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In 1991, the then Minister for Justice introduced a comprehensive program for young offenders which was to shape the whole of their custodial term. He announced that these young adults were to be separated from the mainstream gaol population. The argument was then and is now that by placing young 'impressionable' inmates in specialised programs, they could participate in programs without being influenced in their decisions by older, more 'hardened' offenders. Consequently, the Department of Corrective Services devised an inmate management program specifically for young offenders.

The current Young Adults Program (YAP), originally known as the Young Offenders Program, has undergone several changes since its inception in 1991. These changes pertain mainly to the Specialised YAP offered at the Parklea and Oberon Correctional Centres.

The current statewide program "to address underlying needs of young inmates in each correctional centre" is defined in the 'green book', the policy document, Managing Young Adults in NSW Correctional Centres.

The Corporate Planning and Development Unit has a brief to co-ordinate the evaluation of the YAP in close liaison with the State Co-ordinator of the YAP and an Evaluation Steering Committee comprising the Assistant Commissioner, Inmate Management, the Regional Commander, North-West Region, the Corporate Planner, the Governors of the Parklea and Oberon Correctional Centres and the State Co-ordinator, Young Adult Offenders Program. This Committee oversees the Evaluation Project and submits this report to the Department's Board of Management.

When the 'green book' was revised in 1995, the authors of the document undertook a thorough literature search which indicated that there is limited research in the area of programs for young offenders. Most literature deals with 'juvenile offenders' or boot camp type programs which tend to focus on building personal discipline through challenging physical activity. There is little evidence of a change in the research available. However, from a scan of some overseas material it appears that in some US States the philosophy underpinning boot camps has changed and a more holistic approach has been adopted in which "soft" and "hard skills" (as in the NSW Specialised Program) are combined.²

¹ Foreword in: Managing Young Adults in NSW Correctional Centres
² An example of this approach seems to be outlined in Shock Incarceration Program in New York State: Philosophy, Results and Limitations, Cheryl L Clark and David W Aziz, February 1996
There are no correctional centres specifically for 'young offenders' in any other Australian State. At the Cadell Correctional Centre in South Australia, for example, a specific program has been introduced for male inmates who have been sentenced for the first time to an adult correctional centre. This Operation Challenge runs over four months and, akin to the Specialised Program of Oberon, it combines training and activities in cognitive, social and physical skills. In significant difference to Oberon, however, the program is not an integrated program and is offered to only 14 participants at a time, housed in a separate wing within a low security institution accommodating 140 inmates, about 180 km from Adelaide.

In some correctional centres in northern Europe, young prisoners are housed in small groups with little contact with other inmates.³

During the initial stage of this evaluation, it became clear that the programs of the Parklea and Oberon Correctional Centres are seen by many Departmental employees as synonymous with the Department’s Young Adult Offenders Program. While these two correctional centres offer a unique "specialised young offenders program", it reaches only a minority of young adult offenders in the NSW correctional system. The Parklea Correctional Centre holds no more than 300 inmates. There are about 1400 young adult offenders, i.e., inmates under the age of 25, so 1100 of these cannot participate in the Parklea - Oberon program.

The 'green book' outlines a "Program Structure for all Centres"⁴ with a particular emphasis on the "Core Components of the Program". An evaluation of the YAP must, by definition, take into consideration the overall program as it is implemented, or not implemented, in all correctional centres which accommodate young adult offenders.

The findings of this evaluation should be understood within a particular context as evaluations of programs and services have traditionally not been a regular part of program design and delivery. For this reason alone, it is not surprising that Departmental staff tended to react to this evaluation in a defensive way. There seems to be a certain degree of doubt on their part that the details of their work could be understood by members of Head Office staff, and of suspicion that the results of the evaluation could be used as negative criticism of the quality of their work.

³ Information has been requested from a correctional centre in Germany offering specific services to young inmates but at the time of writing this report, the information was not yet available.

⁴ The Oberon part of the program which includes an adventure based outdoors education component is indeed without peers in Australia.

⁵ Young Adults in NSW Correctional Centres, 10pp
During the initial stage of the evaluation, the opinions of Departmental staff associated with, or with a particular interest in, the YAP were sought.

For the second stage of the evaluation, staff (custodial and non-custodial) and inmates were formally interviewed in Glen Innes, Cessnock, Mannus and Juneo and the specialised young adult offenders institutions of Parklea and Oberon. At the time of writing this report, interviews at Goulburn and the MRRC, although foreshadowed in the first report to the Evaluation Steering Committee, had not yet been carried out.

The questionnaires were not self-administered; all interviewees were randomly selected with the help of the Program Managers in each Centre visited. Inmates had to be under 25 years of age; this was the only criterion for random selection in centres other than Parklea and Oberon. In Parklea, random selection of inmates was made from the category of those who had completed the Oberon component of the Specialised Program and those who had not yet been to Oberon, or who had not yet been assessed for the Oberon part of the program. In both Parklea and Oberon, members of the 'adult nucleus' were also interviewed.

At the beginning of each interview the purpose of the evaluation, the voluntary nature of participation and confidentiality of the information were emphasised.

The questionnaires used to interview inmates in centres without a Specialised Young Adults Program were used

- to gauge the level of awareness among young inmates of the existence of the specialised program;
- to review the selection processes for the Specialised Young Adults Program;
- to appraise how the young offenders themselves view specific programs for young adult offenders;
- to ascertain whether young offenders have an opportunity to participate in programs which are within the parameters of the core elements of the Department's young adult offender management strategies.

---

6 Please see Appendix 1 for details

7 A review of the interviews carried out thus far indicates clear common themes in the answers from staff and inmates and it is questionable whether additional interviews in Goulburn and the MRRC will be necessary.

8 See Appendix 2

9 The term 'adult nucleus' is used to describe inmates over 25 who have been selected for placement in the Specialised YAP to provide some age balance.
The questionnaires used to interview staff in centres without a Specialised Young Adults Program were used

- to estimate the level of awareness among custodial and non-custodial officers of the Department's young adult offenders policy (the 'green book');
- to gauge the level of awareness among custodial and non-custodial officers of the Specialised Young Adults Program;
- to survey staff opinion about the need for programs specifically aimed at inmates under 25 years of age, and about the need for correctional institutions exclusively for young offenders.

The questionnaires used to interview custodial and non-custodial staff in Parklea and Oberon were used

- to establish whether a significant number of staff had chosen to work in these centres in order to be involved with the management of young adult offenders;
- to ascertain the specific management strategies they apply;
- to gauge their level of understanding of the Specialised Program in toto (ie, including their perception of the program of Oberon - if they work in Parklea - and of Parklea - if they work in Oberon);
- to estimate the level of awareness of the Department's overall young adult offenders policy.

The questionnaires used to interview inmates at Parklea after they completed the Oberon component were used

- to get a picture of how they were assessed and chosen for the Specialised Young Adults Program;
- to gauge their progress through the Parklea - Oberon - Parklea stages of the Specialised Program;
- to find out how they perceive the merit to themselves of participating in the YAP;
- to collect information about how they fare in stage 5 of the YAP;
- to assess the pre-release preparation offered at Unit 4 of the Parklea Correctional Centre.

The questionnaires used to interview members of the 'adult nucleus' in Parklea and Oberon were used

- to gain an understanding of how their placement in the Specialised Young Adults Program corresponds with their own case management and program pathway planning;
- to gauge their opinion about the effectiveness of the Specialised Program;
- to review how they were assessed for the placement in the specialised program.
The very broad objectives\textsuperscript{10} listed in the 'green book' include some which are impossible to measure. As regular and systematic evaluations of programs and services are to be conducted by the Department from now on as a matter of course, future program design and service development must take this into consideration when devising objectives and strategies for programs and services.

For the purpose of this evaluation of the YAP, the performance indicators were established based on the stated objectives of the Department's Young Adult Offender Policy and Program.\textsuperscript{11}

It is important to note that although one of the stated objectives of the Department's Young Adult Offender Policy stipulates that "appropriate management and information systems [are established] to enable access to relevant data, eg, demographic, educational etc.", statistics pertaining to young adult offenders in NSW correctional centres are not easily available. For example, all statistics kept by AEVTI are based on state-wide, not individual correctional centre or offender category based data. Nor does AEVTI keep any statistics particularly relevant to the YAP. The same is true for the Department's Alcohol and Other Drugs Services.

There appears to be a great expectation that this situation will change significantly with the introduction of the new IDS data base which is currently being trialed at the John Morony and Cassnock Correctional Centres and which is to make it possible to extrapolate information concerning individual young adult offenders by cross-referencing with the DOB input. In addition, staff consulted for this report have been critical of OMS as it does not yet supply all the information they were used to receiving via the superseded ORS.

The introduction of a Correctional Centre Monthly Report\textsuperscript{12} will also go a long way to ensure that statistical data about operational issues, staffing issues, inmate management and administration is centrally available. Any issues relating to the management of young adult offenders will then be collected as a matter of course.

\textsuperscript{10} For a list of the stated policy/program objectives, please see Appendix 3

\textsuperscript{11} For details about the Performance Indicators, please see Appendix 4

\textsuperscript{12} At the time of writing this report, the Operations Branch had prepared the format for data collection and was also in the process of establishing an electronic data base which allows information from the correctional centres to be entered in 'real time' to be collated in a formal report once a month.
1 THE SPECIALISED YOUNG ADULTS PROGRAM

It should be relatively easy to establish the following statistics since the specialised YAP commenced operation:

- number and percentage of young adult offenders who successfully completed the Oberon component and the number and percentage who have not
- number and percentage who proceeded from Parklea to Oberon program
- number and percentage who returned to Parklea for stage 4 of the specialised program
- number and percentage of inmates who were released from Oberon without returning to Parklea
- number and percentage of inmates who were transferred from Oberon to a correctional centre other than Parklea after completing the Oberon component
- number and percentage of inmates who were 'tipped' from Oberon and the reasons
- number and percentage of inmates who have successfully completed the work release program at Parklea
- number of inmates who were released from Unit 4 at Parklea and who had employment arranged
- number and percentage of inmates who have applied to be included in the Oberon program but were not transferred from Parklea

A request for information pertaining to the above list was forwarded to both the Parklea and Oberon Correctional Centres.

The response from Parklea was brief: the only figure available is the number of inmates (272) released from Unit 4 between April 1994 and December 1997. Attention was drawn to the fact that these numbers do not give any information about inmates released directly from Oberon or about inmates who did not progress from Parklea to the Oberon Program.  

