where TAFE provision is not available/suitable.

8.2.3 All provision of educational services in gaols should be undertaken by trained teachers/trainers at least to certificate 4 levels. It is important that all TAFE teachers teaching in gaols should have the same levels of training as current AEVTI staff.

8.2.4 The CGEA should remain as a vital part of the educational provision in the DCS. There will be many instances when the CGEA is appropriate as a prevocational course. However the link between its use as a prevocational course and an ultimate vocational outcome, preferably accredited, should be established wherever possible. It needs to be acknowledged that the CGEA is likely to be most effective when it is integrated with the development of useful/vocational skills.

8.2.5 There needs to be a longer term MOU developed with TAFE to enable that provider to plan for the medium term. Included in this MOU should be an assurance that TAFE teachers who work in gaols should be trained at least to certificate 4 levels.
8.2.6 Wherever possible, the TAFE provision should be in the form of on-the-job training (such as traineeships) and, hence, closely integrated with CSI. TAFE teachers should participate in the wider case management program.

8.2.7 It would be highly desirable if CSI could be expanded and have as one of its aims the development of skills in inmates which are more closely related to employment prospects in the wider community.

8.2.8 There is a need for educational staff within the DCS to coordinate and monitor the internal and external provision of education. Such staff should develop performance indicators in association with TAFE, which become criteria for success of educational provision in the corrective setting. Such educational staff should ensure that regular evaluation of the provision takes place.

8.3 There is a case for the provision of non accredited courses for inmates in certain circumstances. It is entirely appropriate to develop courses which concentrate on inmate interests so long as a pathway is simultaneously developed between these courses and potential vocational courses/outcomes.

8.4 Current custodial staff need to be provided with staff development to enable them to understand and contribute to the IDS programs. Criteria for recruitment of new staff and their promotion should include capacity to contribute to the IDS programs.

8.5 Resources need to be set aside for a significant upgrading of library and computer facilities within correctional facilities.

8.6 DCS needs to set up an information technology network (an Intranet) which enables inmates educational progress/competencies achieved to be easily transferred from one facility to another.

8.7 The DCS should develop a statement about the purposes of education in correctional facilities and ensure that this is widely distributed and discussed within the DCS.

8.8 Given the gaps in available data which made discussion and measurement of the impact of educational programs difficult, it is recommended that a longitudinal evaluation of educational outcomes for inmates be conducted. It may be possible to develop a university partnership, or gain funding from ANTA for such an evaluation, given that there is very limited research in this field.