The figures received from Oberon are more specific: since the first 'intake' of young inmates in June 1983, a total of 940 inmates have been received.

By mid March 1998, 585 had graduated from the Gumang Life Challenge Program.

13 Staff at Parklea made the point that it was difficult to respond to requests for such statistical data as they were not collected as a matter of course; if such data was going to be required in future, Parklea would implement the necessary steps to ensure their availability.

14 These numbers do not indicate members of the 'adult nucleus'.

15 Members of three 'intakes' (48 inmates) were still in the process of completing the Life Challenge Program by mid March. Also, there was a group of inmates (10) who were accommodated at Oberon but did not participate in the Specialised Program.
Over the five years, 48 inmates were transferred ("tipped") to other correctional centres for security reasons and 38 for drug offences. These 85 inmates must be counted as having failed the Oberon Program in addition to those 107 inmates who attended Gumang for its four month duration but did not meet the standards required to successfully graduate. The overall rate of participants who are not able to perform the tasks set by the Oberon Program according to the set standards is about 21% which — according to the Adventure Based Education Co-ordinator — is at a level similar to the rate expected and accepted by comparable adventure based programs.

According to the data supplied by the Oberon Correctional Centre, 29 inmates were released from Oberon since 1996 without returning to Parklea or placement at another correctional centre. 10 41 inmates (4.36%) were moved from Oberon for protection reasons.

The point must be made that the answers to the complete list of data requests could be provided but would need an enormous amount of time and effort. Even if the numbers were established, the individual MIN numbers would have to be cross-referenced with a range of other variables which cannot be achieved by the push of a button.

2 CENTRALLY COLLECTED DATA

As one of the performance indicators requires "the number of breaches of security and safety experienced with young adult offenders and staff", the Department's Research Unit was consulted. The figures received relate to breaches, reported assaults, escapes, self-harm and misconducts in the calendar years of 1996 and 1997. To ascertain whether these involve inmates under the age of 25 in centres other than Parklea and Oberon, virtually each case would have to be cross referenced with DOB information. Staff from the Research Unit made the point that, if these statistics are needed in future to specifically highlight the situation with young adult offenders, it would be useful at the point of entering the information for the DOB to be added automatically as one variable. Any future search for the information would then be available more easily and speedily.

In the data about Parklea and Oberon received from the Department's Research Unit, comparable information about Grafton and Glen Innes was provided. It should be noted that comparisons between Glen Innes and Oberon and Parklea and Grafton have to be understood in the context of several factors which make each correctional centre unique; for example, the average daily inmate population during 1997 in Parklea was 289; in Grafton it was 257. The average daily inmate population during the same year was 88 in Oberon and 115 in Glen Innes. Inmates in Oberon and Glen Innes have a minimum security classification; in Grafton and Parklea, security classifications vary. Many inmates in Glen Innes are placed there after having been received at Grafton. As a general rule, inmates are transferred to Oberon after having spent time in Parklea.

---

10 Before 1996, no inmate was directly released from Oberon.
The incidence of assaults by inmates against officers and assaults by inmates against inmates - listed in the category of 'breaches' - has remained almost unchanged between 1996 and 1997.\(^{17}\)

The situation concerning assaults remained unchanged in Oberon in 1996 and 1997 (5 assaults by inmates against inmates).

In the category of 'offences in custody', there has been a significant drop in the incidence of 'fighting/assaults' in Parklea from 1996 to 1997.\(^{18}\) This is particularly noteworthy as Parklea accommodates remandees, a group of inmates (in this case under 25 years of age) who are, generally speaking, in the most vulnerable and volatile time of their incarceration. There is much anecdotal evidence\(^{19}\) from staff and inmates that the incidence of assaults (in both categories) has fallen significantly in Parklea since last year.

In Oberon the figures for the same situation have gone up from 0 to 10 in the same time. Again, these statistics must be noted in a particular context as well. For example, the success of Oberon relies on a very structured program during which inmates commit themselves explicitly to certain standards of acceptable behaviour. Consequently any violation of this 'code of conduct' results in official reporting.

As far as Breaches of Prison Discipline are concerned\(^{20}\), Parklea's figures dropped from 831 (in 1996) to 582 (in 1997). When compared as Rate per 100 Inmates, the Parklea figures are still higher than those of Grafton or of NSW in general.\(^{21}\) During the same time, Breaches of Prison Discipline in Oberon have gone up and, in 1997, are above the NSW figures.\(^{22}\) Yet, these figures are not surprising as both institutions are accommodating young adult offenders; in disturbances in any correctional centre in NSW, younger inmates tend to feature predominantly as the culprits.

\(^{17}\) Parklea 1996 - 10 (against officers) 1997 - 10 (against officers)
   1996 - 36 (against inmates) 1997 - 34 (against inmates)

\(^{18}\) Parklea 1996 - 61 1997 - 34

\(^{19}\) At the time of writing this report, more recent figures were not yet available.

\(^{20}\) For a detailed list please see Appendix 5

\(^{21}\) Parklea (1996) - 287.5 (1997) - 207.1
   NSW (1996) - 171.6 (1997) - 154.4

\(^{22}\) Oberon (1996) - 155.7 (1997) - 163.7
   Glen Innes (1996) - 159.1 (1997) - 141.7
   NSW (1996) - 171.6 (1997) - 154.4
In a further breakdown of the figures\(^23\), the charges for *Drugs in Urine* for Parklea are particularly noteworthy: they dropped from 113 in 1996 to 52 in 1997. In Oberon they dropped from 18 to 10.

### 3 ACTIVITIES IN OTHER CORRECTIONAL CENTRES

#### 3.1 The six monthly reporting system

In February 1996 a process was introduced by which all correctional centres provided a report every four months to the State Co-ordinator for the YAP containing information about their inmates under the age of 25. At that time, these reports were collated by the Special Needs Officers in the four Regions.

Since May 1996, these reports are supplied on a six monthly basis and are submitted to the State Coordinator via the offices of the Regional Commanders. The standardised reporting form\(^24\) requires individual correctional centres to provide information about those activities at their centres which meet the criteria of the ‘core program’ for young adult offenders as stipulated in the Department’s ‘green book’.

They include:
- the name of the core program offered in the correctional centre;
- the number of times the core program has been offered in the reporting period;
- the total number of young adult inmates who enrolled in this program during the reporting period;
- the number of young adult inmates who are not participating in the program.

The reporting form also provides an opportunity to ‘comment on attitude/level of involvement of participating inmates’.

The State Co-ordinator for the Young Adult Offenders Program made the following comments when consulted for this report:

- The reporting system is particularly relevant for the North-West and South-West Regions; (In the Metropolitan Region many institutions are now earmarked for specific, eg. therapeutic, programs). All centres, however, are expected to at least fill in the cover sheet of the report package which provides a summary of the number of young adult offenders who are accommodated in each individual centre and who are participating in group and individual programs in accordance with the ‘core’ requirements of the ‘green book’. It notes the number of staff who have completed the *Young Adult Offenders Staff Training Course* at the Academy.

---

\(^23\) See details in Appendix 5

\(^24\) For a sample of these reporting forms, please see Appendix 6 concerning the latest reports from the South-West Region.
> Without specifically commenting on the situation in individual centres, it is obvious that the quality of the reports varies. It does not necessarily follow that the quality of the delivered programs and services varies correspondingly. They also vary in the degree to which individual centres are incorporating the "core elements" of the YAP into the 'mainstream' of their inmate development services. It is important to note that programs and program components must not be explicitly identified as being specifically for young adult offenders only. They can be offered to groups of inmates of all ages and still fulfill the requirements of the "core elements" of the Department's YAP.25

> Apart from the group programs which are offered in correctional centres, the individual interaction between custodial officers and inmates, and non-custodial staff and inmates is important. The reporting form allows for this to be noted.

> Reports from the correctional centres for female inmates are not expected at this stage as the new gender specific classification system for women stipulates different Departmental processes for program design and reporting mechanisms.

3.2 The Glen Innes pilot program

In February this year, the Glen Innes Correctional Centre implemented a pilot program26 over three days specifically for its young adult inmates. It was developed as part of the Centre's pre-release program. This pilot program was instigated by the State Coordinator of the YAP. He was able to acquire funding for this from the Department in response to a request from the Interdepartmental Committee concerning the Strategic Plan to Prevent Young People's Participation in Crime, an initiative of the Premier's Department.

At the time of writing this report, a written account of the Glen Innes Program by the local A/Program Manager had not been received but he gave a brief verbal initial evaluation of the three day program. In summary, it resulted in a re-design not in program content but in delivery style.

1 RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS FOR THE SPECIALISED PROGRAM

A review of budget information obtained from the Finance Branch clearly shows that in

---

25 This is particularly noteworthy as many young adult offenders interviewed in centres other than Parklea and Oberon reported in the interviews that they are "doing nothing which has anything to do with young guys".

26 For details please see Appendix 7
a comparison of cost per inmate per year, the Oberon and Parklea Correctional Centres receive a considerable amount of resources not available to other gaols of comparable security classification and inmate numbers.

For the purpose of this evaluation, Oberon was compared with Glen Innes and Parklea was compared with Bathurst. The following picture emerges:

In Bathurst (320 average inmates per day), the inmate to staff ratio is 1.97 while in Parklea (294 average inmates per day) is more staff intensive with a ratio of 1.26. In Bathurst the inmate to custodial staff ratio is 2.83 and in Parklea only 1.67. The inmate to IDS staff ratio in Bathurst is 25.6 and in Parklea in significant difference, only 19.6.

Glen Innes (115 average inmates per day), has an inmate to staff ratio of 2.91 while Oberon (85 average inmates per day) shows the ratio as only 1.85. The inmate to custodial staff ratio in Glen Innes is 5.75 and in Oberon only 2.83; the inmate to IDS staff ratio in Glen Innes stands at 28.75 whereas in Oberon it is only 17.0.

Based on the year end revised budget figures for 1997, Bathurst was allocated $34,200 per inmate per annum; Parklea received $49,575, Oberon $38,105 and Glen Innes $25,739 per inmate per annum.

If Oberon and Parklea are running a specialised program which goes beyond the 'normal' requirements of inmate management in NSW, and this necessitates such increased level of resource allocation, the Department must examine, for example, what duties custodial officers in both centres have to carry out which they would not have to include in their duty statements if they were employed in one of the Department's 'mainstream' institutions.

Research for this evaluation was unable to identify any 'additional duties' custodial officers have to carry out in the Specialised Program which are beyond those listed in the generic post descriptions used for all of the Department's custodial staff.

If custodial officers participate in the 'camps' in Oberon, for example, it should be noted, that they do so in a voluntary capacity. This does not mean, however, that they participate in their own time. They do so during their working hours and for this they receive an extra allowance. In addition to this increased expense, the Oberon Correctional Centre still has to cover the posts 'vacated' by custodial officers participating in a camp.

Considering the classification structure at, and the physical layout of, the Parklea Correctional Centre (for example, inmates accommodated in Unit 2 are not permitted to mix with inmates in Unit 3), a higher IDS and/or custodial staff ratio, compared to other institutions, might be justified.

For details, please refer to Appendix 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average inmate No</th>
<th>inmates/staff ratio</th>
<th>inmates/cust staff ratio</th>
<th>inmates/IDS staff ratio</th>
<th>$ per inmate p/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>34,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>49,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberon</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>38,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Innes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>25,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that in this comparison, the staffing and budget allocations for the Bathurst and Glen Innes Correctional Centres are not considered benchmark figures. It is impossible to compare the Oberon Program with any program in Australia which is similar in its purpose. As the YAP is classified as a specialised program, a comparison with another of the Department's specialised programs might be more relevant. However, such a comparison again can set only nominal benchmarks as the programs compared are vastly different from each other and they share only their status of being "specialised".

By implementing a specific program for young adults, the Department acknowledges that the management of this particular age group of inmates draws additional resources.

2 RECIDIVISM AS PERFORMANCE INDICATOR

If the effectiveness of the Young Adults Program is measured in the context of the Department's own recidivism research concerning young adult inmates, the picture is grim. A yet unpublished report\(^{28}\), in which "recidivism was defined as the percentage of people returned with a conviction leading to a sentence of full-time custody in New South Wales within two years of discharge"\(^{29}\), categorically states _inter alia_ that

- "recidivism of young inmates in custody for the first time has not improved since before the start of the Young Offenders Project",
- "recidivism of young inmates in custody for the second, third, etc, time has not improved since before the start of the Young Offenders Project",
- "there was no significant difference between the recidivism of the Young Adult Offender Project inmates and the others" and, even more specifically,
- "there was no significant difference between the recidivism of the Oberon graduates and the control group".\(^{30}\)

---

\(^{28}\) Recidivism and Young Offenders: Inmates Discharged 1990 - 1994, Barbara Thompson, Research Statistician, Research and Statistics Unit, July 1997

\(^{29}\) p 1

\(^{30}\) See Recidivism of Inmates Graduating from Oberon Young Adult Offenders Program, cover page.
The methodology and design of recidivism studies is outside the scope of this report but it should be noted that there is now a growing volume of academic work highly critical of using recidivism as the sole indicator of the success of out-door programs involving young offenders. It is also worth pointing out that high rates of recidivism might be an indictment of the quality and extent of resources of community and social services, and the released person’s economic circumstances, rather than of the Department of Corrective Services’ ability to deliver appropriate and effective personal development programs to (young adult) inmates.

Staff at Oberon are particularly keen to introduce a systematic evaluation method by which personality change and behavioural assessments are carried out. This will help to show improvements of young offenders in areas such as problem solving, quality of interpersonal relationships with their peers and Departmental staff, social skills and their ability to deal with authority.

3 ONGOING PROGRAM EVALUATION

A systematic evaluation at different stages of the Oberon Gumang Program is already part of its program design and implementation. It is the specific aim of the Case Team Review (CTR) to “continually assess each inmate’s performance at regular intervals”. The young inmates themselves have an opportunity to complete an evaluation questionnaire at the end of their four months “adventure based” course.

From formal and informal consultations with custodial and non-custodial staff at Oberon, it appears that these internal evaluations are much utilised in the continuous review of the Gumang Program and over time many changes and adaptations to the Oberon Program have been initiated from this process.

The proposed evaluation of the Gumang Program by NOELS, a research company specialising in the assessment of outdoor educational activities will further enhance the Department’s commitment to implement quality programs for young adult offenders. The proposed research plan by NOELS fits in well with the overall evaluation of the YAP.

4 INMATE SELECTION

Because of variation in sentence length alone, there will always be situations when

---

31 See for example, Outdoor Programs for Young Offenders In Detention, An Overview by Susan Reddrop, National Clearinghouse for Youth Studies, Hobart 1997

32 For details of CTR process please see Appendix 9

33 For details of these evaluation forms, please see Appendix 10

34 The NOELS project has been approved and the project is expected to commence in May/June 1998.
young Inmates cannot attend all five stages of the Specialised Program and situations when other overriding classification reasons necessitate the placement of young inmates, even though they may not exactly fit the eligibility categories, at both specialised centres. Further, officers who have been working in Oberon since the Specialised Program started report that there were "never enough inmates at Parklea suitable for the Oberon program" and that the number of inmates to be received at Oberon for each 16 week program 36 tends to "always fall short".

The selection criteria for the Specialised YAP stipulated in the Department's 'green book' are sufficiently flexible to take this into account and they have been adapted over time to meet inevitable inmate management demands.

1 ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Formal interviews were carried out with forty nine (49) staff (33 custodial and 16 non-custodial officers), and fifty eight (58) inmates (including 6 members of the 'adult nucleus'). 38 To give the findings statistical relevance, at least 10 percent of the overall number of staff employed and inmates accommodated where the interviews took place were selected. As random selection was considered vital, the number of staff and inmates interviewed depended on their availability at the time of the visit to each gaol. At least 10 percent of the target population was interviewed at each location.

1.1. Staff responses in context

To obtain a realistic picture from the staff responses to the questionnaires, they should be seen within the following context:

- There exists no Departmental Case Management Policy so it might not be reasonable to expect that staff are familiar with the details of the Specialised YAP.

- The Training Course at the Academy dealing with issues relating to young adult offenders was introduced in 1996. Initially this course was to be offered to 18 participants five times per year giving preference to staff from Parklea, Oberon, Mulawa and Emu Plains. After 12 months, this policy was changed to give staff in other centres a greater chance to attend. Since 1996, one hundred and ninety

---

35 The number can vary but tends to be between 15 and 20
36 For further details, please refer to Appendix 11
six (196) members of staff have completed the course which takes nine days. It is a deliberate management decision in accordance with the YAO Policy that the core elements in of the YAP are to be incorporated into the general IDS programs in centres other than Parklea and Oberon. The rationale for this is twofold - (1) resources for programs are already limited and must so be utilised in the most cost efficient way, and (2) it is undesirable to put the spotlight on a group of inmates (such as young adult offenders).

1.1.1 Staff responses - general

- According to responses to the questionnaires, knowledge of the Department's 'green book' (Managing Young Adults in NSW Correctional Centres) is not widespread. Staff interviewed in Centres other than Parklea and Oberon professed to "very little knowledge" about the Specialised Program. For example, four (4) custodial and four (4) non-custodial staff said that they had "heard about it". The additional five (5) custodial officers who responded (a) "sent one adult nucleus to Parklea", (b) "have a working knowledge of the Program" and (c) have "my own copy of the 'green book'" were all of a rank higher than a Senior Prison Officer. Only one custodial Officer (Glen Innes) said that he "made a point of obtaining my own copy of the 'green book'". Seven (7) staff members (of seventeen) in Parklea and Oberon said that they knew of the existence of a Departmental policy on the management of young adult offenders.

- Of the thirty two (32) staff (22 custodial and 10 non-custodial) interviewed in the centres other than Parklea and Oberon only one custodial and one non-custodial officer had participated in the Academy staff training course concerning young adult offenders.

- Of the same group, twenty (20) custodial and six (6) non-custodial officers were adamant that there were no programs at their centre which were aimed specifically at the needs of young adult offenders. The three custodial officers who said there were programs for young offenders could only cite "keeping them busy", "lots of sporty things and lots of educational courses" and "literacy and numeracy courses" as designated activities for young inmates.

- Sixteen (16) custodial and five (5) non-custodial staff interviewed in centres other than Parklea and Oberon said that special programs for young offenders were needed. Eight (8) members of staff either voiced some doubt or suggested alterations to the existing program. One said "special programs are good but not special goals".

---

37 Some examples: Parklea has given thirty-two (32) staff members an opportunity to attend the course; Oberon has sent fourteen (14); thirteen (13) staff members from Goulburn and nine (9) from Grafton have participated. Although a relatively small centre, Mannus nevertheless has permitted 4 staff members to take part. The Reception and Induction Centre at Long Bay, now closed, sent 8 members of staff.
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A review of the interviews with staff (irrespective of seniority) shows that phrases such as "get them when they're young", "they need protection from the predators" and "they are still very impressionable and easily led" feature predominantly. Several staff members made the point that there "should be more programs for young Kooris". Three (3) custodial staff could not see the need for programs specifically for young offenders.

Perhaps not surprisingly all staff but one interviewed at Parklea said they were in favour of programs specifically for young offenders. All ten (10) who were in support offered suggestions on how to improve the current program.

Generally speaking, of the six (6) staff interviewed at Oberon, all were supportive of special programs for young offenders but voiced some reservations about the program structure such as being "not sure about throwing them all together".

1.1.2 Staff responses - Specialised Program

- None of the custodial staff interviewed at Parklea said they were working at this Correctional Centre because they wanted to work with young offenders; two (2) of the non-custodial staff members stated that they sought employment at Parklea because they wanted to be involved in the Young Adult Offenders Program. Two (2) of the custodial staff and one (1) of the non-custodial staff members interviewed at Oberon said they came to Oberon because they wanted to be involved with the Young Adult Offenders Program.

- Three custodial officers interviewed at Oberon said they had received "special training" to work with young adult offenders. When the program first started at Oberon, special in-house training was offered. None had participated in the relevant course at the Academy. The two non-custodial staff members interviewed at Oberon said although they had not attended the Academy course, they had participated in staff training in their professional field with particular emphasis on young offenders. One custodial officer said that no special training had been available.

- As was the case for staff at Oberon, so for staff at Parklea - training in the area of young adult offenders management (in its broadest sense), did not have a high priority. Five (5) custodial officers interviewed at Parklea had attended "some training" (three of them quite some time ago when the "program first started") but none saw any real merit in it for their work mainly because "life experience is more relevant". Two interviewed custodial officers had not received any special training at all but "wouldn't mind doing some". Only one of the four (4) non-custodial officers interviewed had enrolled in the Academy's Young Adult Offenders Training Course and believed it had brought "good insights".