Andrew Gonczi
November 1999
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITY/ACTION</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 - If a full scale review of educational provision in the DCS is to take place in the future it needs clear terms of reference, adequate resources and a time frame which allows for an in-depth investigation of actual provision, submissions from interested parties, a thorough investigation of the international literature and possibly, visits to other correctional systems to examine best practice.</td>
<td>No further review is proposed at this stage. Issue addressed in 8.8.</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.1 - AEVTI should retain its position in the DCS but should not attempt to stand separate from other inmates services. The intent of this recommendation is to enable IDS to undertake a more integrated and coherent provision of inmate services. Some of the examples of good practice above could form the model of such an integrated provision across the DCS.</td>
<td>Reinforce and support integration of all inmate programs through Case Management process and Inmate Services &amp; Program Plan.</td>
<td>Underway. 2000 - 2001 full implementation of Inmate Services &amp; Program Plan with the Business Planning process.</td>
<td>ACIM, EDFAM</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.2 - The core, but by no means all, of the educational provision should be vocational education and where possible this should be accredited training. Much of this vocational education should be provided by TAFE. There needs to be provision for non TAFE providers of accredited training in those cases where TAFE provision is not available/suitable.</td>
<td>Working party established to develop wholistic model/mechanism for delivery of education &amp; vocational training.</td>
<td>6/2000</td>
<td>Sub-committee including P/AEVTI, P&amp;P, Operations, FAM, HR plus inclusion of expert on purchaser/provider from DET.</td>
<td>Within current cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITY/ACTION</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>BY WHOM</td>
<td>COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.3 - All provision of educational services in gaols should be undertaken by trained teachers/trainers at least to certificate 4 levels. It is important that all TAFE teachers teaching in gaols should have the same levels of training as current AEVTI staff.</td>
<td>Completed. To be included in any MOU with external providers.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>AEVTI</td>
<td>Nil for the Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.4 - The CGEA should remain as a vital part of the educational provision in the DCS. There will be many instances when the CGEA is appropriate as a prevocational course. However, the link between its use as a prevocational course and an ultimate vocational outcome, preferably accredited, should be established wherever possible. It needs to be acknowledged that the CGEA is likely to be most effective when it is integrated with the development of useful/vocational skills.</td>
<td>Develop guidelines for use of CGEA delivery.</td>
<td>6/2000</td>
<td>AEVTI/ACIM</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.5 - There needs to be a longer term MOU developed with TAFE to enable that provider to plan for the medium term. Included in this MOU should be an assurance that TAFE teachers who work in gaols should be trained at least to certificate 4 levels.</td>
<td>Agree within context 2.2 and 2.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within current financial allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.6 - Wherever possible, the TAFE provision should be in the form of on-the-job training (such as traineeships) and, hence, closely integrated with CSI. TAFE teachers should participate in the wider case management program.</td>
<td>Develop strategy for expansion. To take into account 2.0 and 2.2.</td>
<td>3/2000</td>
<td>P/AEVTI and CSI provide strategy to ACIM</td>
<td>Within current financial allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.7 - It would be highly desirable if CSI could be expanded and have as one of its aims the development of skills in inmates which are more closely related to employment prospects in the wider community.</td>
<td>Develop strategy for expansion. To take into account 2.0 and 2.2.</td>
<td>3/2000</td>
<td>P/AEVTI and CSI provide strategy to ACIM</td>
<td>Within current financial allocations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITY/ACTION</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2.8 - There is a need for educational staff within the DCS to co-ordinate and</td>
<td>Included in action for 8.2.1.</td>
<td>Progress report June</td>
<td>Sub-committee with representation from AEVTI, Research &amp; Statistics, National Council Educational Research &amp; ANTA.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitor the internal and external provision of education. Such staff should</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop performance indicators in association with TAFE, which become</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria for success of educational provision in the correctional setting. Such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational staff should ensure that regular evaluation of the provision takes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 - There is a case for the provision of non accredited courses for inmates in</td>
<td>Relates to 8.2 and 8.2.8. Policy &amp; guidelines Inmates Services &amp; Program Plan.</td>
<td>6/2000</td>
<td>Sub-committee as above.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certain circumstances. It is entirely appropriate to develop courses which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentrate on inmate interests so long as a pathway is simultaneously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed between these courses and potential vocational courses/outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 - Current custodial staff need to be provided with staff development to</td>
<td>Follow up accreditation of overseers.</td>
<td>3/200</td>
<td>P/AEVTI, D/CSI, D/HRM</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enable them to understand and contribute to the IDS programs. Criteria for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruitment of new staff and their promotion should include capacity to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to the IDS programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 - Resources need to be set aside for a significant upgrading of library and</td>
<td>Establishment of sub-committee to provide strategy paper.</td>
<td>Progress report 6/2000</td>
<td>P/AEVTI to organise external expert representation on sub-committee.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer facilities within correctional facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 - DCS needs to set up an information technology network (an Intranet)</td>
<td>Define business requirement options for costing model. Systems Administration position to be</td>
<td>4/2000</td>
<td>ACIM to establish position. Working party headed by systems position.</td>
<td>Within current allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which enables inmates educational progress/competencies achieved to be easily</td>
<td>established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transferred from one facility to another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITY/ACTION</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>BY WHOM</td>
<td>COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7 - The DCS should develop a statement about the purposes of education in correctional facilities and ensure that this is widely distributed and discussed within the DCS.</td>
<td>P/AEVTI to prepare draft for ACIM. Paper for BOM and Ministerial approval.</td>
<td>To ACIM 1/3/00, BOM, Minister 4/2000.</td>
<td>F/AEVTI, ACIM</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8 - Given the gaps in available data which made discussion and measurement of the impact of educational programs difficult, it is recommended that a longitudinal evaluation of educational outcomes for inmates be conducted. It may be possible to develop a university partnership, or gain funding from ANTA for such an evaluation, given that there is very limited research in this field.</td>
<td>Investigate the possibility of University partnership and establishment of a dedicated program research position.</td>
<td>Report to BOM 5/2000.</td>
<td>ACIM/D/R&amp;S</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>