- There seems to be no detailed knowledge in staff interviewed (custodial and
non-custodial) at Parklea of the Oberon component of the Specialised Program, and, vice versa, staff at Oberon do not claim great familiarity with the Parklea Program. And yet, when asked whether they believed the two Centres fitted well with each other, six (6) custodial staff at Parklea gave an unequivocal 'yes'. Three (3) members of the non-custodial staff at Parklea were more circumspect. Three (3) members of the custodial staff at Oberon were also cautious in their assessment.

1.2 Inmate responses in context

To properly appraise the answers elicited from inmates by the questionnaires, it is again important to place them into a particular context:

- The Specialised YAP is for inmates who come from the Sydney metropolitan area and, more recently, it includes also inmates referred to Parklea from the Cessnock and Goulburn Correctional Centres. Not surprisingly, there is a difference between how young offenders from country areas perceive a program at a correctional centre in Sydney and which - with the exception of carefully selected adults - only accommodates 'young blokes'. The overriding concern of young offenders particularly those whose families and friends live outside the metropolitan area is to spend their time of incarceration as close to home as possible. The same inmates also tend to have an image of what young people in the city are like and these stereotyped ideas might colour their perception of the Parklea - Oberon Program.

- It is not seen as necessary to inform all young adult offenders of the existence of the specialised YAP if it is clear from the outset that they are ineligible for participation in the Parklea - Oberon program.

- Young adult offenders might participate in courses/programs which meet the aims set out in the core elements of the 'green book'. Yet, for the reasons stated previously, these activities are not identified as such.

- Participation in the Specialised YAP is no longer voluntary for those young inmates who meet the access criteria set out in the 'green book'.

- Generally speaking, at any given time, about 50 - 60 of the young adults in Parklea are 'SORC inmates'. More significantly for the purpose of the staged YAP, about 25% of those inmates returning from Oberon to Unit 4 at Parklea fall under the jurisdiction of the PRLC. This means that classification decisions pertaining to these inmates involve additional administrative processes which may slow down progression from C2 to C3 at the last stage of the Program.

1.2.1 Inmate responses - general

- Of the total of fifty two (52) young adult offenders interviewed, twenty seven (27)
self-reported having spent time in Juvenile Justice institutions; three (3) of the 'adult nucleus' also said that they had earlier been in 'boys homes'. Twenty seven (27) young offenders said they had been in an adult gaol at least once before; four (4) members of the 'adult nucleus' reported the same. Eleven (11) young inmates and two (2) members of the 'adult nucleus' were born overseas; and an additional ten (10) stated that at least one of their parents was born outside Australia. Thirteen (13) of the young adult offenders interviewed and three (3) members of the 'adult nucleus' were Aboriginal.

Only two (2) inmates interviewed in centres other than Parklea and Oberon stated that they were participating in particular activities because they were specifically for 'young' offenders. The rest, thirty one (31) interviewees, were adamant that they were "doing nothing for young guys". (One of the interviewed inmates is a full-time student.)

Two (2) inmates had participated in the Parklea - Oberon program during a previous sentence. Four (4) had been to the Parklea Correctional Centre before. Five (5) inmates in centres other than Parklea and Oberon said that they "never heard" of a program specifically for inmates under the age of 25 and nine (9) said they "know about it".

Eighteen (18) inmates interviewed in centres other than Parklea or Oberon were adamant that they did not want to be placed in the Specialised Young Adult Offenders Program under any circumstances; nine (9) gave their reason for this that it was "too far away from my family" and the other nine (9) did not want to be "just with 'plastic gangsters'" or "only young guys" or "prefer(red) the company of older more mature guys". One (1) interviewee stated that he was explicitly "barred from" the Specialised Program.

1.2.2 Inmate responses - Specialised Program

Of the six (6) of the ten (10) Inmates interviewed at Parklea who had not participated in the Oberon program and who were not on remand, only one said that his placement in Parklea was discussed with him: "I was given an option of Goulburn, Grafton or Parklea at the MRRC and I chose Parklea because it's closest to my family". None of the four interviewed remainderes had any work and they all were very vocal about "having absolutely nothing to do" and "being bored all the time". The six (6) sentenced interviewees were employed in the cabinet shop and two (2) stated that they were listed as working but "there is no work really". All inmates of non-English speaking background interviewed at Parklea complained about being the target of racism, particularly by officers.

The five (5) inmates interviewed at Parklea and who had returned from the Oberon program all reported that apart from being "classed" from other centres

Please refer to Appendix 12
to participate in the Specialised Young Adult Offenders Program, they "had to do nothing special" to get to Parklea. There was also no sense that there was any need for "preparation" - other than having "to get my C2" - for the Oberon part of the Program. All of those interviewed inmates said that Unit 4 was "a let down" after Oberon. Only one (1) of the inmates interviewed in the Work Release Centre had progressed to a C3 classification. They all agreed that a special program for "young guys" was "a good idea" and that Oberon was "really enjoyable" because apart from "the camps which were good", "the officers there are nice".

At the time of the interviews at Parklea, only seven (7) inmates in Unit 4 participated in the external work release program. Of the nine (9) inmates interviewed at Oberon, only two (2) expected to return to Parklea and be able to participate in the external work release program. The others stated that they "don't have enough time to make it to a C3". Only two (2) expected to be sent back although not being able to become eligible for work release; the others expressed their hope to stay at Oberon until release or to be placed in a centre other than Parklea.

All 'adult nucleus' inmates interviewed at Parklea are serving long-term custodial sentences. One had been to Oberon and all had a clear idea of their own program pathway.

The three (3) members of the 'adult nucleus' interviewed at Oberon were also long-term inmates. Again they all had a clear idea about their own program pathway. One (1) had previously been a member of the Parklea 'adult nucleus'.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

It is impossible to gain a complete insight into the operations of a correctional centre simply by visiting several times. Some observations through the eyes of an 'outsider', however, might be helpful in reviewing certain aspects of operations. Therefore the following observations are offered in the spirit of constructive criticism:

1 REVIEW OF STAGE 4 OF THE PROGRAM

Not all young adult offenders will be eligible to participate in pre-release programs as their minimum or fixed-term sentence length will preclude them from progressing to a C3 security classification. This in turn means that they

39 These figures vary. For example, in early November 1997, of fifty-seven (57) inmates accommodated at Unit 4, eighteen (18) participated in the external work release program.

40 See Operations Procedures Manual, Pre-Release Programs, Section 18.4
cannot apply for the Department's Work Release Program. For those young inmates who have graduated from the Oberon Gumang Life Challenge Program and are then transferred to Unit 4 at Parklea without being able to participate in the external Work Release Program, the fourth stage of the YAP does not really represent a 'progression'. At the time of writing this report, a Pre-Release Program for Unit 4 inmates had just been designed and was about to be implemented by mid March 1998. It is planned to offer this as a nine day package to inmates returning from Oberon and to all young offenders at Unit 4 who have a C2 or C3 classification. If the automatic placement of young inmates returning from Oberon at Parklea is maintained, a review of the programs available to them at Unit 4 is urgently needed. A renewed emphasis on (structured) leisure time activities is also desirable to equip those who cannot find employment immediately when released the skills to engage in meaningful and non-offending endeavours.

Many of the staff and inmates in Parklea and Oberon who were interviewed for this evaluation expressed concern about the placement of inmates at Unit 4 after they completed the Oberon component of the specialised YAP irrespective of whether they were able to participate in the external work release program or not. The Oberon Gumang Life Challenge Program provides a true progression from Unit 3 in Parklea with increased program emphasis on personal development, self responsibility and vocational education. But if an inmate is returned to a correctional centre where operations seem to be determined by the requirements of the management challenges posed by a maximum security inmate population, this may not be an appropriate part of a progressively staged program established to ultimately enable young adult offenders to be reintegrated into society. Consideration could be given to establish Unit 4 as an autonomous facility, with selected staff on an independent roster system.

2 STAFFING AT OBERON

The inmates at Oberon are subject for four (4) months to a most detailed organised structured day and program. To keep four courses on track concurrently with very distinct differences in program content and needs is a logistic accomplishment and requires good communication and co-operation among all staff. There seems to be a concerted effort to learn from the experiences with each course and make adaptations accordingly. The demands on the Adventure Based Program Co-ordinator are enormous and the success of the Oberon program hinges to a great degree on this officer's considerable personal skills and commitment.

---

41 It is interesting to note that this pre-release package was developed by one of the Education Officers at Parklea as part of this officer's personal tertiary studies.
3 ROLE OF INDUSTRIES AND EMPLOYMENT

None of the objectives of the Young Adult Offenders Policy as stipulated in the 'green book' deals specifically with the role of Corrective Services Industries (CSI). A general statement about providing "... all young adults with the opportunity for improving/gaining sufficient knowledge, skills, and resources to assist them in surviving lawfully in the community..." is the only reference to training if not vocational training. This is why no performance indicator has been developed to canvass the role of CSI in the YAP, and a systematic analysis of its role within the YAP is not within the scope of this evaluation. It is important to note though, that in the body of the 'green book' the principles of "employment/work skills" and of a "Vocational Program" are outlined.\(^2\)

In the consultations with staff (outside the formally structured interviews) many were critical, not of the operations of CSI per se, but of what they perceived to be a lack of integration of the young adult offenders' employment into the Specialised YAP. Many expressed frustration that the program component (ie, all IDS services) of the specialised YAP "takes a back seat to industry".

The situation in Oberon is different as vocational activities (training and education) are scripted into the Gurnang Life Challenge Program. For example, all participants of the Oberon Program "must complete one vocational course of their choice" and must "apply for work [in CSI and Centre maintenance] through the formal society procedures of résumé, letter of application and interview".\(^3\)

3 A QUESTION OF AMBIENCE

Only in Parklea were inmates (and some staff) concerned that the content of their interviews would not be dealt with in a confidential manner. Even though at the beginning of each interview the process and purpose and the confidentiality of the interviews were explained, many of the inmates interviewed wanted reassurance that they would not be named.

While it is always relatively easy to dismiss inmates' complaints as being part of wanting to 'manipulate the system' for their personal gain and to undermine the security measures designed to stem the influx of illegal substances, for example, it is nevertheless staggering that many inmates at Parklea - not only those formally interviewed - complained of racist treatment.

Issues of race are difficult and complex at the best of times but can become crucial in the volatile environment of a correctional centre. There is little acknowledgment of the fact that staff are increasingly faced with situations on

\(^2\) See pages 14 and 15
\(^3\) Information brochure, The Gurnang Life Challenge, p 3 & 4
a day-to-day basis which require lateral thinking, the ability to consult and an understanding of very diverse cultural and historical backgrounds and possible gang formation. To be able to deal with such difficult circumstances, a personal attitude of goodwill is almost certainly not enough. Specific training in these matters is necessary.

In the middle of last year (1997), a peer education program (Alcohol and Other Drugs) involving a Vietnamese worker from the Fairfield Community Centre had to be cancelled soon after it started. It appears that the demands on this worker were so overwhelming and mostly concerned with issues outside his particular brief, that the program as designed could not go ahead. The worker felt pressurised to deal with these issues as there appeared no staff member available at Parklea to manage the particular concerns of inmates of Asian backgrounds. In his report, the worker from the Fairfield Community Centre stated inter alia that "most participants expressed their feeling of cultural isolation due to the non-availability of ethnic-appropriate workers".

4 STAFF PROFESSIONALISM

All custodial officers (from Prison Officer to Senior Prison Officer) interviewed for this evaluation reported with some pride that they had a "case load". It averaged between six (6) and eight (8) inmates per officer. Many expressed satisfaction about being involved in the Department's case management procedures. Yet, there was no sense that they had an opportunity to really participate in program pathway determinations other than through their case notes. This situation is not in accordance with the explicit directives from the Department's Senior Management. As much as possible, case officers should be involved in case management decisions concerning their "case load" and this requirement needs to be reinforced.44

There appears to exist a significant gap still between staff's theoretical general understanding of the Department's case management (and to a limited degree the Young Adults Program) and their day-to-day work practice and behaviour. It must be of concern that it seems to be still part of the "prison culture" that staff can vent their frustrations by yelling, swearing and using abusive language. In a program such as the specialised YAP, where such emphasis is professed to be placed on assertiveness as opposed to aggression and on self-respect and responsibility rather than low self-esteem, for example, an officer who screams swear words down the corridor of the Works Release Centre can, in the words of one of his colleagues, "undo in one fell blow the work done over weeks of

44 The statement of one officer in Junee seems symptomatic. She was - not as part of her normal work practices - involved in a case management conference and was delighted to be able to contribute to a process which dealt with the situation of one of the inmates who was part of her case load. She said this gave her great job satisfaction and helped her understand what case management really was all about.
programs". It must also be of concern that staff at Unit 4 in Parklea declare that the inmates there have to be "spoken to and treated like children". This is a questionable attitude at the best of times but completely unacceptable at a stage of a specialised program where a focus on mature 'adult' behaviour is not only expected but part of the stated desired program outcomes.

In summary, there is no doubt that the Department's Young Adults Program is based on solid research and policy direction, and that it is an integral part in the implementation of the Department's corporate mission.

Based on the findings of this report, consideration of the following points is recommended:

> Modify stages of the Parklea - Oberon Program

All inmates accepted into the Specialised Program should first be placed at Parklea (as is the practice now with few exceptions) before progressing to Oberon. However, the role of Parklea's Unit 4 within the staged Specialised Program should be reviewed. Under the current structure, a return to Parklea's Work Release Centre after successful completion of the Oberon stage of the Program may not be a true progression in the spirit of the Specialised Program design. A placement in a correctional centre other than Parklea may be a more appropriate case management decision after taking into account individual needs.

An explicit link between the Oberon Program and the mobile camps or (future) projects for Aboriginal inmates in rural areas should be established where it is deemed culturally appropriate.

A further consideration in the proposed modification of stage 4 of the Specialised Program should be the fact that it is unlikely under the current classification rules, that Unit 4 at Parklea can be filled with inmates who have an opportunity to proceed to external work release programs. As additional (minimum security) beds in the metropolitan area are invaluable for the overall operations of the Department, a reassessment of the purpose of Unit 4 at Parklea might be warranted.

> Review Stage 4 of the Specialised Program to ensure the implementation of a detailed structured program for inmates who cannot progress to a C3 security classification

An evaluation of the pre-release program currently 'piloted' at Unit 4 in Parklea can be used as a base for a properly documented program and should be
available to inmates who have completed the Gumang Program. This module of the Specialised Program could also be used at a correctional centre other than Parklea where inmates might be placed after attending the Oberon Program. It is also suggested that access to Parklea’s Unit for its pre-release module of the Specialised Program might be offered to (young) inmates who could not participate in the Oberon stage of the Specialised Program. This is within the spirit of the Young Adults Policy.

If Unit 4 is going to be maintained as Stage 4 of the Specialised YAP, a review of the current roster system should be initiated. Considering the crucial importance of Stage 4 in the overall Specialised Program, a staff selection process for custodial staff should be introduced. This would probably necessitate a separate roster system for Unit 4 at Parklea.

- **Abandon the placement of remandees at Parklea**

The exclusion of remand inmates will allow a review of the ‘hierarchy of privileges and sanctions’ at Parklea. It would give the centre greater scope in the implementation of the two stages of the Specialised Program leading up to participation in the Gumang at Oberon. It would help to ensure that young adult inmates who have been progressing to a lower security category do not have to function within the necessary structures of a maximum security institution as is now the case in Parklea. At present, there might not seem to be enough of a reward for inmates to gain a C1 or C2 classification.

- **Establish a Junior Adventure Based Program Officer’s position at Oberon Correctional Centre**

For several years now, much of Gumang has depended on the expertise and personal commitment of a single member of staff. A new ‘intake’ of inmates arrives at Oberon every month and this particular staff member, more than any other, has to repeatedly take groups of young men through a demanding (physical and mental) regime taking into account their individual fears and doubts whilst at the same time strictly adhering to Departmental security requirements. It is undesirable that a program should depend to such a great degree on a single person, however competent.

- **Ensure that the Specialised Program complies with the Department’s new policy initiatives concerning the ‘through care’ (transitional services) for Inmates**

For example, by establishing/improving information exchange between the Department and Juvenile Justice and, within the Department, between Corrective Services and Probation and Parole, consistency of case management of offenders can be enhanced.
At present there is no formal process which ensures that case notes from the Juvenile Justice Centres can inform the case management process in NSW Correctional Centres unless a young inmate is transferred from a Juvenile Justice Centre to an adult Correctional Centre for the remainder of his custodial sentence. The State Co-ordinator for the YAP (DCS) and the Manager of Juvenile Placements and Transports (JJ) are the official liaison persons between the two Departments when a direct transfer of a young offender occurs. Other than that, most exchange of important case information occurs on an ad hoc basis.

Of more concern must be the comparable situation which exists within the Department itself; while it is recognised that post-release support is vital to decrease the chances of re-offending, the exchange of case information between Corrective Services and Probation and Parole does not seem to function in a systematic manner. For the effectiveness of the YAP, close cooperation between the two functions of the Department seems to be particularly vital.

- Ensure staff (custodial and non-custodial) working specifically with young offenders have an opportunity to undertake appropriate training

  The Specialised Program depends to a very large degree on the skills and attitude of staff. The findings in this report clearly point to a lack of adequate staff training.

- Investigate the possibility of introducing pre-release program modules for young offenders in all NSW Correctional Centres

  A further expansion of pre-release programs as stipulated in the Young Adults Policy is suggested with particular emphasis on the cultural needs of inmates.

- Systematically expand the implementation of the ‘core elements’ of the ‘green book’ in all correctional centres accommodating inmates under the age of 25, and maintain six monthly reporting requirements.

  Many IDS programs offered to inmates in NSW Correctional Centres are - without specifically stating so - in accordance with the ‘core elements’ of the ‘green book’. However, an expansion of the ‘core elements’ in Correctional Centres other than Parklea and Oberon seems only possible when resources dedicated to the Young Adults Program are allocated.

- Revise the current data collection systems so that cross referencing with the age of offenders is easily achieved. In particular, ensure that structures are in place so that the Specialised Program Institutions can provide exact data about the progress of their activities without delay.
For this report, the opinions of the following departmental officers were sought:

- Catriona McComish, ACIM
- Terry Halloran, State Co-ordinator, Young Adult Offenders Program
- Dave Farrell, Regional Commander (formerly Central Region and thus in charge of the specialised program at Parklea)
- John Bromfield and Ron Gibson, Governors of Parklea and Oberon
- Steve Harrison and Jenny Vassallo, ex-Governors of Parklea
- Louise Turner, Program Manager at Parklea
- Christine White, A/Program Manager at Oberon
- Dennis Carey, Adventure Education Co-ordinator, Oberon CC
- Dick Why, A/Deputy, Oberon CC
- Unit 3 Area Manager at Parklea
- SEO at Parklea CC
- Chaplain at Parklea
- Rosemary Caruana, Probation and Parole Service, co-author of the 'blue book', the Department's first specialised Young Offenders Program
- Chris Kenna, Director, Policy - Probation and Parole Service
- Ian Murphy, A/Co-ordinator, Young Adult Offenders staff training, Corrective Services Academy
- Ross Hannah, Director, Corporate Planning and Development Unit
- Karin O'Connell, Policy Officer, WSU
- Simon Eyland, Research Unit
- Barbara Thompson, Research Unit (Recidivism Study)
- Kyleigh Heggy, Research Unit, Home Detention Program
- Simon Corben, Research Unit
- Colleen Subir, Programs Manager, MRRC
- Terry Kelly, A/Programs Manager, Glen Innes Correctional Centre
- Kevin Harris, Juvenile Justice
- Industrial Overseer and First Class Prison Officer, Glen Innes
- Grant Cummins, Management Support Officer, Junee
- Area Manager, Unit 4, Parklea
- Bill Deegan, Deputy Governor, Parklea
- Wayne Simmons, Deputy Governor, Oberon
Memorandum

To: Board of Management Members
From: Director, Executive Support
Date: 19 November 1998

Please find attached papers for additional item under matters arising: Young Adults Program Evaluation Report/Implementation Strategy.

Recommendations: 19.11.98

1. Abandonment of Rwandese at Biriha.
2. Establishment of a Junior Aged Child Training Based Program Office.
3. Review Observed's current staffing levels.
4. Data collection system.
5. Implementation of a Health Service Through a Policy.
6. Develop hiring strategy for staff working in Specialized Program.
7. Review a comprehensive research strategy.

Please discuss.

[Signature]

20.11.98

[Signature]

We meet soon.

[Signature]

Iwa Lulce
The Steering Committee which was established to oversee the evaluation of the Department's Young Adults Program was reconvened on Wednesday, 11 November 1998 to respond to the Board of Management's request to provide an implementation strategy for the recommendations in the Evaluation Report.

The Committee considered all the issues raised in the briefing paper to SACICS from the State Co-ordinator, Young Adults Program and agreed on the attached implementation strategy.

1. Ross Hannah, DCPDU  
2. Catriona McComish, AGM  
3. Board of Management

13/11/98  
16 November 1998
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation - Young Adults Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Review the role of</td>
<td>temporarily suspended because of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Parklea Correctional</td>
<td>pressures due to increased inmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre in the</td>
<td>numbers; to be considered in light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of the</td>
<td>of overall strategy to manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised Young Adults</td>
<td>metropolitan remand inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>stage 4 of the Specialised Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adults Program is no longer to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>linked to Unit 4 at the Parklea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correctional Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A/State Co-ordinator, YAP, convene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a working party to devise strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the implementation of Stage 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and submit report to Board of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management's February meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Commander, North-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region, Parklea Management and CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to devise employment strategy (eg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expansion of local industries) for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parklea Unit 4 inmates and submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report to Board of Management's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish Junior Adventure Based Program Officer at Oberon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Defer decisions about other staffing matters at Oberon until NOELS evaluation is finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Revise the current data collection systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Ensure that Specialised Young Adults Program complies with new policy initiatives re transitional services and through care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Develop a training strategy for staff in the Specialised Young Adults Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>review draft document already submitted by Oberon Management listing the technical skills needed in the Gurnag Life Challenge Program to devise local staff training strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Expand the terms of reference of the current recidivism studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The performance indicators guiding the evaluation of the Department's Young Adults Program (YAP) were derived from the objectives prescribed in the Department's policy document Managing Young Adults in NSW Correctional Centres (the 'green book'). Particular attention was given to the Specialised Young Adults Program which is currently operating in 5 stages from the Parklea and Oberon Correctional Centres.

(1) The evaluation found that the YAP covering inmates between 18 and 25 years of age is based on solid research and policy direction. It is worth noting that, as the implementation of the core elements of the YAP stipulated in the 'green book' must be achieved without any additional resource allocations, correctional centres perform well in taking the specific needs of young inmates into consideration. It appears that individual correctional centres vary in the degree to which they are incorporating the core elements outlined in the 'green book' into the 'mainstream' of their inmate development services. Young adult offenders have opportunities to participate in courses/programs which meet the aims set out in the core elements of the 'green book' but which are not specifically identified as programs for young adults. It is argued that it is counterproductive in practice to 'put the spotlight' on one particular group of inmates.

(2) Stage 5 of the Specialised YAP (Post-Discharge) is currently the least developed. In light of the Department's new policy initiative which deals with transitional services and through care this is expected to change but needs specific policy and procedural development in co-operation with Probation and Parole.

(3) As far as the Specialised YAP is concerned, Unit 4 at Parklea is not operating in a manner which ensures the implementation of stage 4. Under the current structure, a return to the Parklea Work Release Centre (Unit 4) after completion of the Oberon program stage does not permit a true progression in the spirit of the Specialised YAP for the following reasons:

- Not all young adult offenders are or will be eligible to participate in external programs (eg, work release) as their minimum or fixed term sentence length will preclude them from progressing to a C3 security classification. They might spend only a very short time at Unit 4 before being released from full-time custody. After a highly-structured, activity intensive stay at Oberon, a return to Parklea (Unit 4) without having to participate in further specifically developed pre-release programs or work release duties, much of the good work undertaken at Oberon might come undone. It is important to note in this context that Unit 4 at Parklea is designed as a work release centre, ie, its physical layout is not conducive to catering for inmates who spend most of the day within its confined boundaries but who may be eligible for post release programs or other minimum security activities.
- As minimum security beds in the metropolitan area are sought after for the efficient operations of the Department, it is undesirable that a 88 bed facility is not utilised to its full capacity. For example, on 30 April 1998, only 54 inmates (49 young adults and 5 members of the 'adult nucleus') resided at Unit 4. Of those only 9 were participating in external programs (ie, work release). The following Monday (4 May 1998), 9 inmates were expected back from Oberon; two of these were members of the 'adult nucleus'. It appeared that only 4 might progress to external programs.

- It can be argued that a young inmate who has completed the first 3 stages of the Specialised YAP, could participate in the next stage of the program without automatically being placed in a gaol specifically for young adult offenders. Depending on the length of the remainder of his full-time sentence, placements other than in Unit 4 might be more relevant, for example, in the Work Release Centre at Silverwater, the Transitional Centre at John Moroney, or the mobile camps.

(4) To keep four concurrent courses on track in Oberon, each with very distinct differences in program content and needs, is a logistic accomplishment and requires good communication and co-operation among all staff. There seems to be a concerted effort to learn from the experiences with each course and make adaptations accordingly. The demands on the Adventure Based Program Co-ordinator are enormous and the success of the Oberon program hinges to a great degree on this co-ordinator's considerable personal skills and commitment.

(5) It appears that the inclusion of remand inmates at Parklea stifles the scope of stage 2 of the Specialised Program. This stage includes sentenced inmates in Unit 2 and Unit 3, the latter being for those classified with a minimum security rating and who are in preparation for the Oberon component (stage 3). At present, there seem to be insufficient rewards for inmates who gain a C1 or C2 classification as they still have to function within the structures and policies of a maximum security institution prescribed by the presence of remand inmates.

(5) A review of budget information obtained from the Finance Branch shows that in comparison of cost per inmate per year, the Oberon and Parklea Correctional Centres in particular receive a considerable allocation of resources not available to other gaols of comparable security classification and inmate numbers.

(7) Although one of the stated objectives of the YAP stipulates that "appropriate management and information systems [are established] to enable access to relevant data, eg, demographic; educational etc.", statistics pertaining to young adults in NSW correctional centres are not easily available. There appears to be a great expectation that this situation will change significantly with the introduction of the new IDS data base and the Correctional Centre Monthly Report.

(8) The training course at the Academy dealing with issues relating to young adult offenders was introduced in 1996. Since then, 196 members of staff have completed the course. It is still the case, that not all officers working in the
Specialised YAP have completed the course and staff selection for the Specialised YAP remains an issue. The success of a structured program such as the Specialised YAP involving the co-operation of two correctional centres depends to a very large degree on the professional attitude and skills of staff. It is therefore of concern that none of the custodial staff interviewed at Parklea said that they were working at this Correctional Centre because they wanted to work with young offenders.

The content of the training course at the Academy was not part of the evaluation of the YAP, yet it has become quite clear that additional training is necessary for staff working with young adults, particularly around issues of gang related violence and issues of race.

(9) The selection criteria for the Specialised YAP are sufficiently flexible to ensure access of all young adults deemed eligible through the normal case management processes.
RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, there is no doubt that the Department's Young Adults Program is based on solid research and policy direction. In no small measure this must be attributed to the work of the State Co-ordinator for the YAP. The YAP forms an integral part in the implementation of the Department's corporate mission.

Based on the findings of this report, the Evaluation Steering Committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) Review the role of the Parklea Correctional Centre in the implementation of the Specialised YAP by considering:

- abandonment of the placement of remandees at Parklea

  (The Steering Committee recognises the practical difficulties at least in the short-term, in removing remandees from Parklea and acknowledges the changes which have been implemented already to ensure improved operations in this area.)

- modification of stage 4 of the Specialised YAP operating at Unit 4.

As a firm recommendation concerning the operations of Unit 4 is outside the YAP evaluation, the Steering Committee submits the following options for consideration to ensure maximum use of this minimum security facility:

- only those young adult offenders who have completed the Oberon component and who are eligible for external programs to be placed at Unit 4;

- any inmate - irrespective of his age - with a C3 security rating to be included in the Unit 4 program through the normal case management/program pathway processes;

- further development of on-site employment for inmates residing at Unit 4 to be undertaken;

- a review of the program requirements of Unit 4 inmates to be initiated conscious of the fact that the physical environment of this Unit at present is not conducive to facilitate the needs of inmates who are not participating in external programs.

In addition, improve the efficiency of the Parklea operations by increasing the number of inmates not necessarily part of the Specialised YAP.
(2) Establish a Junior Adventure Based Program Officer at the Oberon Correctional Centre.

A review of the staffing levels for Oberon which is already foreshadowed should strive to achieve a cost neutral outcome in establishing this position.

(3) Defer other decisions concerning staffing levels/arrangements at Oberon until the NOELS evaluation is finalised.

The Steering Committee would like to ‘flag’ the following human resource management areas for consideration in the final decision:

- equity issues as far as the remuneration of the Adventure Based Program Co-ordinator and custodial staff attending ‘camps’ are concerned;

- increased involvement of the Oberon IDS staff in the outdoor components of the Program.

(4) Revise the current data collection systems so that cross referencing with the DOB of inmates can be easily achieved. In particular, implement procedures so that the correctional centres facilitating the Specialised YAP can provide exact data about the progress of their activities without delay.

(5) Ensure that the Specialised YAP complies with the Department’s new policy initiatives concerning transitional services and through care.

(6) Develop a training strategy for staff involved in the Specialised YAP to enhance

- cultural awareness and sensitivity, and

- the case management of young adult offenders.

Review Young Offenders Staff Training Course at the Academy with an emphasis on competency based training models, module development, follow-up structures in the Regions and individual correctional centres, and ongoing professional development for staff employed in the Specialised YAP.

(7) Devise a comprehensive research strategy for the Specialised YAP to expand the terms of reference of the current recidivism studies to include the development of instruments to gauge attitudinal change in participating young offenders.
MEMORANDUM

TO: L. Rist
    Senior Projects Officer
    C.P.D.U.

FROM: R. Gibson
       Governor
       OYACC

SUBJECT: Response from Governor OYACC

DATE: 13 August, 1998

cc: T. Halloran - State Co-ordinator, Young Offender Program.
Lioba Rist  
Senior Projects Officer  
C.P.D.U.

Lioba,

I apologise for the delay in forwarding a response to you regarding the Evaluation Steering Committee report to the Board of Management, however I needed to fully analyse and discuss the findings with staff.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS.

1) This recommendation is supported.

2) This recommendation is supported.

3) This recommendation is supported.

4) This recommendation is supported.

5) This recommendation is supported.

6) This recommendation is supported, however the scope of this training strategy must evaluate the diverse needs of specialised programs such as conducted at OYACC.

A Specific Training Plan for O.Y.A.C.C. was submitted in 1995 (copy attached) which will require updating, but should be used as a basis for any review at OYACC.

Secondly a training syllabus was submitted to the Corrective Services Academy in 1993/94 but was never acted upon due to there being no National Association with the accreditation Competencies to assess and establish a training program.

The training program developed at OYACC outlined a syllabus for training competencies required by staff engaged in Adventure Based Experiential program delivery. (NP) This syllabus needs to be re-written as the National Standards are yet to be formalised by the new national body the Outdoor Recreation Council of Australia Inc, ORCA.

7) This recommendation is supported.
RESPONSE TO SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.

In principal this report is accepted, however, the management of OYACC consider that clarification and further submissions from OYACC could have made an impact on the presentation of the summary of findings.

1) Agree with summary.

2) Agree with summary

3) Accept this summation with the following notes:

   Classification Policy
   Sentence Length
   Inmate Population Numbers
   Centre Vacancies.

will all impact upon where an inmate is classified to.

It should also be noted that inmates participating on the Mobile Camps must also have a C3 Security Status, and unless consideration is given to reviewing this requirement all C3 eligible inmates who are Young Offenders will be recommended to be placed in the centre housing Young Adults Parklea.

4) Agree with summary.

5) Agree with summary.

6) Management of OYACC suggest a review of the figures attributed to OYACC. Recent figures from Finance Branch would suggest that the figures quoted in the attachment are not correct and should read:

Oberon $34,547.60 using finance branch’s stats.
Oberon $34,202( using centre statistics). This is due to the actual inmates state being approximately 9 inmates higher per day for the past financial year 1997/98.

Finance Branch stats indicate an Actual State of 93.06
The report uses a base of 85
OYACC stats indicate a yearly average state of 94.0 inmates.

7) Support this summary of findings.

8) The management of the centre consider that Recruitment and Training of staff for the specialised programs is an issue that has not been adequately dealt with in this report.

The current practice of Custodial Recruiting does not give the centre the flexibility it requires to conduct the broad range of developmental programs due to limitations set by generic post duties and staff who did not apply for a developmental program based upon
skills other than required for generic custodial recruitment.

Staff who participate in the specialised programs at OYACC do ‘volunteer’ however, it has always been the aim of the program designers to expand the boundaries of case management to ensure that where practical, suitably qualified and trained staff engaged in the ‘global’ program and did not just engage in case management and generic custodial duties.

Staff who participate in the program do perform duties which are specialised i.e. camps - co-ops. The design of the Roster, and post duties was intended to reflect the policy contained in the Green Book (see Sect 4 (e) Managing Young Adult Offenders in NSW Correctional Centres, page 6).

This centres management also considers a review of the C.S.A.Young Offender training Course for at the Academy is essential.

9) Agree with this summary.

R. Gibson
Governor
OYACC
to: Evaluation Steering Committee YAP
from: Lioba Rist - CPDU 9289 1257
subject: Recommendations to the Board of Management
date:

Please find attached
- the document to be submitted to the Board of Management which I have revised in accordance with the discussions in the Steering Committee meeting at Oberon (28 May 1998), and
- the minutes of the Oberon meeting.
To: The Board of Management

From: Evaluation Steering Committee
Young Adults Program

Catriona McComish, ACIM
Ross Hannah, DCPDU
Ken Middlebrook, Regional Commander
John Bromfield, Governor, Parklea CC
Ron Gibson, Governor, Oberon CC
Terry Halloran, State Co-ordinator, YAP

SUBJECT: Evaluation of the Young Adults Program (YAP)
Findings and Recommendations

Date:

At its meeting on 28 May 1998, the Evaluation Steering Committee for the evaluation of the Young Adults Program finalised its deliberations and agreed to submit the attached recommendations to the Board of Management.

Lioba Rist
Senior Projects Officer, CPDU
SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF YOUNG ADULTS PROGRAM
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BACKGROUND:

The Corporate Planning and Development Unit (CPDU) co-ordinated the evaluation of the Department's Young Adults Program (YAP) in conjunction with an Evaluation Steering Committee comprising ACIM, DCPDU, Regional Commander (North-West Region), the Governors of the Parklea and Oberon Correctional Centres and the YAP State Co-ordinator.

At its last meeting on 28 May 1998, the Steering Committee finalised its deliberations based on the Evaluation Report provided by the CPDU and agreed on the recommendations outlined below.

EVALUATION PROCESS:

The performance indicators guiding the evaluation were derived from the objectives prescribed in the Department's policy document Managing Young Adults in NSW Correctional Centres (the 'green book'). Particular attention was given to the Specialised Young Adults Program which is currently operating in 5 stages from the Parklea and Oberon Correctional Centres.

Following consultations with Departmental staff involved with the YAP, formal interviews were carried out with 49 staff (33 custodial and 16 non-custodial officers) and 58 young adult offenders (including 6 members of the 'adult nucleus') at the Parklea, Oberon, Mannus, Junee, Glen Innes and Cessnock Correctional Centres.

The Department's Women's Program was explicitly excluded from the evaluation of the YAP. The gender specific classification system for women stipulates different Departmental processes for program design and reporting mechanisms.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS:

(1) The evaluation found that the Department's Young Adults Program covering inmates between 18 and 25 years of age is based on solid research and policy direction. In no small measure this must be attributed to the work of the State Coordinator for the YAP. It is also worth noting that, as the implementation of the core elements of the YAP stipulated in the 'green book' must be achieved without any additional resource allocations, correctional centres perform well in taking the specific needs of young inmates into consideration. It appears that individual correctional centres vary in the degree to which they are incorporating the core elements outlined in the 'green book' into the 'mainstream' of their inmate development services. Young adult offenders have opportunities to participate in
courses/programs which meet the aims set out in the core elements of the ‘green book’ but which are not specifically identified as programs for young adults. It is argued that it is counterproductive in practice to ‘put the spotlight’ on one particular group of inmates.

(2) Stage 5 of the Specialised YAP (Post-Discharge) is currently the least developed. In light of the Department’s new policy initiative which deals with transitional services and through care this is expected to change but needs specific policy and procedural development in co-operation with Probation and Parole.

(3) As far as the Specialised YAP is concerned, Unit 4 at Parklea is not operating in a manner which ensures the implementation of stage 4. Under the current structure, a return to the Parklea Work Release Centre (Unit 4) after completion of the Oberon program stage does not permit a true progression in the spirit of the Specialised YAP for the following reasons:

- Not all young adult offenders are or will be eligible to participate in external programs (eg, work release) as their minimum or fixed term sentence length will preclude them from progressing to a C3 security classification. They might spend only a very short time at Unit 4 before being released from full-time custody. After a highly structured, activity intensive stay at Oberon, a return to Parklea (Unit 4) without having to participate in further specifically developed pre-release programs or work release duties, much of the good work undertaken at Oberon might come undone. It is important to note in this context, that Unit 4 at Parklea is designed as a work release centre, ie, its physical layout is not conducive to catering for inmates who spend most of the day within its confined boundaries but who may be eligible for post release programs or other minimum security activities.

- As minimum security beds in the metropolitan area are sought after for the efficient operations of the Department, it is undesirable that a 88 bed facility is not utilised to its full capacity. For example, on 30 April 1998, only 54 inmates (49 young adults and 5 members of the ‘adult nucleus’) resided at Unit 4. Of those only 9 were participating in external programs (ie, work release). The following Monday (4 May 1998), 9 inmates were expected back from Oberon; two of these were members of the ‘adult nucleus’. It appeared that only 4 might progress to external programs.

- It can be argued that a young inmate who has completed the first 3 stages of the Specialised YAP, can participate in the next stage of the program without being automatically placed in a gaol specifically for young adult offenders. Depending on the length of the remainder of his full-time sentence, placements other than Unit 4 might be more relevant, for example, the Work Release Centre at Silverwater, the Transitional Centre at John Moroney, or the mobile camps.

(4) To keep four concurrent courses on track in Oberon, each with very distinct differences in program content and needs, is a logistic accomplishment and requires good communication and co-operation among all staff. There seems to be
a concerted effort to learn from the experiences with each course and make adaptations accordingly. The demands on the Adventure Based Program Co-ordinator are enormous and the success of the Oberon program hinges to a great degree on this co-ordinator’s considerable personal skills and commitment.

(5) It appears that the inclusion of remand inmates at Parklea stifles the scope of stage 2 of the Specialised Program. This stage includes sentenced inmates in Unit 2 and Unit 3, the latter being for those classified with a minimum security rating and who are in preparation for the Oberon component (stage 3). At present, there seems insufficient rewards for inmates who gain a C1 or C2 classification as they still have to function within the structures and policies of a maximum security institution prescribed by the presence of remand inmates.

(6) A review of budget information obtained from the Finance Branch shows that in comparison of cost per inmate per year, the Oberon CC and the Parklea CC in particular receive a considerable allocation of resources not available to other gaols of comparable security classification and inmate numbers. (See attachment for details.)

(7) Although one of the stated objectives of the YAP stipulates that “appropriate management and information systems [are established] to enable access to relevant data, eg, demographic; educational etc.”, statistics pertaining to young adults in NSW correctional centres are not easily available. There appears to be a great expectation that this situation will change significantly with the introduction of the new IDS data base and the Correctional Centre Monthly Report.

(8) The training course at the Academy dealing with issues relating to young adult offenders was introduced in 1996. Since then, 196 members of staff have completed the course. It is still the case, that not all officers working in the Specialised YAP have completed the course and staff selection for the Specialised YAP remains an issue. The success of a structured program such as the Specialised YAP involving the co-operation of two correctional centres depends to a very large degree on the professional attitude and skills of staff. It is therefore of concern that none of the custodial staff interviewed at Parklea said that they were working at this Correctional Centre because they wanted to work with young offenders.

The content of the training course at the Academy was not part of the evaluation of the YAP, yet it has become quite clear that additional training is necessary for staff working with young adults, particularly around issues of gang related violence and issues of race.

(9) The selection criteria for the Specialised YAP are sufficiently flexible to ensure access of all young adults deemed eligible through the normal case management processes.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Evaluation Steering Committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) Review the role of the Parklea Correctional Centre in the implementation of the Specialised YAP by considering:

- abandonment of the placement of remandees at Parklea

  (The Steering Committee recognises the practical difficulties at least in the short-term, in removing remandees from Parklea and acknowledges the changes which have been implemented already to ensure improved operations in this area.)

- modification of stage 4 of the Specialised YAP operating at Unit 4.

  As a firm recommendation concerning the operations of Unit 4 is outside the YAP evaluation, the Steering Committee submits the following options for consideration to ensure maximum use of this minimum security facility:

  - only those young adult offenders who have completed the Oberon component and who are eligible for external programs to be placed at Unit 4;

  - any inmate - irrespective of his age - with a C3 security rating to be included in the Unit 4 program through the normal case management/program pathway processes;

  - further development of on-site employment for inmates residing at Unit 4 to be undertaken;

  - a review of the program requirements of Unit 4 inmates to be initiated conscious of the fact that the physical environment of this Unit at present is not conducive to facilitate the needs of inmates who are not participating in external programs.

In addition, improve the efficiency of the Parklea operations by increasing the number of inmates not necessarily part of the Specialised YAP.

(2) Establish a Junior Adventure Based Program Officer at the Oberon Correctional Centre.

A review of the staffing levels for Oberon which is already foreshadowed should strive to achieve a cost neutral outcome in establishing this position.

(3) Defer other decisions concerning staffing levels/arrangements at Oberon until the NOELS evaluation is finalised.
The Steering Committee would like to ‘flag’ the following human resource management areas for consideration in the Board’s final decision:
- equity issues as far as the remuneration of the Adventure Based Program Co-ordinator and custodial staff attending ‘camps’ are concerned;
- increased involvement of the Oberon IDS staff in the outdoor components of the Program.

(4) Revise the current data collection systems so that cross referencing with the DOB of inmates can be easily achieved. In particular, implement procedures so that the correctional centres facilitating the Specialised YAP can provide exact data about the progress of their activities without delay.

(5) Ensure that the Specialised YAP complies with the Department’s new policy initiatives concerning transitional services and through care.

(6) Develop a training strategy for staff involved in the Specialised YAP to enhance
- cultural awareness and sensitivity, and
- the case management of young adult offenders.

Review Young Offenders Staff Training Course at the Academy with an emphasis on competency based training models, module development, follow-up structures in Regions and individual correctional centres and ongoing professional development for staff employed in the Specialised YAP.

(7) Devise a comprehensive research strategy for the Specialised YAP to expand the terms of reference of the current recidivism studies to include the development of instruments to gauge attitudinal change in participating young offenders.
RESOURCES ALLOCATION FOR THE SPECIALISED YOUNG ADULTS PROGRAM

A review of budget information obtained from the Finance Branch clearly shows that in a comparison of cost per inmate per year, the Oberon and Parklea Correctional Centres receive a considerable amount of resources not available to other gaols of comparable security classification and inmate numbers.

For the purpose of this evaluation, Oberon was compared with Glen Innes and Parklea was compared with Bathurst. The following picture emerges:

In Bathurst (320 average inmates per day), the inmate to staff ratio is 1.97 while in Parklea (294 average inmates per day) is more staff intensive with a ratio of 1.26. In Bathurst the inmate to custodial staff ratio is 2.83 and in Parklea only 1.67. The inmate to IDS staff ratio in Bathurst is 25.6 and in Parklea in significant difference, only 19.6.

Glen Innes (115 average inmates per day), has an inmate to staff ratio of 2.91 while Oberon (85 average inmates per day) shows the ratio as only 1.85. The inmate to custodial staff ratio in Glen Innes is 5.75 and in Oberon only 2.83; the inmate to IDS staff ratio in Glen Innes stands at 28.75 whereas in Oberon it is only 17.0.

Based on the year end revised budget figures for 1997, Bathurst was allocated $34,200 per inmate per annum; Parklea received $49,575, Oberon $38,105 and Glen Innes $25,739 per inmate per annum.

If Oberon and Parklea are running a specialised program which goes beyond the ‘normal’ requirements of inmate management in NSW, and this necessitates such increased level of resource allocation, the Department must examine, for example, what duties custodial officers in both centres have to carry out which they would not have to include in their duty statements if they were employed in one of the Department’s ‘main-stream’ institutions.

Research for the evaluation of the Young Adults Program was unable to identify any ‘additional duties’ custodial officers have to carry out in the Specialised Program which are beyond those listed in the generic post descriptions used for all of the Department’s custodial staff.

If custodial officers participate in the ‘camps’ in Oberon, for example, it should be noted, that they do so in a voluntary capacity. This does not mean, however, that they participate in their own time. They do so during their working hours and for this they receive an extra allowance. In addition to this increased expense, the Oberon Correctional Centre still has to cover the posts ‘vacated’ by custodial officers participating in a ‘camp’.
Considering the classification structure at, and the physical layout of, the Parklea Correctional Centre (for example, inmates accommodated in Unit 2 are not permitted to mix with inmates in Unit 3), a higher IDS and/or custodial staff ratio, compared to other institutions, might be justified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>av inmate no p/d</th>
<th>inmate/staff ratio</th>
<th>inmate/cust staff ratio</th>
<th>inmate/IDS staff ratio</th>
<th>$ per inmate p/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>34,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklea</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>49,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberon</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>38,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Innes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>25,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that in the above comparison, the staffing and budget allocations for the Bathurst and Glen Innes Correctional Centres are not considered benchmark figures. It is impossible to compare the Oberon Program with any program in Australia which is similar in its purpose as there is no comparable other. As the YAP is classified as a specialised program, a comparison with another of the Department’s specialised programs might be more relevant. However, such a comparison again can set only nominal benchmarks as the programs compared are vastly different from each other and they share only their status of being “specialised”.

By implementing a specific program for young adults, the Department implicitly acknowledges that the management of this particular age group of inmates should draw additional resources.
EVALUATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Young Adults Program

MEETING  28 MAY 1998 AT OBERON

Present:  Catriona McComish, ACIM
           Ross Hannah, DCPDU
           Ken Middlebrook, Regional Commander
           John Bromfield, Governor, Parklea CC
           Ron White, Deputy, Oberon CC
           Terry Halloran, State Co-ordinator YAP
           Lioba Rist, CPDU

Apologies: Ron Gibson, Governor, Oberon CC

1. Tabled: Draft document (including recommendations) summarising the results of the evaluation to be submitted to Board of Management

2. Discussion:
   ▶ recommendation concerning recidivism studies to be added
   ▶ recommendation concerning data collection:
     - identify who has responsibility for data collection
     - develop instruments to gauge attitudinal change in young offenders on the Specialised Program
     - build on six monthly reports submitted to State Co-ordinator
   ▶ recommendation concerning remandees at Parklea CC
     - Steering Committee recognises the practical difficulties, at least in the short-term, in taking remandees out of Parklea and acknowledges:
       - changes already implemented, eg, inmates identified as suitable for the Specialised YAP already short-listed at the MRRC (Parklea Program Manager screens short-listed remandees at MRRC)
       - remandees managed in two distinct groups/units at Parklea with good results (before long-term remands posed difficult management issues)
       - no placement of remandees is still the Committee's preferred option
       - develop objective criteria for the placement of remandees at Parklea CC
recommendation concerning function of Unit 4 at Parklea:
- ensure improved case management at Oberon to ensure that only inmates suitable for the work release centre are transferred to Unit 4
- include specific options for the use of Unit 4 in Parklea

recommendation concerning staffing levels at Parklea and Oberon
- address equity issues in the remuneration of the Adventure Based Education Co-ordinator and custodial staff participating in the ‘camps’
- IDS staff to be more involved in the adventure based program component

recommendation concerning staff training
- all staff need to understand what YAP is trying to achieve
- YAP course at the Academy to be reviewed with emphasis of competency based training models, module development, follow-up in the Regions and individual centres, ongoing professional development

recommendation concerning access to Specialised Program
- Program Managers in centres other than Parklea and Oberon to be better equipped to select young inmates for the Specialised YAP
- improve initial case planning/program pathway planning.

3. Actions:

draft document/recommendations to be revised in light of discussion; circulated to members of Steering Committee; after inclusion of feedback to be forwarded to Board of Management’s July meeting;

recommendation concerning Stage 5 of the Specialised Program (as circulated to members of the Steering Committee prior to Oberon meeting) to be implemented.
EVALUATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Young Adults Program

MEETING - 28 MAY 1998 AT OBERON

Present:  Catriona McComish, ACIM  
          Ross Hannah, DCPDU  
          Ken Middlebrook, Regional Commander  
          John Bromfield, Governor, Parklea CC  
          Ron White, Deputy, Oberon CC  
          Terry Halloran, State Co-ordinator YAP  
          Lioba Rist, CPDU

Apologies: Ron Gibson, Governor, Oberon CC

1. Tabled: Draft document (including recommendations) summarising the results of the evaluation to be submitted to Board of Management

2. Discussion:
   - recommendation concerning recidivism studies to be added
   - recommendation concerning data collection:
     - identify who has responsibility for data collection
     - develop instruments to gauge attitudinal change in young offenders on the Specialised Program
     - build on six monthly reports submitted to State Co-ordinator
   - recommendation concerning remandees at Parklea CC
     - Steering Committee recognises the practical difficulties, at least in the short-term, in taking remandees out of Parklea and acknowledges:
       - changes already implemented, eg, inmates identified as suitable for the Specialised YAP already short-listed at the MRRC (Parklea Program Manager screens short-listed remandees at MRRC)
       - remandees managed in two distinct groups/units at Parklea with good results (before long-term remands posed difficult management issues)
       - no placement of remandees is still the Committee's preferred option
       - develop objective criteria for the placement of remandees at Parklea CC
recommendation concerning function of Unit 4 at Parklea:
- ensure improved case management at Oberon to ensure that only inmates suitable for the work release centre are transferred to Unit 4
- include specific options for the use of Unit 4 in Parklea

recommendation concerning staffing levels at Parklea and Oberon
- address equity issues in the remuneration of the Adventure Based Education Co-ordinator and custodial staff participating in the ‘camps’
- IDS staff to be more involved in the adventure based program component

recommendation concerning staff training
- all staff need to understand what YAP is trying to achieve
- YAP course at the Academy to be reviewed with emphasis of competency based training models, module development, follow-up in the Regions and individual centres, ongoing professional development

recommendation concerning access to Specialised Program
- Program Managers in centres other than Parklea and Oberon to be better equipped to select young inmates for the Specialised YAP
- improve initial case planning/program pathway planning.

3. Actions:

- draft document/recommendations to be revised in light of discussion; circulated to members of Steering Committee; after inclusion of feedback to be forwarded to Board of Management’s July meeting;

- recommendation concerning Stage 5 of the Specialised Program (as circulated to members of the Steering Committee prior to Oberon meeting) to be implemented.